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

(Pause.)

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

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

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

When we scheduled this meeting, we did not anticipate the various demands on NOAA that were going to be occurring concurrently, the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, the -- a congressional hearing later on this week. This has caused the NOAA planning staff who work for the HSRP to have to scramble to preserve our agenda and accommodate the needs of some of the people that had hoped to be with us who have to
go elsewhere, but I want to thank Kathy Watson
and her colleagues for responding very well to
daily changes in the program.

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

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

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

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

Welcome back, Tom.

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

John.

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Thank you, Ed.

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

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

With that said, a couple of administrative things. Everybody should be aware that in an
emergency, there's our main exit, is the door we came in.

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

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

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

There's a lot of new things happening, as everyone is aware of. So we have a couple of distinguished speakers. We hope to -- that everybody will understand the direction that NOAA is headed at a high level and hopefully through the FACA itself and the hydrographic services we provide, kind of see how the NAV
services fit into the broader picture as we move forward.

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

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Thank you, Captain.

First of all, I'd like to introduce Jill, our court reporter over there. And I would encourage folks, please speak into the microphone when you recognize -- and speak into
a working microphone, not what I did.

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

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

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

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

So Andy, please.

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

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

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

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

ADAM McBRIDE: Adam McBride, Port of Lake Charles.

ELAINE DICKINSON: Elaine Dickson, BoatUS.

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

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

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

ED WELCH: I'm Ed Welch, Alexandria,
Virginia. I do representational work for the Passenger Vessel Association and the Union of Greek Shipowners.

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Captain John Lowell, NOAA, DFO.

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

ADMIRAL WEST: Dick West, retired Navy, retired president of a nonprofit in DC promoting ocean research and education.

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

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

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

SHERRI HICKMAN: Sherri Hickman, Houston Pilots.

MATT WELLSLAGER: Matt Wellslager, South Carolina Geodetic Survey.

TOM JACOBSEN: Tom Jacobsen, Long Beach Pilots, California.
VIRGINIA DENTLER: Virginia Dentler, Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services and staff for FACA.

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

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

ASHLEY CHAPPLE: Hi, I'm Ashley Chappell, Coast Survey.

CAPTAIN GERO GLANG: Gerd Glang, Office of Coast Survey.

DOUG BROWN: Doug Brown, National Geodetic Survey.

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

BOB HAMILTON: Bob Hamilton with Woods Hole Group.

JOE ESSY: Joe Essy [phonetic], Newport.

HOWARD DANLEY: Howard Danley, Office of Coast Survey.

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
CAPTAIN LOWELL: Okay.

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

So with that, thank you very much, Laura.

LAURA FURGIONE: Is this on? That's on.

Good, great, thank you.

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

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

So again, I am the assistant administrator for NOAA's Office of Program, Planning and Integration. I believe my deputy was here.
speaking with you during your April meeting, April 2009, on NOAA's next-generation strategic plan, so I'll talk with you a little bit more about that after Jennifer Lukens gives us a presentation on a couple of things going on in DC.

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

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

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

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

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

JENNIFER LUKENS: She's flying.

LAURA FURGIONE: Flying. And looking at the impact.

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

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

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

So you can see the accumulative trajectory map here, and it's difficult to pull that up any bigger. You all have seen this on the
Right now, the weather is cooperating, so the National Weather Service is giving spot forecasts for the area. We have had offshore winds, and that's why it hasn't reached the northern Gulf of Mexico coast as of yet. But with the light winds throughout the week, we are expecting some south to southeasterly winds to start up on Thursday and even into Friday. So this weekend again is another threat for the oil to move onshore.

We also have remote-operated vehicles trying to work on the sections of the -- to cut off a section at the end of riser pipe there, so it's a pretty interesting incident, interesting in the fact that a lot of the precautionary measures we've taken at the past have been at like 350 feet, as you've heard on the news, and this incident is at 5,000 feet. So dealing underwater a mile below the surface is pretty significant.

If you move down just a little bit further, you can see that again decreasing winds the sea state on those bullets should
allow for some operations to take place on the
mitigation efforts.

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

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

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

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

And I still think that Tom should be
chairing this meeting, but that's between you
1 and Ed.
2 Thank you.
3 ED WELCH: Laura, thank you. Laura is going to be making a presentation a little bit later in the morning on some substantive aspects of NOAA's work.
4 Does anybody have any general comments or questions they want to put to Laura at this particular time? Okay.
5 Kathy, we are ahead of schedule. What do we do in a situation like that?
6 KATHY WATSON: Don't stop.
7 ED WELCH: Okay.
8 Our next presentation is by Jennifer Lukens from NOAA, and senior policy advisor to the NOAA Undersecretary.
9 So, Jennifer, the floor is yours.
10 Welcome.
11 JENNIFER LUKENS: Thank you. Good morning. It's a long walk up to this podium here.
12 So thank you. I'm really happy to be here, even though I am the third-string.
13 Certainly, as Laura said, we have a lot of all
hands on deck, but the good thing about having
a third string is I'm the person who's been
living and breathing this issue for the past
year, so hopefully I'll be able to answer any
questions that you do have.

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

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

And she -- I know that in her previous
position up here in New England working for the
Nature Conservancy was really engaged in
coastal and marine spatial planning issues and
regional ocean governance. So I just wanted to
speak to that.
So why am I here today? I'm not sure how familiar you all may be with the Ocean Policy Task Force.

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

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

Subsequent -- there was also another commission stood up by the Pew -- stood up by Pew, the Pew Oceans Commission that came out with recommendations in 2003. And together many of their recommendations were pretty consistent with each other.
And one of the overarching themes was that the US government did need a comprehensive national ocean policy. With over 140 different laws and statutes that touched different components of the ocean, there was no comprehensive way of looking at the oceans. So that's one of the reasons the President pulled together this memo and stood up the task force.

The Department of Commerce is one of the members on that task force, Dr. Lubchenco, administrator of NOAA, served as the Department of Commerce representative on that task force. And it's been actually one of her top priorities. She has made every single principal's meeting, all of the public meetings that we had all across the country. Even despite her schedule, she was able to attend those, and she's been extremely engaged in this interagency process and has dedicated a lot of NOAA efforts, and you'll see that in a lot of NOAA's priorities and her vision is reflected in these documents.

But in the document -- in the memo itself,
the President did state we do have a
stewardship responsibility to maintain healthy,
resilient and sustainable oceans coasts and
Great Lakes for this generation and future
generations.

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

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

That was released in September of 2009.

And then the task force went on to the next set
of recommendations to develop, which is working
on a framework for effective coastal and marine spatial planning.

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

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

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

And for the first set of recommendations, the first report that was released in
September, there was a 30-day public comment period on the policy document itself, and then later when the interim framework for coastal and marine spatial planning was released in December, that was put out for a 60-day public comment period.

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

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

And you'll see in the document itself, it breaks out those policies under the themes of
healthy and resilient, the stewardship component, safe and productive in terms of safety, national security, economy, and then also understood and treasured in terms of better understanding/increasing our scientific knowledge of the oceans but also educating folks about them so as to value them.

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

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

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

Afternoon the Ocean Commission -- US Ocean Commission released their report in 2004, the Bush administration responded to that report.
with a US ocean action plan, a series of things, tasks to carry out that would also address that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are two existing groups right now, JSOST and SIMOR, Laura, not SIMOR, which are similar groups under the previous structure, but this policy document outlines a greater coordination between the two entities and the mechanism for them meeting on a regular basis and talking and reporting up to the National
Ocean Council, which we call the NOC.

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

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

The first is how is us as the US Government going to change the way we do business and really focusing on -- at NOAA we've been using kind of an ecosystem-based approach to management for a while, but really adopting ecosystem-based management as a foundational principle for comprehensive management of the oceans across the government.
Agencies that may not be familiar with this term, which is -- a lot of people when you say ecosystem-based management, they think it's just about the fish in the water and the predators and marine plants.

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

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

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

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

Then the areas of special emphasis that
were outlined by the task force of things to focus on, one is resiliency and adaptation to climate change and ocean acidification, regional ecosystem protection and restoration, water quality and sustainable practices on land, because what happens on land ultimately impacts our ocean and coastal resources.

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

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

So we'll get into the fourth task, which is really coastal and marine spatial planning. A lot of different people have a lot of different definitions of what coastal and marine spatial planning is or marine spatial
planning, so -- and this is the definition that
you have 24 federal agencies that came up with
and there's a lot -- it's a mouthful. It
certainly is a mouthful.

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

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

People say it's just zoning in the oceans
and it isn't zoning in the oceans. It's a
planning process. It's a way of looking
forward and thinking about things ahead of time before decisions have to be made.

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

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

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

I've highlighted three here that are new, sort of, that don't link directly back to the -- to the ocean policy, which is really the
goals of coastal and marine spatial planning are to promote compatibility among uses and to reduce user conflicts, to streamline and improve the rigor and consistency of decision-making for permitting, for permitting people who are looking to site things out in the oceans, and also increasing certainty and predictability in planning efforts.

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

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

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

It's also -- again, science is -- needs to
be there and agencies need to work together to be -- have the most -- best available scientific information to make decisions related to coastal and marine spatial plans. And also, something that's really key here is flexibility to accommodate to changing conditions. Plans aren't static. The environment changes, science changes, policy changes and technology changes really need to be wrapped into these plans.

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

It's -- again, they're outlined here, but looking at existing uses that are out there, maintaining existing uses but with new -- new emerging uses, such as wind and hydrokinetic energy, alternative energy, those new uses that are come on, ways to afford them the opportunity to site things, but also maintain
existing uses that are out there, all while being able to sustain our ecosystem services and the things that support those uses.

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

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

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

Streamlining, permitting regulation and governance, by getting all the federal agencies to a table to talk about what -- this type of
planning, it develops relationships and only that way to be able to have -- come up with ways to maybe be able to permit projects together instead of sequentially and running into roadblocks in that process, a way to avoid that.

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

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

The National Ocean Council would set kind of 10,000-foot level objectives for coastal and marine spatial planning, but they recognize that different regions of the country have different drivers and interests, so they wanted to provide -- set this up regionally as opposed to nationally, so that they're consistent to a certain extent nationally but provide flexibility for regions to approach this the way that they are best able to approach it.
You'll see here on this map we -- the regions that were selected by the task force line up and synch up nicely with the existing regional ocean governance groups that are already stood up on the West Coast, the West Coast Governors Agreement. Up in the Northeast, you have NROC. In the Mid-Atlantic, you have MARCO.

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

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

These also not only synch up with the regional ocean governance groups to a certain extent, they also synch up with the large marine ecosystems that have been identified, with the exception of the Pacific Islands. There is no technical large marine ecosystem for all those islands out there, so that's one thing that the task force recognizes is hard.
Sometimes since they're out there in the ocean by themselves, they kind of all get lumped together as one.

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

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

These regional planning bodies, who sits on them, it's the federal government, federal entities that have authorities related to coastal and marine spatial planning, states,
tribes that all have existing authorities
already that are relevant to coastal and marine
spatial planning.

So what is the authority to do this?
Well, CM -- coastal and marine spatial plans in
and of themselves are not going to be
regulatory. The way this is set up is that
states and federal agencies already have the
existing authority to plan, and this is a
planning process.

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

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

And then in terms of, well, what's going
to make it stick, we only had 180 days and
sometimes only things that make it stick are
Congress -- actions by Congress. But really this would be under Presidential direction to the federal agencies. And the signatories would be expected to expedite and adhere to those plans within the limits of their existing regulatory and statutory authorities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And again, the last bullet point is that they're really talking about implementation, but also not only implementing. As I said
earlier, constantly going back and looking at new information and being able to reevaluate it and add new information and modify plans based upon changing conditions.

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

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

So the document acknowledges that it's fundamentally science-based. It calls for mechanisms to identify priority research needs. So across the federal government you don't have duplicative efforts. You have everybody sitting down at the table identifying what they think the priority resources needs and resources can be directed to those
strategically instead of agencies operating in their own little world.

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

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

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

And there's a lot of flexibility built in for those different regions. Some of them, as I said earlier, have infrastructure and agencies already talking together, and they'll be able to maybe move out a little bit quicker as opposed to regions that don't already have
some type of baseline organization and folks talking together at this level.

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

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

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

This is just an example, and many of you may be familiar with this, which is an example of a multisector approach. And it's -- you know, comprehensive coastal and marine spatial planning may include other elements, but this document here, this -- this is in the framework document which really looks at there is an issue with whale strikes coming in and out of...
Boston Harbor and NOAA wanting to look at a way of trying to reduce ship strikes.

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

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

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

It reduced the -- it reduced the collision by -- with whales by 81 percent. A lot of
those whales, 58 percent, were endangered right whales.

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

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

Also, I hear about a lot of proposed projects, and I was talking to Senator Kevin Ranker, a Washington state senator, last week about coastal and marine spatial planning, and they recently just passed a bill in Washington state on coastal and marine spatial planning. And what drove him and his interest in that was that there was a gentleman -- a company that had spent quite a bit -- amount of investment into siting and offshore wind farm in the State of Washington.
They got down the permitting process pretty far with FERC; and at a public meeting I guess for some fishermen discovered that this was being sited in their primary crab juvenile habitat area and that this would basically decimate the crab fishery in Washington.

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

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

So money to do all of this is a question that a lot of people have. You know, NOAA already does a lot of -- has a base -- does a lot of things that can contribute the science data, products and tools and services to contribute to coastal and marine spatial planning efforts; but really in the FY11 budget, there's some new initiatives there which provide 6.77 for NOAA capabilities to support coastal and marine spatial planning
which will help us with some of the decision support tools, data integration and mapping, things such as the multipurpose marine cadaster, using things like that.

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

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

A couple of other things here is that two million identified for the Gulf of Mexico marine elevation pilot, which is to develop a national integrated high-resolution topographic and bathymetric dataset that would ultimately contract to CMSP efforts in the Gulf of Mexico.
and can enhance those ecosystem assessments.

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

So what are the next steps for this?

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

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

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Thanks, Jennifer.

Panel members, do you have any questions or comments?

Tom. Tom Skinner.

TOM SKINNER: Thanks, Jennifer.

I had a similar process, as you mentioned, in Massachusetts with our Ocean Management Task Force back in 2003-2004 that took about a year, so I can understand how complex and what a tight time frame this is to do it at the federal level.
I just wanted to comment on your point about providing some expectation or your exact wording for potential projects and how it provides some clarity so that they don't develop or wouldn't suggest to spend a lot of time on a project and then find out that there's a problem with it.

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

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

We had it a little bit after I left state service and was working on one of the LNG projects you pointed out offshore. Again, having greater clarity would have been much easier.
So people often look at -- and I'm sure you've heard it, this is ocean zoning, you can't go anywhere without government interference, but I think it's actually trying to provide some, as you say, some rules. And there have been a few of those in terms of the new types of projects that we're seeing offshore.

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

JENNIFER LUKENS: Thank you.

ED WELCH: Thanks, Tom.

Other comments or questions? Jon Dasler.

JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.

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

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

JENNIFER LUKENS: The plan itself -- I think in terms of national contingency
planning, your response to an effort only is as
good as the planning that you've done ahead of
time for emergency response, and I think that
we have a lot to learn from that.

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

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

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

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

So under our coastal and marine spatial
planning process, you would be bringing more
information to the table that may not have been
there before or data that has been constructed
to be useful in a decision-making process.

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

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

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

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

And thinking with stewardship, we've had
policies on -- national economic policies,
national security policies, national energy
policies, but none of them have really --
nothing brings them all together. And I think
that's what this national ocean policy does.

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

I -- did I sell you on that?

JONATHAN DASLER: Great.

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

ED WELCH: Gary, did you have something?

Gary Jeffress.

GARY JEFFRESS: Yes.

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

They have a workshop coming up on the 25th
and 26th of May, Silver Spring, for the NOAA
environmental data workshop. You may all be interested in that.

Are you all aware of that?

JENNIFER LUKE: Not that one particularly, no.

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

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

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

Have they been engaged in this process? Are they one of the agencies? Because as you went through this presentation, I was listening closely for the references for the discussion or the pointers
to the Maritime Transportation System, the economy of the nation, et cetera, and I didn't hear too much about that, so I want to be sure that they're engaged in this process.

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

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Dick West.
 ADMIRAL WEST: Thank you, Jennifer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

JENNIFER LUKENS: Right.

ADMIRAL WEST: I mean, we have to do that.
It really is a type of zoning. It really was started a long time ago when we started putting ships in ports where people were going. We started putting channels. We put buoys, and we started planning.

So it really is a planning/zoning process.

JENNIFER LUKENS: Yes.

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

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

And there's fear of the unknown, and people -- you know, a lot of people are concerned that this is going to stop their activities that are already ongoing. That's not the intent.
Recognizing that uses that are already ongoing need to be maintained but thinking smarter about where emerging uses are going so that there aren't conflicts.

ADMIRAL WEST: I agree.

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

JENNIFER LUKENS: There's 24, yes.

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

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

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

But then also on the regional planning
bodies, the states are key in sitting down at the table. They're a part of the membership on the regional planning bodies. They are the boots on ground. They are the people who are living and breathing and taking actions on a daily basis.

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

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

ED WELCH: Jennifer, thank you.

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

ANDY McGOVERN: Thanks, Ed.

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

So they'll start at one agency and work
their way, get approval, approval, approval,
and two or three years down the line it's like
an agency will say no. And it's like, gee, why
didn't you start with us? Because nobody told
me to.

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

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

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

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

So that's one of the issues.

JENNIFER LUKENS: I think that part of
what the budget process is once you have a
policy up in place, that's what helps you to
get the budget, to implement that, and when --
timing of federal budgets and whatnot.

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

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

ED WELCH: Andy, did you have something?

ANDY ARMSTRONG: No.

ED WELCH: Anybody else? Any other panel
members?

Jennifer, if I could just -- thank you.

If I could make a couple observations.

JENNIFER LUKENS: Sure.

ED WELCH: First, as far as the process
and the desire to include as many people as
possible, you have to recognize, however, there
are parts -- elements of the society who aren't
engaged in governmental planning processes.
And no matter how much of an outreach you make, they aren't going to be engaged until there is a specific demonstrable impact on them.

If I could just switch to another NOAA program, there is an extensive planning process for fisheries management in NOAA. There are regional councils in fisheries management.

There is every opportunity in the world for all sorts of folks who have advanced impact into the setting of federal fisheries policy.

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

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

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

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

So that's just one observation.

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

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

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

You run the real risk -- those statutes
have very specific mandates at the agencies.

Let's take oil and gas, for example. There is
an oil and gas planning process. There are
statutory requirements under the Outer
Continental Shelf Lands Act.

If an administration tries to bypass those
by putting in a different policy through the regional planning process and then impose that on the Interior Department when they make those CS decisions, you're opening yourself up to a lawsuit challenging that.

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

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

JENNIFER LUKENS: Correct.

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

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

JENNIFER LUKENS: Thank you.
ED WELCH: Are there any last comments or observations? Okay. Thanks, Jennifer.

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

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

Thank you, Laura.

LAURA FURGIONE: And good morning again.

So it looks like we are running a little bit behind on schedule, so just when you thought we're doing good.

At any rate, I speak rather fast, so slow me down or ask a question at any point in time.

I am covering two topics today. NOAA's next-generation strategic plan and our Arctic strategy and vision.

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

I've really only been involved in formal strategic planning for the last two years since I was forced to move to the beltway from Alaska. I don't know if I did something really good or something really bad; but primarily,
the prior 15 years I spent most of my time
either in Alaska, Missouri or North Carolina.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A lot has happened over the last two years. You look at March 2009 when the Dow
Jones industrial average was at its minimum, around the 6,000 mark. Today -- or yesterday we just went below 11,000 or so on the Dow. So it's interesting to see those fluctuations and what's happened over the last two years.

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

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

Constantly talking with Captain Gerd Glang here to help you all get your information, communicating the science to make sure that those individuals on the Hill understand what exactly the Hydrographic Services Panel is trying to do and formulate that information so they can understand what your priorities are as
So the design criteria, what we're trying to do is make sure our mission, our vision, our functions, our capabilities are in line with all these external changes and challenges and then establish some goal-oriented -- some outcome-oriented goals and objectives.

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

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

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

Well, I just took my five-year-old twins
to kindergarten orientation two weeks ago.
That's the same goals they have.

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

That was supposed to be a joke. Thank
you.

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

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

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

Speaking of engagement, again, NOAA is
organized with the eight regions, eight
regional collaboration teams. They pretty much
line up with those LMEs that Jennifer was
talking about, the large marine ecosystems, and
also that ocean policy task force, coastal and
marine spatial planning, regional planning
areas.

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

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

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

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

And you can see that private businesses
provided us the majority of or the largest portion of the comments.

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

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

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

And you think it's water.

So here is our draft mission. It's not
that different from our current mission. We still have the keywords in there, the "understand" and "predict," and it's all based on our basis of science, service and stewardship.

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

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

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

So the goals, the goals aren't that much different from our current goals. The goal today are commerce and transportation, weather, climate and ecosystems. So our new draft
goals, again, climate, climate adaptation and mitigation, a weather-ready nation that includes weather and water so that when the sugar mill needs to know about the water levels and how the impacts of the freshwater and the saltwater interact there.

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

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

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

CAPTAIN GLANG: "Indicators of success" is
what you've been calling them.

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

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

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

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

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

So in regards to the sustainable coastal community goal, we do have two particular objectives. These are strategic objectives
that I'm just highlighting for you under this particular goal.

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Thanks, Laura.

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

Admiral West.

ADMARIAL WEST: Laura, I'm not sure if now
is the right time to ask, but are you going to
talk a little bit about NOAA's reorganization
for climate service center, or is that not on
the agenda?

LAURA FURGIONE: That is not on the
agenda.

ADMIRAL WEST: Okay.

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

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

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

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

We're still in the planning of that. Of
course that takes, you know, Congress to approve that, and so it's a long process.

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

ED WELCH: Gary Jeffress.

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

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

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

So pulling out the climate from the Office of Atmospheric Research will separate the two
operationally and research-oriented. The OAR will still have responsibilities for all of the line offices. So that's our scientific resource -- research agency.

And I know you tie into them directly.

The cooperative institutes and the RESIS [phonetic] and those kind of entities I believe will fall under -- some of the climate. The cooperative institutes aren't necessarily all tied directly to climate. Some are weather, some are various other focuses of those institutes.

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

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

JONATHAN DASLER: No.

ED WELCH: Anybody else over here? Okay.

Laura, if I could -- you indicated that one of the existing items uses the phrase "commerce," and that would be replaced with
sustainable coastal communities; and within
sustainable coastal communities, you emphasize
the marine transportation.

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

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

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

LAURA FURGIONE: And we've heard those
comments in the past. Of those 1800 comments,
some were exactly the same thing you're saying
there.
It's no indication that marine transportation and safe transportation is not important, but somehow you need to divide up -- you know, you have to have these snapshots.

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

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

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

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

LAURA FURGIONE: The economies across the nation, yes.
ED WELCH: Of course.

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

LAURA FURGIONE: I appreciate that. Thank you.

ED WELCH: Jon Dasler.

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

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

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

That's going to have an impact and could shut down the shipping in the areas and what
that could do to the economy and marine
transportation, so it goes way beyond that.

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

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

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

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

Okay. Laura, let's move north.
LAURA FURGIONE: Thank you.

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

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

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

So Doug DeMaster is the Alaska Fisheries Science Center director in Juno and I -- we were the two co-chairs of the team -- and several other members, Ashley being one of the members, and Amy Holman, the Alaska region collaboration team coordinator is also one of the members.

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

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

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

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

We are -- I personally feel a little bit behind the curve, as the other agencies that rely on our products and services for safe navigation and safe operation in the Arctic already have plans in place, such as the Navy with their roadmap for the Arctic.
But again, there is the need for coordination and collaboration with these partners.

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

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

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

Our guiding principles, we did have critical outcomes for other agencies, again, in support of the national ocean policy that Jennifer went over.
We needed to make sure there were better linkages between the oceans and the climate as we're looking at sea ice and the other things. What are the impacts again globally for those changes? Our ecosystem-based management, coastal and marine spatial planning. But really have a concentrated effort.

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

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

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

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

So the -- the -- we have six Arctic goals. The number one is sea ice. Sea ice was our
organizing principle. That was the primary entity that we were looking at. The sea ice kind of controls everything. It controls the shipping in the Arctic, and the sea ice has really been there protecting the Arctic. That inaccessibility has not allowed for some the development and plans that are in place now.

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

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

Again, another joke. Just kidding.

The fourth one, enhancing our international and national partnerships.

The fifth one is our stewardship, and that's where some of the fishery surveys and those kind of things come into play.

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

And I say that it's the last one, but it's really another one that's reliant -- it's one of our most important ones, and that's where
some of the coastal aspects and the hydrographic survey work comes into play.

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

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

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

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

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

And even when we were talking about stimulus funding and ARRA funding and that kind
of thing, they were calling it "pork" to have
the Coast Guard or the Navy to have an
ice-hardened vessel. What do we need an
ice-hardened vessel for if all the ice is going
away?

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

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

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

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

If there is going to be an increase in
cargo shipping through the Bering Strait, through the northwest passage, through the northeast passage, you can't make those decisions within a week's time frame. You need more like months and even seasons to know if you're going to have that as a potential, the way, the uncertainties and risk and know if it's a potential opportunity for you or not.

In regards to strengthening our foundational science, this is where the improved baseline observations and understanding of the climate come into play. And our five-year strategy is again enhanced, integrated set of environmental observations. A lot of this IT infrastructure would come into play. Some of the same things you guys are dealing with.

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

In regards to improved weather and water
forecasts, we have seen an increase in storm activity, not only the strength of the storms but also the -- how often the storms are happening.

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

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

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

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

Our five-year strategy again is the data-sharing, and that's some of the things
that I thought about when Jennifer was speaking on the oceans policy task force.

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

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

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

So sometimes that works out, but we know there are other weather patterns besides that standard jetstream.
Improving the stewardship and management of ocean and coastal resources is our fifth goal, and that ties into some of our ongoing assessments.

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

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

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

The last one and the one you might be most
It's the one that makes Ashley smile the most and the one she probably contributed to the most.

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

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

Other things within the five-year strategy is the survey and mapping of the Arctic waters and shoreline. A lot of the mapping was done prior to the 1964 earthquake, and so there's
significant changes in the coastline.

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

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

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

One thing in particular, this copy that you have is still a draft. While we're putting it out, again, for Federal -- on the Federal Register, Dr. Lubchenco wanted to make sure that it was still a draft that would help our partners understand that they still had an opportunity to comment and modify the plan as needed.
So as you saw on the ocean policy task force, one of the nine priorities is strengthening the Arctic. And so it's likely it's not official yet that I would be the lead for NOAA for the Arctic strengthening, and so with that, we need to develop within the six-to 12-month time frame a strategic action plan.

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

So with that, there's the team members. Myself and Doug DeMaster. John Calder from the program office. There's Ashley's name. She could have put her name up a little higher. Amy Holman. Elizabeth McLanahan is our international expert. Jim Overland is at the Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, and then Tracy Rouleau is in my office, and she's the bulldog to make sure that these guys continue to get stuff in on time.

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

ED WELCH: Thank you, Laura.
Comments and questions by the panel members? Gary Jeffress.

GARY JEFFRESS: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

With that being said, to make a long story
short, I asked Amy Holman to come up and help me develop and integrated services plan for the Arctic. And with that, we had external members from the state, from University of Alaska Fairbanks, Lawson Brigham was actually on there, the fellow who wrote the Arctic marine fishing assessment.

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

Now I'm living in Maryland. So it's all Amy's fault. And she likes it when I say that. But so I -- from the get-go, over the years we have had extensive contribution from the State of Alaska, several of the commissioners have been on our team. Amy's continuing to engage with those folks in Alaska.

Two of the primary folks on the team, John Calder is on the Sustaining the Arctic
Observation Network. And other international
efforts, the RUSALCA -- is that how you say
that -- and even Elizabeth McLanahan, focusing
on the Arctic Council and other things.
So we have been interacting with those
eight Arctic countries throughout the process,
and -- but I still say we're not doing enough.
We need to continue to engage and have even
more leadership in those activities.
ED WELCH: Captain Andy McGovern.
ANDY McGOVERN: Thanks.
I noticed on your slide for the enhancing
international and national partnerships,
missing was getting more involved in the -- all
the new international regulations that may be
coming out.
I -- I deal with the IMO, the
International Maritime Organization, and they
are already moving forward at full speed on
shipping regulations in Arctic.
And, you know, I know that other
international bodies are looking at, you know,
mining and exploration and everything else.
So it's nice to look at this part of it,
but if we don't get involved in the international rulemaking, we could be on the back end of that.

LAURA FURGIONE: Most definitely.

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

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

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

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

And even though it's not written on here, it's things we've talked about in our meetings. I know it's -- Ashley is aware of that.
And I even have a mentor, Lisa Taylor, that's working with Roger Parsons and some other folks on that type of information and making sure it meets those standards.

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

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

ED WELCH: Admiral Dick West.

ADMIRAL WEST: Thanks.

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

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

And I'm not sure how you are relating with the US rep to the IMO, Coast Guard, but that
would be interesting to hear from next time,
too.

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

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

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

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

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

LAURA FURGIONE: It's referenced -- I'm
not even -- it's referenced in our document.
It's not in this presentation. We talked about having it as --

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

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Other comments or observations?

Larry Whiting.

LARRY WHITING: Larry Whiting.

Thanks for presenting this.

How much of an impact is this going to
have on the native villages that surround that, on coastline?

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

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

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

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

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

But the North Slope Science Initiative John Payne, I just had lunch with him last week.
as well. And so the focus on those indigenous communities is definitely a concern.

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

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Jon Dasler.

JONATHAN DASLER: I just had a minor question.

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

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

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

But there still needs to be more

JONATHAN DASLER: Right.

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

LAURA FORGIONE: Well, I think those folks in Alaska have figured out ways to do those kind of things.
We've figured out ways to measure rivers in Alaska when they're frozen. Most of the old-time river gauges, you actually had to go down and touch the water, which you can't quite do when there's huge, you know, icebergs coming down the river.

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

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

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

It's always been my argument if they would put observation sites in Alaska first, then when -- a lot of times, and I apologize, those of you living on East Coast, things get implemented in the East Coast and then it runs westward, but when you get west of the...
Mississippi, then those folks in North Dakota say, hey, this isn't working here, well, if it would have been developed in Alaska, it will work anywhere.

ED WELCH: Other comments?

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

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

Specifically, one of the things that is increasing the need for additional presence in the Arctic is the possibility of greatly expanded OCS development up there.
And right now under OCS laws, there's a provision for people making bid payments and lease payments, but there isn't a provision for people making federal government infrastructure contributions or payments or assessments to fund federal government infrastructure that has become necessary to support and promote those types of OCS developments.

Is that something that people are looking at?

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

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

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

Are we collaborating with the USGS?
Do we and the USGS have one plan or are we both asking for two different things?

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

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

Let's talk more.

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

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

RICHARD EDWING: CMAN.

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

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

Also, those multisensor observation sites
are critical, and we're finding that out in the Gulf of Mexico as well.

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

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

New resources are good, too, though.

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

But we have in the Arctic, it looks like to me, a whole bunch of potentially new commercial users out there who right now are not demanding -- because they aren't there, they aren't demanding anything from the federal government, but they will be demanding things of the federal government or expecting things of the federal government.
It's in their commercial interest to go into the Arctic. They have the potential for making a lot of money by going into the Arctic, whether it's the oil and gas industry, whether it's commercial shipping, whoever it is.

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

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

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

But to be honest -- and I represent commercial interests. But the type -- to be honest about it, the type of funding that the government would need up there to make a meaningful expansion of their resources, while
it looks big to the agencies, is relatively small given the commercial gain that's going to be gained up there.

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

JONATHAN DASLER: This is Jon Dasler. I think just following on with Ed's comment, we've had this discussion before, especially after the big leases that MMS did in the Chukchi Sea.

If MMS is going to put out these kinds of leases and require the infrastructure now that's going to be needed to support that, is there some way to put some kind of tax or work with MMS and how can we get additional funding? Because that's a huge burden on NOAA now to put that infrastructure in place.

LAURA FURGIONE: And I think Gary was just at MMS. They had an Arctic Day and were likely
talking about those kind of things.

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

ED WELCH: Any other comments or questions for Laura?

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

LAURA FURGIONE: Yes, through much.

ED WELCH: Okay.

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

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

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

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

Okay. Thanks.
(Recess.)

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Thank you, Ed.

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

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

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

So what the testimony is specifically on
is, is does this give NOAA anymore authority to work in the Arctic?

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

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

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

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

The second thing I just wanted to mention --

ED WELCH: John, Captain Lowell, if we could just for a moment, let's talk about the bill before we move to the other things in case
anybody has any comments or questions about the
bill or the hearing tomorrow at a subcommittee
of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Are there other folks that have questions
or comments?

Yes, Andy Armstrong.

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

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

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Admiral West.

ADMIRAL WEST: John, it's says it's
authorizing 10 million in '11, '12, is that
what the specific --
Is this additional money? This of course comes with no money.

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

Where is that money coming from?

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

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

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

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

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

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

But the money now to pay for the ECS
mapping is in the OAR budget under ocean exploration and research.

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

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

Other -- Jon Dasler.

JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.

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

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

I guess from looking at this, this would be an added $10 million budget. And I guess
getting back to the Admiral's question, is this over and before or does it come out of one of those other items that are listed there?

ED WELCH: Andy.

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

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

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: I think Ashley can answer the question.

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

So it could be mapping and charting base, it could be address survey backlogs, but it
isn't right now anything. Does that make sense?

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

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

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

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

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

And of course that's what we have sometimes with our existing Hydrographic
Services Act, authorization. We have an authorization of certain levels, but it may not translate into an appropriation of that amount year by year.

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

ADMIRAL WEST: That's a good point.

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

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

JONATHAN DASLER: Again, I just pulled up the '08 amendments, but it looks like seven and
eight, these are going to be in addition to, so that other six items that were in the budget are listed there.

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

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

Okay.

Other comments on this bill?

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

Okay.

CAPTAIN LOWELL: All right.

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

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

I don't know if we provided that URL, but

search on "Deepwater" on the NOAA site, and I'm

sure you'll find dozens of hits.

I did want to mention a few things

specifically having to do with the NAV Services
groups, their offices that are here today.

Some of the things that we're doing, I have a

quick list here, this is not meant to be

all-inclusive.

Over at Coast Survey, we're doing a few
different things that we've done in the past.

Because this is a sustained event over longer

periods of time and the various ports and

people moving the ships around are concerned

about where the oil is, is we are putting on

our electronic chart updates and we're actually

creating daily paper charts that are available

for download for free of the extents of the

oil, so that the actual mariner coming in and

the Coast Guard managing the vessel traffic

have a good idea where it is.

It's not meant to be a panacea, but right

now they're trying to drive the ships right
through the oil and then dealing with it should they get contaminated on the hull.

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

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

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

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

So I guess the takeaway message I want everyone to take away is that the NAV Services here are playing a critical role in the
Deepwater response, although we're not really an oil spill responder per se.

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Gary, Gary Jeffress.

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Well, everything we create we create with an eye towards litigation, unfortunately. And what we've done, because they are for navigation, is we do take the trajectories, the total uncertainty, and we don't give all -- currently we're not provided all of the -- inside the oil spill
data, which is pretty much saying within 48 hours, within the uncertainty bounds, this is where the oil is expected to be. There's multiple lanes there that perhaps they can route ships through.

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

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

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

JONATHAN DASLER: John, is anything being done in mapping the debris? I'm sure BP is doing a lot of that, but I was curious if NOAA has taken on any role in trying to map the debris that's on the bottom or even acoustically mapping the plume that's coming up with the resources just so there's -- Or are you getting that kind of information, is any of that filtering back from BP for analysis by NOAA?
CAPTAIN LOWELL: Well, the actual rig is in very, very deep water. Our current assets, the NOAA fleet, hydrographic fleet, we don't have assets that can survey that deep.

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Elaine Dickison.

ELAINE DICKISON: Yes.

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: I would have no idea.

ED WELCH: Did you have a comment?

LAURA FURGIONE: The only thing right now,
the closure is for ten days, and the idea is to do an assessment after that and see if it needs to extend longer than that or not.

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Juliana Blackwell.

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

Basically what we're doing is going over
to the OR&R, Office of Response and Restoration, the designated priority areas to establish a baseline imagery of that shoreline.

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

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

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

Is NOAA calculating all of its response costs?

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

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

LAURA FORGIONE: My friend and cohort,
Maureen Wiley, immediately set up an accounting code so we could be putting up all of the dedicated efforts for Deepwater Horizon on that accounting code.

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

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

LAURA FURGIONE: Yes.

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

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

ED WELCH: Okay, fair point. That's a question of timing as opposed to actual eventual payment.
I would on behalf of the panel here, if the NOAA system of tracking this spending can in some way designate for us how much of Hydrographic Services' resources are going to be devoted to some kind of response, that would be -- that would be interesting to us.

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

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

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

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

So that shows a little bit about the
limits of strategic planning. Your agencies have to be nimble about responding to whatever comes their way.

Any additional comments or -- Admiral?

ADMIRAL WEST: Yes, just a quick comment.

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

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: I can tell you just from listening to the news reports, everybody down there is acknowledging it, so it's very much a coordinated effort for not just Feds but all of the agencies involved, even BP and the support services there. And I hear NOAA referenced frequently at all levels, so...
ADMIRAL WEST: You got to document for the long haul, though, John. That's a one-time thing that looks good, but you got to --

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

LAURA FURGIONE: I always have a comment.

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

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

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

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: We'll go ahead and capture that.
JONATHAN DASLER: One more comment?

ED WELCH: Yes, Jon.

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

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Yes. I didn't go into all the details, but we do have a couple of rushes on to try to get some of that -- again, specific, larger-scale working documents that aren't -- necessarily not the charts per se but can be delivered to the people on the ground in
the field close to the shore where they might, you know, find some uses with these products, to give them the latest imagery on the shoreline we have. And then as the new stuff comes in, we'll do what we can.

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Okay. Thanks, Captain.

I think probably we've got to move on to
the next topic, which is status of solicitation
for the next round of members to this panel.

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

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

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

Basically, ever since the creation of
the -- of this particular FACA back in 2002,
this was the process that had been put in
place. And they went through, they made some recommendations, the recommendations went out to NOAA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would imagine we'll set a timeline in place for closing that out, viewing the packages and putting the names forward again. We just have to reconstitute the selection group, who I suppose will be a little bit different than the last time. Juliana has to walk through it again.

So that's where we're at right now. I
would open it up for questions at this point.

I don't know how much more clarification I can
do on the -- on the process.

ED WELCH: Captain Andy McGovern.

ANDY McGOVERN: Thanks.

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

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

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

And if NOAA chooses to take that advice,
that's fine. That's what a FACA is. It's an
So we make advice and, you know, they can choose to either ignore it, you know, take it wholly or take part of it.

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

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: I didn't mean to infer that we're trying to get people to -- to already agree with the direction NOAA is going. Obviously a FACA is constituted specifically to do that, to provide advice to the director, and you all work for -- excuse
me, the administrator of NOAA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Jon Dasler.

JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.
I think the other concern is with the broadening of the -- the skill sets is that it could be watering down to some extent, I guess, the Hydrographic Services component of it. Because it still seems like the focus should be as Hydrographic Services is defined in the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act, and I think that's maybe some of the concern of the panel, is that that scope could be broadening and would lose that focus.

CAPTAIN LOWELL: I actually don't think it would broaden that much. And, in fact, the FACA specifically does call out things like coastal managers, fisheries managers, things of that nature, right in the language itself.

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

LARRY WHITING: Yes, Larry Whiting.

John, Captain John, there's only two contractors here on this panel this time.

We've both been extended, and we're due to leave. Whenever you start broadening out this scope, we do lose our focus. You can tell that into the last couple of years as of the number of contractors here. With the demise of John Oswald, we became less focused on hydrographic work. We've broadened out what we're trying to do.

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

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

ED WELCH: Admiral West.

ADMIRAL WEST: John, I -- this -- just to jump in here, I think one of the things that probably could have made this a little easier is had this all been explained up front before
it was all done to the committee -- and I mentioned to Jennifer, my suggestion is from now on -- I think --

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

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

But my suggestion was when you bring this slate up, don't make it so secretive. Take the chairman and the vice chairman of the -- of the FACA, doesn't necessarily have to be this one but all of them, take the responsible AA, NOS, and go up and discuss the slate with Jane and her team and then get the input from everybody.
Then she closes the door and makes her decision. That's fine.

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

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

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Thank you very much, Admiral.

ED WELCH: Tom Skinner.

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

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

But I would imagine no more than a couple of months here after the close of the process. We don't have that much time, because everybody will expire in one year.
TOM SKINNER: Just follow up on that, should the people who are expiring or who have expired in terms of membership, like I am, plan on attending the next meeting or is that still in flux?

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

TOM SKINNER: 13th?

LAURA FURGIONE: September. Be there.

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

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

ED WELCH: Yes, Kathy Watson.

KATHY WATSON: Sorry.

Just a little bit of the logistics on the FRN. It closes on June 30th. And we take all the 2009 applicants that still want to be considered with the new ones, the 2010 that have come in.
Then we got to set up the evaluation committee, which is Juliana, Captain Lowell and Rich Edwing now, you get to join in on that process.

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

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

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

ED WELCH: Could I ask for a show of hands of all the people who had expired and have been extended, just so that we know who we're
talking about here? Thank you.

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

One observation I would have, and this -- this comes about with some of the other FACAs that Andy McGovern --

The FACAs are set up so that there's a scheduled turnover, and so there's always a mix of experience and new blood coming in. And if you delay too much for whatever appropriate reason, you run the risk of too much experience leaving all at one time and a whole bunch of new folks coming on that really don't know the institutional history or what the committee is about.

So that's -- there always are understandable reasons, I guess, for why FACA appointments are delayed or reconsidered, but that's one of the unintended negative consequences, and I hope that the NOAA leadership recognizes that.

Also, it would -- some of the Coast Guard FACAs I'm familiar with where there had been extensions and problems, there was the
primary reason for the dissatisfaction with the
slates was lack of gender and racial diversity.

Is that -- was that a consideration here
or is it more of experience and work expertise,
lack of diversity?

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Well, I believe FACA law
doesn't allow you to take race and gender into
consideration. So it was really a broadening
of, you know, the direction the HSRP should --
or the issues the HSRP should be engaging in.

ED WELCH: Okay. Other comments?

Kathy Watson.

KATHY WATSON: And I just want to quickly
say, the five that we extended was Dasler,
Whiting, Myrtilis, Hickman, Skinner.

And the five that are going to expire
January 1, 2011, are Wellslager, McBride,
McGovern, Dickinson and West.

ED WELCH: Okay. Thank you, Kathy.

I guess when one of our -- when we had one
of our previous meetings and we sent our
comments and recommendation to the
administrator, I guess Dr. Lubchenco had just
assumed her duties, and she did reply to us,
and in her reply she said she looked forward hopefully to attending one of our HSRP meetings, and I think that would be great, if that could occur.

And I think it would be great if -- we're six months out, if we could start making efforts to see if she can come to Portland and if she can arrange her schedule to do other things.

So that -- that would be, I think, an excellent thing for both the agency and her and us if it could be arranged.

So I think we'll -- we'll pursue that here. But I wanted to mention that with Laura here before you go back, and obviously we'll work with Captain Lowell and some of the other NOAA to see if that might be possible.

But she did express in her reply to us an interest in trying to do that at some point.

Okay.

All right. Well, then I think, Captain, we can move on to the last item that we had here this morning, which was your observations on the original most-wanted recommendations.
But I also understand there's some internal rearrangement of some of what we're going to talk about.

CAPTAIN LOWELL: This would be the in-flux part of the agenda.

As most of you know, I will be departing at 3:00 this afternoon. My -- my DFO duties will be delegated to Juliana Blackwell, so -- and the reason I'm doing that is to testify tomorrow on the Arctic bill that we just discussed.

So to kind of align everything, and it's a little out of schedule, we originally wanted to talk about all of the activities against the HSRP most-wanted and then do office reviews tomorrow.

But talking to Juliana and Rich, I'm just going to go ahead and do all OCSs here. I got a little less than 30 minutes at this point.

And then they'll take the hour for tomorrow and divide that hour up into two 30-minute chunks.

So that's kind of what happened here, and I hope that doesn't surprise anybody.

We already went through one of the slides.
Good. We're off to a good start.

VIRGINIA DENTLER: Oh, I can start at the beginning.

CAPTAIN LOWELL: Oh, I think it's just the title slide. Yes.

So this is structured around the HSRP most-wanted. So the first one, of course, is aggressively map. Some of the -- some of the statistics have just come out is in '09 we got 3,219 square nautical miles. In '10, we got 2200 to date, with a target of 2600. '09, we got a lot of that with the ARRA funds, which I believe is the next slide coming up.

We do have some additional impacts, someone of which was due to the ARRA funds, which got the RAINIER a longer repair period -- we took it off line, but we'll get a more capable vessel out of that process -- and there's been some unfortunate delays with the FERDINAND HASSLER, which is the new build swath being built down in Moss Point, VT Halter.

And I do believe Admiral Bailey will get into some details this afternoon on that.

ADMIRAL BAILEY: Love to.
CAPTAIN LOWELL: I'm sure it's one of your favorite topics.

So that slowed down some the NOAA acquisition. The contracts are steaming right along, and we're doing very good on that.

So go on to the next one.

Here is the ARRA slide. As everyone knows, the Hydrographic Services received 40 million via the ARRA funding package. It was allocated across the three offices. And there's kind of the output there. We got about 1900 square nautical miles of data on the hydrographic side, and there's some of the areas they worked. And approximately 32 million of that went out to the hydrographic contractors.

Water levels, 2.5 million was spent. I believe Rich will go into -- where did Rich go? Rich will go into some details tomorrow on what that bought. And the shoreline, 2 million, Juliana will cover tomorrow also.

But actually, I think we're leveraging some other work that's been done with that, so I think we'll get a really big output on that.