**HSRP Comments to CO-OPS Strategic Plan FY19-23**

**Juneau HSRP Public Meeting Aug 28-30, 2018**

**General Comments:**

Plan demonstrates good strategic vision for the next 5 years.

Recommendation that details and specific examples be added where appropriate.

Recommendation that a NOAA/CO-OPS organizational chart be included. Include also more details on which products and services are under CO-OPS.

Recommendation that key performance indicators be added, even if they are executed under the Implementation Plan. These indicators should be measurable and objective.

Will the tidal datum epoch be updated in 2022 when NAVD88 is replaced?

Recommendation to include some graphics showing what PORTS delivers to mariners, and where PORTS are located around the US. Include example of what a mariner in Miami or Long Beach would see, and how it is accessed (smart phone, ECDIS, etc).

Acknowledge the private sector more prominently. Examples of private/public partnerships.

Thank you for calling out the “IOOS Regional Associations” under partnerships. As known, there is a wealth of information and talent at the regional level. Hopefully this document will promote further cooperation at all levels.

I would like to see something more on communications and communicating the value of CO-OPs products and services internally and externally as we have often seen CO-OPS products confused with NWS.

I also think partnerships and leveraging partnerships might rise to a Goal level rather than being buried within an objective as partnerships whether with the private sector for PORTS or Universities and other entities seems critical to the infrastructure and data network.

I also wonder if CO-OPs wants to consider calling out Precision Navigation and PORTS more specifically in the plan as these seem to be key priorities and components of the "Blue Economy" and the focus of this administration.

Needs a good scrub (editing) for repetitive verbiage – references to what CO-OPS programs and products support, namely safeguarding/protecting/etc. life/property/the environment/the economy are mentioned no less than 6 times in the document. This may be purposeful but it currently reads as a little repetitive.

The document does need a final edit to fix some grammar/spelling issues.

Confusing terms – a couple of terms or perhaps terms of phrase are not common parlance and should either be clarified or changed. I have highlighted the two that stick out most (both in paragraph 5):

* “maritime navigation community” – shouldn’t this just be “maritime community”
* “charting our safe marine navigation routes” – charting creates safety…and would they ever chart “non-safe” marine navigation routes. It appears to be redundant (like “armed gunman”).

How does this document more succinctly tie to the overall NOAA strategic plan? There is brief mention that it supports/takes into account NOAA priorities but it seems like it would be a good idea to tie it more clearly to higher level plans.

“Partnerships and Support for NOAA Priorities” subtitle – given the structure of the follow-on paragraphs, perhaps the subtitle should be “Support for NOAA Priorities and the Benefit of Partnerships” or something like that so that it flows better with the text.

The document mentions the complementary implementation plan. Will we have an opportunity to review that plan as well?

Specific Comments:

Some of the goals such as 1.1 “advance and integrate a full spectrum of inundation products with extended outlook and spatial coverage, including storm surge, high tide flooding and sea level trends” could become very expensive to fulfill and of possible limited utility. There are many inundation products developed already. Cities are contracting companies such as Dewberry to do their mapping and data products. Perhaps more details on what is being planned for this section.

Goal 1: Objective 1.1

Suggest coordination with partnerships be called out specifically for this task. Encourage coordination between federal and regional efforts for inundation modeling. Example is that some efforts are being done at NCEP, CO-OPS and at the regional level without much coordination.

Goal 2: Objective 2.1

“Implement a data-driven system…” Suggest including an example or short explanation. Explain how this is different from what you are doing now.

Goal 2: Objective 2.3

Expanding coastal observations is costly as is known. IOOS has attempted to do this over the years. Include a short explanation that highlights a realistic plan for observation expansion.

Goal 2: Object 2.4

Suggestion to add more detail/specifics to this section. How is this different than your current operations? This might be the section to include the verbiage modeling and “validation”. Even though the validation is assumed, when funds are tight (at the end of a project), the validation is often skipped or minimized. Validation should be acknowledged and funding set aside up front.