

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL

PUBLIC MEETING

DAY 1 - VOLUME I

PAGES 1-157

LOCATION:

Marriot Providence

1 Orms Street

Providence, Rhode Island 02904

Acting Chair: Ed Welch

Vice Chair: Ed Welch

May 5, 2010

8:33 a.m. - 5:55 p.m.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 ED WELCH: Good morning. Does this seem
3 to be on or not? Try this.

4 (Pause.)

5 ED WELCH: I am challenged. Apparently on
6 some of these you have to push the button and
7 hold the button while you talk.

8 So good morning. I'm Ed Welch. This is
9 the Hydrographic Services Review Panel for the
10 National Oceanic and Atmospheric
11 Administration.

12 We're having one of our generally two
13 meetings per year. We're delighted to have all
14 in attendance from the panel from NOAA and from
15 the general public. So welcome.

16 When we scheduled this meeting, we did not
17 anticipate the various demands on NOAA that
18 were going to be occurring concurrently, the
19 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, the -- a
20 congressional hearing later on this week. This
21 has caused the NOAA planning staff who work for
22 the HSRP to have to scramble to preserve our
23 agenda and accommodate the needs of some of the
24 people that had hoped to be with us who have to

1 go elsewhere, but I want to thank Kathy Watson
2 and her colleagues for responding very well to
3 daily changes in the program.

4 We typically as part of our meeting have a
5 public comment period where anybody that wants
6 to make some remarks to us will be able to do
7 so. We encourage people to do that. If you
8 want to do that, we'd like for you to sign in
9 on the sheet outside in the front, although
10 that's not necessary, but it does help us
11 figure out how many people we're likely to hear
12 from.

13 The HSRP is a Federal Advisory Committee,
14 a FACA committee, to use government speak, and
15 our mission, as set by statute, is to review
16 and advise the NOAA leadership on various
17 aspects of NOAA's hydrographic services, and so
18 that's the mission that we find ourselves in.

19 This panel several years ago produced a
20 report to the NOAA leadership called the
21 Most-Wanted Navigation Services Improvements,
22 and we are on the verge of updating that
23 report, renewing it and perhaps bringing it up
24 to date so that we can submit it to the current

1 administration.

2 I'd like to acknowledge the presence here
3 of our physically-healed chairman emeritus, Tom
4 Skinner, who, despite all of our efforts, is
5 clinging to the status of chair emeritus.

6 Welcome back, Tom.

7 And with that, I think I will recognize
8 Captain John Lowell to go through some opening
9 remarks and some opening organizational aspects
10 of our meeting.

11 John.

12 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Thank you, Ed.

13 As Ed said, my name's Captain John Lowell.
14 I believe I've met everybody here, maybe not
15 everybody in the gallery yet, but I'm the new
16 designated federal official for this particular
17 panel.

18 I'm very happy to be here working with
19 everybody. I've been -- attended several of
20 the meetings in the past in other capacities,
21 and I'm looking forward to the next -- for the
22 next several years, I hope.

23 With that said, a couple of administrative
24 things. Everybody should be aware that in an

1 emergency, there's our main exit, is the door
2 we came in.

3 There's also bathrooms right on the right
4 as you go out, so at any time you feel the
5 need, help yourself.

6 As Ed mentioned, this is a FACA, which is
7 specifically chartered in law to provide
8 information on the hydrographic services that
9 NOAA provides. And the biggest body of work
10 that we've seen so far has been the five
11 most-wanted that came out in 2007, I believe.

12 So I know we've had a lot of progress on
13 the refresh there, but as we head down the
14 final lap of that particular refresh, it will
15 be very useful for the FACA members here to go
16 through the next two days to see where NOAA is
17 headed.

18 There's a lot of new things happening, as
19 everyone is aware of. So we have a couple of
20 distinguished speakers. We hope to -- that
21 everybody will understand the direction that
22 NOAA is headed at a high level and hopefully
23 through the FACA itself and the hydrographic
24 services we provide, kind of see how the NAV

1 services fit into the broader picture as we
2 move forward.

3 So I actually had a few other things to
4 say that were written down that I was supposed
5 to say, and I have lost the sheet that Kathy
6 worked up for me, so I apologize for that.

7 I would like to mention, as Ed did, that
8 the agenda has been in flux pretty much every
9 day, every hour for the last several weeks. So
10 some of the topics on it we might be a little
11 bit out of order and some of the topics might
12 change in thrust slightly, but please bear with
13 us on that. We'll just go with the flow on
14 that.

15 So with that said, I'd like to go ahead
16 and introduce -- oh, got a few more things to
17 say.

18 All right. Well, with that said, I'll
19 turn the mike back over to Ed.

20 ED WELCH: Thank you, Captain.

21 First of all, I'd like to introduce Jill,
22 our court reporter over there. And I would
23 encourage folks, please speak into the
24 microphone when you recognize -- and speak into

1 a working microphone, not what I did.

2 Secondly, if you would at least for a
3 while, let's introduce ourselves each time we
4 speak so that Jill can get it right.

5 She says I speak slow, like a southerner,
6 and that's good. Some of you all speak a
7 little bit more fast, and so you may need to
8 take that into account.

9 Also, I think we've got time to do this,
10 because we have several folks here who are
11 speakers to us and from the NOAA leadership who
12 don't know all of us, I think I'd like to take
13 a moment if we could just go around the room,
14 probably start with Andy Armstrong, if the
15 members could introduce themselves, and let's
16 just have everybody introduce themselves.

17 I think we've got time to do it. We'll go
18 around, do the table, and then we can have our
19 guests introduce themselves, too. I think it's
20 good so that we all know who we all are.

21 So Andy, please.

22 ANDY ARMSTRONG: Andy Armstrong. I'm the
23 NOAA -- co-director of the NOAA University of
24 New Hampshire Joint Hydrographic Center.

1 CAPTAIN ANDY MCGOVERN: Andrew McGovern,
2 Sandy Hook Pilots of New York.

3 JON DASLER: Jon Dasler. I'm with David
4 Evans and Associates. We're a NOAA contractor
5 with the Hydrographic Services Division.

6 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Juliana Blackwell,
7 director of the National Geodetic Survey.

8 GARY JEFFRESS: Gary Jeffress, I'm a
9 professor at Texas A&M University, Corpus
10 Christi. We run the Texas Coastal Ocean
11 Observation Network in partnership with the
12 National Ocean Service.

13 ADAM MCBRIDE: Adam McBride, Port of Lake
14 Charles.

15 ELAINE DICKINSON: Elaine Dickson, BoatUS.

16 LARRY WHITING: Larry Whiting, Terra
17 Surveys. I'm a retired contractor with NOAA.

18 RICHARD EDWING: Richard Edwing, acting
19 director of the NOS Center for Operational
20 Oceanographic Graphic Products & Services.

21 LAURA FURGIONE: Good morning, Laura
22 Furgione, assistant administrator for NOAA's
23 programming and integration.

24 ED WELCH: I'm, Ed Welch, Alexandria,

1 Virginia. I do representational work for the
2 Passenger Vessel Association and the Union of
3 Greek Shipowners.

4 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Captain John Lowell,
5 NOAA, DFO.

6 JENNIFER LUKENS: Jennifer Lukens, senior
7 policy advisor to the NOAA administrator.

8 ADMIRAL WEST: Dick West, retired Navy,
9 retired president of A nonprofit in DC
10 promoting ocean research and education.

11 KATHY WATSON: Kathy Watson, Office of
12 Coast Surveys HSRP.

13 TOM SKINNER: Tom Skinner. I'm a partner
14 at Durand & Anastas Environmental Strategies in
15 Boston.

16 MINAS MYRTIDIS: Minas Myrtidis, vice
17 president of fleet regulatory compliance for
18 Norwegian Cruise Line.

19 SHERRI HICKMAN: Sherri Hickman, Houston
20 Pilots.

21 MATT WELLSLAGER: Matt Wellslager, South
22 Carolina Geodetic Survey.

23 TOM JACOBSEN: Tom Jacobsen, Long Beach
24 Pilots, California.

1 VIRGINIA DENTLER: Virginia Dentler,
2 Center for Operational Oceanographic Products
3 and Services and staff for FACA.

4 ED WELCH: I think we've got time, so
5 let's start with our back table and then move
6 to the other folks in attendance.

7 CAPTAIN JOE MACO: Captain Joe Maco,
8 president, Northeast Marine Pilots and Sound
9 Pilots, basically serving all the ports between
10 New York and Boston.

11 ASHLEY CHAPPELL: Hi, I'm Ashley Chappell,
12 Coast Survey.

13 CAPTAIN GERD GLANG: Gerd Glang, Office of
14 Coast Survey.

15 DOUG BROWN: Doug Brown, National Geodetic
16 Survey.

17 JACK HARLAN: Jack Harlan, Integrated
18 Ocean Observing System for NOAA.

19 BOB HAMILTON: Bob Hamilton with Woods
20 Hole Group.

21 JOE ESSY: Joe Essy [phonetic], Newport.

22 HOWARD DANLEY: Howard Danley, Office of
23 Coast Survey.

24 KRISTEN TRONVIG: Kristen Tronvig, NOAA

1 Center for Operational Oceanographic Products
2 and Services.

3 KEN CIRILLO: Ken Cirillo from C-MAP
4 Jeppesen Marine.

5 IVAN VICTORIA: Ivan Victoria [inaudible]
6 Bay, Iceland.

7 ADMIRAL BAILEY: Good morning. John
8 Bailey, Office of Marine and Navy Operations.

9 GARY MAGNUSON: Good morning, Gary
10 Magnuson, National Ocean Service and CMTS.

11 TIFFANY HOUSE: Tiffany House, National
12 Geodetic Survey.

13 PAUL BRADLEY: Good morning. Paul
14 Bradley, National Ocean Service.

15 ED WELCH: Okay, thank you. Whoops.

16 MICHELE DIONNE: Sorry. I had to be near
17 a plug to work on my little PowerPoint.

18 Michele Dionne, Wells National Estuarine
19 Research Reserve in Wells, Maine, not far from
20 the Joint Hydrographic Center at UNH where I
21 hold an affiliate appointment.

22 ED WELCH: Did we get everybody? Well,
23 good. Thank you. Welcome. We obviously have
24 a diverse group, and welcome especially to our

1 guests.

2 And so, Captain Lowell, I will let you
3 take over with the introduction of our first
4 speaker.

5 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Okay.

6 And for those of you who are aware, Laura
7 Furgione has been on the agenda the entire
8 time, and she's really stuck it out through all
9 the other changes that we've been through. So
10 we're very happy that she could take the time
11 to speak to us.

12 So with that, thank you very much, Laura.

13 LAURA FURGIONE: Is this on? That's on.
14 Good, great, thank you.

15 I just wanted to take a few minutes here
16 real quickly to say, as our sheet says, good
17 morning, good afternoon, and hopefully a good
18 meeting to you all for the next couple of days.

19 I'm only going to be with you this
20 morning, and then I have to take off back to
21 Silver Spring.

22 So again, I am the assistant administrator
23 for NOAA's Office of Program, Planning and
24 Integration. I believe my deputy was here

1 speaking with you during your April meeting,
2 April 2009, on NOAA's next-generation strategic
3 plan, so I'll talk with you a little bit more
4 about that after Jennifer Lukens gives us a
5 presentation on a couple of things going on in
6 DC.

7 But yes, I have been on the agenda the
8 entire time, but I wasn't the DOC and NOAA
9 delegate until Sally Yozell and Kennedy dropped
10 out on me. So here I am.

11 But Admiral Bailey, which he didn't
12 introduce himself as Admiral Bailey, is a big
13 powerful hitter.

14 The third string, as Jen Lukens referred
15 to herself as, she said I could say that about
16 her, we are happy that Jen could be with us
17 here today as well.

18 One thing, I'm not going to be giving this
19 presentation yet. I do want the NOAA website
20 up, though, because the reason that Sally and
21 David Kennedy are not here, of course, is
22 because of the Gulf of Mexico oil spill
23 incident.

24 Dr. Lubchenco is actually on ground in the

1 Gulf of Mexico, and Sally Yozell is on the
2 ground as well. And Dr. Lubchenco may not be
3 on the ground. She might be flying.

4 JENNIFER LUKENS: She's flying.

5 LAURA FURGIONE: Flying. And looking at
6 the impact.

7 So we do have three aircraft in the area,
8 and Admiral Bailey can speak more about those
9 aircraft in his presentation later, but we have
10 a lot of efforts. This is all hands on deck.

11 While it says here NOAA is the nation's
12 leading scientific resource for oil spills, we
13 have at least four of the six line offices, as
14 well as the Office of Marine and Navy
15 Operations, and many other entities and
16 individuals and employees working on this
17 effort. It's a focused effort.

18 While we do need to make sure we have
19 resources available for any other incident that
20 pops up at the same time, this is our most
21 significant incident right now.

22 So you can see the accumulative trajectory
23 map here, and it's difficult to pull that up
24 any bigger. You all have seen this on the

1 news.

2 Right now, the weather is cooperating, so
3 the National Weather Service is giving spot
4 forecasts for the area. We have had offshore
5 winds, and that's why it hasn't reached the
6 northern Gulf of Mexico coast as of yet. But
7 with the light winds throughout the week, we
8 are expecting some south to southeasterly winds
9 to start up on Thursday and even into Friday.

10 So this weekend again is another threat
11 for the oil to move onshore.

12 We also have remote-operated vehicles
13 trying to work on the sections of the -- to cut
14 off a section at the end of riser pipe there,
15 so it's a pretty interesting incident,
16 interesting in the fact that a lot of the
17 precautionary measures we've taken at the past
18 have been at like 350 feet, as you've heard on
19 the news, and this incident is at 5,000 feet.

20 So dealing underwater a mile below the
21 surface is pretty significant.

22 If you move down just a little bit
23 further, you can see that again decreasing
24 winds the sea state on those bullets should

1 allow for some operations to take place on the
2 mitigation efforts.

3 Again, NOAA has three aircraft on scene,
4 the King Air and two twin otters, primarily for
5 taking of photographs and also marine mammal
6 observations.

7 The Coast Guard is also using our
8 forecasts and graphics of the oil spill
9 movement, so our dispersion models that the
10 Office of Atmospheric Research produces and
11 also the Emergency Response Division. And
12 unfortunately we did restrict -- we have put
13 out a notice to restrict fishing in the area
14 where the oil is impacting the Gulf.

15 So as they say on the news, that's only 25
16 percent of the area in the Gulf, but it's still
17 a significant impact.

18 So that's what I was going to say. That's
19 why we're still here supporting you in your
20 efforts, appreciate the time that you have
21 devoted this week and throughout the year to
22 the Hydrographic Services Review Panel.

23 And I still think that Tom should be
24 chairing this meeting, but that's between you

1 and Ed.

2 Thank you.

3 ED WELCH: Laura, thank you. Laura is
4 going to be making a presentation a little bit
5 later in the morning on some substantive
6 aspects of NOAA's work.

7 Does anybody have any general comments or
8 questions they want to put to Laura at this
9 particular time? Okay.

10 Kathy, we are ahead of schedule. What do
11 we do in a situation like that?

12 KATHY WATSON: Don't stop.

13 ED WELCH: Okay.

14 Our next presentation is by Jennifer
15 Lukens from NOAA, and senior policy advisor to
16 the NOAA Undersecretary.

17 So, Jennifer, the floor is yours.
18 Welcome.

19 JENNIFER LUKENS: Thank you. Good
20 morning. It's a long walk up to this podium
21 here.

22 So thank you. I'm really happy to be
23 here, even though I am the third-string.
24 Certainly, as Laura said, we have a lot of all

1 hands on deck, but the good thing about having
2 a third string is I'm the person who's been
3 living and breathing this issue for the past
4 year, so hopefully I'll be able to answer any
5 questions that you do have.

6 I'm here on behalf of my boss, Sally
7 Yozell, who is the director of the Office of
8 Policy for NOAA. She was really excited to
9 come up here and disappointed that she couldn't
10 make it here, but she's obviously needed down
11 in the Gulf right now to deal with that
12 situation.

13 I can speak for Sally that she's really
14 excited about the Ocean Policy Task Force and
15 Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning. She just
16 joined us a little over two months ago at the
17 policy office, and she's really excited about
18 these issues.

19 And she -- I know that in her previous
20 position up here in New England working for the
21 Nature Conservancy was really engaged in
22 coastal and marine spatial planning issues and
23 regional ocean governance. So I just wanted to
24 speak to that.

1 So why am I here today? I'm not sure how
2 familiar you all may be with the Ocean Policy
3 Task Force.

4 Last June -- June is oceans month -- the
5 President released a memo to the heads of 24
6 different agencies throughout the federal
7 government asking them to stand up an
8 interagency ocean policy task force to be
9 chaired by the Council on Environmental
10 Quality, and their purpose was really to look
11 at developing a national ocean policy for the
12 United States Government.

13 Back in 2000, Congress passed the Oceans
14 Act, looking at standing up a US commission on
15 ocean policy to really look at comprehensively
16 at what our oceans needed in terms of ocean
17 policy -- we have one of those commissioners
18 here today -- and produced a report in 2004.

19 Subsequent -- there was also another
20 commission stood up by the Pew -- stood up by
21 Pew, the Pew Oceans Commission that came out
22 with recommendations in 2003. And together
23 many of their recommendations were pretty
24 consistent with each other.

1 And one of the overarching themes was that
2 the US government did need a comprehensive
3 national ocean policy. With over 140 different
4 laws and statutes that touched different
5 components of the ocean, there was no
6 comprehensive way of looking at the oceans.

7 So that's one of the reasons the President
8 pulled together this memo and stood up the task
9 force.

10 The Department of Commerce is one of the
11 members on that task force, Dr. Lubchenco,
12 administrator of NOAA, served as the Department
13 of Commerce representative on that task force.

14 And it's been actually one of her top
15 priorities. She has made every single
16 principal's meeting, all of the public meetings
17 that we had all across the country. Even
18 despite her schedule, she was able to attend
19 those, and she's been extremely engaged in this
20 interagency process and has dedicated a lot of
21 NOAA efforts, and you'll see that in a lot of
22 NOAA's priorities and her vision is reflected
23 in these documents.

24 But in the document -- in the memo itself,

1 the President did state we do have a
2 stewardship responsibility to maintain healthy,
3 resilient and sustainable oceans coasts and
4 Great Lakes for this generation and future
5 generations.

6 And that we do need to have a framework
7 for a clear national policy, comprehensive
8 ecosystem based framework for long-term
9 conservation and use, was the direction to the
10 task force.

11 And it laid out some responsibilities for
12 that task force in a pretty tight timeline.
13 Within 90 days, they had to develop
14 recommendations for a national ocean policy, a
15 framework for policy coordination, which was
16 really another way of saying how is us as a
17 federal government, all of these different
18 agencies, going to work and interact and
19 coordinate together, and then develop a
20 strategy to actually implement that national
21 ocean policy.

22 That was released in September of 2009.
23 And then the task force went on to the next set
24 of recommendations to develop, which is working

1 on a framework for effective coastal and marine
2 spatial planning.

3 Now, the task force really had the benefit
4 of lots of time and effort that went into the
5 recommendations and information from the two
6 task forces, the Pew Oceans Commission and the
7 US Ocean Commission.

8 So really, they wanted to build upon all
9 that work that had been done, but also do
10 additional public stakeholder outreach and
11 engagement to really hear what folks across the
12 country had to say about developing a national
13 ocean policy.

14 So as I mentioned earlier, they stood --
15 there was six regional public meetings held
16 throughout the country. One was actually held
17 here in Providence. And CEQ, Council on
18 Environmental Quality -- sorry, I keep speaking
19 in acronym, DC speak -- had held 38 expert
20 roundtables for stakeholders individually to
21 hear back and forth in the smaller setting of
22 what their interests and concerns were.

23 And for the first set of recommendations,
24 the first report that was released in

1 September, there was a 30-day public comment
2 period on the policy document itself, and then
3 later when the interim framework for coastal
4 and marine spatial planning was released in
5 December, that was put out for a 60-day public
6 comment period.

7 We received over 5,000 comments through
8 the CEQ website and through the -- the regional
9 public meetings that happened.

10 So, as I said, the interim report was
11 released in 2009. It had a vision statement
12 that's in there, and for 24 different agencies
13 to agree upon a vision statement, that kind of
14 took a while, but we -- we got to something
15 that was overarching that encompassed
16 everything, really, which is looking at -- you
17 can't really read it here, America stewardship
18 ensures that the ocean coast and Great Lakes
19 are healthy and resilient, safe and productive,
20 understood and treasured so as to promote the
21 well-being, prosperity and security of present
22 and future generations.

23 And you'll see in the document itself, it
24 breaks out those policies under the themes of

1 healthy and resilient, the stewardship
2 component, safe and productive in terms of
3 safety, national security, economy, and then
4 also understood and treasured in terms of
5 better understanding/increasing our scientific
6 knowledge of the oceans but also educating
7 folks about them so as to value them.

8 It outlines nine different principles for
9 how the US Government will manage decisions on
10 any actions that affect the oceans. It's
11 guided by stewardship, by ecosystem-based
12 management -- I'll touch on that a little bit
13 later -- but it also looks at managing and
14 balancing current uses and existing future and
15 emerging uses.

16 It focuses on developing an improved
17 awareness of changing environmental conditions
18 and also enhances formal and informal education
19 of our oceans.

20 So the second task was to come up with a
21 proposed policy coordination framework.

22 Afternoon the Ocean Commission -- US Ocean
23 Commission released their report in 2004, the
24 Bush administration responded to that report

1 with a US ocean action plan, a series of
2 things, tasks to carry out that would also
3 address that.

4 It also stood up a committee on ocean
5 policy of cabinet-level members, which I
6 believe only met once. And so a part of this
7 Ocean Commission's task -- this task force was
8 to really look at what hadn't worked in the
9 framework that was set up in 2006.

10 And really, they -- we came to the
11 conclusion -- "we" being me as one of the
12 people on the working committee for the task
13 force, I did not sit on task force myself --
14 was looking at a need for a strong, clear and
15 overarching policy, which we have in the
16 recommendations, but also the need for
17 high-level direction and policy that -- and
18 sustained high-level engagement, which really
19 had not occurred, so set up a structure for
20 that.

21 Also, it looked at the need for greater
22 integration and coordination with states and
23 local governments and travel entities, not just
24 the Feds talking to each other, but horizontal

1 coordination and vertical coordination.

2 So in this document, the interim document,
3 it sets up a National Ocean Council led by the
4 Council on Environmental Quality and the Office
5 of Science and Technology Policy in The White
6 House.

7 They would lead this, and membership would
8 be of the 24 different agencies that are --
9 that were on this task force itself, and really
10 to coordinate across the federal government, as
11 I said, to implement the national ocean policy
12 and provide that direction.

13 It also establishes at the federal level
14 some interagency policy committees for all of
15 the agencies to talk on two different areas,
16 which is ocean resource management and ocean
17 science and technology, and provide --

18 There are two existing groups right now,
19 JSOST and SIMOR, Laura, not SIMOR, which are
20 similar groups under the previous structure,
21 but this policy document outlines a greater
22 coordination between the two entities and the
23 mechanism for them meeting on a regular basis
24 and talking and reporting up to the National

1 Ocean Council, which we call the NOC.

2 It also creates a government's advisory
3 committee, something that didn't exist in the
4 previous structure, which -- to improve
5 coordination/collaboration with states, tribes
6 and local authorities, and at the existing
7 regional governance authorities. The one
8 that's most relevant where we are today is
9 NROC, the Northeastern Regional Council on the
10 Ocean.

11 So as far as implementation of the
12 national ocean policy, the task force outlined
13 nine priority objectives. There's a lot of
14 things to get done, but what are we going to
15 focus on? And they broke that out into two
16 different sets of things.

17 The first is how is us as the US
18 Government going to change the way we do
19 business and really focusing on -- at NOAA
20 we've been using kind of an ecosystem-based
21 approach to management for a while, but really
22 adopting ecosystem-based management as a
23 foundational principle for comprehensive
24 management of the oceans across the government.

1 Agencies that may not be familiar with
2 this term, which is -- a lot of people when you
3 say ecosystem-based management, they think it's
4 just about the fish in the water and the
5 predators and marine plants.

6 No, it's about -- ecosystem-based
7 management is about the people and interactions
8 with those national systems, so thinking
9 comprehensively.

10 Two, the second one, is on coastal and
11 marine and spatial planning, which I'll touch
12 more in-depth on in a few minutes.

13 Three is improving and informing our
14 decisions and improving our understanding,
15 which, again, as I spoke earlier, is to
16 increase our knowledge to continually inform
17 and improve management policy decisions, using
18 science to inform our decision-making.

19 The third -- the fourth is coordination
20 and support, as I talked earlier, really being
21 able to coordinate across the federal
22 government but with the folks that are on the
23 ground in the states and the regions.

24 Then the areas of special emphasis that

1 were outlined by the task force of things to
2 focus on, one is resiliency and adaptation to
3 climate change and ocean acidification,
4 regional ecosystem protection and restoration,
5 water quality and sustainable practices on
6 land, because what happens on land ultimately
7 impacts our ocean and coastal resources.

8 Changing conditions in the Arctic, and
9 then ocean, coastal and Great Lakes
10 observations and infrastructure.

11 So with each one of these priority
12 objectives, the National Ocean Council would
13 within six to twelve months of being stood up,
14 if the President does decide to act on these
15 recommendations, would have to develop a
16 strategic action plan for each one of these
17 nine priority objectives in six to twelve
18 months using that structure that I --
19 interagency structure that I just talked about.

20 So we'll get into the fourth task, which
21 is really coastal and marine spatial planning.
22 A lot of different people have a lot of
23 different definitions of what coastal and
24 marine spatial planning is or marine spatial

1 planning, so -- and this is the definition that
2 you have 24 federal agencies that came up with
3 and there's a lot -- it's a mouthful. It
4 certainly is a mouthful.

5 But it has words here that we like to use
6 a lot at NOAA, which is "comprehensive,"
7 "adaptive." It -- I will say, this document is
8 in your package, and you can find both of
9 them -- the interim report isn't in there, but
10 you can find them on the website I'll show you
11 at the end of the presentation.

12 But again, CMSP is based on
13 ecosystem-based, looking at human interactions
14 with those physical and environmental
15 conditions. And a transparent planning process
16 that's again based on sound science, using
17 sound science for decision-making and analyzing
18 what the current uses are and what anticipated
19 uses are in the future and really -- and trying
20 to find a simplistic way of explaining what
21 coastal and marine spatial planning is.

22 People say it's just zoning in the oceans
23 and it isn't zoning in the oceans. It's a
24 planning process. It's a way of looking

1 forward and thinking about things ahead of time
2 before decisions have to be made.

3 It's a public policy process for actually
4 society to really determine how we're going to
5 use our ocean and costs sustainably, to
6 maintain those human uses, but maintain healthy
7 and resilient ocean and coastal ecosystems,
8 because ultimately, those are the things that
9 sustain human uses that we -- that we conduct
10 in our oceans and coasts on a regular basis.

11 It's comprehensive in the fact of instead
12 of just dealing with things on a
13 sector-by-sector basis, it's looking, bringing
14 everybody to the table and talking about their
15 sector's interests and where those may overlap,
16 conflict or they may waste it to maximize ways
17 of working together.

18 So in the framework itself, it outlines
19 seven goals for coastal and marine spatial
20 planning that link back to the goals of the
21 national ocean policy.

22 I've highlighted three here that are new,
23 sort of, that don't link directly back to
24 the -- to the ocean policy, which is really the

1 goals of coastal and marine spatial planning
2 are to promote compatibility among uses and to
3 reduce user conflicts, to streamline and
4 improve the rigor and consistency of
5 decision-making for permitting, for permitting
6 people who are looking to site things out in
7 the oceans, and also increasing certainty and
8 predictability in planning efforts.

9 It also lists 12 principles for coastal
10 and marine spatial planning, again, going back
11 to ecosystem-based management.

12 It -- a key component of coastal and
13 marine spatial planning is stakeholder and
14 public engagement. If you don't have everybody
15 at the table expressing what their interests
16 are, what they value in the ocean, what they
17 want to be doing in the ocean, then they don't
18 have a voice, and planning goes on without that
19 voice being heard, so it's really critical.

20 And you'll see in the document, in every
21 single public engagement, it is embedded in
22 every single step of the process, coastal and
23 marine spatial planning process.

24 It's also -- again, science is -- needs to

1 be there and agencies need to work together to
2 be -- have the most -- best available
3 scientific information to make decisions
4 related to coastal and marine spatial plans.

5 And also, something that's really key here
6 is flexibility to accommodate to changing
7 conditions. Plans aren't static. The
8 environment changes, science changes, policy
9 changes and technology changes really need to
10 be wrapped into these plans.

11 So people -- a lot people say isn't this
12 just another level of bureaucracy, and they're
13 concerned that this is going to take more to
14 time and not provide any benefits. And really,
15 the task force has -- identifies what some the
16 benefits of what coastal and marine and spatial
17 planning are.

18 It's -- again, they're outlined here, but
19 looking at existing uses that are out there,
20 maintaining existing uses but with new -- new
21 emerging uses, such as wind and hydrokinetic
22 energy, alternative energy, those new uses that
23 are come on, ways to afford them the
24 opportunity to site things, but also maintain

1 existing uses that are out there, all while
2 being able to sustain our ecosystem services
3 and the things that support those uses.

4 And as I said a moment ago, it ensures
5 that all stakeholders have a seat at the table
6 and opportunity to say what's important to
7 them.

8 It also provides an opportunity and
9 greater degree of certainty for folks in
10 industry who may be looking to site a wind
11 energy -- being able to --

12 If you're going to invest a lot of money
13 and resources into siting a project out in the
14 ocean, you want to be able to have a better of
15 idea of where siting -- you might have a better
16 idea of actually being able to get a permit
17 from all agencies instead of maybe one federal
18 agency, and instead of investing a lot of money
19 into a project and then finding out that one
20 agency thinks that that's not an appropriate
21 area to site your project.

22 Streamlining, permitting regulation and
23 governance, by getting all the federal agencies
24 to a table to talk about what -- this type of

1 planning, it develops relationships and only
2 that way to be able to have -- come up with
3 ways to maybe be able to permit projects
4 together instead of sequentially and running
5 into roadblocks in that process, a way to avoid
6 that.

7 Also, the CMSP also makes decision-making
8 that's actually transparent to all with their
9 level of stakeholder engagement in these -- and
10 the way the process is set up in the document.

11 So how are we going to do this? The
12 framework outlines that there's nine regional
13 planning bodies that will be established and
14 conduct coastal and marine spatial planning.

15 The National Ocean Council would set kind
16 of 10,000-foot level objectives for coastal and
17 marine spatial planning, but they recognize
18 that different regions of the country have
19 different drivers and interests, so they wanted
20 to provide -- set this up regionally as opposed
21 to nationally, so that they're consistent to a
22 certain extent nationally but provide
23 flexibility for regions to approach this the
24 way that they are best able to approach it.

1 You'll see here on this map we -- the
2 regions that were selected by the task force
3 line up and synch up nicely with the existing
4 regional ocean governance groups that are
5 already stood up on the West Coast, the West
6 Coast Governors Agreement. Up in the
7 Northeast, you have NROC. In the Mid-Atlantic,
8 you have MARCO.

9 There's a regional group that's just been
10 stood up in the South Atlantic; and then in the
11 Gulf of Mexico, you have the Gulf of Mexico
12 Alliance, which has been around for quite some
13 time.

14 It also creates a region in the Caribbean,
15 up in Alaska -- which is a huge region in and
16 of itself -- and then in the Pacific Islands.

17 These also not only synch up with the
18 regional ocean governance groups to a certain
19 extent, they also synch up with the large
20 marine ecosystems that have been identified,
21 with the exception of the Pacific Islands.
22 There is no technical large marine ecosystem
23 for all those islands out there, so that's one
24 thing that the task force recognizes is hard.

1 Sometimes since they're out there in the
2 ocean by themselves, they kind of all get
3 lumped together as one.

4 The geographic scope of the planning areas
5 would go from -- it includes the territorial C,
6 the EEZ and the outer continental shelf and it
7 would extend land board into the mean high
8 water, with the exception of states that have
9 private ownership that go down to mean low
10 water. All states are a little different in
11 how they have that ownership.

12 It does include inland bays and estuaries,
13 and it does not include land bays, but there is
14 a lot of discussion in the document itself
15 about the importance of the land-sea interface.
16 What happens on the land ultimately impacts the
17 water, so it provides a flexibility. If a
18 regional planning body does want to look at
19 things that are happening up on land, they are
20 encouraged to do that if they desire so.

21 These regional planning bodies, who sits
22 on them, it's the federal government, federal
23 entities that have authorities related to
24 coastal and marine spatial planning, states,

1 tribes that all have existing authorities
2 already that are relevant to coastal and marine
3 spatial planning.

4 So what is the authority to do this?

5 Well, CM -- coastal and marine spatial plans in
6 and of themselves are not going to be
7 regulatory. The way this is set up is that
8 states and federal agencies already have the
9 existing authority to plan, and this is a
10 planning process.

11 So the legal subgroup that we had made the
12 determination that we really do not need
13 existing authorities to sit down and to
14 cooperatively plan things together.

15 But what they -- the document does set up
16 is that these regional planning bodies would be
17 signatories to a development agreement, and it
18 was a way of committing -- making a commitment
19 that they're going to work together to develop
20 these coastal and marine spatial plans for
21 their area.

22 And then in terms of, well, what's going
23 to make it stick, we only had 180 days and
24 sometimes only things that make it stick are

1 Congress -- actions by Congress. But really
2 this would be under Presidential direction to
3 the federal agencies. And the signatories
4 would be expected to expedite and adhere to
5 those plans within the limits of their existing
6 regulatory and statutory authorities.

7 And if the -- if an agency does decide
8 that they need to make a decision outside of
9 the -- that plan, they do need to provide some
10 justification and explanation why they had to
11 deviate from that -- from the plan itself.

12 This goes through the long process that is
13 identified in the document, but really it
14 starts off by looking at what the region's
15 objectives are and political drivers.

16 It also -- this is not something that's
17 going to stop all other planning processes.
18 It's really a way of building upon existing
19 efforts of regional ocean governance groups,
20 things like the state of Massachusetts has
21 their -- their ocean plan. Rhode Island,
22 you'll hear from Grover Fugate I guess later
23 today or tomorrow talking about what they've
24 been doing with just the focus of energy in the

1 State of Rhode Island, building upon those, not
2 stopping those and being retroactive.

3 The third bullet there is really engaging
4 stakeholders at all points throughout the
5 process. That's a key point that's embedded
6 through this.

7 Again, talking about science, using data,
8 analyzing it, looking at all of the different
9 uses, services and impacts from those uses on
10 the environment and looking at ways to develop
11 and evaluate alternative and future-use
12 scenarios and tradeoffs that need to be made,
13 this --

14 Looking at supporting environmental impact
15 analysis for the -- and public comment on those
16 plans. And ultimately, those plans do have to
17 be submitted to the National Ocean Council for
18 their concurrence. But really, that's --
19 that's kind of the last step there, just ensure
20 some consistency with the objectives that will
21 be set up by the National Ocean Council.

22 And again, the last bullet point is that
23 they're really talking about implementation,
24 but also not only implementing. As I said

1 earlier, constantly going back and looking at
2 new information and being able to reevaluate it
3 and add new information and modify plans based
4 upon changing conditions.

5 This is really key point here, this slide,
6 from NOAA's perspective, that the underpinning
7 of the national ocean policy and Coastal and
8 Marine Spatial Planning is science and data and
9 information.

10 We have lot of data and information about
11 our oceans and coasts, but not all of it is in
12 accessible or usable format for coastal and
13 marine spatial planning. And we really do need
14 to work with all of our partners and government
15 and industry, NGOs and academia to really -- to
16 create what we need to make these decisions.

17 So the document acknowledges that it's
18 fundamentally science-based. It calls for
19 mechanisms to identify priority research needs.
20 So across the federal government you don't have
21 duplicative efforts. You have everybody
22 sitting down at the table identifying what they
23 think the priority resources needs and
24 resources can be directed to those

1 strategically instead of agencies operating in
2 their own little world.

3 It also kind of sets up an infrastructure
4 for a national information management system
5 with -- with our national system, but regional
6 nodes of ways to connect coastal and marine
7 spatial planning information.

8 It really -- it also would be developing
9 national standards and consistent derived data
10 products so different data can talk to each
11 other from region to region.

12 This is in the document, it's just -- you
13 can't really read it, but the point of me
14 putting it up here is is that this is a long
15 schedule that we don't expect that coastal and
16 marine spatial plans will be done overnight.
17 The anticipation is that plans will be done
18 within a five-year time line.

19 And there's a lot of flexibility built in
20 for those different regions. Some of them, as
21 I said earlier, have infrastructure and
22 agencies already talking together, and they'll
23 be able to maybe move out a little bit quicker
24 as opposed to regions that don't already have

1 some type of baseline organization and folks
2 talking together at this level.

3 But really, it divides it up into three
4 phases here, which is building a foundation to
5 implement coastal and marine spatial planning
6 on a national level and really building up
7 capacity -- and the second phase is building up
8 capacity in the regions and testing elements of
9 the process that's outlined here.

10 This is new to everyone, so this -- I
11 don't expect that this will be perfect, but
12 they will have to learn and test the elements
13 of the process.

14 And then the third phase is really
15 building out and scaling up efforts for
16 implementation at the end of five years.

17 This is just an example, and many of you
18 may be familiar with this, which is an example
19 of a multisector approach. And it's -- you
20 know, comprehensive coastal and marine spatial
21 planning may include other elements, but this
22 document here, this -- this is in the framework
23 document which really looks at there is an
24 issue with whale strikes coming in and out of

1 Boston Harbor and NOAA wanting to look at a way
2 of trying to reduce ship strikes.

3 You'll see all those little dots there are
4 whale sightings over the past 23 years of data,
5 and they're more concentrated down in the lower
6 area.

7 The dotted line is where the traffic route
8 existed; and NOAA together working with the
9 Coast Guard wanted to look at ways of perhaps
10 adjusting the traffic separation scheme in
11 order to minimize the potential impacts of
12 whale strikes, but without having impacts to
13 industry.

14 Also, you see those little green circles
15 where -- are proposed deepwater LNG port
16 siting. And together looking at all of those
17 different interests including recreational --
18 excuse me, commercial fishing, they were able
19 to sit down and come up with an adjustment to
20 the traffic separation scheme that did have a
21 slight impact on navigation. It increased
22 times only from about nine to 22 minutes.

23 It reduced the -- it reduced the collision
24 by -- with whales by 81 percent. A lot of

1 those whales, 58 percent, were endangered right
2 whales.

3 It also reduced conflicts with the
4 commercial fishermen which were more active in
5 the previous traffic scheme. And it also
6 provided a way of looking at where the siting
7 of the LNG facilities wouldn't be in that --
8 within that navigation channel there.

9 So that's kind of -- this is an example of
10 a bunch of different interests in sectors
11 coming together to kind of identify a better
12 way of doing business to reduce impacts
13 overall.

14 Also, I hear about a lot of proposed
15 projects, and I was talking to Senator Kevin
16 Ranker, a Washington state senator, last week
17 about coastal and marine spatial planning, and
18 they recently just passed a bill in Washington
19 state on coastal and marine spatial planning.

20 And what drove him and his interest in
21 that was that there was a gentleman -- a
22 company that had spent quite a bit -- amount of
23 investment into siting and offshore wind farm
24 in the State of Washington.

1 They got down the permitting process
2 pretty far with FERC; and at a public meeting I
3 guess for some fishermen discovered that this
4 was being sited in their primary crab juvenile
5 habitat area and that this would basically
6 decimate the crab fishery in Washington.

7 And so they had to go back and really --
8 the state agencies that were involved in, who
9 had expressed this concern, hadn't been
10 involved in the permitting process.

11 So really looking at things ahead of time,
12 being able to avoid those conflicts will
13 ultimately save money in the long run under
14 this framework that's been set up.

15 So money to do all of this is a question
16 that a lot of people have. You know, NOAA
17 already does a lot of -- has a base -- does a
18 lot of things that can contribute the science
19 data, products and tools and services to
20 contribute to coastal and marine spatial
21 planning efforts; but really in the FY11
22 budget, there's some new initiatives there
23 which provide 6.77 for NOAA capabilities to
24 support coastal and marine spatial planning

1 which will help us with some of the decision
2 support tools, data integration and mapping,
3 things such as the multipurpose marine
4 cadaster, using things like that.

5 There's 20 million in the budget for
6 regional ocean partnerships grants for those
7 regional ocean governance groups that I spoke
8 of earlier, and that to start -- whether they
9 become the official regional planning body, as
10 I mentioned earlier in the framework, or not,
11 for them to be able to start doing coastal and
12 marine spatial planning.

13 It also -- that money can also go towards
14 the priorities actions that they've identified
15 of -- the issues that they need to work on in
16 the region, many of which are data-gathering
17 that could contribute to an overall coastal and
18 marine spatial planning effort.

19 A couple of other things here is that
20 two million identified for the Gulf of Mexico
21 marine elevation pilot, which is to develop a
22 national integrated high-resolution topographic
23 and bathymetric dataset that would ultimately
24 contract to CMSP efforts in the Gulf of Mexico

1 and can enhance those ecosystem assessments.

2 And then 5.4 million that's in our
3 National Fishery Service budget to expedite
4 integrated ecosystem assessments and three
5 regional ecosystems in the US, the California
6 current, in the Gulf and also in the Northeast,
7 really incorporating diverse sources of data
8 into ecosystems models to inform
9 decision-making.

10 So what are the next steps for this?

11 The framework was published in December.
12 It was out for 60 days of public comment. That
13 public comment period closed on February 12th.
14 We have reference to the website here where you
15 can find both the interim report, the interim
16 framework, and there's also -- you can sort all
17 of the comments that have been turned in by who
18 submitted them or what area of the region that
19 they are from and see all the public comments.

20 The task force has met to deliberate over
21 what they received in those comments and are
22 really finalizing -- putting the final touches
23 on their final recommendations.

24 And I'm hoping that that will be submitted

1 to the President. I have early 2010. We're
2 getting towards June, and that means we're on
3 the latter part of 2010 after June. So I am
4 hoping shortly that those recommendations will
5 be transmitted to the President and that he
6 will in fact take action, that remains to be
7 seen, but I certainly hope with the amount of
8 effort that has gone into this.

9 I know that's a lot of absorb. The past
10 11 months have been pretty intense and a lot of
11 work has gone into this.

12 So I just open it up for questions if
13 anybody has questions.

14 ED WELCH: Thanks, Jennifer.

15 Panel members, do you have any questions
16 or comments?

17 Tom. Tom Skinner.

18 TOM SKINNER: Thanks, Jennifer.

19 I had a similar process, as you mentioned,
20 in Massachusetts with our Ocean Management Task
21 Force back in 2003-2004 that took about a year,
22 so I can understand how complex and what a
23 tight time frame this is to do it at the
24 federal level.

1 I just wanted to comment on your point
2 about providing some expectation or your exact
3 wording for potential projects and how it
4 provides some clarity so that they don't
5 develop or wouldn't suggest to spend a lot of
6 time on a project and then find out that
7 there's a problem with it.

8 In -- I think that's one thing that's
9 often overlooked. And the problems that we had
10 initially with the Cape wind project in
11 Massachusetts was that there was no framework,
12 so that a group had to sort of sit down and see
13 and figure out how we're going to do this.

14 And I think that's that's -- a very
15 negative aspect of not having a framework is
16 it's left up to an informal process. It's bad
17 for the developer. I think it leaves the
18 process open to multiple lawsuits, and then --
19 so that was from one perspective.

20 We had it a little bit after I left state
21 service and was working on one of the LNG
22 projects you pointed out offshore. Again,
23 having greater clarity would have been much
24 easier.

1 So people often look at -- and I'm sure
2 you've heard it, this is ocean zoning, you
3 can't go anywhere without government
4 interference, but I think it's actually trying
5 to provide some, as you say, some rules. And
6 there have been a few of those in terms of the
7 new types of projects that we're seeing
8 offshore.

9 So I -- that's a support for what you guys
10 are doing.

11 JENNIFER LUKENS: Thank you.

12 ED WELCH: Thanks, Tom.

13 Other comments or questions? Jon Dasler.

14 JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.

15 With the Deepwater Horizon, a lot has been
16 on the news and I've heard criticism that there
17 is no national oceans policies right now and
18 that could have really have played a
19 significant role.

20 Do you see that as helping with this
21 process and help it move forward and kind of
22 expedite that effort?

23 JENNIFER LUKENS: The plan itself -- I
24 think in terms of national contingency

1 planning, your response to an effort only is as
2 good as the planning that you've done ahead of
3 time for emergency response, and I think that
4 we have a lot to learn from that.

5 In order to avoid conflicts, it's not at
6 the same level in terms of other things,
7 incidents that may happen in the ocean or
8 siting problems that you may have.

9 But really, if you're planning ahead of
10 time, you're going to be able to avoid
11 conflicts and be able to make significant
12 strides in the right direction if you sit down
13 at the table and plan ahead of time.

14 So I think that's one way of demonstrating
15 why CMSP is important to do.

16 I think another thing is is that what
17 informs where you site different types of
18 energy facilities, whether it be renewable or
19 traditional oil and gas, should be informed by
20 information and scientific information.

21 So under our coastal and marine spatial
22 planning process, you would be bringing more
23 information to the table that may not have been
24 there before or data that has been constructed

1 to be useful in a decision-making process.

2 So I would argue that this is another
3 reason -- it's not going to solve -- it
4 couldn't have stopped probably -- I can't say
5 if it could have stopped the Deepwater Horizon
6 incident, but certainly it will only help to
7 inform as we make decisions.

8 And we need to be careful about how we
9 make decisions as to where we're siting things
10 in the ocean and our responses capabilities,
11 what the proposed impacts could be.

12 And that's part of coastal and marine
13 spatial planning, what those -- what impacts
14 could happen and are you willing to make that
15 decision and the tradeoffs in making
16 decision-making.

17 So certainly I can make the argument -- I
18 think I can make the argument for that. That's
19 a way to -- our oceans are in trouble. This is
20 certainly a horrible event that no one
21 anticipated, but by thinking more
22 comprehensively and looking down the line and
23 taking the time to be thoughtful.

24 And thinking with stewardship, we've had

1 policies on -- national economic policies,
2 national security policies, national energy
3 policies, but none of them have really --
4 nothing brings them all together. And I think
5 that's what this national ocean policy does.

6 It's not all just about stewardship.
7 Stewardship is primary in making sure that
8 you've got ecosystems that are healthy and
9 resilient to support uses, but it also -- it
10 calls out the importance of, you know, keeping
11 our economy going and keeping the safe -- the
12 safety of Americans, so...

13 I -- did I sell you on that?

14 JONATHAN DASLER: Great.

15 I was hoping we could get that on the
16 record. Thank you.

17 ED WELCH: Gary, did you have something?

18 Gary Jeffress.

19 GARY JEFFRESS: Yes.

20 I also sit on a working group for the
21 National -- sorry, not national, the Scientific
22 Advisory Board for NOAA.

23 They have a workshop coming up on the 25th
24 and 26th of May, Silver Spring, for the NOAA

1 environmental data workshop. You may all be
2 interested in that.

3 Are you all aware of that?

4 JENNIFER LUKENS: Not that one
5 particularly, no.

6 Like I said, we have a lot of data and a
7 lot of things going on at NOAA that can
8 contribute to this, and this can provide a
9 focal point for not only us internally of how
10 we're going to work and support these efforts,
11 but also externally bringing other -- we're not
12 the only people who gather data.

13 ED WELCH: Thank you, Jennifer. Good
14 presentation. If I could -- oh, wait a minute.
15 Yes, Adam McBride.

16 ADAM McBRIDE: Laura [sic], I was
17 interested in -- to what extent you have been
18 involved with the cabinet committee on Maritime
19 Transportation System.

20 Have they been engaged in this process?
21 Are they one of the agencies?

22 Because as you went through this
23 presentation, I was listening closely for the
24 references for the discussion or the pointers

1 to the Maritime Transportation System, the
2 economy of the nation, et cetera, and I didn't
3 hear too much about that, so I want to be sure
4 that they're engaged in this process.

5 JENNIFER LUKENS: Yes, they have been
6 engaged. We have Gary Magnuson back over there
7 and Helen Brohl who have participated in a lot
8 of the initial meetings there, I think.

9 And also, the agencies that all sit on the
10 committee on Marine Transportation System are a
11 lot of the same agencies or most of the same
12 agencies that are on the committee of Marine
13 Transportation.

14 So yes, they have been involved in
15 discussion and dialogue, and that's why you see
16 those interests reflected in the principles and
17 guidelines and policies in -- for coastal and
18 marine spatial planning.

19 So it recognizes that any of this new
20 structure does have a coordination mechanism
21 with the committee on Marine Transportation,
22 and Gary can maybe talk later to that if he
23 wants.

24 ED WELCH: Dick West.

1 ADMIRAL WEST: Thank you, Jennifer.

2 As you know, I testified on behalf of DoD
3 to the US Ocean Commission ten years ago that
4 started this whole process, so hopefully
5 something will happen soon.

6 One caution, in my travels around the
7 ocean committee, you mentioned earlier -- you
8 said this is not zoning.

9 Well, I think there's part of the Maritime
10 Transportation community -- certainly the oil
11 and gas industry -- that really do look at this
12 as a zoning process, and it is a process to
13 determine who uses what, where, when and how.

14 So I think you can't just say it's not
15 zoning. It is a type of zoning or something.

16 I think NOAA has to better explain marine
17 spatial planning so that we get everybody on
18 board, because right now it's kind of fuzzy as
19 far as zoning.

20 But it really is a -- should I not say
21 zoning? It is a form of determining usage,
22 right?

23 JENNIFER LUKENS: Right.

24 ADMIRAL WEST: I mean, we have to do that.

1 It really is a type of zoning. It really was
2 started a long time ago when we started putting
3 ships in ports where people were going. We
4 started putting channels. We put buoys, and we
5 started planning.

6 So it really is a planning/zoning process.

7 JENNIFER LUKENS: Yes.

8 And I say it's not zoning, because that
9 incites, I guess, fear in a lot of people. And
10 I want to focus more on that it is a process to
11 talk about what makes sense and what areas are
12 more conducive to certain uses and where uses
13 can occur or co-occur together and still not
14 run into those user conflicts.

15 So the terminology, sometimes people have
16 different interpretations of what different
17 words are, so you're right. I have not found
18 the perfect word that says all of this that
19 doesn't incite concern.

20 And there's fear of the unknown, and
21 people -- you know, a lot of people are
22 concerned that this is going to stop their
23 activities that are already ongoing. That's
24 not the intent.

1 Recognizing that uses that are already
2 ongoing need to be maintained but thinking
3 smarter about where emerging uses are going so
4 that there aren't conflicts.

5 ADMIRAL WEST: I agree.

6 One other issue, you've grown from an
7 original 12 agencies involved with ocean stuff,
8 which was the national oceans partners, up to I
9 think you said 24 --

10 JENNIFER LUKENS: There's 24, yes.

11 ADMIRAL WEST: Formal process here. But
12 at some point, I think there has to be
13 recognition that the states have to have some
14 type of input on this back in Washington,
15 because they're an integral part of that little
16 piece of the --

17 JENNIFER LUKENS: Correct. They are a
18 very integral part.

19 And that's why under the new policy
20 coordination framework structure they've
21 created the governance coordinating committee
22 or advisory committee to have that input at the
23 national level with that cabinet member body.

24 But then also on the regional planning

1 bodies, the states are key in sitting down at
2 the table. They're a part of the membership on
3 the regional planning bodies.

4 They are the boots on ground. They are
5 the people who are living and breathing and
6 taking actions on a daily basis.

7 So it's not about the folks in Washington,
8 DC. That's why the flexibility and framework
9 was set up, to recognize and have the regions
10 set their own objectives and be able to tweak
11 things a little bit to make it work for them.

12 So yes, you're right, they're key in
13 making this work.

14 ED WELCH: Jennifer, thank you.

15 If I could make -- oh. Okay. Andrew
16 McGovern.

17 ANDY MCGOVERN: Thanks, Ed.

18 A couple of things. I just want to
19 support Tom. And there has to be a process for
20 these developers. I've seen it in New York
21 where they'll spend years going from agency to
22 agency. And it depends on where they start,
23 because, as Tom said, there is no process.

24 So they'll start at one agency and work

1 their way, get approval, approval, approval,
2 and two or three years down the line it's like
3 an agency will say no. And it's like, gee, why
4 didn't you start with us? Because nobody told
5 me to.

6 So I think that's one of the big steps
7 that has to go on here.

8 Other is it's great to have a policy, but
9 you have to have a process behind it, which,
10 you know, we see this committee has been
11 watching for years now the budget. And the
12 requests don't always back up the policy, so
13 there has to be --

14 It's nice to have this grand policy there,
15 but if nothing is being done behind it, then
16 what is it?

17 So that seems to be a big -- on the
18 requests for the things that people on this
19 committee think are important, it kind of looks
20 a little hollow.

21 So that's one of the issues.

22 JENNIFER LUKENS: I think that part of
23 what the budget process is once you have a
24 policy up in place, that's what helps you to

1 get the budget, to implement that, and when --
2 timing of federal budgets and whatnot.

3 So yes, I agree with you. It's going to
4 cost money and -- to be able to do all of this.
5 And, you know, you can do a lot with existing
6 resources by reorganizing; but if it's going to
7 be a priority, yes.

8 And we've been fortunate in the FY11
9 budget to get some funds to be able to -- or at
10 least request those funds -- we haven't gotten
11 them yet -- from Congress to be able to do
12 this.

13 ED WELCH: Andy, did you have something?

14 ANDY ARMSTRONG: No.

15 ED WELCH: Anybody else? Any other panel
16 members?

17 Jennifer, if I could just -- thank you.
18 If I could make a couple observations.

19 JENNIFER LUKENS: Sure.

20 ED WELCH: First, as far as the process
21 and the desire to include as many people as
22 possible, you have to recognize, however, there
23 are parts -- elements of the society who aren't
24 engaged in governmental planning processes.

1 And no matter how much of an outreach you
2 make, they aren't going to be engaged until
3 there is a specific demonstrable impact on
4 them.

5 If I could just switch to another NOAA
6 program, there is an extensive planning process
7 for fisheries management in NOAA. There are
8 regional councils in fisheries management.
9 There is every opportunity in the world for all
10 sorts of folks who have advanced impact into
11 the setting of federal fisheries policy.

12 Theoretically, by the time it got to the
13 administrator, it ought to be all worked out
14 and it ought to be not controversial. Well,
15 you can see how well that works, you know?

16 There were several thousand people up on
17 the Capital a couple of months ago raising hell
18 about federal fisheries policies.

19 So planning, despite everybody's good
20 intentions to include everybody, you aren't
21 going to include everybody. People have other
22 things to do. People are scared of working
23 with government. They aren't -- they don't --
24 they don't understand government planning

1 processes.

2 Those people are going to be left out of
3 your planning process, and you're just going to
4 have to realize that.

5 So that's just one observation.

6 Secondly, if I understand your charts,
7 you're not proposing a governance structure
8 that proposes any kind of new statutes or
9 regulatory authority.

10 You'll be -- you'll be implementing this
11 in the context of the existing statutes and
12 regulations.

13 And you indicated that there's going to be
14 possibly a White House directive to the agency
15 saying you've got to comply with the general
16 plans that have been done in implementing your
17 various statutory responsibilities.

18 You run the real risk -- those statutes
19 have very specific mandates at the agencies.
20 Let's take oil and gas, for example. There is
21 an oil and gas planning process. There are
22 statutory requirements under the Outer
23 Continental Shelf Lands Act.

24 If an administration tries to bypass those

1 by putting in a different policy through the
2 regional planning process and then impose that
3 on the Interior Department when they make those
4 CS decisions, you're opening yourself up to a
5 lawsuit challenging that.

6 So I think there's a big hole in here in
7 terms of the adherence aspects of this.

8 And finally, I was glad to see on your --
9 one of your early charts about one of the goals
10 being the observation and infrastructure of
11 various types of maritime uses. We would
12 submit that what we're talking about here in
13 terms of hydrographic services and nautical
14 charts and the PORTS system and that type of
15 thing are exactly that type of thing.

16 JENNIFER LUKENS: Correct.

17 ED WELCH: And perhaps at another venue or
18 later today we can learn a little bit more
19 about what the likely plan thinks and that type
20 of thing.

21 So those are just some observations I have
22 from -- responding to your presentation, which
23 we thank you for.

24 JENNIFER LUKENS: Thank you.

1 ED WELCH: Are there any last comments or
2 observations? Okay. Thanks, Jennifer.

3 And now Laura, I think you're back on.

4 Laura's presentation is on NOAA's
5 next-generation strategic plan, and it's part
6 of vision and strategy.

7 Thank you, Laura.

8 LAURA FURGIONE: And good morning again.
9 So it looks like we are running a little bit
10 behind on schedule, so just when you thought
11 we're doing good.

12 At any rate, I speak rather fast, so slow
13 me down or ask a question at any point in time.
14 I am covering two topics today. NOAA's
15 next-generation strategic plan and our Arctic
16 strategy and vision.

17 So the first 13 slides will be on the
18 strategic plan, and then the second half will
19 be on the Arctic.

20 I've really only been involved in formal
21 strategic planning for the last two years since
22 I was forced to move to the beltway from
23 Alaska. I don't know if I did something really
24 good or something really bad; but primarily,

1 the prior 15 years I spent most of my time
2 either in Alaska, Missouri or North Carolina.

3 Devastation, as I mentioned before, seemed
4 to follow me at every position I had along the
5 way from starting at a GS4. And devastation is
6 good on your resume, and so I moved a lot.
7 Running away from those storms.

8 So this is the strategic plan. Paul
9 Doremus did cover this with you, as I mentioned
10 before in one of your earlier sessions, and we
11 were just in the early phases of the plan. Now
12 we're getting close to putting it out for
13 public comment. Version 3 will ideally be out
14 later this month for formal public comment.

15 So again, that's what I'm going to cover.
16 So why do we even have a strategic plan? Well,
17 it gives us the ability to present the new
18 administration strategic priorities. So we are
19 required, the last bullet there, we're required
20 by Government Performance Results Act, GPRA, to
21 do a strategic plan every four years anyway,
22 and this one coincides with the new
23 administration, so it allows us the opportunity
24 to make sure that Dr. Lubchenco and the new

1 administration's priorities are presented in
2 this fashion.

3 It also gives us another opportunity to
4 engage with stakeholders. And as Ed was saying
5 before, you can have as formal and thorough of
6 an engagement process as possible, but you're
7 still going to miss some people along the way.

8 So continuing this engagement along the
9 process as we develop the plan and even as we
10 get into the implementation of the plan will
11 remain to be critical.

12 And of course in regards to this, we're
13 always wondering about monitoring and
14 evaluation. So when you implement anything,
15 then you need to evaluate and determine if you
16 have implemented it properly, and so that's a
17 component of why you have to have a strategic
18 plan as well.

19 So the basis for our strategic plan is
20 organizational alignment and, again,
21 stakeholder engagement. So how are we
22 responding to the external changes?

23 A lot has happened over the last two
24 years. You look at March 2009 when the Dow

1 Jones industrial average was at its minimum,
2 around the 6,000 mark. Today -- or yesterday
3 we just went below 11,000 or so on the Dow. So
4 it's interesting to see those fluctuations and
5 what's happened over the last two years.

6 So trying to align our strategic
7 priorities and our plan with those external
8 type of challenges is very important, also with
9 the external environment and the changes going
10 on with that.

11 This strategic plan also helps to frame
12 our investments and ideally planning that links
13 to budgeting. So one of my peers that I
14 interact with constantly is Maureen Wiley, our
15 chief financial officer, so how are our plans
16 then tying into the budget process and helping
17 us with that case for change.

18 Constantly talking with Captain Gerd Glang
19 here to help you all get your information,
20 communicating the science to make sure that
21 those individuals on the Hill understand what
22 exactly the Hydrographic Services Panel is
23 trying to do and formulate that information so
24 they can understand what your priorities are as

1 well.

2 So the design criteria, what we're trying
3 to do is make sure our mission, our vision, our
4 functions, our capabilities are in line with
5 all these external changes and challenges and
6 then establish some goal-oriented -- some
7 outcome-oriented goals and objectives.

8 So again, reflecting these administrators'
9 priorities, responding to long-term threats.
10 When we started the process, Dr. Doremus, I'm
11 sure, got into the scenario planning and
12 different things as we looked out to 2035
13 horizon, how things could potentially be
14 modified in our environment,

15 And so you can see all of those things on
16 our website, and I'll show you the website in a
17 little bit, but you can get to it right from
18 the noaa.gov website.

19 Interestingly enough, are these
20 outcome-oriented goals and objectives "SMART"?
21 And that's an acronym for "specific,
22 measurable, attainment, realistic and
23 time-bound."

24 Well, I just took my five-year-old twins

1 to kindergarten orientation two weeks ago.

2 That's the same goals they have.

3 So remember, everything you learned you
4 learned in kindergarten, right? So it's the
5 same in strategic planning or anything you're
6 trying to do. Make sure you've got that glue
7 and paper scissors available.

8 That was supposed to be a joke. Thank
9 you.

10 Here are the phases. As I said, the last
11 time Dr. Doremus talked to you, we were in an
12 earlier phase. Now we're pretty much in
13 Phase V, the purple phase here.

14 So we're still -- we are Version 2.0, but
15 we're developing Version 3.0 that will then go
16 out for public comment.

17 So we've interacted with all of the NOAA
18 FACs and various other entities to make sure
19 that we are engaging as much as possible and
20 moving forward in the process.

21 Speaking of engagement, again, NOAA is
22 organized with the eight regions, eight
23 regional collaboration teams. They pretty much
24 line up with those LMEs that Jennifer was

1 talking about, the large marine ecosystems, and
2 also that ocean policy task force, coastal and
3 marine spatial planning, regional planning
4 areas.

5 So we did have all eight regions, had
6 forums, Alaska, central region, Great Lakes --
7 of course we don't have LME in the central
8 region, but they do contribute, particularly to
9 the Gulf of Mexico.

10 But challenges throughout NOAA's mission
11 are impacted from the central region, the Great
12 Lakes, the Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic,
13 Pacific, southeast and Caribbean and western.

14 So again, 21 stakeholder forums. I know
15 some of you are involved in some of those
16 forums, and also even in our national
17 stakeholder forum that we held this past
18 December in DC.

19 We also had online comments. You could go
20 online and provide your comments as well. So
21 we had over 1800 responses. The top color
22 there is our internal responses, and then the
23 blue is the responses from our external folks.

24 And you can see that private businesses

1 provided us the majority of or the largest
2 portion of the comments.

3 So how did we develop this? As we looked
4 at all the comments and tried to figure out
5 what our goals should be, there were two
6 primary selection criteria for our goals; and
7 again, these goals are drafts that I'm talking
8 to you about because the document is not final.
9 Dr. Lubchenco has not put her final stamp on
10 it, and we have not gone out for public review.

11 So again, the goals and -- the mission,
12 the vision and the goals that I'm getting ready
13 to present are still draft.

14 Again, the selection criteria. We wanted
15 to know if it was -- what was the contribution
16 to society? Responsive and robust. And was it
17 a fit to NOAA? Was this actually something
18 that NOAA should be doing? Was it distinctive
19 to NOAA? Is it feasible for NOAA to execute in
20 our current and potential capabilities? And of
21 course budget is always a concern in that as
22 well.

23 And you think it's water.

24 So here is our draft mission. It's not

1 that different from our current mission. We
2 still have the keywords in there, the
3 "understand" and "predict," and it's all based
4 on our basis of science, service and
5 stewardship.

6 But we have predict changes in weather,
7 climate, oceans and coast. Also to share that
8 information and knowledge with others, and to
9 use it to manage our natural marine resources.

10 And then you can see those
11 function-oriented on the science, the service
12 and the stewardship.

13 In regards to our vision and our goals,
14 the vision did change quite a bit. We're
15 now -- it now states -- again, this is draft.
16 We're focusing on thriving communities and
17 economies within ecosystems that are resilient
18 in the face of change. And again, that term
19 "ecosystem" includes those human uses and
20 impacts.

21 So the goals, the goals aren't that much
22 different from our current goals. The goal
23 today are commerce and transportation, weather,
24 climate and ecosystems. So our new draft

1 goals, again, climate, climate adaptation and
2 mitigation, a weather-ready nation that
3 includes weather and water so that when the
4 sugar mill needs to know about the water levels
5 and how the impacts of the freshwater and the
6 saltwater interact there.

7 The third goal there is sustainable ocean
8 ecosystems which pulls in a lot of the
9 ecosystem goal that we currently have; and
10 the fourth goal is the sustainable coastal
11 communities, and that's the one that you're
12 primarily interested in in regards to this
13 particular activity you're talking about today.

14 So to break it down a little bit further,
15 looking at our vision, this is, again, a
16 snapshot of our current goals and objective
17 structure. So under each goal then there are
18 five-year objectives.

19 And then through them we have -- we call
20 them success indicators or -- the term just --
21 I just missed that term. I think it's
22 indicators? Measurable indicators? What are
23 they, Gerd?

24 CAPTAIN GLANG: "Indicators of success" is

1 what you've been calling them.

2 LAURA FURGIONE: Indicators of success. I
3 had success indicators. I apologize.

4 So again, you can see our vision and our
5 mission. And the thing -- so our folks in the
6 research community and our satellite community
7 are now saying, well, where are we? We don't
8 see ourselves in these four goals.

9 Research and the satellite-observing
10 capabilities are covered under our enterprise
11 objectives, we're calling them, because that
12 flows and integrates across all of the goals.

13 So you can see in the green area our
14 five-year target for functions, that would
15 include environmental literacy. So the
16 education folks were saying where are we?
17 Again, the science and technology and the
18 enterprise organization.

19 So that includes modernization of our IT
20 infrastructure would support the observations,
21 the data management and all of that.

22 So in regards to the sustainable coastal
23 community goal, we do have two particular
24 objectives. These are strategic objectives

1 that I'm just highlighting for you under this
2 particular goal.

3 One in particular is the resilient coastal
4 communities that can adapt to the impacts of
5 weather and climate, and under that is the
6 commerce -- the CMSP. And also the safe and
7 efficient and environmentally sound marine
8 transportation.

9 Under the objective of improved coastal
10 water quality and human health, again, that
11 safe environmentally sound Arctic access and
12 resource management comes into play.

13 So with that being said, that's what I
14 wanted to cover on the next-generation
15 strategic plan. I think I will pause and see
16 if you have any questions or comments on that
17 portion of the presentation, and then I'll move
18 on to the Arctic, segueing from this last
19 bullet.

20 ED WELCH: Thanks, Laura.

21 Panel members have any comments or
22 questions on this part of the presentation?

23 Admiral West.

24 ADMIRAL WEST: Laura, I'm not sure if now

1 is the right time to ask, but are you going to
2 talk a little bit about NOAA's reorganization
3 for climate service center, or is that not on
4 the agenda?

5 LAURA FURGIONE: That is not on the
6 agenda.

7 ADMIRAL WEST: Okay.

8 LAURA FURGIONE: I can give you a
9 two-minute elevator speech on that, if you
10 like.

11 We did put out plans in February. In
12 fact, month, the day of Snowmageddon, is when
13 we rolled out our NOAA climate service, the
14 intention to develop a NOAA line office.

15 And with that, the same time we rolled
16 that out, we also rolled out the intention to
17 hire six regional climate directors.

18 So those six regional climate directors
19 will be co-located with the National Weather
20 Service regional directors, and so that's why
21 we chose six, to coincide with the
22 infrastructure that's already in place with the
23 National Weather Service regional offices.

24 We're still in the planning of that. Of

1 course that takes, you know, Congress to
2 approve that, and so it's a long process.

3 The ideal situation is when we first
4 rolled this out in February, it was going to be
5 approved by October 1st. We're not seeing that
6 as a realistic timeline at this point in time.

7 ED WELCH: Gary Jeffress.

8 GARY JEFFRESS: Laura, is this change
9 of -- emphasis to climate change, is that a new
10 directive for NOAA which the administration is
11 going to fund as a new effort or is this within
12 your existing resources?

13 LAURA FURGIONE: Right now, it's in
14 existing resources. So what has happened is
15 that the primary line office that has taken if
16 you want to say the greatest hit or that --

17 Right now, the climate program office is
18 within OAR, so pulling that out of OAR, the
19 Office of Atmospheric Research, does make that
20 line office considerably smaller, but it
21 doesn't change the need for a research entity
22 that's separate from and a operational entity.

23 So pulling out the climate from the Office
24 of Atmospheric Research will separate the two

1 operationally and research-oriented. The OAR
2 will still have responsibilities for all of the
3 line offices. So that's our scientific
4 resource -- research agency.

5 And I know you tie into them directly.
6 The cooperative institutes and the RESIS
7 [phonetic] and those kind of entities I believe
8 will fall under -- some of the climate. The
9 cooperative institutes aren't necessarily all
10 tied directly to climate. Some are weather,
11 some are various other focuses of those
12 institutes.

13 So it's definitely all of the line offices
14 are contributing -- well, NOS and National
15 Marine Fisheries are not impacted by the -- the
16 new organization or the intent to reorganize
17 for the climate service.

18 ED WELCH: Jon Dasler, did you have a
19 comment.

20 JONATHAN DASLER: No.

21 ED WELCH: Anybody else over here? Okay.

22 Laura, if I could -- you indicated that
23 one of the existing items uses the phrase
24 "commerce," and that would be replaced with

1 sustainable coastal communities; and within
2 sustainable coastal communities, you emphasize
3 the marine transportation.

4 I worry that NOAA is missing the
5 implication -- marine transportation and
6 commerce is of far more importance than just to
7 coastal communities. And focusing on coastal
8 communities, you seem to imply that -- or some
9 people could take the implication that marine
10 transportation and marine commerce don't have
11 any implication for non-marine communities,
12 which is not the case at all.

13 And this is sort of one of these things
14 where you have to be a little bit careful about
15 how you create these snapshots, because that --
16 that easily is a message that one can take away
17 from this propose changed.

18 And I think it's not -- if that were the
19 direction you were going, it's not a sound
20 direction.

21 LAURA FURGIONE: And we've heard those
22 comments in the past. Of those 1800 comments,
23 some were exactly the same thing you're saying
24 there.

1 It's no indication that marine
2 transportation and safe transportation is not
3 important, but somehow you need to divide up --
4 you know, you have to have these snapshots.

5 And so we're still discussing the terms --
6 it's likely -- it's primarily goal three and
7 four, the ecosystem -- the oceans goal and the
8 coastal goal that we're still struggling with
9 the snapshot terminology.

10 And I think we've had conversations over
11 and over when the goal team leads, with others
12 internally as to what this should say.

13 I think the information underneath each of
14 the goals everyone is pretty comfortable with,
15 but we're still struggling with that. As you
16 say, the snapshot of what that goal should be,
17 the title of that goal.

18 ED WELCH: Well, as an analogy, you could
19 say that the oil spill is a consequence to
20 coastal communities. And it is. But it's just
21 an intense consequence to everybody else in the
22 country.

23 LAURA FURGIONE: The economies across the
24 nation, yes.

1 ED WELCH: Of course.

2 And there has been -- there have been
3 periodic swings within NOAA over the past three
4 decades about the importance -- relative
5 importance you attach to marine commercial
6 transportation. And sometimes it ebbs and
7 sometimes it flows, and to me this might be a
8 danger signal that's beginning to ebb.

9 LAURA FURGIONE: I appreciate that. Thank
10 you.

11 ED WELCH: Jon Dasler.

12 JONATHAN DASLER: Yes. Ed brought up a
13 good point.

14 And I guess in the context of the
15 Deepwater Horizon effort, I mean, that's going
16 to have a tremendous impact on marine
17 transportation.

18 I know right now, NOAA is looking at
19 special anchorages off of Mississippi where
20 they can be de-oiling ships, ships transiting
21 through the slick and then up through the
22 Mississippi.

23 That's going to have an impact and could
24 shut down the shipping in the areas and what

1 that could do to the economy and marine
2 transportation, so it goes way beyond that.

3 And hopefully that's being captured -- I
4 noticed one of the eight regions is a central
5 region. Again, people I guess don't
6 necessarily know how much their commerce -- how
7 much commerce is brought in from the Marine
8 Transportation System that's being captured,
9 but I think it really highlights the need for a
10 national policy as opposed to regional policy.

11 LAURA FURGIONE: Well, I would have to say
12 if we're walking the walk of our talk, then
13 this is a significant external challenge and a
14 significant event that we should be responsive
15 to.

16 The last big oil spill like this was in
17 1989. So it's been 21 years since anything
18 like this happened, so this is definitely
19 something that we need to be responsive to, and
20 I take your points, and I'll take them back to
21 the office.

22 ED WELCH: Any other comments on the
23 strategic plan presentation?

24 Okay. Laura, let's move north.

1 LAURA FURGIONE: Thank you.

2 I did have the next steps, I apologize,
3 which we already talked about those. So the
4 public review will be out in May, and we'll
5 prepare -- the next thing after it's finalized
6 is implementation and start planning for FY13.

7 So the Arctic, speaking of Exxon Valdez
8 and 21 years ago -- but I will recognize Ashley
9 Chappell -- oh, there's Ashley over there.
10 Ashley is one of my team members.

11 In December, Dr. Lubchenco formalized a
12 new team to develop this Arctic vision and
13 strategy to have something -- a concise
14 document. She wanted a 15-page document that
15 was really high-level and concise and had a
16 clear, concise vision and strategy.

17 So Doug DeMaster is the Alaska Fisheries
18 Science Center director in June and I -- we
19 were the two co-chairs of the team -- and
20 several other members, Ashley being one of the
21 members, and Amy Holman, the Alaska region
22 collaboration team coordinator is also one of
23 the members.

24 So we basically needed this developed by

1 March 15th. That's when the State of the
2 Arctic Conference was in Miami that
3 Dr. Lubchenco needed to give a keynote address,
4 and so that was the timeline we had, basically
5 ten weeks to pull this document together.

6 Thankfully, there's so many documents that
7 we were able to rely upon, and in particular
8 the document that Ashley had pulled together
9 internally on NOAA's strategy of the Arctic.

10 So this is what I'm going to go over as
11 some of our guiding principles, and then we do
12 have six goals and strategies for the Arctic,
13 our next step and then discussion and
14 questions.

15 So the background again, this is NOAA's
16 strategic plan for the Arctic. I'm going to
17 give you a little bit of an importance of an
18 Arctic strategy for NOAA.

19 We are -- I personally feel a little bit
20 behind the curve, as the other agencies that
21 rely on our products and services for safe
22 navigation and safe operation in the Arctic
23 already have plans in place, such as the Navy
24 with their roadmap for the Arctic.

1 But again, there is the need for
2 coordination and collaboration with these
3 partners.

4 So as we develop the strategy and vision
5 for the Arctic, we thought of two main things.
6 What do we, NOAA, need to do? What are we
7 mandated to do in the Arctic? And then what do
8 our partners and stakeholders need, again, for
9 their safe operations and efficient operations
10 in the Arctic?

11 Here is our Arctic vision. We envision an
12 Arctic where conservation, management and use
13 are based on sound science, support healthy,
14 productive and resilient communities and
15 economies.

16 And also, you have to take the
17 international tact here in regards to the
18 global implications of climate change or Arctic
19 change that are better -- we need to better
20 understand and predict them.

21 Our guiding principles, we did have
22 critical outcomes for other agencies, again, in
23 support of the national ocean policy that
24 Jennifer went over.

1 We needed to make sure there were better
2 linkages between the oceans and the climate as
3 we're looking at sea ice and the other things.
4 What are the impacts again globally for those
5 changes? Our ecosystem-based management,
6 coastal and marine spatial planning. But
7 really have a concentrated effort.

8 We have -- it's a data-sparse region
9 throughout, but it's very data-sparse or no
10 data, as you are very well aware of, in the --
11 north of the Bering Strait, the Chukchi and the
12 Beaufort Sea.

13 So it's really focusing on the high Arctic
14 or at least the Bering Strait and North.

15 We wanted to be able to inspire and engage
16 our stakeholders, incorporate that traditional
17 knowledge of our indigenous communities in
18 Alaska, also educate and integrate the
19 education and outreach, and support some new
20 science and technology development.

21 Again, anticipate and respond to emerging
22 issues, as we were just talking.

23 So the -- the -- we have six Arctic goals.
24 The number one is sea ice. Sea ice was our

1 organizing principle. That was the primary
2 entity that we were looking at. The sea ice
3 kind of controls everything. It controls the
4 shipping in the Arctic, and the sea ice has
5 really been there protecting the Arctic. That
6 inaccessibility has not allowed for some the
7 development and plans that are in place now.

8 The second goal is basically the
9 monitoring and observations. Strengthening our
10 foundational science so again we can understand
11 what's going on there and the global impacts.

12 The third one and the only one that I
13 really care about is weather and water.

14 Again, another joke. Just kidding.

15 The fourth one, enhancing our
16 international and national partnerships.
17 The fifth one is our stewardship, and that's
18 where some of the fishery surveys and those
19 kind of things come into play.

20 And the last one is advanced resilient and
21 healthy Arctic communities and economies.

22 And I say that it's the last one, but it's
23 really another one that's reliant -- it's one
24 of our most important ones, and that's where

1 some of the coastal aspects and the
2 hydrographic survey work comes into play.

3 So you have all these things going on, but
4 who is it really going to impact? It's going
5 to impact those communities and economies up
6 there in the Arctic.

7 And so that's a -- you start with the --
8 the sea ice as the organizing principle, but
9 what's the final impact?

10 And so our eye and our target is on this
11 last and sixth goal here.

12 So we just tried to use this schematic to
13 show how all six of the goals are tied
14 together. Again, the Arctic -- the forecast of
15 the sea ice loss. We've been seeing minimal
16 sea ice. 2007 was the record sea ice minimal
17 year. 2008 wasn't far behind. And we'll see
18 what happens this upcoming summer.

19 But right now, March 15th is basically the
20 time of year when you have the most ice.
21 September 15th is when you have the minimal
22 ice.

23 And even when we were talking about
24 stimulus funding and ARRA funding and that kind

1 of thing, they were calling it "pork" to have
2 the Coast Guard or the Navy to have an
3 ice-hardened vessel. What do we need an
4 ice-hardened vessel for if all the ice is going
5 away?

6 And so we need to be careful with the way
7 we're communicating this information. It's not
8 ice-free year round. It's potentially ice-free
9 in the summertime come 2030.

10 So the terminology might be better an
11 "ice-diminished" Arctic rather than "ice-free."

12 You can see the national and international
13 partners are right there in the middle, and
14 everything flows down and is supportive, the
15 improved management of our ocean resources and
16 also those resilient communities and economies.

17 So we have a goal on, again, forecasting
18 sea ice. We need to make sure we have
19 quantitative daily forecasts to decadal
20 predictions. And that five-year strategy,
21 again, is to improve the daily and weekly sea
22 ice and new seasonal predictions, so how can we
23 forecast further in advance?

24 If there is going to be an increase in

1 cargo shipping through the Bering Strait,
2 through the northwest passage, through the
3 northeast passage, you can't make those
4 decisions within a week's time frame. You need
5 more like months and even seasons to know if
6 you're going to have that as a potential, the
7 way, the uncertainties and risk and know if
8 it's a potential opportunity for you or not.

9 In regards to strengthening our
10 foundational science, this is where the
11 improved baseline observations and
12 understanding of the climate come into play.
13 And our five-year strategy is again enhanced,
14 integrated set of environmental observations.

15 A lot of this IT infrastructure would come
16 into play. Some of the same things you guys
17 are dealing with.

18 Also, the interpretation of this data in
19 realtime, making sure there's the
20 interoperability, and water level information.
21 So we need those tide gauges. There are no
22 tide gauges right now north of the Bering
23 Strait.

24 In regards to improved weather and water

1 forecasts, we have seen an increase in storm
2 activity, not only the strength of the storms
3 but also the -- how often the storms are
4 happening.

5 So weather-related, routine and extreme
6 events are very important. So you think of
7 your extreme events, and we often end up
8 focusing on that high-impact events, but it's
9 really about those routine --

10 Drought is a significant issue, which then
11 ties into fire weather, and also the flooding.
12 So if you have drought and then you have the
13 significant rainfall behind it, you could have
14 some flash flooding and other flooding.

15 So it then gets into the commerce and
16 transportation and how these communities along
17 the river are able to survive.

18 In regards to enhancing national
19 partnerships, we have to make sure that they're
20 engaged, have a greater emphasis on things such
21 as the Arctic Council. You can see the
22 international logos here at the bottom.

23 Our five-year strategy again is the
24 data-sharing, and that's some of the things

1 that I thought about when Jennifer was speaking
2 on the oceans policy task force.

3 We think of a lot of these things as no
4 new funds, even just having an increased
5 collaboration and coordination. While that's
6 not going to cut it, that's not going to
7 completely get you to your end goal, it will
8 definitely help in leveraging funds and making
9 sure that we don't have redundant activities
10 going on so those funds that are being used are
11 being used as efficiently as possible.

12 So other things, providing leadership and
13 resources for the Arctic governance and
14 supporting this sustainable Arctic observation
15 network.

16 So if we better understand what's going in
17 the Arctic, a lot of your weather -- when I was
18 living in Alaska, my mom would say, well, three
19 days later that same weather is going to be
20 hitting Missouri and two days later that would
21 be hitting DC.

22 So sometimes that works out, but we know
23 there are other weather patterns besides that
24 standard jetstream.

1 Improving the stewardship and management
2 of ocean and coastal resources is our fifth
3 goal, and that ties into some of our ongoing
4 assessments.

5 When the Northwest Pacific Fisheries
6 Management Council closed the commercial
7 fishing north of Bering Strait, now they're
8 saying, well, we didn't just close that to
9 close it. We need to have that fishery
10 assessment data, because there was -- they had
11 no idea what was going on north of the Bering
12 Strait.

13 So we need to get more information on the
14 marine mammals, the fish, the shellfish in
15 support of potentially opening that up for a
16 commercial fishery north of the Bering Strait.

17 There are other things going on as well,
18 and of course ocean acidification is a big
19 issue in the Arctic. If you like that crab on
20 your Christmas dinner table, you might want to
21 know about ocean acidification, because that
22 would definitely impact the shellfish and the
23 crab.

24 The last one and the one you might be most

1 concerned about is, again, advancing resilient
2 and healthy Arctic communities and economies.
3 And this is improved through the geospatial
4 infrastructure, safe navigation, oil spill
5 response and climate change adaptation
6 strategies.

7 It's the one that makes Ashley smile the
8 most and the one she probably contributed to
9 the most.

10 In regards to the five-year strategy,
11 definitely looking at an overhaul of the Arctic
12 geospatial framework, our Arctic pollution
13 response. And I know there is concern that if
14 we're devoting our funds to the Arctic, they
15 could be taken away from elsewhere.

16 But again, look at this as an opportunity.
17 If we're learning more about the Arctic, how
18 that will then help you understand ocean
19 acidification elsewhere, oil spill response
20 elsewhere, et cetera.

21 Other things within the five-year strategy
22 is the survey and mapping of the Arctic waters
23 and shoreline. A lot of the mapping was done
24 prior to the 1964 earthquake, and so there's

1 significant changes in the coastline.

2 So the next steps, we actually -- it says
3 we were going to put it on the Federal Register
4 May 10th. It's my understanding because that
5 team is such a great team -- and Ashley is
6 giving me a thumbs up there -- that it's
7 actually going to be on the Federal Register
8 this week.

9 And we have a copy for you, I believe.
10 Ashley -- that was the crash you heard when my
11 presentation started, which are copies of the
12 Arctic strategy and vision. And we also have a
13 website you can go to to get an electronic
14 copy.

15 So we're going to continue to coordinate
16 NOAA and collaborate with our partners.

17 One thing in particular, this copy that
18 you have is still a draft. While we're putting
19 it out, again, for Federal -- on the Federal
20 Register, Dr. Lubchenco wanted to make sure
21 that it was still a draft that would help our
22 partners understand that they still had an
23 opportunity to comment and modify the plan as
24 needed.

1 So as you saw on the ocean policy task
2 force, one of the nine priorities is
3 strengthening the Arctic. And so it's likely
4 it's not official yet that I would be the lead
5 for NOAA for the Arctic strengthening, and so
6 with that, we need to develop within the six-
7 to 12-month time frame a strategic action plan.

8 So from this internal NOAA vision and
9 strategy, we're going to start developing a
10 NOAA action plan which will likely parallel the
11 efforts of the ocean policy task force.

12 So with that, there's the team members.
13 Myself and Doug DeMaster. John Calder from the
14 program office. There's Ashley's name. She
15 could have put her name up a little higher.

16 Amy Holman. Elizabeth McLanahan is our
17 international expert. Jim Overland is at the
18 Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, and
19 then Tracy Rouleau is in my office, and she's
20 the bulldog to make sure that these guys
21 continue to get stuff in on time.

22 With that, I think that's the conclusion
23 of my presentation.

24 ED WELCH: Thank you, Laura.

1 Comments and questions by the panel
2 members? Gary Jeffress.

3 GARY JEFFRESS: Yes.

4 Laura, I was wondering how much input into
5 this was shared with the Russians and the
6 Canadians and also the State of Alaska?

7 LAURA FURGIONE: So input into this draft
8 directly, we relied upon documents that had
9 been produced in the past.

10 So when I was in Alaska, I was -- I was
11 the National Weather Service regional director,
12 and so all I cared about at that point in time
13 was the weather service.

14 And then all of a sudden, Admiral
15 Lautenbacher decided to have these regional
16 collaboration teams. We needed regional team
17 leads.

18 All of a sudden, October 2006 I was told
19 that 40 to 60 percent of my time would be
20 dedicated to NOAA's regional collaboration
21 effort. Take off the blinders. Figure out
22 what all the other line offices in the Arctic
23 and in Alaska can contribute.

24 With that being said, to make a long story

1 short, I asked Amy Holman to come up and help
2 me develop and integrated services plan for the
3 Arctic. And with that, we had external members
4 from the state, from University of Alaska
5 Fairbanks, Lawson Brigham was actually on
6 there, the fellow who wrote the artic marine
7 fishing assessment.

8 So we had a diverse group of stakeholders
9 help us with this integrated services plan. It
10 was finalized in 2008, and that may have been
11 the reason -- actually, when I asked Amy to
12 come up to Alaska, said I need you to help me
13 with this plan, don't do it too good, though,
14 they might make me move.

15 Now I'm living in Maryland. So it's all
16 Amy's fault. And she likes it when I say that.

17 But so I -- from the get-go, over the
18 years we have had extensive contribution from
19 the State of Alaska, several of the
20 commissioners have been on our team. Amy's
21 continuing to engage with those folks in
22 Alaska.

23 Two of the primary folks on the team, John
24 Calder is on the Sustaining the Arctic

1 Observation Network. And other international
2 efforts, the RUSALCA -- is that how you say
3 that -- and even Elizabeth McLanahan, focusing
4 on the Arctic Council and other things.

5 So we have been interacting with those
6 eight Arctic countries throughout the process,
7 and -- but I still say we're not doing enough.
8 We need to continue to engage and have even
9 more leadership in those activities.

10 ED WELCH: Captain Andy McGovern.

11 ANDY MCGOVERN: Thanks.

12 I noticed on your slide for the enhancing
13 international and national partnerships,
14 missing was getting more involved in the -- all
15 the new international regulations that may be
16 coming out.

17 I -- I deal with the IMO, the
18 International Maritime Organization, and they
19 are already moving forward at full speed on
20 shipping regulations in Arctic.

21 And, you know, I know that other
22 international bodies are looking at, you know,
23 mining and exploration and everything else.

24 So it's nice to look at this part of it,

1 but if we don't get involved in the
2 international rulemaking, we could be on the
3 back end of that.

4 LAURA FURGIONE: Most definitely.

5 And those international standards are high
6 on my priority list. It's one of the first
7 things coming from the meteorological
8 committee, WMO. If you aren't on the
9 international codes, then you aren't anything,
10 really.

11 So we changed over really to the METAR
12 back in the mid '90s for meteorological
13 information.

14 But I think even the volunteer
15 ship-observing program -- and when we get those
16 ship observations, those needs to be on
17 international code as well.

18 Those are just examples of making sure
19 that we are following those international
20 standards. I think that's definitely
21 important.

22 And even though it's not written on here,
23 it's things we've talked about in our meetings.
24 I know it's -- Ashley is aware of that.

1 And I even have a mentor, Lisa Taylor,
2 that's working with Roger Parsons and some
3 other folks on that type of information and
4 making sure it meets those standards.

5 ANDY MCGOVERN: Well, I don't necessarily
6 mean just meeting the standards but being
7 involved in formulating those standards, being
8 out front and making sure we get what we need
9 out of those standards and not just following
10 what, you know, the Europeans or Russians or
11 whatever have decided.

12 We've got to be involved in the -- you
13 know, in the initial phases of those -- of that
14 rulemaking.

15 ED WELCH: Admiral Dick West.

16 ADMIRAL WEST: Thanks.

17 The follow-up to Andy's comment, I think
18 the Coast Guard is still our representative to
19 the IMO, I think, US rep.

20 And I think you might want to have them
21 come to our next meeting and tell us where we
22 are with all of this.

23 And I'm not sure how you are relating with
24 the US rep to the IMO, Coast Guard, but that

1 would be interesting to hear from next time,
2 too.

3 The other comment is you mentioned
4 international partnership, but you never
5 mentioned Law of the Sea. I guess that's one
6 of those in the punchbowl things.

7 But the -- the first recommendation came
8 out of the Ocean Commission literally before
9 the report came out, which was unanimous
10 recommendation to the President and to Congress
11 to accede to Law of the Sea.

12 And here we are ten years later, and we
13 still don't even talk about it where it's
14 appropriate to talk about it.

15 So I think NOAA has to have a position. I
16 think you have to say that it's important for
17 our knowledge and experience and access to the
18 Arctic that we accede to Law of the Sea.

19 There's political ramifications for that,
20 but if you're truly going to do what you just
21 said, I think that's going to have to be NOAA's
22 position.

23 LAURA FURGIONE: It's referenced -- I'm
24 not even -- it's referenced in our document.

1 It's not in this presentation. We talked about
2 having it as --

3 Is it even one of our recommendations? I
4 don't believe it's one of our recommendations,
5 though, because that's -- you know, it's not a
6 copout, but that's the State Department's
7 bailiwick, and they get excited when we start
8 talking about it, but we are there.

9 It's stated within our document. I know
10 Jane is a strong -- I'm sorry, excuse me,
11 Dr. Lubchenco is a strong supporter of signing
12 the Law of the Sea treaty, and again, a focus
13 of the ocean policy task force.

14 So it's not something -- I would say it's
15 not something that we've going to have -- it's
16 not our mandate, but the items that are within
17 our document will help support that effort.

18 So it's not off the burner, but it's not
19 in the middle of the hotspot for NOAA.

20 ED WELCH: Other comments or observations?

21 Larry Whiting.

22 LARRY WHITING: Larry Whiting.

23 Thanks for presenting this.

24 How much of an impact is this going to

1 have on the native villages that surround that,
2 on coastline?

3 And did the -- like the North Slope
4 Regional Corporation or do any of those
5 corporations have any input into this?

6 LAURA FURGIONE: They will be receiving
7 personal copies. We have a long engagement
8 list, and so I wanted to be as inclusive as
9 possible. I didn't want to say anyone to say
10 you excluded me, so that was the reason to put
11 it on the Federal Register.

12 But we have a long list -- an engagement
13 list of individuals that will receive personal
14 email copies, hard copies, and we'll be doing
15 presentations throughout Alaska.

16 So I did meet with Commissioner --
17 goodness, he's going to kill me. But Larry
18 Hardwick, I talk with him often.

19 So before I left Alaska I was on that
20 climate change adaptation workgroup that
21 Governor Saran Palin established. We're still
22 heavily involved in those type of things.

23 But the North Slope Science Initiative
24 John Payne, I just had lunch with him last week

1 as well. And so the focus on those indigenous
2 communities is definitely a concern.

3 I didn't even talk about the -- the
4 village and the coastal erosion aspects. But
5 it's definitely important, and in incorporating
6 that traditional ecological knowledge is a --
7 most of those things --

8 It was difficult to get all of this
9 information in a -- in a 15-page document, and
10 that's what Ashley struggled with before. Some
11 of our other planning documents were 70 to 100
12 pages.

13 And so to get this under the constraints
14 that Dr. Lubchenco wanted, I know there were a
15 lot of people that wanted to see their, quote,
16 Pet Rocks and their initiatives within this
17 document, and my response was I understand, I'm
18 passionate about this. Just like Law of the
19 Sea, it's something we've got to do.

20 But this document I at least wanted to get
21 out the door with Dr. Lubchenco's signature on
22 it. And most of the detailed items and a lot
23 of the -- I assume the comments coming in from
24 this draft will be incorporated into our action

1 plan then.

2 ED WELCH: Jon Dasler.

3 JONATHAN DASLER: I just had a minor
4 question.

5 Actually, CO-OPS does have operational
6 gauges in the Arctic. There's one in Barrow
7 and Prudhoe Bay. And we installed them a few
8 years ago at the Red Dog Mine, but Rich has
9 the --

10 RICHARD EDWING: Yes, there are a couple
11 of these.

12 LAURA FURGIONE: I know there was a tide
13 gauge at Red Dog Mine. I didn't know there was
14 one at Barrow. So if this has happened, my
15 time frame has been cut off, so I'll correct --
16 I apologize and I correct my statement.

17 But there still needs to be more

18 JONATHAN DASLER: Right.

19 And figuring out a way how to do that in
20 the winter up there, because they're even
21 nonfunctional or problematic.

22 LAURA FURGIONE: Well, I think those folks
23 in Alaska have figured out ways to do those
24 kind of things.

1 We've figured out ways to measure rivers
2 in Alaska when they're frozen. Most of the
3 old-time river gauges, you actually had to go
4 down and touch the water, which you can't quite
5 do when there's huge, you know, icebergs coming
6 down the river.

7 So we now have, you know, type of LiDAR
8 gauges and things that can electronically send
9 laser beams and tell us. So I think we could
10 do the same can some of our tide gauges.

11 That was one of the things, make sure that
12 we've incorporated all the science and
13 technology advancements into the Arctic and
14 elsewhere as well.

15 So some of those things that we figure out
16 how to do in Alaska because we're forced into
17 it can then be incorporated elsewhere and find
18 efficiencies down the road.

19 It's always been my argument if they would
20 put observation sites in Alaska first, then
21 when -- a lot of times, and I apologize, those
22 of you living on East Coast, things get
23 implemented in the East Coast and then it runs
24 westward, but when you get west of the

1 Mississippi, then those folks in North Dakota
2 say, hey, this isn't working here, well, if it
3 would have been developed in Alaska, it will
4 work anywhere.

5 ED WELCH: Other comments?

6 Laura, I was recently looking at some
7 Coast Guard material about their plans for
8 expansion of Coast Guard activities and Coast
9 Guard presence in the Arctic above the Bering
10 Strait, and they made the point that doing
11 traditional Coast Guard activities up there is
12 exponentially more expensive than doing the
13 same activities even down in Cook Inlet, for
14 example. And that's just a common obstacle
15 that everybody, including NOAA, is going to run
16 into as far as expanding presence in the
17 Arctic.

18 Have agencies been looking at whether
19 there are additional funding sources to help
20 drive this move to the Arctic?

21 Specifically, one of the things that is
22 increasing the need for additional presence in
23 the Arctic is the possibility of greatly
24 expanded OCS development up there.

1 And right now under OCS laws, there's a
2 provision for people making bid payments and
3 lease payments, but there isn't a provision for
4 people making federal government infrastructure
5 contributions or payments or assessments to
6 fund federal government infrastructure that has
7 become necessary to support and promote those
8 types of OCS developments.

9 Is that something that people are looking
10 at?

11 LAURA FURGIONE: I know that our Honorable
12 Don Young has been looking at those kind of
13 things and various taxes and other areas we
14 could tap into.

15 One of the things -- I go back -- you
16 know, when you're strapped for cash, if you'll
17 say, when your resources are tight is when
18 you'll really -- is when the brainstorming
19 kicks in and you find some really cool things.

20 When my folks in Alaska were putting
21 together their plan for tide gauges and even
22 river gauges and such, I'm asking, so, are we
23 working, for example, with river gauges?

24 Are we collaborating with the USGS?

1 Do we and the USGS have one plan or are we
2 both asking for two different things?

3 So if you're going forth on the Hill and
4 requesting to your -- your high leadership
5 within your agency two different sets of plans,
6 it's not very beneficial.

7 So if we can all get together, again,
8 it's -- it's a lot of talk. Let's collaborate.
9 Let's talk more.

10 But definitely within Alaska region, we
11 have a tight partnership with the Coast Guard,
12 with Alaska Ocean Observing System, the IOOS
13 folks, making sure that all these plans are
14 tied together.

15 Our -- one of the -- not the buoys but the
16 coastal sites --

17 RICHARD EDWING: CMAN.

18 LAURA FURGIONE: CMAN, thank you. I got
19 to get that weather service lingo back down.

20 But our CMAN sites definitely make sure
21 that that's incorporated, and the IOOS is
22 saying the same things. They have the same,
23 you know, reports and requests into play.

24 Also, those multisensor observation sites

1 are critical, and we're finding that out in the
2 Gulf of Mexico as well.

3 So if you can have a buoy in place, it
4 shouldn't just be reporting weather. It should
5 be giving you salinity and, you know,
6 everything else you need, ocean acidification
7 measurements, pH measurements, et cetera, along
8 the way.

9 So there's a lot of things I think, again,
10 using our current resources, that we could be
11 doing a little bit better.

12 New resources are good, too, though.

13 ED WELCH: Well, it's fine to coordinate
14 and maximize governmental resources to make
15 sure you aren't spending twice for essentially
16 the same thing.

17 But we have in the Arctic, it looks like
18 to me, a whole bunch of potentially new
19 commercial users out there who right now are
20 not demanding -- because they aren't there,
21 they aren't demanding anything from the federal
22 government, but they will be demanding things
23 of the federal government or expecting things
24 of the federal government.

1 It's in their commercial interest to go
2 into the Arctic. They have the potential for
3 making a lot of money by going into the Arctic,
4 whether it's the oil and gas industry, whether
5 it's commercial shipping, whoever it is.

6 And I'm just wondering if the government
7 ought to start thinking about, look, folks, if
8 you want to go to the Arctic and if you want us
9 to go to the Arctic to support your operations,
10 we need to figure out some kind of a mechanism
11 up front where you can help you, who are going
12 to profit from all this activity, can help us
13 fund the government's new reach into the
14 Arctic.

15 LAURA FURGIONE: It sounds like a new head
16 tax on those Norwegian cruise liners.

17 ED WELCH: Well, I'm not sure there are
18 any Norwegian cruise liners heading up there
19 yet because of ice.

20 But to be honest -- and I represent
21 commercial interests. But the type -- to be
22 honest about it, the type of funding that the
23 government would need up there to make a
24 meaningful expansion of their resources, while

1 it looks big to the agencies, is relatively
2 small given the commercial gain that's going to
3 be gained up there.

4 And I'm just wondering if anybody in
5 government is wondering, thinking, you know,
6 not how can we best coordinate our existing
7 resources, but how can -- you know, is there a
8 potential for new resources with the people
9 that are going to benefit commercially from
10 access to the Arctic.

11 JONATHAN DASLER: This is Jon Dasler.

12 I think just following on with Ed's
13 comment, we've had this discussion before,
14 especially after the big leases that MMS did in
15 the Chukchi Sea.

16 If MMS is going to put out these kinds of
17 leases and require the infrastructure now
18 that's going to be needed to support that, is
19 there some way to put some kind of tax or work
20 with MMS and how can we get additional funding?

21 Because that's a huge burden on NOAA now
22 to put that infrastructure in place.

23 LAURA FURGIONE: And I think Gary was just
24 at MMS. They had an Arctic Day and were likely

1 talking about those kind of things.

2 But I think there's -- it's basically just
3 throwing ideas around at this point in time.

4 ED WELCH: Any other comments or questions
5 for Laura?

6 Laura, you're going to be able to stay
7 with us for the rest of the morning; is that
8 correct?

9 LAURA FURGIONE: Yes, through much.

10 ED WELCH: Okay.

11 Well, thanks very much, and we appreciate
12 your presentation and your presence.

13 Now I think we're going to have Captain
14 Lowell finish -- well, we're scheduled for a
15 break, and you're also scheduled to make a
16 couple of comments.

17 Why don't we have our break. We actually
18 have 25 minutes for the break, so if we can be
19 back in place and get started and 11:00, that
20 would be great.

21 So people come staggering back in at five
22 minutes to 11:00, not staggering back in at
23 11:00.

24 Okay. Thanks.

1 (Recess.)

2 ED WELCH: Thanks. Welcome back. We're
3 going to have Captain Lowell start off with
4 some observations about some legislation on the
5 Hill that he's going to be testifying about.

6 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Thank you, Ed.

7 This isn't a push-to-talk, I hope.

8 Actually, I've got about three topics
9 here. I didn't mind moving the first one back
10 for now, because I'm not going to spend a lot
11 of time on it.

12 I did want to mention that you should all
13 be receiving the latest Arctic bill that Ed
14 just referenced. It's HR 2864. It's not a
15 very long change, it's just the front and the
16 back. And fundamentally it is to amend the
17 Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of about
18 98 authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data
19 and provide services hydrographic specific to
20 the Arctic for safe navigation, delineated in
21 the United States extended Continental Shelf
22 and the monitoring and description of coastal
23 changes.

24 So what the testimony is specifically on

1 is, is does this give NOAA anymore authority to
2 work in the Arctic?

3 And the testimony is focused on the fact
4 that it doesn't grant us any additional
5 authorities. We have all the authorities we
6 need to operate in the Arctic, but we certainly
7 don't dissuade them from moving the legislation
8 forward.

9 It highlights the need for these services
10 in the Arctic, as -- as Laura has adequately
11 covered over the last hour.

12 So the testimony -- the written testimony
13 just cleared last night, and we had copies made
14 this morning, so everybody should at your
15 leisure -- it's about two pages, a little bit
16 longer than the bill itself.

17 So with that said, unless there's any
18 specific questions on that, we can always come
19 back to that in a few minutes.

20 The second thing I just wanted to
21 mention --

22 ED WELCH: John, Captain Lowell, if we
23 could just for a moment, let's talk about the
24 bill before we move to the other things in case

1 anybody has any comments or questions about the
2 bill or the hearing tomorrow at a subcommittee
3 of the House Natural Resources Committee.

4 Are there other folks that have questions
5 or comments?

6 Yes, Andy Armstrong.

7 ANDY ARMSTRONG: Yes. I'd just like to
8 remark that Larry Mayer, the other co-director
9 of the Joint Hydrographic Center, will be
10 testifying along with Captain Lowell on -- on
11 this bill tomorrow.

12 ED WELCH: And, Captain, do we know who
13 any other witnesses might be?

14 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I don't. Paul, would you
15 happen to know who else was going to --

16 PAUL BRADLEY: Dr. John Farrell with the
17 Arctic Research Council.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I haven't heard of
19 any of the other witnesses, but I'll let you
20 know if I hear something.

21 ED WELCH: Admiral West.

22 ADMIRAL WEST: John, it's says it's
23 authorizing 10 million in '11, '12, is that
24 what the specific --

1 Is this additional money? This of course
2 comes with no money.

3 ADMIRAL WEST: Well, I know. But, I mean,
4 there's lot going on now that Andy and Larry's
5 gang is doing up there now.

6 Where is that money coming from?

7 CAPTAIN LOWELL: That's actually -- Andy,
8 do you want to --

9 ANDY ARMSTRONG: The -- the money that
10 we're using to do the extended continental
11 shelf mapping now originally came in a separate
12 line item for Alaska EEZ mapping that was under
13 the mapping and charting line.

14 That -- that line item has ended, and now
15 the --

16 ED WELCH: Andy, would you call that an
17 earmark?

18 ANDY ARMSTRONG: Well, in some sense, it
19 is -- it was, and others in wasn't. It was
20 specifically directed, but it wasn't aimed at a
21 particular target.

22 Now the money is coming from -- well,
23 Larry might know something about that.

24 But the money now to pay for the ECS

1 mapping is in the OAR budget under ocean
2 exploration and research.

3 And so the ECS money now is in OAR for
4 mapping, and then that money is going to pay
5 for ship time not just in the Arctic but in
6 other places as well, central Pacific in
7 particular. And the Joint Hydrographic Center
8 is leading that mapping effort.

9 ED WELCH: So, Admiral, are you fully
10 informed now?

11 Other -- Jon Dasler.

12 JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.

13 I guess these are budget line items
14 because, under the Hydrographic Services
15 Improvement Act, they have all the budgetary
16 items, and I guess -- for starters, I guess,
17 how much does NOAA actually use that when
18 they're putting their budget together?

19 Is this going to be an additional line
20 item? Because I guess there are several
21 categories. I was just trying to pull that up
22 in the '08 amendment.

23 I guess from looking at this, this would
24 be an added \$10 million budget. And I guess

1 getting back to the Admiral's question, is this
2 over and before or does it come out of one of
3 those other items that are listed there?

4 ED WELCH: Andy.

5 ANDY ARMSTRONG: I guess I would point out
6 this is an authorization bill, and so there's
7 no real money associated with this. This only
8 authorizes money to be appropriated.

9 So it -- it won't necessarily mean any
10 additional money unless the Appropriation
11 Committee chooses to add the money.

12 JONATHAN DASLER: I guess what my question
13 was is, when the President's budget is being
14 put together, do they use this authorization as
15 a guide?

16 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I think Ashley can answer
17 the question.

18 ASHLEY CHAPPELL: They could use it as a
19 guide. It could if they chose to fund --
20 specifically for the Arctic, it could be
21 proposed in any one of our lies or a separate
22 line, as you were asking.

23 So it could be mapping and charting base,
24 it could be address survey backlogs, but it

1 isn't right now anything. Does that make
2 sense?

3 In other words, it's not in the
4 President's request.

5 ED WELCH: For those of -- those of you
6 who are not Congress junkies, like me, it's
7 easy for Congress to pass an authorization
8 which provides legal authority to an agency to
9 spend money if they get the money.

10 It's harder in times like this to get the
11 appropriation, which is a second piece of
12 legislation, which actually provides real money
13 so, it's --

14 You know, the hard lifting in Congress is
15 not getting the authorization, although you
16 want to have an authorization. It's getting
17 the appropriate year by year.

18 So just because you have an authorization,
19 just because it's enacted into law doesn't mean
20 that Congress is going to appropriate it at all
21 or to the amount that's full allowed under
22 authorization.

23 And of course that's what we have
24 sometimes with our existing Hydrographic

1 Services Act, authorization. We have an
2 authorization of certain levels, but it may not
3 translate into an appropriation of that amount
4 year by year.

5 So the way this bill, if it were enacted
6 into law, the way I read it is it would add
7 additional line items to the authorization in
8 the Hydrographic Act, but it might or might not
9 lead to additional line items with real money
10 in a President's budget proposal or in the
11 annual appropriation bill Congress enacts.

12 ADMIRAL WEST: That's a good point.

13 But the problem we have here potentially
14 is if it's not appropriated, if you look at who
15 sponsored this bill, you may expect it be taken
16 out of hide and expect this to be done, in
17 which it does -- it goes back to what John
18 said, then you do take it out of hide and focus
19 someplace elsewhere you'd have to take it out
20 of already-appropriated money.

21 So that was what my question was, where
22 does this all come from and why?

23 JONATHAN DASLER: Again, I just pulled up
24 the '08 amendments, but it looks like seven and

1 eight, these are going to be in addition to, so
2 that other six items that were in the budget
3 are listed there.

4 So it looks like this would be in addition
5 to what's already authorized.

6 ED WELCH: That's the way I read it, Jon.
7 Okay.

8 Other comments on this bill?

9 So right now we don't know if there's a
10 Senate companion to the bill, and this is a
11 hearing at the subcommittee level. And
12 presumably after, that subcommittee and then
13 the full committee will vote or mark up the
14 bill.

15 Okay.

16 CAPTAIN LOWELL: All right.

17 Moving on to the next one, which was just
18 on the Deepwater comments, once again, Laura
19 covered the NOAA response to Deepwater quite
20 well there.

21 There's quite a bit of information
22 available to anybody who wishes to look for it
23 to get daily updates, oil spill trajectory,
24 thing of that nature, they're all on the

1 various websites.

2 I don't know if we provided that URL, but
3 search on "Deepwater" on the NOAA site, and I'm
4 sure you'll find dozens of hits.

5 I did want to mention a few things
6 specifically having to do with the NAV Services
7 groups, their offices that are here today.
8 Some of the things that we're doing, I have a
9 quick list here, this is not meant to be
10 all-inclusive.

11 Over at Coast Survey, we're doing a few
12 different things that we've done in the past.
13 Because this is a sustained event over longer
14 periods of time and the various ports and
15 people moving the ships around are concerned
16 about where the oil is, is we are putting on
17 our electronic chart updates and we're actually
18 creating daily paper charts that are available
19 for download for free of the extents of the
20 oil, so that the actual mariner coming in and
21 the Coast Guard managing the vessel traffic
22 have a good idea where it is.

23 It's not meant to be a panacea, but right
24 now they're trying to drive the ships right

1 through the oil and then dealing with it should
2 they get contaminated on the hull.

3 A lot of work on modeling. Coast Survey
4 continues to support lot of the OR&R efforts
5 there. NowCOAST, which I believe will be
6 coming up in a slide, most everybody here is
7 aware of that, but there's a lot of the
8 similarities between the nowCOAST engine and
9 the ERMA engine which is being used at OR&R.

10 So there's a lot of interaction between
11 the various developers there to try to get
12 information out on a realtime basis.

13 Aerial photos, I think it was mentioned
14 earlier today that NGS is actively getting
15 ready to fly an aircraft to support a lot of
16 the activities down there.

17 And of course CO-OPS, if you go over some
18 of the links directly off the OR&R site to the
19 CO-OPS support, it's really focused on
20 delivering a massive amount of data to the
21 decision-makers.

22 So I guess the takeaway message I want
23 everyone to take away is that the NAV Services
24 here are playing a critical role in the

1 Deepwater response, although we're not really
2 an oil spill responder per se.

3 Although the products and services we
4 generate in our -- always do is providing a
5 real resource for the people out there doing
6 the work.

7 And I ignored a lot of the other
8 interactions and coordinations and things of
9 that that the groups are doing.

10 I was going to close the Deepwater
11 comments there unless anybody had any specific
12 questions.

13 ED WELCH: Gary, Gary Jeffress.

14 GARY JEFFRESS: John, these products are
15 great, but I was wondering down the track will
16 they be used in litigation? And do you prepare
17 these maps with that in mind?

18 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Well, everything we
19 create we create with an eye towards
20 litigation, unfortunately. And what we've
21 done, because they are for navigation, is we do
22 take the trajectories, the total uncertainty,
23 and we don't give all -- currently we're not
24 provided all of the -- inside the oil spill

1 data, which is pretty much saying within 48
2 hours, within the uncertainty bounds, this is
3 where the oil is expected to be. There's
4 multiple lanes there that perhaps they can
5 route ships through.

6 But right now, we're not so much focused
7 on litigation, other than it seems to be a
8 reasonable, safe way forward at this point.
9 And of course we archive every chart history
10 that goes out every day at this point.

11 I wouldn't be surprised if there's one or
12 two lawsuits involved with Deepwater.

13 ED WELCH: Other comments or questions,
14 observations? Jon.

15 JONATHAN DASLER: John, is anything being
16 done in mapping the debris? I'm sure BP is
17 doing a lot of that, but I was curious if NOAA
18 has taken on any role in trying to map the
19 debris that's on the bottom or even
20 acoustically mapping the plume that's coming up
21 with the resources just so there's --

22 Or are you getting that kind of
23 information, is any of that filtering back from
24 BP for analysis by NOAA?

1 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Well, the actual rig is
2 in very, very deep water. Our current assets,
3 the NOAA fleet, hydrographic fleet, we don't
4 have assets that can survey that deep.

5 I don't know whether BP has been using
6 those. I know they have ROEs down there and
7 they're all in the pipes. I actually can't
8 answer that question as to what they're using
9 and how they're doing it.

10 JONATHAN DASLER: You have access to
11 contractor assets in serving that?

12 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Nobody has asked us for
13 that. I think we know where everything is at
14 this point.

15 ED WELCH: Elaine Dickison.

16 ELAINE DICKISON: Yes.

17 John, I know this isn't your bailiwick,
18 but on the fisheries closure, is that going to
19 last as long as there's oil out there? Do you
20 have any idea how long the duration is going to
21 be?

22 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I would have no idea.

23 ED WELCH: Did you have a comment?

24 LAURA FURGIONE: The only thing right now,

1 the closure is for ten days, and the idea is to
2 do an assessment after that and see if it needs
3 to extend longer than that or not.

4 The other thing is also to assess when the
5 openings of various fisheries are, maybe, you
6 know, if the cleanup actually is successful,
7 then you could have an opening delay versus
8 having complete closure.

9 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Let me get back to the
10 second half of John's question, which was
11 tracking the oil. There actually are some
12 proposals out there that have been floated to
13 utilize some of the existing multibeam sensors
14 to perhaps try to track the oil in the water
15 column.

16 UNH is thinking it's eminently possible.
17 It's a matter of getting out there and trying
18 it.

19 ED WELCH: Juliana Blackwell.

20 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Just to comment on the
21 imagery that has already been started to be
22 collected, NGS has personnel that collected
23 300-plus images yesterday.

24 Basically what we're doing is going over

1 to the OR&r, Office of Response and
2 Restoration, the designated priority areas to
3 establish a baseline imagery of that shoreline.

4 So we're trying to collect the baseline
5 imaging now in areas that we think will be --
6 OR&R thinks will be first impacted, and then go
7 back and fly those areas if and when they do
8 get impacted by the oil.

9 So right now, we're just doing baseline
10 collection imagery.

11 ED WELCH: Captain, under the Oil
12 Pollution Act, for an OCS facility, which
13 Deepwater Horizon is, they are the responsible
14 party which presumably is British Petroleum, is
15 responsible to repay the government all
16 response costs.

17 Is NOAA calculating all of its response
18 costs?

19 CAPTAIN LOWELL: There's been fairly good
20 guidance coming down as to cost being expended
21 right now.

22 I know we're acting and tracking that in
23 my office. Perhaps Laura can --

24 LAURA FURGIONE: My friend and cohort,

1 Maureen Wiley, immediately set up an accounting
2 code so we could be putting up all of the
3 dedicated efforts for Deepwater Horizon on that
4 accounting code.

5 So we do have -- that code will then
6 ideally be reimbursed. And the next thing
7 would be likely supplemental that comes along
8 with this as well.

9 ED WELCH: When you -- Laura, when you say
10 "supplemental," do you mean a supplemental
11 appropriation?

12 LAURA FURGIONE: Yes.

13 ED WELCH: Because all your response calls
14 should be reimbursed but the responsible party.

15 LAURA FURGIONE: I just received some
16 money from Exxon Valdez last year, so 20 years
17 later. We would likely need to be reimbursed
18 immediately. And so if you want reimbursal
19 immediately beyond litigation that could
20 potentially arise, you might need a
21 supplemental to offset that.

22 ED WELCH: Okay, fair point. That's a
23 question of timing as opposed to actual
24 eventual payment.

1 I would on behalf of the panel here, if
2 the NOAA system of tracking this spending can
3 in some way designate for us how much of
4 Hydrographic Services' resources are going to
5 be devoted to some kind of response, that would
6 be -- that would be interesting to us.

7 Because early you said -- I think in your
8 remarks you said you all really weren't an oil
9 spill response agency or unit, but here you are
10 putting in some of your resources to -- to
11 respond, which basically just sort of
12 reinforces the fact that you were there to
13 respond in the first place.

14 In other words, you had resources
15 available that could be used to respond, even
16 though that's not your main mission.

17 And had you not had those resources, there
18 would not have been that aspect of the
19 response.

20 Also, dare to speculate that the current
21 NOAA strategic plan doesn't say anything about
22 responding to a massive oil -- 5,000-foot oil
23 spill.

24 So that shows a little bit about the

1 limits of strategic planning. Your agencies
2 have to be nimble about responding to whatever
3 comes their way.

4 Any additional comments or -- Admiral?

5 ADMIRAL WEST: Yes, just a quick comment.

6 Parallel to keeping track of your
7 expenditures was this group met in Houston,
8 what, four years ago. We reviewed NOAA's
9 response to Katrina, and we were all very, very
10 pleased with what the Coast Guard and NOAA did,
11 and there was a report and we kept asking about
12 where is this report. I don't think it ever
13 came up, the response NOAA had as opposed to
14 Katrina.

15 So maybe this time you around you could
16 get a little better press on reaction to this
17 oil spill.

18 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I can tell you just from
19 listening to the news reports, everybody down
20 there is acknowledging it, so it's very much a
21 coordinated effort for not just Feds but all of
22 the agencies involved, even BP and the support
23 services there. And I hear NOAA referenced
24 frequently at all levels, so...

1 ADMIRAL WEST: You got to document for the
2 long haul, though, John. That's a one-time
3 thing that looks good, but you got to --

4 ED WELCH: You got to toot your own horn
5 with OMB and everybody else. I think Laura had
6 a comment.

7 LAURA FURGIONE: I always have a comment.

8 But my point on the Katrina effort is
9 definitely the media picked up on the Coast
10 Guard and NOAA's responses, the two agencies
11 that actually were successful in the response
12 to Katrina.

13 So there are several reports on our
14 response to Katrina, and we did our own
15 assessment as well internally.

16 But you can never celebrate your successes
17 enough, so I appreciate the comment.

18 ADMIRAL WEST: Well, if that report was
19 produced, then maybe at the meeting we could
20 get -- maybe somebody could come and share it
21 with this group here, because we pressed for
22 that and never really saw it.

23 CAPTAIN LOWELL: We'll go ahead and
24 capture that.

1 JONATHAN DASLER: One more comment?

2 ED WELCH: Yes, Jon.

3 JONATHAN DASLER: Just while we're on the
4 subject, talking with one of the NAV managers
5 down there the other day, one of the concerns
6 is they're trying to do oil trajectories based
7 on a 100-year-old hydrography where a lot of
8 the shallow water shoreline and the concerns of
9 the oil moving in to some of that habitat, I
10 mean, you can have areas where there's 30
11 feet -- I mean, significant changes in the
12 shoreline than what's charted.

13 Fortunately, a lot of that was recently
14 charted with some of the debris mapping, but
15 there's still a lot of areas where the charts
16 are vastly out of date, and that has significant
17 impact when you're talking about trajectory
18 models in the shallow water.

19 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Yes. I didn't go into
20 all the details, but we do have a couple of
21 rushes on to try to get some of that -- again,
22 specific, larger-scale working documents that
23 aren't -- necessarily not the charts per se but
24 can be delivered to the people on the ground in

1 the field close to the shore where they might,
2 you know, find some uses with these products,
3 to give them the latest imagery on the
4 shoreline we have. And then as the new stuff
5 comes in, we'll do what we can.

6 But to wrap it up from my end, I -- you
7 know, speaking for myself, and I'm going to
8 presume almost all of NOAA is doing the same
9 thing, is everybody is taking a little bit of
10 time to kind of look at their current what they
11 do, how they do it, and I understand, okay, we
12 have these skills and abilities and resources
13 and how can we apply that here to any
14 meaningful effect.

15 So I think we're going to see some fits
16 and starts. We're going to see some successes
17 and some things that maybe aren't as useful as
18 others, so...

19 And we continue to develop our next -- our
20 next, you know, product that may be useful.
21 And so at this point, we're dedicating
22 resources to try to help that effort.

23 ED WELCH: Okay. Thanks, Captain.

24 I think probably we've got to move on to

1 the next topic, which is status of solicitation
2 for the next round of members to this panel.

3 Okay. Well, what I'd like to do is just
4 kind of walk everybody through what happened.
5 And I don't have the actual timeline in front
6 of me, but as everyone was aware early or the
7 middle of last year, we knew that we were going
8 to -- we had five -- I believe five, maybe six
9 panel members or slots vacant.

10 The three office directors at the time,
11 Juliana, Mike and Steve -- I'm not really sure
12 if Andy was involved in the selection
13 process -- but they went out, followed the
14 procedures, collected a bunch of candidates.

15 They felt they didn't have enough
16 candidates at the time on the first
17 announcement, so they actually went out again.
18 They had another call, shook the tree a little
19 harder. Then they ended up with a reasonable
20 number of people based on what we've done in
21 the past.

22 Basically, ever since the creation of
23 the -- of this particular FACA back in 2002,
24 this was the process that had been put in

1 place. And they went through, they made some
2 recommendations, the recommendations went out
3 to NOAA.

4 And of course during this time frame, as
5 NOAA leadership had changed, of course
6 presidential leadership had changed, as we've
7 been walking through today, there's been some
8 realignment of some directions and some
9 thinking about where NOAA should be headed.
10 And when the package made it up to -- the --
11 the new administrator, apparently there'd
12 been --

13 Let me take it one step back and say that
14 a lot of these processes have been in place for
15 a while. And, you know, lack of clarifying
16 guidance as you continue to go through the
17 process that you know.

18 And at the time, she had seen a couple of
19 FACA packages go through. She wasn't really
20 happy with the process. She wasn't comfortable
21 about some of the names, and she kept going
22 back, you know, this is not -- you know, we
23 need to refine this, we need to improve this.

24 And then when our particular FACA package

1 got to her, she just said I still don't see any
2 changes. So at that point, she said I'm going
3 to hold on these things until we get this
4 process looked at again, we take a broader look
5 at what it is we want everybody to thinking
6 about, where NOAA's going, and just kind of
7 reevaluate how we're dealing with these.

8 And so that said, it went back, and that
9 put us in a bit of a pickle, because we had a
10 bunch of FACA members expiring. We couldn't
11 hold the next HSRP, which is this one, without
12 enough members.

13 So that looking at all the options we had,
14 the decision was to go ahead and offer an
15 extension to the existing members of which --
16 and I thank you all who were extended for
17 taking on the additional workload.

18 And we wrote those to be extended for a
19 year or until we could get the new members on.

20 So that kind of gave us some time. New
21 guidance has now come down from NOAA, and we
22 are actively going out again, following the new
23 guidance, following the new procedures, and
24 we're not really throwing out any of the old

1 applicants.

2 In fact, we wrote letters to every
3 applicant that we had, and we pretty much said
4 simply wave your hand if you want to be
5 considered again, and you will automatically be
6 considered. Your application is valid, and we
7 will move on that.

8 So that's where we are right now. I
9 believe the FRN -- rather, the Federal Register
10 Note -- is out. I don't know whether that's
11 expired yet.

12 KATHY WATSON: June 30th. Twelve weeks to
13 apply.

14 CAPTAIN LOWELL: So we're actively --
15 people are busy doing their application
16 packages.

17 I would imagine we'll set a timeline in
18 place for closing that out, viewing the
19 packages and putting the names forward again.

20 We just have to reconstitute the selection
21 group, who I suppose will be a little bit
22 different than the last time. Juliana has to
23 walk through it again.

24 So that's where we're at right now. I

1 would open it up for questions at this point.
2 I don't know how much more clarification I can
3 do on the -- on the process.

4 ED WELCH: Captain Andy McGovern.

5 ANDY MCGOVERN: Thanks.

6 I've been involved in FACAs for a while,
7 and this happens every time you go through a
8 change of administration. Generally nobody
9 wants to make a decision.

10 And I've been on FACAs that every single
11 person on the committee was -- had been
12 expired, so it had been in some cases five
13 years since a slate was signed, so I don't
14 think it's a big deal as far as that goes.

15 To me, what's a bigger deal is, I guess,
16 is that there's this feeling that the
17 membership needs to be hand-picked in order
18 to -- I guess my observation is to rubber-stamp
19 what the administrator wants to go forward as
20 opposed to, you know, this committee should be
21 picked for the expertise in the room and to
22 advise NOAA on what they think NOAA should do.

23 And if NOAA chooses to take that advice,
24 that's fine. That's what a FACA is. It's an

1 advisory committee.

2 So we make advice and, you know, they can
3 choose to either ignore it, you know, take it
4 wholly or take part of it.

5 But to, I guess, load the committee so
6 that it's almost a rubber stamp, that's where
7 I -- and it just seems like maybe I'm getting
8 the wrong impression here, but that's where it
9 seemed like it's going, and that -- that I have
10 a problem with, not with delay. I think that's
11 just normal government, especially around a
12 change of administration.

13 But I just seem to think that, you know,
14 the committee should be, you know -- the
15 membership should be based on expertise and not
16 on their view where they think NOAA should go,
17 because that's going to come out later based on
18 their expertise.

19 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I didn't mean to infer
20 that we're trying to get people to -- to
21 already agree with the direction NOAA is going.

22 Obviously a FACA is constituted
23 specifically to do that, to provide advice to
24 the director, and you all work for -- excuse

1 me, the administrator of NOAA.

2 I think, you know, when you read the FACA
3 for the authorization for the Hydrographic
4 Services panel, it is rather broad in scope,
5 and I think the -- the current membership is
6 very much focused on the maritime, you know,
7 commercial users.

8 So I do know when we're looking at the new
9 memberships, they were looking at specifically
10 KSAs, because there's also a regional focus.
11 There's a few other things that they look at.

12 ED WELCH: Captain, translate a "KSA,"
13 please.

14 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Oh, I'm sorry, knowledge,
15 skills and ability, which is what Captain
16 McGovern was referring to there.

17 And he's exactly right. You want people
18 who are experts in that particular area that
19 they're going to be providing advice to NOAA
20 on.

21 So I don't believe anybody is trying to
22 get anything to be rubber-stamped here at all.

23 ED WELCH: Jon Dasler.

24 JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.

1 I think the other concern is with the
2 broadening of the -- the skill sets is that it
3 could be watering down to some extent, I guess,
4 the Hydrographic Services component of it.

5 Because it still seems like the focus
6 should be as Hydrographic Services is defined
7 in the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act,
8 and I think that's maybe some of the concern of
9 the panel, is that that scope could be
10 broadening and would lose that focus.

11 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I actually don't think it
12 would broaden that much.

13 And, in fact, the FACA specifically does
14 call out things like coastal managers,
15 fisheries managers, things of that nature,
16 right in the language itself.

17 I actually didn't see a big problem with
18 that at all. It's just a recognition that, you
19 know, we just needed a little bit of diversity
20 in the panel so that as these new directions,
21 as these new topics come up, you can get a
22 group of diverse opinions to kind of hash those
23 matters so that the recommendations can go
24 forward, fully fleshed out and argued.

1 ED WELCH: Larry Whiting.

2 LARRY WHITING: Yes, Larry Whiting.

3 John, Captain John, there's only two
4 contractors here on this panel this time.
5 We've both been extended, and we're due to
6 leave. Whenever you start broadening out this
7 scope, we do lose our focus. You can tell that
8 into the last couple of years as of the number
9 of contractors here. With the demise of John
10 Oswald, we became less focused on hydrographic
11 work. We've broadened out what we're trying to
12 do.

13 In the last couple of years, we have -- I
14 talked to the last NOAA administrator, and I
15 called him floundering and he wanted know my
16 definition of "floundering."

17 We don't have a direction we're going now.
18 And if you broaden this thing out, we're not
19 going to have a direction to go.

20 ED WELCH: Admiral West.

21 ADMIRAL WEST: John, I -- this -- just to
22 jump in here, I think one of the things that
23 probably could have made this a little easier
24 is had this all been explained up front before

1 it was all done to the committee -- and I
2 mentioned to Jennifer, my suggestion is from
3 now on -- I think --

4 By the way, we kind of work for Jane and
5 we kind of don't. We're special government
6 employees, so we have access to some privileged
7 information that the government has to do our
8 job. But we're there to advise her. We don't
9 work for her. And I think we actually work for
10 Congress. That's the...

11 And so my suggestion is -- and I don't --
12 I think she has the right to do what she's
13 doing now. And maybe, I don't know, broadening
14 or whatever the right word is, but taking a
15 look at who's on the panel and make sure you
16 don't get too much of some and not -- you know,
17 that's her priority.

18 But my suggestion was when you bring this
19 slate up, don't make it so secretive. Take the
20 chairman and the vice chairman of the -- of the
21 FACA, doesn't necessarily have to be this one
22 but all of them, take the responsible AA, NOS,
23 and go up and discuss the slate with Jane and
24 her team and then get the input from everybody.

1 Then she closes the door and makes her
2 decision. That's fine.

3 But I think if you got more people
4 involved with this, then a lot of this concern
5 that we all had -- including me -- maybe would
6 have been advised a little bit, and we might
7 even be able to have some good input for her on
8 what we are missing as a committee.

9 So I pass that to Jennifer. I don't know
10 where it's going to go from there.

11 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Thank you very much,
12 Admiral.

13 ED WELCH: Tom Skinner.

14 TOM SKINNER: Just a logistics question,
15 John, what's your time frame for getting the
16 new members on board?

17 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I think we'll lay out the
18 actual time frame pretty quick here. We'll
19 have to sit down and start coordinating
20 schedules. You know how it works.

21 But I would imagine no more than a couple
22 of months here after the close of the process.
23 We don't have that much time, because everybody
24 will expire in one year.

1 TOM SKINNER: Just follow up on that,
2 should the people who are expiring or who have
3 expired in terms of membership, like I am, plan
4 on attending the next meeting or is that still
5 in flux?

6 CAPTAIN LOWELL: The next meeting is
7 scheduled for September --

8 TOM SKINNER: 13th?

9 LAURA FURGIONE: September. Be there.

10 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I would say at this
11 point, it's going to take probably beyond that.

12 What we should really do is think about
13 how to transition. We're going to lose a lot
14 of panel members, so there's going to be a big
15 vacuum when that occurs. So maybe that's a
16 topic for discussion, as to how to capture some
17 of that.

18 ED WELCH: Yes, Kathy Watson.

19 KATHY WATSON: Sorry.

20 Just a little bit of the logistics on the
21 FRN. It closes on June 30th. And we take all
22 the 2009 applicants that still want to be
23 considered with the new ones, the 2010 that
24 have come in.

1 Then we got to set up the evaluation
2 committee, which is Juliana, Captain Lowell and
3 Rich Edwing now, you get to join in on that
4 process.

5 And we've got to review and set the
6 criteria, and then you do the recommendations
7 that go to the NOS administrator. And then
8 from there, it goes to Lubchenco, and that's
9 going to take at least a couple of months, two
10 to three months.

11 And we're looking at maybe
12 mid-September/October time frame. That's if
13 she makes an approval and a decision on those
14 recommended candidates. Could be possible she
15 could come back and say, well, let me look at
16 more of your pool of candidates. That may
17 delay things a little bit longer. We don't
18 know.

19 But we're hoping by the end of the year we
20 would have the 11 vacancies filled. That's the
21 target.

22 ED WELCH: Could I ask for a show of hands
23 of all the people who had expired and have been
24 extended, just so that we know who we're

1 talking about here? Thank you.

2 And then who is planning to expire at the
3 end of the year? Okay.

4 One observation I would have, and this --
5 this comes about with some of the other FACAs
6 that Andy McGovern --

7 The FACAs are set up so that there's a
8 scheduled turnover, and so there's always a mix
9 of experience and new blood coming in. And if
10 you delay too much for whatever appropriate
11 reason, you run the risk of too much experience
12 leaving all at one time and a whole bunch of
13 new folks coming on that really don't know the
14 institutional history or what the committee is
15 about.

16 So that's -- there always are
17 understandable reasons, I guess, for why FACA
18 appointments are delayed or reconsidered, but
19 that's one of the unintended negative
20 consequences, and I hope that the NOAA
21 leadership recognizes that.

22 Also, it would -- some of the Coast Guard
23 FACA committees I'm familiar with where there
24 had been extensions and problems, there was the

1 primary reason for the dissatisfaction with the
2 slates was lack of gender and racial diversity.

3 Is that -- was that a consideration here
4 or is it more of experience and work expertise,
5 lack of diversity?

6 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Well, I believe FACA law
7 doesn't allow you to take race and gender into
8 consideration. So it was really a broadening
9 of, you know, the direction the HSRP should --
10 or the issues the HSRP should be engaging in.

11 ED WELCH: Okay. Other comments?

12 Kathy Watson.

13 KATHY WATSON: And I just want to quickly
14 say, the five that we extended was Dasler,
15 Whiting, Myrtidis, Hickman, Skinner.

16 And the five that are going to expire
17 January 1, 2011, are Wellslager, McBride,
18 McGovern, Dickinson and West.

19 ED WELCH: Okay. Thank you, Kathy.

20 I guess when one of our -- when we had one
21 of our previous meetings and we sent our
22 comments and recommendation to the
23 administrator, I guess Dr. Lubchenco had just
24 assumed her duties, and she did reply to us,

1 and in her reply she said she looked forward
2 hopefully to attending one of our HSRP
3 meetings, and I think that would be great, if
4 that could occur.

5 And I think it would be great if -- we're
6 six months out, if we could start making
7 efforts to see if she can come to Portland and
8 if she can arrange her schedule to do other
9 things.

10 So that -- that would be, I think, an
11 excellent thing for both the agency and her and
12 us if it could be arranged.

13 So I think we'll -- we'll pursue that
14 here. But I wanted to mention that with Laura
15 here before you go back, and obviously we'll
16 work with Captain Lowell and some of the other
17 NOAA to see if that might be possible.

18 But she did express in her reply to us an
19 interest in trying to do that at some point.
20 Okay.

21 All right. Well, then I think, Captain,
22 we can move on to the last item that we had
23 here this morning, which was your observations
24 on the original most-wanted recommendations.

1 But I also understand there's some internal
2 rearrangement of some of what we're going to
3 talk about.

4 CAPTAIN LOWELL: This would be the in-flux
5 part of the agenda.

6 As most of you know, I will be departing
7 at 3:00 this afternoon. My -- my DFO duties
8 will be delegated to Juliana Blackwell, so --
9 and the reason I'm doing that is to testify
10 tomorrow on the Arctic bill that we just
11 discussed.

12 So to kind of align everything, and it's a
13 little out of schedule, we originally wanted to
14 talk about all of the activities against the
15 HSRP most-wanted and then do office reviews
16 tomorrow.

17 But talking to Juliana and Rich, I'm just
18 going to go ahead and do all OCSs here. I got
19 a little less than 30 minutes at this point.
20 And then they'll take the hour for tomorrow and
21 divide that hour up into two 30-minute chunks.

22 So that's kind of what happened here, and
23 I hope that doesn't surprise anybody.

24 We already went through one of the slides.

1 Good. We're off to a good start.

2 VIRGINIA DENTLER: Oh, I can start at the
3 beginning.

4 CAPTAIN LOWELL: Oh, I think it's just the
5 title slide. Yes.

6 So this is structured around the HSRP
7 most-wanted. So the first one, of course, is
8 aggressively map. Some of the -- some of the
9 statistics have just come out is in '09 we got
10 3,219 square nautical miles. In '10, we got
11 2200 to date, with a target of 2600. '09, we
12 got a lot of that with the ARRA funds, which I
13 believe is the next slide coming up.

14 We do have some additional impacts,
15 someone of which was due to the ARRA funds,
16 which got the RAINIER a longer repair period --
17 we took it off line, but we'll get a more
18 capable vessel out of that process -- and
19 there's been some unfortunate delays with the
20 FERDINAND HASSLER, which is the new build swath
21 being built down in Moss Point, VT Halter.

22 And I do believe Admiral Bailey will get
23 into some details this afternoon on that.

24 ADMIRAL BAILEY: Love to.

1 CAPTAIN LOWELL: I'm sure it's one of your
2 favorite topics.

3 So that slowed down some the NOAA
4 acquisition. The contracts are steaming right
5 along, and we're doing very good on that.

6 So go on to the next one.

7 Here is the ARRA slide. As everyone
8 knows, the Hydrographic Services received
9 40 million via the ARRA funding package. It
10 was allocated across the three offices. And
11 there's kind of the output there. We got about
12 1900 square nautical miles of data on the
13 hydrographic side, and there's some of the
14 areas they worked. And approximately
15 32 million of that went out to the hydrographic
16 contractors.

17 Water levels, 2.5 million was spent. I
18 believe Rich will go into -- where did Rich go?
19 Rich will go into some details tomorrow on what
20 that bought. And the shoreline, 2 million,
21 Juliana will cover tomorrow also.

22 But actually, I think we're leveraging
23 some other work that's been done with that, so
24 I think we'll get a really big output on that