U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION (NOAA) HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 2015

+ + + + +

The Hydrographic Services Review Panel met in the Long Beach Hilton International Conference Room, 701 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, California, at 8:30 a.m., Scott Perkins, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT
SCOTT R. PERKINS, HSRP Chair
WILLIAM HANSON, Vice Chair
ANDY ARMSTRONG*
LARRY ATKINSON
RADM KENNETH BARBOR
JULIANA BLACKWELL*
DR. LAWSON W. BRIGHAM
RADM EVELYN FIELDS
ED J. KELLY
DR. FRANK KUDRNA
DR. GARY JEFFRESS
CAROL LOCKHART
DR. DAVID MAUNE
JOYCE E. MILLER
CPTN. SALVATORE RASSELLO
SUSAN SHINGLEDECKER
PETER STONE (for Richard Edwing)*

*** Non-voting members**

ALSO PRESENT

REAR ADMIRAL GERD F. GLANG, HSRP Designated Federal Official
MICHAEL ASLAKSEN, Chief, Remote Sensing Division, National Geodetic Survey, NOAA
CAPTAIN (sel) RICK BRENNAN, Chief, Coast Survey Development Laboratory, NOAA
ASHLEY CHAPPELL, IOCM Coordinator, Office of Coast Survey, NOAA
JEFF FERGUSON, California Navigation Manager, Office of Coast Survey, NOAA
TIFFANY HOUSE, Project Analyst, Remote Sensing Division, National Geodetic Survey, NOAA
AUDRA LUSCHER-AISSAOUI, Resilience Program Manager, Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services
LYNNE MERSFELDER-LEWIS, HSRP Coordinator
RUSS PROCTOR, Chief, Navigation Services Division, Office of Coast Survey, NOAA
BIANCA TERRY, Office of Assistant Administrator, National Ocean Service, NOAA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome and Recap of Day 2

Mr. Scott Perkins. 4

RADM Glang 5

Breakfast Sessions: Develop a Work Plan for Responses to NOAA 6

Reconvene to Discuss Work Plan Assignments to Working Groups. 7

Public Comment Period. 80

HSRP Discussion on Meeting Report to NOAA Administrator 81

Reconvene for Discussion to Finalize Work Assignments, Working Groups and NOAA Meeting Report. 173

Public Meeting Adjourns

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

(8:35 a.m.)

CHAIR PERKINS: Good morning. Alright, we're reconvening the 29th meeting of the Hydrographic Services Review Panel here in Long Beach, California. So, beginning day three of a three-day engagement.

Yesterday we heard some very interesting presentations, specifically the presentation on the precision navigation project here at the Port of LA/Long Beach, the Southern California Region Stakeholders Panel. Very interesting information on both the environmental management and the spill prevention programs here in this geographic area.

We received a briefing on the emerging Arctic priorities from our working group, with the clear takeaway of the complete lack of infrastructure that's presently available in the Arctic region.

We received a very nice briefing on the National Coastal Mapping Strategy, an

excellent primer on coastal intelligence and coastal resilience, the differences and the relationships between those two objectives.

And we got a real nice first look at the shallow water bathy-topo data that has been collected with the Sandy Supplemental Funding. So, some extremely high-fidelity bathymetry in the shallow water, back bay areas. So that was a really, really nice visualization of the data.

And then we concluded yesterday with work in breakout sessions on coastal intelligence and coastal resilience. So, a very full day for the Panel yesterday.

So, the task in front of us now is to continue our work following up on the breakout sessions.

RADM GLANG: Good morning, I'm Gerd Glang, Designated Federal Official for this FACA. We'll continue with the breakout sessions that were started yesterday afternoon.

Lynne, is the Coastal Intelligence Panel meeting in this room again? Yes, okay.

So, Coastal Resilience will be back upstairs in Mediterranean II.

Alright, so the idea is that, after yesterday's brainstorming session, that this morning each of the breakout sessions can continue for 45 minutes and develop a bit of a work plan.

I think after yesterday's discussions we realized that these questions are not easily answered and that the Panel members may want -- for those questions that they want to respond on and provide their views on, that there will be a need to continue the conversation and produce some kind of a report out to the Administrator on that.

So, I think the 45 minutes this morning will be best spent coming up with a work plan. Certainly, conversations can continue in any way you'd like. But the goal is to get the Panel organized around how they want to proceed on responding to these questions.

So, after that, around 9:30, we'll

reconvene and hear from each of the working groups on how they'd like to proceed. And that should move along pretty quickly to our 10:30 session when we can continue that conversation.

So, any questions on how we want to proceed this morning?

(No response.)

RADM GLANG: Okay, seeing none, we'll go ahead and adjourn to our working sessions, breakout panel sessions.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 8:39 a.m. and resumed at 9:43 a.m.)

CHAIR PERKINS: So, this is where we have that discussion about resilience sitting on the shoulders of intelligence. And who goes first?

(Laughter.)

MEMBER MILLER: Are we ready to go? All right. I apologize to the other working group. We just went through this.

This is a summary of our work

yesterday and we refined it to some extent today. The way I structured it was trying to look at some of the questions in the structure of the NOS Roadmap.

Number one is just sort of a general statement. It kind of goes to Russell's first question about intelligence and resiliency.

Okay. A is just a statement of what the Roadmap is. This group had some concern that Navigation Services' routine activities, their core activities, to fulfill those, that's not emphasized in this particular roadmap. And we know that. And does it take away from core activities? I would say the answer to that is maybe. Should the NOS Roadmap better reflect core activities? Probably.

And then this is really the only -- there's three different elements. This is the one we discussed in -- what are they called -- strategies, I guess.

We discussed the precision navigation strategy. So, the priority is meet the need for

expanded commerce in busy ports through enhanced and integrated decision support tools. And under that, maximize access to highly-trafficked and increasingly space-constrained ports.

And our answer to that was the three actions. The first one was demonstration in LA-Long Beach. The second one was integration of NOAA data. And the third one was development of an integrated product.

And our answer was, we think, yes, but there are another one to two years of development and system validation expected.

And the second one, evaluation of the product and consider repeating the process in other ports. This says positioning themselves for post-Panamax expansion, but I think it should be any port in the United States is a candidate.

And Admiral Glang posed the question how we should the next locations for Precision Navigation. Actually, that was number six on Russell Callender's list.

So, in our discussions we had a lot of

-- we had a long list of items to recommend. And then Ed pointed out that there's something called PAWSA developed by U.S. Coast Guard. And that's the webpage. And then down below it lists some of the factors. It's mostly a risk model, but it pretty much encompassed most, but not all, of what we were proposing.

And then we added some that were -- okay, evaluate the -- there's another model, the U.S. Army Corps' cost-benefit analysis, and other factors that are not in the PAWSA or potentially the U.S. Army Corps model. Who is willing or ready to partner? Who needs it most? Places most at risk? Is there port expansion planned? That speaks kind of to the post-Panamax. Where is it easiest to install? Timing? And what does the existing infrastructure look like at a port that might help to make it a good candidate?

And so this is not for just the next port, it's for the next 20 ports, according to Russell's. But it could be for any port that might need it.

And then we had a pretty robust discussion about how to market that product. Need to develop new marketing models for Precision Navigation.

And this is, particularly for those Panel members who are new, we have, time and time again, almost every HSRP meeting we have recommended that the PORTS be federally funded and we have got a resounding, "forget it." Every time.

And so this Precision Navigation is not just PORTS 2.0, it's a different product. But we think that trying to market it in the same method that PORTS was marketed, which was NOAA paid for the original sensors and somebody else was expected to maintain it, just doesn't work.

Now, whether that's a completely commercial model, or whether a public-private partnership, or whatever, it's just a recommendation.

And, you know, of concern was if a commercial entity opts to buy the sensors and the

program can/should/must data be made public? And does that commercial entity have the right to sell the data on a 900 line or whatever?

The other two priorities we really didn't get to. So, basically, we answered one of the six -- well, I don't if know we answered, but we provided input to one of the six questions on the priority C3, which is forecasts.

We did have some topic of discussion -- how does NOS deal with accepting and -- go down, Tiffany -- and validating external models and provide outreach to local communities. So that's sort of a parking lot topic. We didn't have time to really get into it.

So, that's the report-out. If anybody has additions or would like to make comments, please.

CHAIR PERKINS: I just took a quick look at the PAWSA risk-based matrix. Is the intent -- you know, there's the follow-on chart where they actually put numbers to it. So, is the intent of the working group, do you think

you'll numerically try to rate in similar fashion?

MEMBER FIELDS: No, that was an example. And it was put in there as something to say this could be a way to evaluate, or to start at evaluating, the risk or whatever to get to some of the other issues. A cost-benefit analysis could be part of that input from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. So it was to look at ways of managing and prioritizing.

MEMBER KELLY: It incorporates a really professional examination that's been done by Coast Guard, widely reviewed, widely known, highly credited. And it covers most of the issues we think should be done. And just as an evaluation tool it would be a good thing.

Every major port has one of these every few years. We had one in New York about two years ago. We heard that LA-Long Beach is going to have one this summer.

So, to review the findings of Coast Guard might, you know, they've already done a lot

of the heavy lifting. So, to review these and to take these considerations into, you know --

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, so a data point in --

MEMBER KELLY: Yeah, it's a good data point as part of the evaluation process.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, great. Thank you. It makes sense to build on other people's hard work.

So, resilience. Michael is going to do our presentation.

MR. ASLAKSEN: Wow, you guys had it easy. So, this is tough, but -- and as we go to the outcomes I'll try to remember things. But as far as the work went, first and foremost we've really got to define what are those core products that the Nav Services provide that enable or are critical tool resiliency.

And I think all of us have in our minds items that we can identify, but I think collectively we need to do that and prioritize them.

And this also includes looking at data streams and long-term data streams. Audra made the example of the PORTS systems and decades of data there. Can that be an example of a data stream that could help support resiliency? You know, building a climatology of a certain area that then can lead to decisions.

I referenced one of the access -- we talked about access to the data in a way that a coastal manager, or mayor, or a hotel owner can access the data and see it in a visualization way.

We all have great deliveries of systems. They're very technical. But we need to look at how we deliver the data in a way this is really a priority to support resiliency.

And we reference on the back of the Coast Survey Strategic Plan that it was maybe an opportunity to create a one-stop dissemination portal for integrated digital NOAA navigation data. Maybe taking that one more step to enable resiliency users and target those folks to do

that.

NOS Roadmap. After doing one and looking at, number one, identifying gaps. What was another discussion item? And then once we do that, prioritize the two between the data streams and then the gaps and pushing those forward was number four.

Next page. Really, we really need to demonstrate this. And the opportunity is this Hampton Roads Pilot Project that's ongoing that admittedly -- and Dr. Atkinson's here to keep us honest.

And we've had this discussion that we don't have a single belly button on that from the Nav Services perspective. We have different people working on different aspects.

But this is the real opportunity for us to look at the previous bullets and say how can we demonstrate what can be done in a high profile case supported by the White House, supported by many other efforts and agencies, by collectively the Panel recommending that this

demonstration be a focus area for the Nav Services to deliver and provide capabilities to support resiliency.

We had a lot of discussion of identifying the stakeholders in ongoing efforts. There was a lot of discussion of are we doing and taking advantage of current activities, both within NOAA and outside of NOAA, of education?

There's great examples of folks like OCM taking the base layer data that we all provide at Nav Services and doing the sea level rise viewer. I mean, that, in its basic level, they're engaging those communities that we're trying to talk to very effectively. So, we need to really identify those folks and see how we can work with them directly and not recreate efforts that are ongoing.

Yeah, kind of going back to number one, how do we connect what we do in the priority data streams to the current funding efforts? The grants, you know. That's the folks, that's what we're talking about. These are the only

opportunities out-years that they're going. How do we connect Nav Services to those grant efforts in coastal resiliency? Are there ways or avenues that we work with OCM or whoever is going to be the oversight of these grants to include guidelines and specifications that we provide, and/or referencing the capabilities within the Nav Services in order to meet the outcome of that grant?

And then we had discussions on coastal resiliency rating criteria. Does NOAA have that? What is it? Audra has some more background on that than I do, but there was a lot of discussion. And Frank felt important from his experiences that, if there's incentive out there for communities to do certain things certain ways, that may be an avenue for a recommendation to the Panel in the Nav Services.

So, Audra, do you have anything to add? Or anybody else that was on the group?

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I would just add, looking at what the other group came out

with, I think that we shared some of the concern. Looking at the NOS Roadmap and saying we want to take a closer look at this because I'm afraid there's some things that aren't covered here and that we might want to express comments on that.

MR. ASLAKSEN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER BLACKWELL: Can you just do a brief summary of the Hampton Roads Pilot Project? I know some of us know about it, but the coastal intelligence group didn't really have that information.

MR. ASLAKSEN: I would really love to allow Dr. Atkinson to do that. Because he is -- I mean, I know my part of it, but --

(Pause.)

MEMBER ATKINSON: Sometime I can give you a longer presentation, but this all started because we have increased flooding in Hampton Roads. DoD is a huge part of it.

The solution is going to be done by money coming from the Feds. So all the federal agencies have to work together. And we know

that's not easy.

So, it started out, how do you get them all together in the room? And there's been a lot of background going on since 2010. So, it started out as a way to get everybody in the room. And in our case, ODU decided to provide the glue, the coffee, the lunches, the space. We ended up hiring Ray Toll full-time and a second person full-time, an environmental lawyer. So, they're working full-time on this.

And what it's evolved to, from an initial effort just to get data together, because there's a lot of new instruments being put in, it quickly evolved to people like Senator Kaine coming down and getting all the elected officials in the room and 500 people showing up. So there was a lot of top-down going on and a lot of bottom-up.

But the top-down, what it's evolved to now is this pilot project, which I think is going to have a new name with "resilience" in it.

And it's got phrases like -- well, you

can see the vision. We've got about a year left to come up with a plan on how to integrate all of the jurisdictions, the federal government, the state government all into one working unit. Ray Toll does that. I stay with the science.

Scan down a little bit. There's all kinds of working groups being developed, like the Science Advisory Committee. I chair it with Carl Hershner of VIMS. And we've got points of contacts at every -- Mike, I think you're our official point of contact. There's several people at NOAA on the mailing list. NASA, EPA, a lot of universities, companies, about 30 people.

And kind of the good thing that happened, you know, Senator Kaine's letter went out to all the agencies and there was all this stuff filtering down. And NASA said, ah, we'll fly their G3 SAR and start to do some science measurements. So that's hopefully going to be funded. And NOAA said, what are we going to do? So they're stepping in with help with the pilot project.

There's others, like the private infrastructure group has got Verizon, Dominion, a bunch of companies I didn't know controlled so much infrastructure.

I mean, the really enlightening thing is the critical infrastructure is mostly owned by private companies. So how do we get them to start to divulge what their best practices are, for example?

There's a municipal planning group. Anyway, there's all those groups. They're all populated. Ann Phillips, a retired admiral some of you may know, she's head of the infrastructure one. There's a senior advisory committee. It's mayors, former mayors, elected officials.

And then go up. It started out pretty Navy-heavy, but now it's got all these -- there are actually all people defined for all these groups. Just keep scanning down.

Oh, and then the National Security Council got involved and Judge Alice Hill. We had one meeting. Well, it was a Marine

Technology Society meeting. And who's head of EPA? Anyway, her scheduler called and said she would be giving the final remarks at our meeting. You know, that was nice.

Just keep going. Anyway, there's just a pile of people. So, I don't know what else you need to know. Back to data. One thing we need to do is integrate all the data that's becoming available. All the cities are putting in their own water-level gauges. Norfolk has already got six in. They've had those in for a decade. Virginia Beach is putting in 20-some. On and on.

So, what we would like to see is to help them get good data and also get it realtime. They don't really plan on realtime. So, that's really important because subsidence is a huge issue and it's very localized. It's on a scale of kilometers. So we've really got to nail down subsidence. And then there's other things about sea level rise and the Gulf Stream.

So we need to be able to integrate all that data together so the decision-makers, the

stakeholders can get at it.

And obviously we've got people like Mark Bushnell involved and the people at CO-OPS. So that's going to be a challenge: how do we do that? And we don't want to reinvent anything. I'll say it off record later -- other stuff.

Any questions? And I can do more later at another meeting.

CHAIR PERKINS: Is there standardization in the gauges, then? If they're being put in at the local level.

MEMBER ATKINSON: I don't know. I'm sure -- okay. Kind of.

MS. LUSCHER-AISSAOUI: Hi, this is Audra Luscher, CO-OPS. They're being put in for very specific activities that that community wants. However, it's not necessarily contributing to the reference frame like an NWLON would.

But what we'd like to do is, how do you tie these subordinate stations to an NWLON so that they could derive the data and then

calculate mean sea level? Or how could they integrate this into a decision-making product that's tied to landmarks, socially relevant areas, that then they can tell a story about when that flooding is going to happen on land?

So I think there's a number of ways that we're really interested in looking at expanding our how reference frame for water level integrates with these community-driven activities, and how we can be better supportive and integrate these activities.

So, there are four decisions required.

MEMBER ATKINSON: And now you're on our committee too.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER ATKINSON: And so how is NOAA going to do this in Hampton Roads, in Philadelphia, in New York, in Boston and the Gulf Coast areas? You know, I think that's your challenge. And this may be a model, or at least one model on how to do it.

MS. LUSCHER-AISSAOUI: But when you

mentioned standardization, I think it's, you know, don't just do the pilot, but how do we take this and provide protocols that another community could pick this up and you could start implementing it?

And I think that's really important, what you just mentioned, is you can't just do this stuff and then it just lives in Norfolk. How do we make this something that people are accessing regularly and expanding to other case scenarios.

MEMBER KUDRNA: We had a lengthy discussion on this. And we supported this as a prototype that might demonstrate to other regions, as you suggested. But the real test is behavioral changes by planning commissions, municipalities. And that's really the accomplishment. Because many of the other major events that occurred, there were predictive tools that talked about what could happen. But no one believed it or did anything about it. So, that's a major issue.

But we think, you know, clearly you've got the right players and municipalities and government involved. And the key is, in addition to providing this information, getting them to do something. When there's a zoning application in an area that's --

MEMBER ATKINSON: Well, and when one city decides to build a big structure that's going to affect another city.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Absolutely.

MEMBER ATKINSON: You know, so, the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission covers all this area. And now the mayors have formed a committee. But it's going to be really hard, because land use, there's a committee that's got land use, and that's where the big issue is. That's what it's all about.

MEMBER MAUNE: I have a question for you. Dave Maune over here. Is this primarily based on subsidence and sea level rise? Or are you also considering worst-case scenarios such as if you got hit by a Hurricane Sandy kind of

thing?

MEMBER ATKINSON: Oh yeah, yeah. Yeah, it's --

MEMBER MAUNE: All of the above?

MEMBER ATKINSON: Personally, the phrase "sea level rise" got in there and it's hard to get it out. But, yeah, I mean we all know what, you know -- right now we're putting up with increased -- it's called nuisance flooding now, which is a pretty good phrase.

MEMBER MAUNE: Several years ago, before Hurricane Katrina hit, the year before, FEMA developed a Hurricane Pam scenario which predicted what would happen to New Orleans if it got hit by a Level 4 hurricane.

And all those things happened one year later. And I was just wondering if --

MEMBER ATKINSON: No, we've done the scenario if Sandy turned left a little earlier. We've run that.

MEMBER MAUNE: Okay.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Yeah, everybody is

aware that's not a pretty scene. So, it's really two things going on. One is how to deal with the increased nuisance flooding, which is really costing a lot of money now. And then how do you deal with the big one?

And then DoD behind all this is running, has done a huge study that you may want to see sometime on the Norfolk base. And now it's expanding to all Navy facilities.

MS. LUSCHER-AISSAOUI: That was run by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Yeah. We've got a library of all his stuff you can connect. Or you know where it is. Yeah.

MEMBER KUDRNA: David, during our session, elaborated on what FEMA is doing with incentives where communities that do positive efforts can reduce the individual flood insurance premiums 5 to 45 percent.

MEMBER ATKINSON: CRS, yeah.

MEMBER KUDRNA: One of the things we discussed is the potential for NOAA to

incentivize -- they provide huge amounts of grants out to folks. And there might be a mechanism to increase participation and interest.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Well, having, you know, if you had a good database that might go into the CRS, yeah. That would be really important.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: Gary Jeffress. Larry, one of the things we did after Hurricane Ike, which hit Houston-Galveston in 2008. It was in September. And by the first week in October we tried to arrange a little workshop for local government officials to make them aware of the data that the Texas Coastal Ocean Observation Network, which is an extension of NOAA's NWLON, that data is available as a resilience tool, for example, and preparedness tool.

And we were very close to the mayor of Corpus Christi at the time. So we arranged for him, the mayor, to send out invitations to all of the coastal counties and coastal cities to send their elected officials to this workshop. Only

three showed up.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Oh, well, we're doing better.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: And what I got out of that was that local officials do not like to deal with potentially bad news.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Right. Ours are getting better, but I didn't mention, we have -- every three or four months we have what we call an adaptation forum. Some of you may have been to them.

But anyway, like the next one is, you know -- there's now plans for huge structures, $600 million things are going to get built. So, in the last of the month we're having a forum on what do these things look like, pros and cons. We're going to bring in people from the Corps, from NOAA, from Skanska, Moffatt & Nichol, some other large construction companies, and people that know green versus grey structures.

All the cities are running their own ADCIRC models. But they had questions. So we

brought in Rick Luettich and Brian Blanton and people from Dewberry that actually run ADCIRC. Okay, you have technical questions. We had 100 people show up at all these. It's all the city engineers, storm water managers. The pilots for the elected officials show up when Senator Kaine appears. It's pretty impressive. So, there's a lot more to talk about.

CHAIR PERKINS: Great, thank you for those two reports. We've got a short break in front of us. But, you know, we don't want to lose sight of, you know, how will the Panel continue to work on these questions on coastal resilience and coastal intelligence?

Which leads us to, on the agenda, it says after the break we reconvene, discuss the work plans and assignments to working groups. But as you're aware, we need to work through what the working groups are going to be.

So, when we come back from break we'll address the previous working groups, proposed working groups, and try to get some clarity to

that so that we can make these assignments on coastal intelligence and coastal resilience going forward.

So, 15-minute break. Then we reconvene.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:16 a.m. and resumed at 10:42 a.m.)

CHAIR PERKINS: I'd like to ask for the Panel's input on one thing before we start on this working group discussion.

The inability to properly manage the time schedule on the opening day resulted in us extremely abbreviating and truncating the presentations from the tri-service directors.

So, to try and correct for that, what I would like to ask the Panel to consider is whether we do an administrative committee of the whole-type engagement and receive those briefings in their entirety via webinar.

The other option would be that we take the time and the effort to do the Federal

Register notice and schedule it so that the public would have access to those presentations as well. They will be on the HSRP website in their entirety.

So, the question I'm asking is, do we do this as a committee of the whole action, or do we take that other step and Federal Register notice and make it open to the public to see those in their entirety?

MEMBER KUDRNA: Scott, it's informational. We're not going to take action during the session. So I think a committee should suffice.

MEMBER ATKINSON: I agree. And I think since it's going to be posted it seems to be okay.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, great. Thank you. I think that's definitely the easier path and the more expedient path. So we'll work with the admiral's office to get a time and date scheduled for when we can receive those in their entirety.

So, we need to now engage on this discussion of which of the working groups, if any, as defined we want to retain, or if we want to introduce replacing them.

Some of these have legacy, as you'll see group members assigned and include prior panel members. I will open that up to discussion on how we would like to formulate our working groups going forward.

RADM GLANG: So it might be helpful just to walk through the three existing working groups that were established in 2012, and then the two that were proposed in Charleston just to orient everyone to what's been put out there, or what has been out there.

And then go back to the group conversation and bring in the -- put it into the context of the tasks that we've asked the panel to respond to.

CHAIR PERKINS: Can we zoom in just a little on that? Great, thank you.

So, Legislative and Policy

Initiatives. Susan was identified as the chair. You can see the prior members. I'm looking at the chair.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I am actually no longer the chair. I've moved Joyce as the chair.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay. I am just -- I'm toast.

Lynne distributed a page that Admiral Glang had asked us to do provide some structure and some objectives and outcomes for what the working group was currently doing. So that was passed out yesterday at some point.

I fleshed it out a little bit and I would like to expand it a little bit, based upon what we've been doing here perhaps, or not.

Current members are Evelyn Fields and Ken Barbor. And Russ Proctor is our NOAA Liaison.

The objective and outcomes that I proposed were review and revise the HSRP charter which we have accomplished this time.

The time-line was revised charter is due in September 2015. So that now has to go up. So that was an immediate concern from the administrative meeting and I thought it was appropriate for us to take that on, given that we were legislative and policy.

And there was a lot of other people that -- Frank and several other people contributed.

Proposed, perhaps proposed ones for discussion inside the group. Review revision of the HSIA. Review it and see if we have any recommendations by the next meeting.

The same thing with the -- it's not the IOCM, it's something else. It's the -- the letters are scrambled.

And then on a longer term monitor legislative initiatives pertinent to HSRP.

I might add to that that I think in that we do need some standard operating procedures, this could be one place where we could work on that too. And I see my two

committee members nodding. So I'd just like to add that.

If we decide on not having a legislative and policy working group I don't have, you know, I think we should but if there's more important things then perhaps we should.

But because the charter comes up every two years we do need to deal with that on a relatively frequent basis.

So that's, I guess, my plug for the legislative working group.

CHAIR PERKINS: Great. Great. Thank you, Joyce. I think that what you've described makes sense, that that almost becomes a standing working group if nothing else because of the 48-month cycle on the charter renewal.

And I think Representative Lowenthal's Economy in Motion Act that we heard about. So, HR1308, that looks like an engagement for that working group as well to engage with Lowenthal's staffer and potentially with the Coastal Caucus, or to gather information. Engage may not be the

right adjective, or the right verb. But to look at and report back information on those pieces.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay. Bill, did you get feedback on those? Didn't you engage with Congressman Lowenthal's staffer?

VICE CHAIR HANSON: Yes, we got that confirmation that they signed up. Yes.

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes, Frank.

MEMBER KUDRNA: And I agree what Joyce has outlined here is very good.

I think we've discussed it, but just to clarify, working committees would involve conference calls, email correspondence and report back at subsequent meetings.

So the expectation of level of activity I think unless specifically defined would not involve travel or those type of activities I think as we define them.

MEMBER MILLER: Yes, I think everything we can do. Certainly my assessment here, I might bump the IOCM back to a year from now and put up the standard operating procedure

as something that we work on between then and now.

MEMBER KUDRNA: And I'm suggesting this for all of them as a general issue.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay, yes.

CHAIR PERKINS: If I can interrupt, I'm not sure that we need to get into the grassroots.

You know, our objective at this session of the public meeting is to recognize the working groups, get the panel's endorsement of them, and then we can circle back and get into the business of the working group later.

So I think we've got clear consensus that working group number 1 on legislative and policy shall remain. Joyce will be the chair.

So if we can move onto the next one.

MEMBER MILLER: And additional members are welcome if they're interested.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: I did join you for the last session, but I don't know if you kicked me off or what.

CHAIR PERKINS: So, working group number 2 was previously titled Strategic Mission-Centered Effectiveness.

So, comments regarding the purpose and the necessity of working group number 2.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: Am I the only name? Oh, Bill was on there. So was Evelyn.

I don't think we were very productive in this group. I don't think we had a well-defined mission so I'm not sure it should remain.

CHAIR PERKINS: Any other comments?

MEMBER MILLER: Could it be modified to better meet current needs?

MEMBER KUDRNA: This might be a working group that could respond to the resiliency questions if you wanted a group to deal with offline providing further response.

CHAIR PERKINS: And I think maybe for simplicity's sake pulling the plug on working group number 2 and then establishing a new working group that's properly titled that has a clearer purpose, that might be the more effective

way to approach it.

So, do we have anyone in a dissenting opinion regarding discontinuing working group number 2?

(No response)

CHAIR PERKINS: So with that we'll say working group number 2 will be dissolved and we'll move onto working group number 3 which is Emerging Arctic Priorities.

Panel member Dr. Brigham has had to depart early, but I think we're all very happy with the work that working group has done and the reports that we received yesterday and on Wednesday from the working group.

So we'll retain working group number 3 with Lawson as the chair. We need to freshen up the membership. But we can do that after the fact as well.

So that leads us into the proposed from Charleston --

RADM GLANG: Can you go back up? There's a little one here. There was this ad

hoc. We can update the Arctic Working Group document.

At the bottom of this page there's one that we overlooked which I actually suggested earlier is continue with an ad hoc planning working group for the purpose of the next meeting. I think that's useful.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay.

RADM GLANG: I think the language is fine. I'm sorry, go ahead.

MEMBER KUDRNA: There was a discussion of having a committee of the whole working group that you could take on various topics.

You may want to do that here and give it as an assignment, the planning activity for the next. So you have a format that lets you have a committee of the whole.

CHAIR PERKINS: So if we can, on the screen, go to the two proposed working groups from the Charleston meeting.

So, after Charleston we had proposed an engagement working group. So we should

discuss whether we want to implement this in the purpose statement for the working group.

MEMBER MILLER: Can we look at what the fifth one was so we have an idea what the two are? The additional one. Or was there a fifth one?

MEMBER BARBOR: Yes, I think and if you go back up it was like number 2, working group number 2 got re-morphed into infrastructure. It was still Strategic Mission-Centered Effectiveness, but now it's infrastructure.

MEMBER MILLER: But that one was -- and we kind of took on infrastructure in the Standard Operating Procedures.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: Frank, do you think you could provide more? I know we discussed engagement. I need a refresh on it, especially in light of conversations we've had about what we as the panel need to provide recommendations on engagement versus the delivery of communications which maybe would be left to

NOAA.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Well, we heard during the meeting the need for communication and outreach to take place.

And we're not to it yet, but in terms of -- now, this links to one of our recommendations. And we didn't get to it at the earlier session but I'll read it to you. We can go back to it later, but it links to it.

Outreach engagement. Our meeting clearly identified the need for HSRP to communicate the needs and accomplishments of HSRP.

As identified by NOAA's Science Advisory Board's Engagement Working Group Report, HSRP, like many parts of NOAA, needs to significantly strengthen itself in this area. A newly established working committee will develop a report and identify detailed recommendations by the next HSRP meeting.

Its intent would be -- we had the discussion of inviting some congressional

staffers there dealing with appropriation to talk to us.

If you do that, you've got to have some document that has an ask of what you need, and what you've accomplished, and what goes forward. So that was my thought concerning the principal activity of an outreach engagement committee.

CHAIR PERKINS: So when we left Charleston what we had put down was Frank and Susan as co-chairs, and Rachel Medley and Lynne as the two NOAA staffers.

RADM GLANG: So the question was would the topics that the engagement working group would like to do fit better under the legislative working group.

VICE CHAIR HANSON: I think there's a lot of groundwork to be done before you get there. Perhaps eventually you could come to something more specific.

But we talked a lot about branding and the precision navigation. I think that's a great

venue for us to pursue and wrap our arms around.

But we really, as Frank said, we need to get our act together and have something to lay out. We have to be comfortable with it as well, not just ad hoc.

MEMBER BARBOR: I think what we envisioned as legislation was not that we wouldn't potentially be dealing with folks on the Hill, but if we were dealing with nuts and bolts --- words in the legislative process that -- as opposed to other activities.

VICE CHAIR HANSON: And we have to be careful. We are an advisory committee.

MEMBER MILLER: Yes, and in that I don't have experience in that I wouldn't be comfortable necessarily -- I mean other people could do it, but you know.

Could it be part of the planning committee for the next time? That's just a thought. Because that would be part of the planning.

If we were going to meet with, or

invite people in then, as Frank said, you have to have a message.

I mean, this could be an ad hoc, but I think given the questions that Dr. Callender gave to us we need to address the six questions in some form.

And maybe it's just before the next meeting, so maybe it's an ad hoc. But I think --

MEMBER BARBOR: And question 5 is an engagement question. So, whether the engagement committee takes on question 5 among other things or - - is really Hill-focused is, you know.

VICE CHAIR HANSON: And before we go the Hill we have to be sure that NOAA senior management, senior leadership is behind us. Because they get the first phone call. And if they're not with us then we've just wasted our time.

Joyce, you would be very good at that.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: Admiral, didn't you say this morning we have a one-pager ready to go up the Hill with?

RADM GLANG: Yes, the panel developed a one-pager -- was that last year, Scott?

CHAIR PERKINS: It is on the website presently and we could probably cue it up and take a quick look at it.

I would say it probably warrants a refresh, or at least a review before we would walk it to the Hill again. Just because we've taken it there in its present form one time.

MEMBER MILLER: I think precision navigation would be a perfect, you know, addition to it. And maybe drop something else out.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I guess for me, specific to the question of which working groups.

I think we've seen when we've had working groups that have a nice title but not a real clear purpose and outcome we haven't had a product.

On the engagement side I'm still a little confused as to what we want to communicate, and how it is wanted to be communicated, and how it would be received.

There was the 10 most wanted, whether that would happen again or not.

Effort was put into that white paper and it sits on the website. Nothing has really happened with it.

While I'm interested in the topic of engagement, unless I knew what specifically we were going to do and that it would be received well and then useful.

I'm not that excited about putting a lot more time into it until those questions would be answered first I guess.

And so I would think that while it is a useful topic, if we don't have those questions answered a working group that spent more time answering Dr. Callender's questions or the breakout group questions might be more beneficial.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Scott, if I could add one more comment.

I've been observing NOAA for a few years. NOAA does terrific research. NOAA does

terrific data collection.

NOAA's engagement is the weak link in the place across the board. And the Science Advisory Board told that to the Administrator along the way.

And I think we could be very helpful for HSRP to identify the accomplishments and needs that could be communicated.

Now, we can use the old document if you think that's appropriate. But I think there's a need there. And when we go to D.C. and if we're going to talk to some committee staffers and others I think that's a need. Because I think that, at least in my opinion, is the weak link in NOAA.

MEMBER MILLER: Actually, I found it very interesting in the budget briefing that Dr. Sullivan gave.

There was a very extremely popular NOAA outreach program called Teacher at Sea that was canceled. And there was great public outcry. There were two people that were just saying oh my

God, this is such a beautiful program.

And NOAA, evidently, the administration said we want outreach to be in specific agencies. And she said it twice. And I was quite interested in that because I thought the Teacher at Sea program was excellent. So I think there's, to some extent, mixed messages.

CHAIR PERKINS: So, have we reached a consensus?

MEMBER FIELDS: The question is whether to keep that working group or to discontinue it?

And the question that I heard from Susan was it needed to be fleshed out a little bit more before you could go one way or the other. Is that what I heard?

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: Well, specifically for an engagement working group I think we would need to have a more specific charge of what would success for that working group look like between now and next meeting before I think people would want to spend a lot

of time on it.

CHAIR PERKINS: So, hearing no further discussion in defense of an engagement working group I think we're saying we're going to set that aside. Is that correct?

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I mean, I think as a group we need to ask what do we want to accomplish between now and when we go to Washington, D.C. for our next meeting.

It sounds like we need to answer the questions posed of our breakout groups. It sounds like we've got some -- the legislative and the Arctic groups are continuing.

Is there anything other than answering these six questions that we feel we need to be working on between this meeting and the next? Because that's what a working group would do.

MEMBER MILLER: Well, preparation for the next meeting, especially if we're going to the Hill, I think is a priority.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: And if there are engagement pieces that would make that more

productive, yes. So that's where I would see an engagement working group coming in is if we identified something.

CHAIR PERKINS: So you're suggesting a planning and engagement working group, which strikes me as kind of useful.

MEMBER MILLER: Well, could that be the same as the ad hoc working group that's planning for the next meeting?

MEMBER FIELDS: Or certainly be combined.

RADM GLANG: Yes, I think so. I would ask for a little help just kind of whipping up a little purpose statement.

And if you think about the context of planning and what you want to accomplish at the next meeting it's likely then the engagement piece will sort of answer itself.

CHAIR PERKINS: So we need a chair or co-chairs. This is where you volunteer.

MEMBER MAUNE: I'm not sure I'm the best to chair it, but I'd like to be on the

committee.

CHAIR PERKINS: Great. Thank you, Dr. Maune. So I think we have a co-chair.

MEMBER MAUNE: Co-chair.

RADM GLANG: We don't need to agonize over it right now, Scott. What we can do is pull these together into a clear document for the last session of the day, and then we can sort of revisit them. I don't want to cause any people to agonize over should they or shouldn't they.

Clearly the way these working groups are going to succeed is we have willing participants.

And as I said before, the way these are going to work best is if the members are initiating back to us, hey, we want to go ahead and set up a meeting, and we'll help facilitate that.

But we get distracted as well. So we really rely on the panel to help prompt when they need support with the activities and when they want to communicate among each other in a more

formal way.

MEMBER ATKINSON: I just see being actively engaged in creating the agenda as a pretty big task in itself. I've volunteered for that and then the scope of this thing expanded, so I've learned my lesson.

RADM GLANG: That's a good point, Larry. So I think within a planning and engagement working group you could certainly have members who say, look, we'll help build out a plan for you.

But then as you identify, hey, is there an opportunity to, for instance, engage and therefore we need a one-pager then we can reopen the question to the panel and say hey, we've got this opportunity with congressional staffers. We're going to need the one-pager reviewed. Who wants to participate in that.

I agree with you, each working group doesn't have to take on everything.

MEMBER MILLER: Actually, I had volunteered for that group. I'll take a stab at

the one-pager.

I mean, it already exists and it was pretty good. We need to update it, but I don't think it's going to be a massive effort.

So I think we had a pretty good stab at it already. So, at any rate.

MS. MERSFELDER-LEWIS: Could I ask a question? You guys have a variety of tasks in front of you. Would you want to put that into that working group?

MEMBER MILLER: I think the tasks from the meeting itself should be the temporary working group for outcome for that meeting.

To the extent that the questions can be answered, great. And very honestly at this point I would say pay attention to Dr. Callender's questions and the structure of the individual -- the intelligence and resilience was difficult.

So that would be my advice on that, a temporary working group to address coastal intelligence and resilience in the context of Dr.

Callender's questions.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: So, as I understood that, Joyce, that would mean we would have a legislative working group, an Arctic working group, a planning and engagement working group, and then a fourth working group to address whether it's the coastal intelligence and resilience working group to answer the questions posed of us.

MEMBER FIELDS: And that would be temporary, right?

CHAIR PERKINS: Legislative and policy, Arctic emerging priorities, planning and engagement, and a newly assigned working group to address the questions put before the panel on coastal intelligence and coastal resilience.

Is there any need or suggestions for a working group beyond those four?

RADM GLANG: So I just, I want to hear more broadly from the panel on whether you are serious about combining all six of those questions into one working group.

CHAIR PERKINS: Question number 6 itself of creating the criteria to consider in selecting the next 20 ports for precise navigation. That sounds like a lot of work unto itself.

VICE CHAIR HANSON: If you get into the nuts and bolts, yes. But if we're advising and directing, I don't think so.

In fact, one of the questions we came up with, Scott, is is it 1, is it 20, is it 59, is it 300. So, the 20 is just a number, I'm sure. So it's about NOAA's capabilities to execute.

RADM GLANG: So, just to be clear on that question, Scott. NOAA is not asking for the panel to develop the list of ports. We're asking for the panel to provide criteria to consider how we might prioritize efforts like precise navigation.

I think the criteria were discussed pretty substantially this morning. And I would say we actually have a pretty good idea of how we

might proceed on that one.

MEMBER MILLER: I think a lot of the questions 1 through 5 generally have elements of both intelligence and resilience in them. That was the reason I suggested a single working group on that.

MEMBER KUDRNA: I guess I have a question. Is the listing from Dr. Callender something expecting a longer-term multiple response? Or is this a set of questions for this meeting to be followed by some alternate questions at subsequent meetings?

I guess the question is what is the expectation of the term of this assignment. Is he looking for a response to all of these by the next meeting and there will be more questions posed?

Or are these things that we can talk about some initial responses and then more fully develop through a working committee more details?

RADM GLANG: I would leave that up to the panel. I think -- I would leave that up to

the panel how you want to respond on these.

I think what we're looking for is input at the higher level sooner. So, if we could have something by the next meeting that would be great.

The panel may discover along the way that there's more to this, we'd really like to have more time. And so maybe the panel does choose to spin off into a smaller working group.

You know, I'm going to have to come up with a new method to prioritize my national survey priorities.

I'm going to have to come up with an approach to prioritize where we go with Precise Nav for the purpose of our budget process. And I'm going to have to start doing that this summer. So, with or without the panel we're going to be doing this.

MEMBER BARBOR: I have indeed found the one-pager and it is very much marine transportation-centric. And I think it's very good in that respect.

Perhaps a one-pager on resilience as a companion would be warranted. And that would be a very bounded, identifiable task that a working group could take on.

MEMBER MAUNE: I'd like some clarification. This is Dave Maune.

I think I'm the co-chair of a planning and engagement working group planning the next conference and I don't know who else is on the committee with me.

There were some names up there. Did those people volunteer?

MEMBER MILLER: No, those were the old school.

MEMBER MAUNE: Those were old names. There's a planning and engagement working group.

So Scott, Frank, and Susan, and Joyce did not volunteer to be on this committee.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay, Larry, Dave, Susan, Bill and Joyce.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, can we take just a little bit of time to craft quickly the purpose

statement for that working group?

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I took a shot at it. I left the original planning part of the purpose statement and I would propose adding one sentence for the engagement part.

Feel free to modify it, but I said, identify and develop -- I can email this -- Identify and develop appropriate outreach tools to effectively engage with relevant stakeholders to convey the key messages identified by the HSRP.

So if you like that I'll email it.

MS. MERSFELDER-LEWIS: Susan, please do email it and we'll incorporate it into a draft for you guys to look at.

CHAIR PERKINS: And so then we should try to do the same for the new coastal intelligence, coastal resiliency, you know, response to questions working group.

It will be useful to actually at least put a sentence down on the purpose.

MEMBER FIELDS: Since it's a temporary

working group would it not be just appropriate to say that this working group will address the questions left by Dr. Callender for the next meeting?

Because it could go away or not go away. And if it turns out that by addressing those questions and the discussions we find that it's going to be much more in-depth and take much more time or whatever then we can come up with -- maybe might come up with more than just temporary. Maybe it will run for a year or something, I don't know.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay. I was thinking that the purpose might be in the context of the purpose of that working group is to establish the criteria for prioritization.

You know, looking through these six questions, you know, the word priority is a reoccurring theme in here.

So, does that make sense? That the purpose of that newly-formed I'll call it, perhaps temporary in its term of engagement, the

specific purpose is to work on identifying the criteria for prioritization.

MEMBER LOCKHART: I would basically leave it as it is, but add that as an emphasis at the end of the sentence.

So, the statement is there to address the questions posed including -- and then emphasize the fact that it is all about prioritization.

Because I think it's important that we do it in the context of these questions.

CHAIR PERKINS: Right. And the task is to create the criteria for prioritization, not to actually prioritize.

MEMBER LOCKHART: Yes, that's very clear in the questions that that's what's asked for.

MEMBER FIELDS: And that way it keeps it a narrow focus since it's a temporary working group as opposed to something broader.

CHAIR PERKINS: And so we have Carol as the chair, is that correct?

MEMBER LOCKHART: No.

MEMBER ATKINSON: There's two parts to that working group, right? I mean, there's the coastal intelligence and the coastal resilience.

MEMBER LOCKHART: Yes, there are two parts, but I think some of the things we were struggling with at least from our discussing coastal intelligence and at least for me, I find it really hard to separate those two things.

MEMBER FIELDS: You can't have the resilience without the intelligence.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Why don't we try it together? Do you want to co-chair it?

MEMBER LOCKHART: Sure, let's do that.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Okay. Okay, we need more volunteers.

MEMBER FIELDS: I'm willing to help with that.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Scott, I'd serve on the planning and engagement if you need someone.

CHAIR PERKINS: Great. Let the record reflect that Dr. Kudrna will be part of the

planning and engagement. Thank you, Frank.

MEMBER FIELDS: Now, is it a correct understanding on my part that when the meetings are set up that it will go out to all of us like it was over the last iteration before this meeting?

Such that if we want to sit in on it because we think we have something to add that we can do that. Is that the way it's going to be?

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes, right. The people identified have the responsibility to at least convene the meeting and be prepared to provide some sort of report-out of the activity in advance of our next meeting in September.

But they are open for participation to all panel members. And invited outside experts or subject matter experts as are beneficial to the purpose of the working group.

MEMBER FIELDS: But the expectation is that those people who have volunteered for the group are the core group, and that there may be others of us who may be a part of it for one

session but maybe not another session. Is that right?

CHAIR PERKINS: That's exactly right, yes.

MEMBER FIELDS: Okay.

CHAIR PERKINS: Those other panel members can step in, step out, contribute, you know, as they can to help with the purpose.

MEMBER MILLER: Since I'm the chair of the legislative committee, I received an email just now and it says Lowenthal joined the -- this is the Coastal Community Caucus.

CHAIR PERKINS: Advocacy in action. What more can you ask for?

RADM GLANG: So, I actually think that's a good item the panel might want to consider putting in their report-out to Dr. Sullivan. Credit for that goes to I think Bill, you mentioned that to him?

VICE CHAIR HANSON: That goes to the panel.

CHAIR PERKINS: I think Frank

volunteered for planning and engagement. Dr. Kudrna. No, I think he volunteered to chair. You turned the mic on, the light turned red and everything.

(Laughter)

MEMBER MAUNE: Put my name on that one too. Frank and Dave, did you put it up there?

CHAIR PERKINS: That's correct. Okay, we're about 10 minutes away from the public comment period. Do we want to review the prior one-page flyer? Just take a quick look at it while we're here.

MEMBER MILLER: Actually, I'd like to add just one sentence to the legislative committee.

And that would be that -- let's see. Develop standard operating procedures for the HSRP.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Scott, may I make a suggestion about -- you suggested the one-pager.

I'd suggest folks on that committee and that Lynne send out Science Advisory Board's

Engagement Working Group Report that talked about the topic as a whole, the one-pager and the previous top 10. And we look at those documents and then see where we go from there.

CHAIR PERKINS: I think that's a good recommendation.

RADM GLANG: Frank, can you just restate that so we can get it in the notes?

MEMBER KUDRNA: That we would distribute to the committee the Science Advisory Board's working group report on engagement, the previous one-pager and the previous top 10 report that we had issued.

And after reviewing those make a determination what we recommend.

RADM GLANG: Thank you.

CHAIR PERKINS: So, to recap, the items that we've identified for consideration in the recommendation letter -- full utilization of the hydro survey fleet, a statement in the letter regarding our engagement with Representative Lowenthal, his proposed legislation and his

joining the Coastal Caucus Community.

A statement regarding the importance of what we learned on the precision navigation project here in Long Beach-L.A.

Have I missed anything?

MEMBER MILLER: I have down from previous notes, and I would note that Evelyn and Ken are currently working on the rewriting of the statement I read this morning.

I would say that we should make mention of effective partnerships. And this is an attaboy. The HSRP was pleased to note the progress is being made on NOS cooperative agreements and Pre-Scripted Mission Assignments with U.S. Army, USAID -- whatever it is, and FEMA, although no new agreements are in effect at this time.

CHAIR PERKINS: I think that's very good. There's a good and a bad there. We heard good progress on the Pre-Scripted Mission Assignments, and we know that progress is being made, but that MOA is not signed yet so I think

that's appropriate. Well stated.

MEMBER MILLER: And then we decided not to -- and that we have gotten a response on the right whales. We would not include that.

CHAIR PERKINS: That is correct.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay. And then we had a previous item of importance of outreach and engagement. And importance of the buoy network on the West Coast for recreational boating as a strictly local issue.

I don't know, you know, we can decide whether to keep those in. I just have those from previous days' notes.

CHAIR PERKINS: Is there an implied action that we're seeking regarding the statement on the buoy network?

MEMBER MILLER: I'll leave that to Susan.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I don't think there was an implied action necessarily.

I mean, it might fit into the early part that just kind of says it was a productive

meeting and we heard about this. I know we're trying to reduce some of that. So I don't have a specific recommendation or action though.

MEMBER MILLER: So we wouldn't put that in?

CHAIR PERKINS: I think it's an acknowledgment, you know, not a recommendation I think is how we should -- so we'll put it in there in terms of the acknowledgment of what we heard about --

MEMBER MILLER: On a local level.

CHAIR PERKINS: -- at a local level.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay. And then the one I was -- I never had any notes on it, but it was presented was the importance of outreach and engagement. Who presented that?

MEMBER KUDRNA: That was the statement I read earlier as a possible inclusion. It was outreach, engagement.

Our meeting clearly identified the need for HSRP to communicate the needs and accomplishments of HSRP as identified in NOAA's

Science Advisory Board -- which is the Administrator's board -- Engagement Working Group Report. HSRP, like many other parts of NOAA, needs to significantly strengthen itself in this area.

A newly established working group, Planning and Engagement, will develop and report detailed recommendations at the next HSRP meeting.

MEMBER MILLER: Does that need to go into the letter to the Administrator? I don't know. For discussion.

CHAIR PERKINS: I think it definitely should go in the report from the meeting, you know, the official meeting report.

I think what we agreed to earlier was trying to keep the letter as short as possible, clear and succinct, and focused on the recommendations.

So having it in the report I think makes sense, but I'm open to suggestion.

MEMBER MILLER: I agree.

CHAIR PERKINS: We're about seven minutes in front of the public comment period.

MEMBER MILLER: So does that mean basically besides reporting out and saying we're glad to see the partnerships are working better. Precision navigation, you know, report out and say we're impressed by the precision navigation that's still being built. Success with Congressman Lowenthal.

So the only recommendation then would be the ship usage one.

CHAIR PERKINS: Right. The heart of the recommendation as we've drafted this potential recommendation letter is going to be addressing the under-utilization of the days at sea, the 58.6 percent problem.

I'm looking to confirm everyone is on board with that.

I think we have a pretty clear vision of what we want this letter to look like. So you know, we have some time during our administrative session over lunch. I think it's entirely

feasible that if a couple of people can sit down we could actually straw man up a pretty good draft outline of this.

So it'll take a little effort to put into not more than 150 words how we want to address the 58.6 percent utilization problem. But I think that would --

MEMBER MILLER: That was 144 words, the paragraph.

And the two admirals are working on this so I think we're --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER MAUNE: And planning for the next conference. So we were talking about having the Washington, D.C. area, where hotels are very expensive, we were considering some alternatives.

On planning for it, to me, I would like to know if I can plan on it being reachable by Metrorail from D.C., so that people from various federal agencies can get there by Metro. Or are you really thinking of going to Baltimore or someplace within an hour of D.C.?

RADM GLANG: We haven't decided on anything, Dave. I think it's open for discussion, and it probably should really be built around what it is the panel would like to accomplish at the next meeting.

So, there's the opportunity to interact with IOOS. There's the opportunity to bring the panel to Commerce. And we could certainly have some or all of the meeting take place at Commerce. There's meeting space there.

Where we sort of locate ourselves as far as hotel goes, that could be flexible. These are all things that could be explored here.

But I think we want to decide on what the panel would like accomplish and who they'd like to speak with. So we're not locked in on any location.

MEMBER MAUNE: Somebody else can do the planning on the side on the hotel and that sort of thing. We just sort of plan on the program.

RADM GLANG: Exactly. The panel lets

us know what they think they'd like to accomplish.

There's always the element from NOAA of what they would like to hear from, if anything different.

And I like the idea of trying to get onto Dr. Sullivan's calendar, and I think it would be convenient if we appeared in her chambers to do that.

VICE CHAR HANSON: On the way to Secretary Pritzker's office?

RADM GLANG: That's a longer shot, Bill, but you're probably our best connection there.

You know, if we had the meeting at Commerce, we probably would be -- it would be more easy to attract staffers to come over.

VICE CHAR HANSON: Yes. And we could follow up on that supply chain discussion because David Long's group would be there, the International Trade guys as well. So that's part of the outreach discussion.

MEMBER MILLER: Actually, is the supply chain issue something that we want to mention in the letter at all?

I hadn't really thought of that, but it was early on. It's just a question. It's mostly, I guess, to Bill.

VICE CHAR HANSON: In terms of relevance, if we're looking for ways to sell NOAA and NOS, I think that's a natural. There's a lot of big players involved in that discussion who understand that data is king.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I guess I see that tying in with some of the concerns I've heard expressed about what's in or not in the NOS Roadmap.

I mean, that potentially could be -- I don't know if we have a precise recommendation on it, but we could express concern about what we see so important that may be missing.

VICE CHAR HANSON: Well, when you get guys like Maersk, or Target, Lowe's, folks that you don't normally think about, and they

understand logistics and supply chain better than anybody.

You get Carnival involved. These are people that are actually end users, and when they're selling a product then that's where you want to be. You don't want to have the vendor selling. You'd like to have the user selling.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay. We are right on schedule here for the public comment period at this time.

So there are no online questions that had been submitted for public comment. So it looks like we are without public comment on day 3 here, which is fine. That allows us more time, but it's important that we at least recognize that requirement in the agenda and that we have met it.

So let it be noted that the public comment period was opened and closed at 11:45 a.m. on the third day of the HSRP meeting in Long Beach, California.

We have work ahead of us to do here

through our administrative session on lunch. So my recommendation would be that we adjourn now, go into our lunch session a little early with the goal of trying to have a pretty good presentation of our recommendation letter here before we reconvene this afternoon. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:46 a.m. and resumed at 1:13 p.m.)

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, welcome back to our afternoon session of the 29th meeting of the Hydrographic Services Review Panel.

We have a draft recommendation letter that we'll be working on, and we need to spend time working on our process and procedures document as well.

RADM GLANG: Is this screen view being shared on the webinar?

MS. HOUSE: Yes.

RADM GLANG: Thank you.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, let's spend a little time talking about the process.

So there will be somewhat of a lag between when this meeting concludes later this afternoon and before we get the transcript.

Do we know what that timeframe is, Lynne? On how soon we'll have a transcript from the meeting.

MS. MERSFELDER-LEWIS: The summary report is about a month and the full transcript is longer because the last meeting I believe it was about 1,800 pages.

CHAIR PERKINS: So what we had drafted was a statement that says, at the end of each meeting segment or half-day the panel will summarize critical points brought up during that segment.

White boards or onscreen documents will be used to record these summaries and the panel members, with NOS support personnel, will coordinate compilation and collection of those summaries.

So I think we've done a pretty good job of executing that step to this point over the

last two days.

Joyce, do you have that on your laptop?

MEMBER MILLER: Yes, I do. Somewhere.

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes, no problem. So, what we want to try to do is deal with the timeline.

So, would the goal of having a finished letter that we can send to the Administrator with a 45-day target, knowing that it's going to take 30 days to get the initial transcript.

So I think it would be inappropriate for us to prepare the letter without having the benefit of having the transcript to review. But that's a question, not a statement.

MEMBER LOCKHART: If that's a question, Scott, I don't know -- I mean, I'm not familiar with how you've done this in the past. Have you referred back to the transcript when you've been building the letter before?

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes, yes. In the

prior letter preparation step having the transcript as a reference document to make sure both that content was in proper context and with the right detail.

MEMBER FIELDS: Well, you know Scott, I think that with this session having each day come up with the particular points for that day, or a nugget for that day, I think goes a long ways towards making this a little bit more robust and viable from the standpoint that it might take less of the offline time once we get -- once we leave here, we will now have kind of a framework to start with, the points, by getting something each day that we want to talk about in our letter.

And so looking at getting that put together I think would go a long ways into reducing the timeframe and maybe even the concern about the input from the entire panel.

I don't know if that actually made sense, but I hope it did.

CHAIR PERKINS: Thank you, Admiral.

I think that makes sense.

So what we want to try and do is I think craft the flow chart of how this takes place, and then after that put the timelines to it.

And the intent here is that we have a framework document that future panel members will be able to use and look at and understand.

This is a process that has been proven to work. It's produced an outcome that was acceptable.

I just emailed the draft SOP that Joyce's working group prepared to Tiffany. So maybe we can put that up on the screen.

MEMBER MILLER: I didn't realize who prepared the summary. I thought that was Coast Survey or Navigation Services and so I didn't understand that it was prepared by the recorder -- the company that does the recording. So there's a lot in there that is not correct, yes.

RADM GLANG: Prior to Charleston it was the program Coast Survey, the DFO staff that

prepared a meeting summary. I'm not sure how we got in the habit of relying on the court reporter's meeting summary, which is still somewhat extensive.

I don't know where Lynne went. They're all gone. I'm left alone.

So if you look at the prior meetings there were meeting summaries developed that were more succinct summaries. So that would be my aspiration is to get back to that, and that kind of a meeting summary we should certainly be able to produce in a couple of weeks. We shouldn't be waiting to rely on the court reporter's summary.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay, I guess a question. In that -- I mean, I was taking notes part of the time. The admiral has been taking notes, but what else do we have to rely on to make that meeting summary from?

I mean, that's part of the procedure I'm concerned with is that if we're developing the summary out of notes, then we have to have designated note-takers.

All I was trying to do was capture high-level points within what I was doing. So that's one thing we need to have an assignment for is who is responsible for taking extensive notes.

MEMBER FIELDS: The thing about taking extensive notes is if it's one of us sitting here at the table then we lose out on the discussion. So that becomes a little bit of a concern.

MEMBER MILLER: And in previous sessions -- in Alaska, for instance. It was during a budgetary-constrained time, and Kathy asked that we take notes during the breakout session, that panel members take notes. And we were glad to because there really weren't support people there at that point.

But then it was asked again in New Orleans, and I have to note in every case it was women that were asked to take notes. And the next time I was assigned to take the notes I questioned it, and it was Carol and Deborah and myself that were asked again, the third time, to

take notes.

And I just decided I was going to stand up and say, if I'm going to be asked to take notes, then everyone on this table should be asked to take notes. And when the previous chair looked at the bylaws it says clearly that NOAA is required to provide us with clerical services during these meetings.

Now if that's the court reporter and that we have to wait for the court reporter's summaries, that's fine. But if we need these summaries quickly, then we have to have kind of -- I don't know if verbatim, but someone who is trying to capture everything that's coming in.

MEMBER ATKINSON: Do we need to capture everything coming in? I don't know.

I run a group where we keep a Google Doc going and we're all on it, and one person is kind of keeping track of the key points and others modify it. And that's just a question.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I think that's a good point. I mean, I think we have the

benefit of the court reporter's notes for the record.

But I think if we build into the agendas more regularly ---- before we convene each day we have a 10-minute of, okay, in each of your own notes what were the things that stuck out to you, and we capture those. And maybe that's as much of formal daily notes as we need.

MEMBER MAUNE: Would that take an hour every day to do that? To summarize the notes.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: Well, we did it yesterday. I think it took maybe 10, 15 minutes max. You know, before you adjourn the meeting of the day. Now granted at the end of an intense day, your brain can be a little fried.

But then it could be again in the morning, the chair can recap the day before. The critical points that were identified at the end of the day were A, B and C. Overnight did anything else jump out at any of you? Okay, then let's move on.

MEMBER LOCKHART: Yes. I mean, we've

come to a pretty good consensus on the kind of things we want to go in the letter already at this meeting. So is there a need for additional notes to put to that? I don't think so. I think it's just taking notes for notes' sake at that point.

Although in fairness we came to a lot of those consensuses because Joyce was taking a lot of notes.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay. So to try and clarify, it's clear we need to have some daily capture of key points and takeaways.

It's clear that each of us have the capability to do that and we can share those at the end of the day, in our wrap-up administrative session, and in the morning ---- at the beginning of each day in our brief administrative sessions.

We can do that over the three days of the meeting and we can hopefully get to a point where we are at today where we're taking that information and transferring that into the framework of a recommendation letter.

After this, the creation of the meeting report, where does that take place and by who?

MEMBER BLACKWELL: I think we just need to clarify what the NOAA staff support should be.

And if you guys -- what I've heard in the last couple of minutes is you're willing to take your own notes and compile that at the end of each day to make sure that you've captured those points.

But does that mean that that's all you want? Or do you want a summary from the NOAA staff as a start or in addition to that too?

Because I think it is -- you're taking on a lot of administrative burden, I think, even with doing the daily things if that's the case.

So I think it really is our responsibility to make sure that there's some capturing of the information as we had done in the past. Separate from the court reporter and that whole transcript type of thing.

MEMBER MILLER: Well, and it was Admiral Glang that said he wanted a summary sooner than a month, and he wanted it to be done by people.

I think if there is a summary being done, somebody with sort of technical knowledge needs to at least review it -- or the panel needs to review it to see if it is. But I don't remember everything that's being said and I certainly didn't capture everybody that's being said.

So, I just think -- and it's kind of your expectation, Admiral, you were the one that said you wanted to see the summary in a short period of time so we can get the letter out. So how do we do that?

RADM GLANG: So I think my concern was that the letter was being created after we left this meeting, and that the content of the letter didn't necessarily reflect everyone's input.

So one way to mitigate that is to have available some notes or takeaways. They don't

have to be 100 percent complete, but everyone should certainly agree that they are representative of what we talked about.

So that when it comes time to review the meeting and everyone finalize it and sign off on it, all the panel members, that it's representative of what they think happened at the meeting.

This is where we got into a disconnect here in the last few cycles of producing the letter to the Administrator. The panel members should be satisfied that the letter represents what they want it to represent, that they had their opportunity to provide input to it.

So today we're in really good shape since we're about to review it, but that may not always be the case. I don't know. So, you know.

MEMBER FIELDS: Yes, and what I was saying, as a part of the operating procedures that we are trying to do here is that that should be part of it.

At the beginning of the day, or the

end of the day, or both, we kind of do a high-level, these were the points, we agree, and then the next day we do the same thing.

And we should be in this kind of position at the end of each meeting where we've got the one or two points -- or three points, or whatever it is that we want to see in the letter, and we've all agreed.

And then it's a matter of getting the writeups done. And I think that that would at least take care of ensuring that the concerns of the board or the topics of the board that need to be in the letter are in the letter.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: It seems to me that there's two separate deliverables or outcomes that are supposed to come out of each meeting. Maybe three.

You've got the full court reporter's transcript. You've got a summary that in theory if someone were not in the meeting, were not here, they could read through that and get a pretty good sense of things. And then there's

the letter to the Administrator.

And I think we -- originally the letters to the Administrator sometimes also contained that summary of the meeting and that's why they got so long. We heard from these people, and they said all these great things, da-da-da-da, and then we would get to the recommendations.

So if we're keeping the meeting summary as one and the letter to the Administrator as another I guess my question is it seems -- can they be developed in parallel? Does the summary letter have to be developed before the letter to the recommendations? If so, it's going to slow it down.

I mean, it seems to me like in this meeting we've got a pretty good handle on the letter to the Administrator and the recommendations. So that actually might come before the summary, and maybe that's okay.

And the summary could be developed from -- the court reporter then does a summary,

and then the NOAA staff with their technical knowledge help tease out some of the summary, and then that's finalized by us.

I guess my thing is there's two separate pieces and I don't think they have to -- what's the order they have to be done in. I could see how it could slow things down if it were one then the other.

MEMBER BARBOR: I agree with Susan. I think part of the problem is some of the later meetings we dissolved with virtually no thought to what the recommendation letter was going to be. I mean, it might have had one or two loosely developed ideas.

And so then we all dissolve and okay, now, whose job is it to take the -- and what is the responsibility of all of us to say yes, that's what we said.

So I think the real key is if we progress smartly with a recommendation letter over the course of the deliberations then, yes. The meetings, we're not going to change that.

It's what do we want for our recommendations.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: So I guess to Juliana's point and getting assistance from NOAA and where would we want their clerical support.

Personally, I would rather have their support on the meeting summary side of things and leave the letter of recommendation to us if I had to divide it up.

MEMBER MILLER: And I think during breakout sessions, NOAA should provide someone to take notes during the breakout session. The presentations, we've mostly got PowerPoints, except for a very few exceptions.

And, I mean, that's one thing that makes the meeting summaries so long is if you try to include all the information that somebody put out. You know, it might be that you just put links to the PowerPoints and you can go look at those.

But in breakout sessions where you're trying to capture things and you're trying to interact with if there is the public here, I just

think in those circumstances -- and by the way, I would say I don't think we need to have breakout sessions every time.

But in those circumstances I think there should be a NOAA recorder there. Because there's not going to be a court reporter. And you lose -- well, I don't know if -- yes.

So that would be my recommendation, is that NOAA expects to provide the staff to support the breakout sessions.

And what happens during the meeting, if we're happy with what notes we take, that's --

MEMBER BARBOR: Again, I think the problem comes is when we're sitting here trying to draft a letter three months after the fact. Then, yes, we need to have the summary and the transcription to remember what the heck we did and what we thought was important.

MEMBER BLACKWELL: So are we okay with making sure that NOAA staff are charged with doing a summary -- draft summary of the meeting?

Kind of doing it realtime as each

session wraps up. Having something that's not too detailed, but at least catches the high points and provides the notes from any breakout sessions that do occur in any future meetings that we have.

We all have -- we bring people here. They're busy with conducting a webinar and making sure other things are happening.

But I think besides the actual presentations, maybe some of the questions that come up for some of the discussion things, those are the things that would be captured when they're not manning the presentations.

MEMBER MILLER: I don't think the presentations need to be summarized. Unless there's discussion.

MEMBER BLACKWELL: The discussion part. I agree. And only if there's really something that comes out. And maybe it's, hey, is that something that we want to capture. Or are we okay with that just being a transcript annotation.

And I think we just have to be cognizant of that. Maybe as each session is completed we just -- you know, is there something you want to make sure is captured by the staff, and people are okay with the way it's going.

It's going to take some getting used to, I think, to retrain ourselves to do that, but I think it's probably the right way to go. We should do that. Gerd?

RADM GLANG: We have a reporter. He produces a summary within 30 days. So if we want to do something in addition, we're going to have to pay for that. We've got to have somebody over there.

So what's the purpose of all this recording and meeting minutes? What is it we're trying to do?

As part of the FACA law, there is a statutory requirement that we produce meeting minutes. So that's the first requirement we have to meet.

The second requirement is so that we

can recall what it was we discussed for the purpose of reporting out. Although there is no requirement to report out. The panel can choose how it wants and when it wants to communicate.

I don't recall it saying anywhere that the panel has to write a letter to the Administrator, but that's how this panel has chosen sort of as their -- chosen to document that they met and this is what they heard.

So if we're asking to produce informal meeting minutes I think we can ---- you know, certainly there are enough folks here from our staff who can be charged with taking notes going into the future, but I just don't think we should be striving for a product that's going to be as comprehensive as what we're going to get from the court recorder because that would be a duplication.

You know, I think what the panel did here today was we actually got a letter drafted. So I think the urgency is much less, right? We have a letter. We along the way stopped and

said, well, what did we hear. Oh, we'd like to include this point.

So I think we've actually practiced some better behavior here that will help support us when we do get the final meeting summary from the court reporter. So how much more do we need?

The panel is going to be able to produce a letter here pretty much more or less ready to go. There will be some wordsmithing, I'm sure, but what are we trying to achieve here?

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I guess my question was you had said that prior to Charleston it was NOS staff that did the summary, is that correct? And then Charleston it was the court reporter.

And I don't know if this is where things got out of line ---- and I'm sure our court reporter is wonderful, but do we need someone with the technical knowledge of these discussions a little bit to help inform that summary or not?

RADM GLANG: So we receive the meeting

summary that comes to everyone. And there's an opportunity to review it and make changes to it.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: So I think we partly got to where we are now, which is a good state of the affairs, on the back of Joyce's efforts.

And so I think maybe what we need to do is find a way that we get to the same point without asking Joyce to carry the load.

MEMBER MILLER: Well, I don't mind being one of the people that catches summary things and so forth.

But I felt like in the breakout session, it was us talking and it just wasn't being captured anywhere. And that's the reason I said I think the breakout session is where we do need good recording.

And I don't know if during the -- if we're going to get a summary from the court reporter. I mean, I think it behooves us if we get the summary from the court reporter that somebody with technical knowledge goes through

that 1,800 pages and looks at the summary and says, is everything that we needed to capture here?

CHAIR PERKINS: Maybe we can do this in two pieces, right?

So the letter. I think we've got a clear vision of how we're going to build the letter. We're going to build the letter from the input, the key inputs that we capture each day, like we've done here.

We're going to draft it like we're doing here. We're going to put it up on the Google Drive, and we can distribute it by email.

And then we're going to set a review period. I would like to get a finite agreement on how long that review period needs to be, knowing that our goal is to exceed the Admiral's expectations and have this in less than 30 days.

So maybe let's just talk about the letter for a minute and get through that, and then we can get back to the meeting summary report and/or minutes because that's a little

more complicated.

So how long is a reasonable -- I mean, we all travel. We all have other responsibilities. Some of you are out deployed on ships and don't have seven by 24 internet access.

So, if we said ---- how long?

MEMBER MILLER: One week, and if somebody is going to be gone and inaccessible, you let the chair know beforehand.

But I would also suggest that if it's somehow on Google Docs or by email that if you don't have any comments that you -- or in the Google Doc at the end of it you put your name and then say, no comment, so that we know everybody has had a chance to review it.

That way it's like, well, you know, we haven't heard from three panel members.

CHAIR PERKINS: Is seven days acceptable? Anyone feel that that's not acceptable?

MEMBER LOCKHART: I'm a little

uncomfortable with that. I mean, if you're traveling, travel often takes five days.

If you stretch that out to at least a week and a half, I think there's a good chance that I would be in an office or be able to look at something, but if you set it to one week there's a good chance a lot of the time I may not be able to.

MEMBER MAUNE: I agree. Many of us are out all next week for a different conference.

MEMBER KUDRNA: I would say two weeks for that review and then after the final revision, two weeks. So you have four weeks in total after the review. A final version in two weeks and that's it.

MEMBER KUDRNA: I'd like to pose something concerning the court reporter kind of issue.

I attend the Port of Chicago meetings and they have legal authorities in a board meeting. And what they do is they tape the meeting, and staff does a summary of that

meeting, and if there is an issue they'll go back and transcribe it.

And 98 percent of the time they never have to look at anything associated with those tapes, and they save all the resources and all the time applicable to that issue.

So if we started doing that there could be a recording. They use a simple recorder for their meetings. Their numbers are similar to ours. Let the NOAA staff do a daily summary that we see, and do a two week/two week thing. It would be less expensive and probably in 98 percent of the occurrences we'll never have to go back to the meetings.

MEMBER FIELDS: I thought it was required that we had to have recordings or whatever for the entire time because it was a public meeting. Is that correct or not?

MEMBER KUDRNA: You will and we do in Chicago, but it doesn't mean you have to transcribe it.

CHAIR PERKINS: Can we go back to the

letter again for a second? This is really clear what the panel's responsibility is here and what our timeframe is.

But there's the NOS review of the letter that has always taken place. So is the NOS review of the letter going to fit within this timeframe?

RADM GLANG: It's the panel's letter. We don't need to be involved at all.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay. On the last letter from Charleston I reached out to Paul Bradley, asked for his help with wordsmithing.

So if we choose -- if the panel chooses to ask for that assistance, does that timeframe look reasonable?

RADM GLANG: You've got two and two up there? Two weeks and then two weeks?

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes, sir.

RADM GLANG: That seems reasonable to me.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, great. Now the meeting summary. In the disconnect that happened

after the Charleston and why we had to amend the minutes.

In what we've done here today, we went upstairs to the third floor right? With Mike's help and Audra's help, we've got eight, nine flip charts that got consolidated into a two-page document that got distributed to you this morning. All of that happened completely opaque to the court reporter.

So the court reporter isn't going to completely solve capturing all of the content. And I think that's part of what led to how things didn't end up in the meeting summary after Charleston, is that we had similar breakout sessions and not all of that content gets captured by the court reporter because, one, he can't be in both places, and two, we didn't have mics and all of the recording equipment in those rooms. And we brought flip charts and things back in that weren't audible.

So, you know, out of our breakout sessions and the summaries that were prepared and

that we showed today, how does that content end up in the meeting summary report?

RADM GLANG: Well, so certainly the outcome from the breakout sessions gets recorded in some takeaway. So there's a hard copy of that as you mentioned. That becomes part of the record.

CHAIR PERKINS: There is this time.

RADM GLANG: It becomes part of the record at the time that the full panel then is reconvening and discussing the breakouts, and then we're also discussing it on the record, what came out of the breakouts.

So it is, in fact, part of the record. It may not have all the details of what's in that two-page document, for example, that a particular session produced. But that then becomes a product of the meeting. So it's made available.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay. And so the court reporter summary transcript is going to be put on the Google Drive? Or is it going to be emailed to all of the panel members?

It went to me last time, and I reviewed it and I missed the omissions. And that's what led to having to do our amended minutes. So I would like to create clarity on how that summary report is going to be distributed.

And then let's talk about what the review timeline, if any, needed for that is so that we can get to a meeting summary report or minutes that everyone is happy with the content of.

RADM GLANG: I think as a matter of practice that meeting summary is always shared with the full panel by email. And I'm pretty sure it would have been shared that way after the Charleston meeting. Was it not?

CHAIR PERKINS: I don't --

RADM GLANG: It doesn't matter.

CHAIR PERKINS: I don't know.

RADM GLANG: We can share it by email. We can also post it as a Google Doc. We can do it both ways.

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes. If it was shared, we didn't have a proper inclusion and participation in it, that's true.

So if we put it on the Google Drive, same two weeks? Okay, and then there will be -- after comments, there will be another two weeks, and we should be good.

So what else do we need to have in a standard operating process procedures document?

MEMBER MILLER: Well, the expectation we talked about earlier today, about responses to our letters, perhaps.

You know, how we expect getting responses and in what form. For instance, the right whale issue that we were talking about earlier.

CHAIR PERKINS: On the follow-ups. Okay.

So after Charleston, as the chair, I sent correspondence to everyone who presented at the Charleston meeting thanking them for their time and sharing with them a copy of the

recommendation letter.

Looking for I guess consensus that that same thing could happen with signatures from the entire panel, or it could be a letter sent on behalf of the panel, not just the chair and the vice chair.

MEMBER FIELDS: I think listening to some of the issues I certainly understand.

And I applaud you for sending the speakers a thank you for attending the meeting because obviously the meetings are only informative if these folks show up at the meeting, and I think that that was a good thing to send out. Thank you.

And I think if there is -- if the spreadsheet, or whatever is on the website, is kept current with the list of recommendations -- I'm not asking for a whole lot of other stuff, just the list of recommendations. And then a column that says that this is the response, or whatever we got back from NOAA.

Using the right whale thing as an

example. If the email came back -- well, not if, but the email came back that said that Fisheries was going to be looking into this, or had the ball to deal with this. It would be easy to put that then on the site that said right whale -- NOAA has filtered down to Fisheries.

And then you could go back -- if this is the current concern that you have, you could go back to those speakers and say -- or those who were interested in that particular issue and say, you know, this is the response. Go to the website and there's the information. And your concern about follow-up with the folks that you sent this thank you letter to would be done.

CHAIR PERKINS: Agreed.

MEMBER FIELDS: And that would be easy. All of us would be able to see it. They would be able to see it, and there would be no other responsibility on your part. My thoughts.

CHAIR PERKINS: I think that's a workable implementation of both documentation and visibility on the website.

MEMBER FIELDS: Absolutely. It would take care of the issue of keeping track of all of our recommendations that we have out there, and then the status of those recommendations.

They're being worked on, it's not going to be worked on. Whatever the resolution is, or non-resolution is, at least everybody would then know.

And I would recommend that in the staff putting together and updating the website that if this is something that is agreed upon, then we start with this meeting and the last meeting, and then work our way back to the other recommendations and not try to work from ten years ago forward. And that's just an example.

I think we should work presently back, using Charleston meeting as the starting point and then if you want to fill in the other ones, go back and fill them in.

CHAIR PERKINS: I agree, going back beyond that may not be fruitful. But implementing that with Charleston as the starting

point.

How do we engage the new website developer to get that document on the website?

RADM GLANG: So that's still going to take awhile. We have a lot of website updates that need to happen program-wide and that's his responsibility. It's the whole website. We're going to rebuild the framework.

So I'm not expecting any changes to our website for quite a few months, probably another eight or nine months before anything starts moving.

CHAIR PERKINS: So in the interim we'll track those recommendations in that manner on the Google Docs site.

RADM GLANG: So I mean that said though, as clunky as the current website is, any documents we can still post to it. It's just clunky discovering them.

MEMBER FIELDS: Well, then my recommendation would be to start with Charleston and this meeting.

We know we're going to have ---- we had four recommendations from Charleston. We've got, well maybe two here. That will be six. Put them on the website as it exists now. And as you all get to -- as the web person gets to setting it up, then you can set it up in a more formal manner, and then go back.

Put the recommendations there and put whatever the response was there and let it go from there, and then that way it will be on the website. Everybody, the public and everybody would know where to look for it.

CHAIR PERKINS: Should we talk about expectations for the working groups? You know, for tracking their activity?

Working groups in the context of what do we want to put in our standard operating procedure and process document for how workgroups report back to the larger panel.

We want to leave whoever follows us with a clear outline and roadmap so when someone like Dave who's new to the panel gets volunteered

to co-chair a working group, and his chair leaves him hanging and he has to do it all himself, it would be nice if there was a process document that clearly defines what is supposed to take place.

So this is where we could talk about working groups will meet at least monthly. You're only talking about trying to get five meetings in. You know, four meetings in and then prepare your report that's due at the next panel meeting.

MEMBER MILLER: It kind of depends upon how much you've got to do.

For instance, in between now and the next meeting Legislative has review the HSIA. And we could review that and probably have a single telephone con and we'd be fine. And probably to some extent codify these notes, these standard operating procedures. That's also one meeting.

I don't think you want to say that you have to have a meeting a month. But it needs to

be -- and the planning group may have to have a meeting every two weeks for awhile. I don't know that you want to say once a month.

CHAIR PERKINS: Well, maybe we say that the chair will report progress once a month.

I'm trying to avoid the situation of forming another working group that doesn't meet, doesn't get engaged, and then gets disbanded.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I would think, instead of dictating how frequently they're going to meet, we could say that at each physical meeting of the HSRP we will discuss the activities and expected outcomes for each workgroup that will be delivered by the following meeting. So basically ensuring -- we check in with the working groups and we make sure they all have something to do.

I get nervous when you say you have to meet once a month that it's going to make people more reluctant to chair those working groups.

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes. Agreed, that's not a good plan, mandating that they meet.

MEMBER ATKINSON: In our case we know what our deadline is and we kind of know what we're supposed to do. So we'll make the deadline.

MEMBER KUDRNA: I think in some cases you've got to have a clock on it.

Like for example, the planning piece of the next meeting. Lynne said if you want a particular venue you have to commit to a location by then.

So there probably are some elements like the planning of the next meeting that need some short-term decisions that feed back to NOAA to take action concerning bids for hotel, schedule, and initiation of invitations and all those kind of things.

Other things could be worked on by the committee towards the next meeting.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay. Is there anything else we should include in a standard operating process and procedures outline? Beyond the letter and the review of the meeting summary

minutes.

MEMBER FIELDS: At this point I will say no and we start with that. And if at the next meeting we discover that there's something that needs to be added to it, then we add and let it be a living document as opposed to cast in concrete.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, good. Feels like progress from where I'm standing, but I'm standing up here and you're all looking at me, so --

(Laughter)

MEMBER MILLER: Scott, I'm still very unclear that we came to any consensus about the notes-taking during. Whether we want summary notes taken during the meeting and/or the breakout sessions.

I'm trying to sort of incorporate what we're discussing. I'm still very unclear what we want there.

And also what the schedule is for later on in the meeting summaries in terms of

reviewing them. Does anybody have a clear idea of what's been said?

CHAIR PERKINS: Well, I think our expectation is it takes at least 30 days to get the meeting summary transcript.

MEMBER MILLER: And that's the only summary transcript?

CHAIR PERKINS: Correct.

MEMBER MILLER: Or that's the only summary that we're producing?

CHAIR PERKINS: It's the only one I'm aware of.

So somewhere between 30 and 45 days we get a court reporter-provided meeting summary transcript that we will post and review within two weeks. Those changes/comments/edits get posted, another two-week review cycle, and then the official meeting summary and minutes should be done.

That didn't answer your question on the note-taking that's required to accomplish that.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Scott, just to clarify, then we might be sending our letter to the Administrator before we see the minutes.

CHAIR PERKINS: That's correct. It sounds like we absolutely will be in a position where the letter to the Administrator will precede the meeting summary transcript.

MEMBER FIELDS: And as I have understood this discussion that should be okay because we have as a group decided what the points are that we want to put in that letter throughout the meeting period, and then put the recommendations together. Or have I misunderstood that?

CHAIR PERKINS: No, I think the Achilles' heel might be is if we have a panel member who's unable to attend.

So if we have a panel member who's unable to attend they're not going to have content from a summary transcript available. So their ability to review and contribute would be diminished. Other than their own subject matter

expertise, you know.

VICE CHAR HANSON: I guess that's why it's important to attend.

CHAIR PERKINS: Exactly.

VICE CHAR HANSON: That's why we're here, right? So I'm with Evelyn. I don't see a big deal with this.

CHAIR PERKINS: I don't either. I'm not going to lose sleep over that.

MEMBER FIELDS: Joyce, was your concern the actual meeting as opposed to the summary of the meeting? Is that what you were asking about?

MEMBER MILLER: No, we'd had various discussions about recording during the meeting and getting summaries.

I guess what I've already said and what I would push for is that during breakout sessions that we are provided with a staff member to take notes.

MEMBER FIELDS: And I think we all agreed with that. I think that's exactly what we

agreed to. That's what I heard.

MEMBER MILLER: Yes, but if we're all taking our own notes during the general meetings we've got that information for ourselves to check on.

MEMBER FIELDS: And in order to put this letter together.

MEMBER MILLER: And in order to put that letter together.

MEMBER FIELDS: Right.

MEMBER MILLER: But we only sit in one breakout session. There's no court reporter in the breakout session.

So what I would advocate for is that we make sure that there is an NOS staff member who is responsible for taking notes during the breakout session.

MEMBER FIELDS: And what I heard was that's what we're going to do.

CHAIR PERKINS: Tiffany, can we put the draft letter to the Administrator up?

All right. So if you can take a

second. We're going to post it and you're going to have two weeks to review it. But we'd like to say let's try to get an 80/20 solution here. You know, can we make sure that we've at least got 80 percent of the content.

VICE CHAR HANSON: Scott, I would recommend you strike Vice Chair Hanson with a request and just say the panel requested. It needs to be anonymous ---- unified, I guess. That's right, that's a better word.

RADM GLANG: This may be a technicality, but are we potentially out of line if the panel requested that a congressman do something?

(Simultaneous speaking)

CHAIR PERKINS: So, just a reminder that we're still on microphone here, folks. So in order for everyone to hear us and the court reporter to pick us up we should be practicing good hygiene with the microphone. Audio hygiene.

MEMBER MAUNE: I don't know if the numbering makes any difference ---- this is Dave

Maune.

I'm not sure if the numbering makes any difference, but it seemed as though when I saw the list before that the planning and engagement was working group number 2.

CHAIR PERKINS: Well, I think 1 and 2 were the prior existing ones, Dave. Legislative Policy and Arctic Emerging Priorities were created in prior HSRP meetings. So I think that we may have showed it as 1 and 2.

MEMBER MAUNE: I have no objection, then we should change the other document.

I just don't want to be asked are you on working group 2 or 3. I may not know which one is correct.

CHAIR PERKINS: It might be easier if we change those to bullet points and get rid of the numbers, for clarity.

So the intent of the last statement is that the purpose statement, the membership of the working groups, that will be reflected in the meeting summary transcript document, then we

don't have to put it into the letter to the Administrator.

Great. Can we go down to the next page?

RADM GLANG: So, hang on a second. Just to be clear that the DFO has approved these four working groups, right?

There's a little thing in the bylaws or charter, or maybe both, where the DFO approves working groups. So I would ask that you reflect that in some way.

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, so after the word in ---- resulting in the DFO approving four working groups going forward.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: Are those now formally approved, or do you need the purpose statement written out for each of those? Because I know that was a gap in the past.

RADM GLANG: So I just looked at the draft document on the working groups and we don't have a fully formed purpose statement for the Coastal Intelligence and Resilience working

group.

I think the others are adequate for me to get what you mean.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I think, if I recall Evelyn gave a nice concise one-sentence purpose for that. But if we need to come up with something more thorough, we probably should do that.

MEMBER LOCKHART: Larry and I can do that next week.

RADM GLANG: So the one sentence by itself is, if that's all you want, okay.

MEMBER FIELDS: We're looking at this as a temporary group that might not have to continue after about six months. And so that's the reason why we only looked at a very brief statement and a very specific statement as to what they were going to do because it wasn't expected to be a long-term working group like the other three might be.

RADM GLANG: So would we want the purpose statement to reflect that?

MEMBER FIELDS: That's what we were trying to do.

RADM GLANG: Okay. So you will be adding something to that single sentence.

MEMBER FIELDS: If you want us to add something, we will do that.

RADM GLANG: I think it should be clear what you expect to get out of the working group, and over what period they'll do their work, and then the group will be disbanded.

MEMBER FIELDS: Okay.

CHAIR PERKINS: So can we move down to page two, please?

I think it's important that we do spend a little bit of time on the wordsmithing of this while we're all here.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I think it looks really good.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Scott, does this increase the backlog?

RADM GLANG: So Frank, to just unpack your question for a moment. You asked does this

increase the backlog. Not getting enough surveys done will not reduce the backlog. So I'll leave it at that.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Well, I mean the point here is to have NOAA do something about this, and if it increases the backlog ---- I mean if that's an accurate statement, I'm posing that as an arguing point for why NOAA should do something about this.

CHAIR PERKINS: I think your point is perfect. We've got an introduction. We've got a nice body there. What we don't have is our conclusion. We don't have the ask.

MEMBER BARBOR: And to Frank's point I actually consciously did not address the backlog because I thought a 201-year isn't much different than a 200-year backlog.

And the issues that we saw was just really being inefficient. And actually that last part wrote long-term core competency of NOAA.

CHAIR PERKINS: So we need a concluding sentence that begins with something

like, the HSRP asks that the Administrator within 60 days, do something.

And we need to put our heads together on what the do something should be worded as.

MEMBER MILLER: I don't think we want to tell them what to do. There's many things they could do. If it's just reduce backlog, oh well, put out more contract surveys.

What we're concerned about as much as anything is the basic hydrographic expertise, and the need to reduce the backlog of course, but that NOAA has to maintain its core capabilities.

Basically I think we're asking that the Administrator facilitate better usage of ships. I don't know how to --

MEMBER BARBOR: Could we call them systemic issues? The panel invites the Administrator to address the systemic issues, which prevents full utilization of the hydrographic survey ship time.

CHAIR PERKINS: Are you saying this is just an issue with the hydrographic survey ships?

MEMBER FIELDS: We consciously talked about hydrographic ships because this panel's purview is hydrographic services and not what's going on with the other ship time. Because that's not something that we should be involved in.

CHAIR PERKINS: Ken, can you say that one more time, please?

MEMBER BARBOR: The Hydrographic Services Review Panel invites the Administrator's attention to address the systemic issues preventing full utilization of hydrographic ship time.

RADM GLANG: Wouldn't you rather actually hear what NOAA is doing to fix the problem?

CHAIR PERKINS: Is there anything wrong with us requesting a report? The HSRP would request a report on what is being done.

MEMBER FIELDS: I'm not sure that we should ask for a report more than ask for feedback as to how it's going to -- what they're

going to do because I know who's going to write the report.

So I'm not certain that a report is what you want because that looks to me like you're looking for a lot of detail that I'm not sure we really need. What we want is just the ships to sail for the number of days that they should be sailing.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: Are we asking for highest-level attention to this issue? You know, above NOS.

VICE CHAR HANSON: What's the historic usage?

MEMBER BARBOR: My buddy here wanted that information and I said well, it doesn't matter what it was. It's 58 percent less. We're only using 58 percent of it, so.

VICE CHAR HANSON: Just looking, I don't know if that's good or bad, right?

MEMBER KUDRNA: I think invite is a little soft. I would use urge. Urges the Administrator's attention.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: Bill, as far as historic -- Gerd had a nice visual that definitely showed a very clear downward trend line.

RADM GLANG: So where that 58.6 percent comes from. So that was for -- the sea days were allocated at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2014. I don't remember exactly what the number was. And that's what was allocated to our ships.

And of those total number of days, the ships were only able to execute 58.6. Does that help, Bill?

VICE CHAR HANSON: We have issues with our dredge fleet as well. There's some years we get 40 percent. There's some years we get 80 percent. Weather, wait time, sail. In a maritime environment to me, unless it's got a baseline it's kind of hard to understand what that means.

Would you typically do 80 percent? Is this a dramatic shift or is this just a bad year?

What story are you trying to tell?

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: We typically do close to 100 percent.

CHAIR PERKINS: I think the word used after OCS, should be received or something other than used.

RADM GLANG: So technically the way this works, right, is the ships are owned and operated by OMAO. And for the purpose of Coast Survey's projects the ships are allocated a certain number of sea days.

So when the ships go to work they're executing projects on behalf of Coast Survey, the program.

CHAIR PERKINS: I'm trying to make sure we have that sentence worded to where it's clear that the problem wasn't a lack of execution on OCS's part.

If we say that OCS only used 58 percent it's not --

RADM GLANG: That could be misinterpreted. So I get your point.

MEMBER MAUNE: Executed?

MEMBER MILLER: Was able to utilize?

MEMBER BARBOR: Only 58.6 percent of the allocated ship days were made available to --

MEMBER MILLER: No, it's not that they were -- see, there's a couple of different issues.

Three or four years ago, or five years ago when the fuel prices shot up, NOAA hadn't allocated enough money to run the ships.

And so we were seeing -- out in the Pacific, we were seeing where we had run 223, 224. We were seeing years where we ran 170. And that was strictly because NOS didn't give the sea day -- or there weren't the sea days.

So that's not the case anymore. You had two hundred and something sea days for the two ships last year? Something. And because -- in that case, because they didn't have staff, they couldn't make use of them. They didn't have engineers in that case.

But it can also be that the ships are

broken. So it's a combination of the three. It's not just that there aren't any engineers.

MEMBER BARBOR: The ships were ready for sea only 58.6 percent of the allocated days. Is that accurate?

VICE CHAR HANSON: On that sentence there, instead of saying for example because that invites me to think about what you're comparing it to.

But if you say, as a result, in 2014 OCS only ---- whatever word you want to use there. It ties it back to the first sentence.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: So again, going back to, as a result, in 2014 ships were only available for sea.

MEMBER MILLER: No. Ships --

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: Were only ready for --

MEMBER MILLER: -- were only capable of going to sea. I mean, there probably -- it probably was some combination of not having engineers and broken things, but that year it

wasn't sea days.

I mean, you could also say, in the past five years ships have only been allocated fewer than 180 sea days a year.

MEMBER BARBOR: But we're saying 58 percent of those ---- of the days allocated.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: Yes. So if NOAA doesn't get the budget to operate the ships, the Administrator can't do anything about that.

But in this case it was budgeted, the sea days were allocated and the ships were only able to sail. I think that's right, Admiral, is it not? For whatever reason, the ships were funded and set up to operate that but they just were not able to go because of staffing and equipment.

MEMBER MILLER: You might say, was only able to use. I don't know if that makes it any better.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: Achieve.

MEMBER MAUNE: It seems like they could only deploy 58 percent of the time.

CHAIR PERKINS: Is it beneficial for us to have the statement in there about the decline over the past decade? Or do we want to try to keep this succinct and focused on the problem last year?

MEMBER MILLER: I think it's important to point out the declining number of days that the ships actually operate, for whatever reason there is, and it has steadily declined. I wish we could put the graph in there but we can't, so.

CHAIR PERKINS: Why do you say we can't put the graph in there? Why can't we put a graph in?

MEMBER MILLER: Because it's not my graph.

CHAIR PERKINS: It's our letter. Where do we get the data for a graph? I mean, I think that's exactly what it's lacking is substance, you know, tangible metrics to support the 58.6 under-utilization.

MEMBER MILLER: Are there such graphs on any website?

CHAIR PERKINS: Well, that gets back to why we're requesting a report.

MR. STONE: It's part of the public record because it was reported out, right? You can use the graphic.

MEMBER MILLER: Well, actually, perhaps we should ask for an analysis of ship usage. I mean, is that an ask? An analysis of ship usage. Juliana?

MEMBER BLACKWELL: I'm sorry, I haven't paid close attention, but can you maybe ask for a briefing or something at the next HSRP when we're in town? And maybe have something talk to it?

I mean, it puts them a little bit on the spot, but having a dialogue I think might be -- I don't know.

MEMBER BARBOR: I think a briefing is fine.

Again, I feel a bit hesitant to tell the Administrator to solve the problem, but a report back on -- or a review with concern, what

actions are you taking, what plans do you have to address?

MEMBER MILLER: Well, a report-out at the next meeting means that we're going to learn how many sea days they lost this year next meeting.

And I mean, get those ships to sea whatever it takes. Whether it takes sending out only one, or raising the pay scale, who knows, but do something.

CAPT BRENNAN: Joyce, this is Rick. Having just come off of a CO assignment out there, I mean a lot of the reason why -- and we've discussed this, but I think for the Board's edification.

There's no easy solutions here, and this is why this has become such a systemic problem. It's a really complex issue. I know it shouldn't be. From a private sector perspective it doesn't seem like this should be a complex issue.

But I think given the situation that

we're dealing with it is. And I think that's the -- certainly I would think that's the sensitivity that we need to display in whatever comment goes into that.

So I think certainly asking for how that would be -- maybe a more holistic way to deal with that is asking how this board could potentially help with that situation would be maybe a better cooperative way to look at it.

Because we are certainly in violent agreement that it's an untenable situation, but certainly some of the legislative things that are hamstringing us on this and some of the other budgetary reasons.

There's a number of whys and none of them are certainly satisfying. I think the reason that nothing has happened is not for a lack of trying, I think, on the O&O parts.

MEMBER MILLER: I understand, but I also listened to Margaret Davidson last time who said, look at what NOAA is doing, seeing if they're doing it right, and if they aren't kick

them in the butt. And that's exactly what she said. And she's a major NOAA figure, you know.

And so, you know, we don't have to be as sensitive to internal NOAA politics. We need to look at what NOAA is doing and seeing if it's doing it right. And have her tell us why it's not doable.

MEMBER KUDRNA: How about something like adding to the last sentence, we would like to assist in resolving these issues.

MEMBER MILLER: I think we should ask for an analysis of the situation too. And she's probably already got it, or NOAA probably already has it.

MEMBER BARBOR: Tiffany, I think what Frank was saying there. So, have a comma after times, and welcomes any suggestions on how the panel may assist in this matter.

Also, if you go up one sentence there, before hydrographic. Right above your cursor. Where your blinking cursor is. Insert the word allocated.

MEMBER MILLER: One of the things -- I put NOAA in several places because there's other ships out there that could be used.

MEMBER MAUNE: Are you saying may assist in this manner or assist in this matter? M-A-T-T-E-R.

MEMBER FIELDS: Are we okay with that one now?

CHAIR PERKINS: That's pretty good for a first draft.

MEMBER BARBOR: And I took the liberty to insert a recommendation too.

MEMBER MILLER: Should we spell out what SCCOOS is?

MEMBER BARBOR: Sure. Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System Regional Association. Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System Regional Association.

CHAIR PERKINS: I know what we're trying to accomplish, but the end of that first paragraph with, modern environmentally friendly

vessels.

The system works for those old, rusty, nasty, smoke-bellowing vessels too. So maybe we should say expanding the navigation window, rather than enlarging?

MEMBER MILLER: Perhaps you should spell out larger, rather than just modern. I mean, you're really talking about size.

CHAIR PERKINS: Right, right. Panamax and post-Panamax. What nomenclature do we want? Because that's really what we're saying. It comes into play with things over 1,000 feet long where 1 degree of pitch changes the under-keel clearance by 10.74 feet. I took notes.

(Off the record comment.)

CHAIR PERKINS: So, I think we want to say, Tiffany, for larger, deeper draft and wider-beam vessels.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER KELLY: Yes. The vessels are in fact more environmentally friendly because these are newer engines that are in compliance

with the MARPOL, the international -- yes.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER KELLY: I mean, these are in compliance with the latest requirements from the international regulations regarding emissions and vessel incidental discharges and ballast water, et cetera. So these are actually much cleaner, more environmentally friendly ships. And with the economy of scale with the larger vessels the emissions per ton of payload are actually much less.

And you know, typically these -- one very large ship requires fewer transits of support vessels, i.e., tugs, pilot boats, et cetera. Instead of 3 4,000 TEU ships coming in and out, each with tugs and pilot boats alongside refueling and whatnot there's now just a very limited amount. So they are actually environmentally friendly. I don't just say stuff like that.

CHAIR PERKINS: What are the future enhancements that we're fully supporting?

MEMBER FIELDS: We were thinking in terms of technology.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I wasn't clear if that was future enhancements of the system here in Long Beach, or the further deployment of this as well to other ports. I wasn't in your breakout, so I don't know.

MEMBER BARBOR: Initially I had, yes, supports the future build-out of the system which, again, could be equally ambiguous in terms of whether it's here or elsewhere.

CAPT BRENNAN: This is Rick Brennan. In the presentation I gave I talked about adding some enhancements to that web server that showed the data. And we had talked about adding the wave model overlay into that web viewer and winds and AIS. And I know those were things that we were wanting to add into that.

That synthesis in that web viewer though, that's a bit of a point of debate there, as far as whether or not that's actually a service that we would be providing everywhere or

not. I mean, in this instance the way that we've created and the specific intent for that web service is purely to demonstrate the capabilities.

And so I think that we would be more than happy if a third party, or if the port, or if PROTIDE were to pick up that method of doing it. We just feel like that's a better way to portray the data, and to visualize it and to share it. And so that's why we put it together in that format. So how it happens is unclear who would do -- would we do something like that again in another port or not, we're not sure.

MEMBER MAUNE: Dave Maune here. Are you saying you support or do not support the future enhancements and nationwide build-out?

CAPT BRENNAN: No, I absolutely do. I'm just saying depending on what exactly we're talking about when we talk about those enhancements, because I think that term, we'd be adding enhancements to that. I wanted to at least say what I was talking about when I was

talking about enhancements in my precision navigation briefing that I gave yesterday.

So maybe we're talking about two different things. Because I know I had used that term and I'm not sure if that's what got picked up on and what we were talking about as far as that term "enhancements." So that's the context in which I was making that statement.

CHAIR PERKINS: So do we want to add for clarity the future enhancements presented by Captain Brennan? Are you comfortable with that, sir?

MEMBER FIELDS: Why can't we just say presented? Because we had a lot presentations, and that's what these recommendations are based on, is the presentations that we were given.

MEMBER BARBOR: Again, those would be for L.A.-Long Beach. So, fully support the future enhancements as presented. Of this system, I guess that's fine. And Dave had good words there in terms of nationwide build-out. Yes, so presented of this system, and the nation-

wide build-out.

MEMBER KELLY: I think it's also important we maintain that this is a different system. This is a precision navigation system. It's not an enhancement of the existing PORTS, or PORTS 2.0. Because hopefully we'll be able to re-brand this to be able to possibly, hopefully attract funding, possibly in relation to other things that are happening with WRDA and the harbor maintenance tax. There's a few possible areas that, if we can position this right, we have a shot at maybe selling it as a new product.

MEMBER BARBOR: Well, and the top thing said, it was across-the-board sorts of people, but we're advising OCS or NOS.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER BARBOR: Okay, NOS then.

CHAIR PERKINS: Tiffany, in that next sentence change that "on behalf of the HSRP members, we" change the "I" to a "we." And it's two recommendations, not three in this letter. Then you can strike the "and submit prior

recommendations," because we're not resubmitting any prior recommendations.

MEMBER MILLER: I can't remember, did we have in there the discussion of the fact that that MOUs were underway and so forth? That's in the beginning. Okay, I couldn't remember.

CHAIR PERKINS: The paragraph that starts with "As you know," I think we can strike that whole paragraph because we address the new working groups earlier in the letter. If you'll scroll back up to the top.

MEMBER MILLER: And would welcome your attendance this fall in Washington, D.C. Can we give her a date? September?

CHAIR PERKINS: Well, if we're going to go to Commerce do we want to make that statement? I guess we can always invite her to attend.

RADM GLANG: You could just be somewhat generic and say "and look forward to meeting with you." So either way you're looking forward to meeting with her.

CHAIR PERKINS: So, after the "and

meetings," "and look forward to meeting with you." Soon.

RADM GLANG: Well, you may want to put in during our September -- what are the dates? Seventeen through nineteen? Meeting in Washington, D.C. Sixteenth through eighteenth.

CHAIR PERKINS: Well, we have the luxury of time. Let's try to resolve the wording of the "consider joining."

MEMBER BARBOR: I'll take a stab. So the HSRP requested Representative Lowenthal -- no, didn't request. The HSRP informed Representative Lowenthal of the Coastal Community Caucus. Or the formation, recent formation. Okay. "We received," and then that stands.

CHAIR PERKINS: No, I think we can simply say we received communication on April 10. Actually, Tiffany, it's taking the words out in front of that. I think we can get rid of the "from Representative Lowenthal's staff on April 10." Perfect.

So Bill, what were we going to say

after this? My short-term memory is failing me. We urge the timely completion of the MOA? So I think after the word "place," Tiffany, if we can add a new sentence that says, "The HSRP urges the timely completion of the MOA."

MEMBER MAUNE: On FEMA, was there actual progress or lack of progress? There was some progress? Okay.

CHAIR PERKINS: Continued efforts towards completion of the MOA?

MEMBER MILLER: And urge continued.

MEMBER KUDRNA: I'm not sure we're pleased if it's not done. Maybe we should say we understand that progress has been made.

CHAIR PERKINS: We noted.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Yes.

MEMBER MILLER: What about at the end of that say -- after "FEMA" say something like and urge that NOAA continue to pursue cooperative agreements with -- I was going to say cooperative agreements with other agencies.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER MAUNE: Should we just generalize as agreements or formal agreements?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER MILLER: Or collaboration.

MEMBER MAUNE: If we call it a cooperative agreement with USACE, is that wrong on the top row?

(Off the record comments.)

CHAIR PERKINS: Okay, so we can delete that comment.

MEMBER MILLER: I have a question. With a letter to the Administrator, I mean we've got acronyms all over the place here. And we cleaned up the Southern California whatever it was. But do we need to spell out acronyms the first time you use it? I used to be an editor, excuse me.

CHAIR PERKINS: My opinion is that USACE and MOA are so commonly used that we don't need to burn the word space to define them. SCCOOS RA, though, I think it was good to define. I bet she knows it, but that's okay. This is the

best point of conclusion that we've had regarding a recommendation letter since I've had the opportunity to serve on the panel.

VICE CHAR HANSON: All your leadership. Congratulations.

CHAIR PERKINS: I wasn't fishing for the compliment. This feels really good and to be at this point in the meeting. We have time now where we can spend a little more time on the planning of what we hope to accomplish in the September meeting. Thank you for the reminder. And we could maybe dig in a little deeper to what we would like to share with IOOS on April 30, when we go attend the IOOS FACA and convey to them.

MEMBER BARBOR: And I mentioned it yesterday or whenever it came up. This is Ken Barbor. The one thing that many of the regional associations do is outreach, very well. And they have pointers to NOS data and NOS products.

And so to the extent that we can use their outreach mechanisms to get support for

those, I think that's well worth the effort. And as I kind of had the discussion at our lunch table, issues of providing guidance and not just models in certain cases would be beneficial, what we could provide to them, or what NOS could provide to them.

I guess that's the panel's purview to say we're going to do that. But I think that's what we could walk away from is solicit their comments on NOS's data and models, information and model, and see if those are actionable things that we can take on, or make recommendations.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I just pulled up for -- if you're interested, Paul Bradley sent Scott and I the agenda, this was back in March, for the IOOS meeting. And I commented that it was hard to tell what the real meat of the agenda was.

He wrote back to say that for the IOOS agenda will focus next on AC priorities, raise visibility and support for IOOS as a national-level program within NOAA and IOOC, develop a

statement on essential need for IOOS to support resilience -- sounds familiar -- facilitate ICOOS Act reauthorization, provide recommendations on quality management indicators for IOOS, provide recommendations to meet post-certification challenges, plan to improve integration of industry into IOOS.

Paul then went on to say, "I think it would be beneficial for you and Scott to see how the IOOS Advisory Committee approaches its work and what comes out of their meeting. "You should know that IOOS external players, not the NOAA program, has been providing outreach on how IOOS supports the maritime industry."

So if that's a focus of their April meeting it would certainly be helpful for some HSRP members to listen in. So that's the guidance we've been given so far.

MEMBER BARBOR: Didn't hear the question, but I don't know how many panel members are unfamiliar with IOOS. If there's some need to at least talk about high-level, what they do and

why.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Following on Ken's comment, maybe for our meeting in D.C. if you're talking about outreach, to have Zdenka Willis, who administers the program out of Washington, and maybe Josie Quintrell, who runs the IOOS Association, which is the membership of the 11 regional associations, and maybe even Sea Grant outreach and their extension, talk to us about how they could take things from HSRP and assist in the outreach aspects. That would be a good dialogue to begin.

MR. STONE: I think for the consumer out there it really gets confusing with the IOOS and the NOS. They have trouble knowing who's doing what. Just an observation.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: Could I change the subject briefly on recommendation 1 there? It's not clear why that word "potential" is in there in the subtitle.

RADM GLANG: So maybe I could just coach a little bit here. What Scott has the

opportunity to do is he's got an hour, I think, on the agenda for the next IOOS meeting in April. And I think Scott is going to need some guidance on what it is he should be talking about, the HSRP panel. Let's assume they know what we are by name and maybe not much more. We'll certainly support Scott in preparing a presentation if that's what you'd like, Scott.

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes, please.

RADM GLANG: But you'd certainly do with a bit of an outline. And I don't know how you want to proceed. But in general maybe the panel has some input on specifically what is it Scott could be communicating to them.

So we have the leading questions where the panel might say, oh, IOOS FACA, we'd be interested in learning more about how you do outreach, or the model piece, or how you're approaching the coastal resilience questions. But is there some other information, perhaps an overview of the programs that the HSRP looks after or something like that? If you were in

Scott's shoes, and you had an hour in front of that FACA where would you start?

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I might think that there's kind of two sides to it. It's what does the HSRP do, what offices do we work with, and what is the data and information that comes out of these three offices and how that plays into coastal intelligence, which is a key part of what IOOS feeds into as well.

And then the second part of it could be what can we learn from you in terms of processes and how you're working with engagement and that side of it. So, half about us, and half asking what we can learn from them. I mean, those of you on the panel who have worked more closely with IOOS, when you've come over to HSRP, and what are the things that we're doing that you think they don't know about?

MEMBER KUDRNA: Let me try a little bit, and part of it's a little background. IOOS is not only NOAA. It's interagency, EPA, Corps of Engineers, a whole string of agencies. Well,

I'm talking about the federal side of it.

And the bottom line is for all practical purposes NOAA is the only one who bellies up to the bar with any money, and they provide grants to the 11 regional associations. And those are the principal operating monies for these agencies, but each of these regional associations has an independent board organization structure. They function as a grant recipient.

And they're going through a process called certification. NOAA is requiring that. They have to go through data verification standards because it's unlike other parts of NOAA and the federal government that just takes information and can release it without any liability issues, their boards are potentially subject to litigation if someone hits something out there and uses a piece of data.

So those are the kinds of issues that the regional associations deal with. Trying to get a broader, more inclusive participation from

the federal government, trying to get data from the other parts of the government. It's been pulling teeth in many areas as to getting data released into their system so they can put it on their portal.

So those are the kinds of issues they're dealing with. And they're different in the sense that they're not like the three arms of HSRP, that they're all part of the federal government. These are all independent, outside parties, even though some things are done internally by the NOAA staff with some of the funds. So that's the distinction and those are some of the issues that they're dealing with.

CHAIR PERKINS: In January I did a presentation at a conference in Puerto Rico on this FACA, on HSRP. A couple of other people presented on FGDC, NGAC and some others. So, I do have a PowerPoint that I prepared, kind of giving that overview. So I'll get that on the Google Drive. And if you can provide comments, or improvements, or feedback on that. This is a

smarter audience, right, than IOOS. Because I was presenting to people that weren't even familiar with what FACAs are.

MEMBER KUDRNA: Well, it's chaired by a former NOAA Administrator, so that's to start with. So I would think they're up to speed.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: I noted in the presentation from Julie that many of the sensors and observations they make have potential value in the precision navigation environment. And so I think there's potentially some synergy. And I know that CO-OPS has been sort of working in that direction, but I would point that out for the membership.

MR. STONE: We have been working on that. And it's actually one of kind of the issues of how operational they are. I mean, I think precision navigation really requires a truly operational nature. And Julie, who is very, very good and stuff like that, but she's very much up front in saying we don't want to be responsible for that level of operational. So,

getting some clarification, or having some discussion on that issue I think would be a very good thing with the wider IOOS community.

CHAIR PERKINS: The one-pager that we need to refresh that we prepared a couple of years ago, it just struck me that it might be nice to have that refreshed and ready to go to take to the IOOS meeting. I think that would be beneficial. We have time.

While we wait for the one-pager, thoughts on where we go after the September meeting? So, our 2016, you know, first meeting of 2016. Geographic location and what we would hope to obtain from that location in regional stakeholder inputs.

VICE CHAR HANSON: When is the last time we were in Houston?

CHAIR PERKINS: Gary, how far are you from Houston?

MEMBER JEFFRESS: It's a three-hour drive. It's the fifth largest port by tonnage in the nation, and it doesn't have a PORTS system.

VICE CHAR HANSON: Houston has so many issues. I mean, if you're going to sell precision navigation, that's the place to do it.

CHAIR PERKINS: So we can go watch Texas Chicken live while we're down there?

VICE CHAR HANSON: You can talk about the oil spills. You can talk about the collisions. You can talk about coastal issues.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: You could go to Galveston. That's a little nicer than Houston. And they have a PORTS system. They have their own pilots. I'm sure Sherry would like to see us.

CHAIR PERKINS: Any thoughts other than South Texas? Miami?

RADM GLANG: There is a sheet and I don't have it handy right now -- I think Lynne is trying to look for it while she's multitasking -- that lists all the places we've been with the dates. So we do have that document, it's just not handy at the moment. I think it's been a few years since we went to Houston. Certainly before my time. Quite awhile, it's been quite awhile.

MEMBER MILLER: What about the Great Lakes? When were we last there?

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: We were in Duluth.

RADM GLANG: 2010, 2011.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay, that must have been right before I came onboard, I think. Yes.

CHAIR PERKINS: Yes, I participated in Duluth on the phone bridge. I listened in. And that was when my application was still in the hopper.

MEMBER MILLER: Okay.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: Duluth was 2009.

MEMBER MAUNE: Have we been to Norfolk?

MEMBER MILLER: Quite recently.

MEMBER MAUNE: Okay.

MEMBER MILLER: What about Seattle? Have we ever been to Seattle?

RADM GLANG: I think the panel has been to Seattle, but quite awhile ago. More recently they were in Portland, Oregon, or just across. Did you find the sheet, Gary? I think Norfolk was 2012. Portland, Oregon was 2010.

October 2010.

MEMBER MILLER: Another thing I remember from a previous meeting was that there was certainly interest in going up to UNH to kind of kick the tires up there, at one point.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: So we did UNH back in 2003 or '04, one of the first meetings. Then it's been -- then we went to Rhode Island some years ago. But certainly we'd be happy to host a meeting.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER KELLY: Ed Kelly. I've done that with other maritime-related groups where we've used passenger ships that are either being repositioned, or seasonally transitioned, or -- I'm sure we could get a discount employee rate. But it actually turns out to be a lot cheaper than paying for a hotel and meals. You can get conference space.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: The problem would be the public perception, the public access.

MEMBER MILLER: Public access and

perception. It's like going to Vegas or something.

RADM GLANG: So the way we've done this in the past, as far as selecting a meeting location is we've asked for input from panel members. Within Coast Survey we'll go to our regional navigation managers and they always provide a great deal of information about issues in their port, that they think are especially reasons why the panel should come visit them.

So we kind of look for inputs and reasons. And then we also will provide, we can provide to all the members the latest update of the historical list of where we've met in the past. And then we just kind of do an informal poll by email. On my list I had Houston, we should think about going to Houston. I had Great Lakes. Russell Callender wrote down China, for some reason.

MEMBER MILLER: We do have a panel member that's from Texas, though.

RADM GLANG: And we have, program-

wise, good connections with organizations in Houston that we work with. So it could be a good meeting. So we'll share the information that way and poll folks virtually and see what we come up with.

MEMBER FIELDS: I apologize for taking a short break. We're talking about the follow-on meeting after September? Okay.

MEMBER KUDRNA: I was going to add a comment. I think if we came to the Great Lakes Cleveland might be a good location. It's centrally located. And we might do something linked to the Great Lakes port directors. Great Lakes have different issues because of the St. Lawrence, and we were talking at lunch about the Asian carp implications to shipping in the Great Lakes and the series of issues going on. So I think for a future one that might be a potential.

I agree that going out on a cruise ship would have the wrong optics for a meeting, but meeting in Miami and maybe discussing cruises and visiting a ship for a day might not be an

inappropriate thing to do, to open up the issue of the cruise aspects of the issues we deal with.

MEMBER JEFFRESS: We actually have been to Miami and did do that. We had lunch. The cruise line hosted us for lunch on the boat. But we actually met in a hotel. It was very nice. We went up on the bridge and checked out all the NOAA charts.

CAPT BRENNAN: Would it be possible to make that coincide with next year's Miami Boat Show? Is that possible? It would be a good way to get the recreational boater community in there.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: I like that idea, personally. I mean certainly we could try and bring some resources to the table on the recreational side that way.

RADM GLANG: Yes, the logistics would be a real challenge. That's a huge event. Hotel rooms are really tight. They're booked in -- they're probably already booked.

MEMBER SHINGLEDECKER: That's why we

stay on the cruise ship. Problem solved.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR PERKINS: If you feel strongly about one of the locations, you know, be it the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in Cleveland, or the Miami Boat Show, South Texas, you know, compose your thoughts.

Send them out to the panel as a body and then we can, you know. We've got a planning working group that can take that input and work with NOAA staff and the input we get from the regional navigation managers. So I think we've got plenty of choices.

MEMBER MAUNE: Are the political conventions in Cleveland next year for the Presidential campaign? I think there's one in Cleveland.

MEMBER ARMSTRONG: I don't think we want to be there then.

VICE CHAR HANSON: Why not? It's a great place to talk about precision navigation, right?

CHAIR PERKINS: So, we're pretty close to our scheduled 3:30 break. So let's see if we can keep the break a little shorter than what we've done.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:26 p.m. and resumed at 3:50 p.m.)

CHAIR PERKINS: All right, if we could reconvene for our conclusion of the 29th meeting of the Hydrographic Services Review Panel.

MEMBER FIELDS: I asked for that one to be put up so that the admiral would know that we are looking forward to the temporary. He missed that part of the discussion. So he's now satisfied that working group purpose-fits what we suggested.

CHAIR PERKINS: We're approaching 4 o'clock. A couple of us have travel commitments. Is there any pressing business anyone wants to make sure we address, or have reflected in the minutes for the meeting before we do a final wrap-up and conclusion?

MEMBER FIELDS: This doesn't necessarily have to be in the minutes, but I wanted to address it before everybody takes off. I was wondering why our meeting went from Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday to Wednesday-Thursday-Friday. I don't have a problem with traveling on a Saturday, but if I don't have to that would be my preference. And that's why I ask the question.

RADM GLANG: Right. So the answer to your question is quite simply because last Sunday was Easter Sunday.

MEMBER FIELDS: But I notice that September is Wednesday-Thursday-Friday.

RADM GLANG: So the other factor was looking at people's availability in the Doodle poll, trying to maximize availability.

MEMBER FIELDS: All right, thank you.

MEMBER MILLER: I think as a general rule if we can schedule Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday it's better, particularly for those who have jobs and families and things.

CHAIR PERKINS: Great. Well, I thank

all of you for your service. We have work ahead of us to do so you know your assignments. I want to thank NOAA and NOAA staff for the great support that was provided both in advance and during and throughout the last three days. An outstanding job of logistics and support.

Excellent visit to the harbor and to the Marine Exchange. And compliments to Mr. Ferguson for his help in getting the stakeholder panels. I think it's been a very successful meeting. I wish everyone safe travels, and we shall officially adjourn the 29th meeting of the Hydrographic Services Review Panel.

MEMBER FIELDS: I would also like to say to whomever did the planning to thank them for the variety in the meals. Because I liked the fact that we could have salads or whatever, as opposed to the more heavier meals that we've had in the past. I appreciate that, however that was done.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:53 p.m.)

A

$600 31:14
a.m 1:11 4:2 7:12,13 33:7,8 80:20 81:8
abbreviating 33:14
ability 123:21
able 23:21 85:8 86:11 102:7 106:5,8 114:17 114:18 135:12 137:2 139:12,15,18 151:6,7
above-entitled 7:11 33:6 81:7 173:5 175:21
absolutely 27:10 115:1 123:5 149:17
AC 157:20
acceptable 85:11 105:20,21
accepting 12:10
access 9:3 15:8,9,11 34:2 105:6 168:21,22
accessing 26:10
accomplish 53:8 54:16 77:5,15 78:2 122:21 145:21 156:10
accomplished 36:22 46:5
accomplishment 26:18
accomplishments 45:12 51:7 73:22
accurate 131:7 138:5
achieve 102:10 139:20
Achilles 123:16
acknowledgment 73:7 73:9
acronyms 155:13,15
across-the-board 151:14
act 38:18 47:3 158:3
action 34:6,11 68:13 72:15,20 73:3 120:14
actionable 157:11
actions 9:6 142:1
actively 56:3
activities 8:10,11,14,16 17:7 24:16 25:10,11 39:18 47:11 55:21 119:13
activity 39:16 43:15 46:7 67:13 117:15
actual 99:9 124:11 154:7
ad 42:22 43:5 47:5 48:3 48:8 54:8
adaptation 31:10
ADCIRC 31:22 32:2
add 18:20,22 37:19 38:2 50:19 65:4 67:8 69:14 121:5 130:5 148:18 150:9 154:4 170:9
added 10:8 121:5
adding 63:4 130:4 144:9 148:13,15 149:21
addition 27:3 49:11 91:14 100:12
additional 40:18 44:5 90:3
additions 12:16
address 32:21 48:5 57:21 58:6,15 64:2 65:6 76:6 131:15 132:18 133:11 142:2 152:9 173:20 174:3
addressing 64:6 75:15
adequate 129:2
adjective 39:1
adjourn 7:9 81:2 89:13 175:12
Adjourns 3:22
administers 159:5
administration 1:3 52:3
administrative 33:18 37:4 75:21 81:1 90:15 90:17 91:16
Administrator 2:11 3:16 6:14 51:4 74:11 83:10 93:11 95:1,3,11 95:18 101:7 123:3,6 125:21 128:2 132:1 132:14,18 139:9 141:21 155:12 164:5
Administrator's 74:2 133:10 134:22
admiral 2:2 9:18 22:12 36:9 48:20 84:22 86:16 92:2,13 139:12 173:12
admiral's 34:20 104:17
admirals 76:10
admittedly 16:11
advance 67:14 175:4
advantage 17:7
advice 57:20
advising 59:7 151:15
advisory 21:8 22:14 45:15 47:13 51:4 69:22 70:10 74:1 158:10
Advocacy 68:13
advocate 125:14
affairs 103:5
affect 27:9
afraid 19:3
afternoon 5:20 81:6,11 82:3
agencies 16:21 19:22 21:16 52:4 76:20 154:21 161:22 162:7
agenda 32:15 56:3 80:16 157:15,17,20 160:2
agendas 89:4
ago 13:19 28:11 115:15 137:8,9 165:6 167:19 168:9
agonize 55:5,10
agree 34:14 39:9 56:19 74:22 93:2 94:2 96:9 99:18 106:9 115:20 170:19
agreed 74:16 94:8 114:15 115:11 119:21 124:22 125:1
agreement 104:15 143:11 155:6
agreements 71:14,16 154:20,21 155:2,2
ah 21:17
ahead 7:9 43:10 55:16 80:22 175:1
AIS 148:17
Alaska 87:11
Alice 22:21
allocated 135:7,9 136:10 137:4,10 138:4 139:3,6,11 144:22
allow 19:13
allows 80:14
alongside 147:16
Alright 4:4 6:3
alternate 60:11
alternatives 76:16
ambiguous 148:10
amend 109:1
amended 111:3
amount 147:18
amounts 30:1
analysis 10:10 13:8 141:7,8 144:12
Analyst 2:7
and/or 18:7 104:22 121:16
ANDY 1:14
Ann 22:12
annotation 99:22
anonymous 126:9
answer 8:14 9:5,10 53:10 54:18 58:8 122:20 174:9
answered 6:10 12:5,6 50:12,15 57:15
answering 50:16 53:14
anybody 12:15 18:20 80:2 122:1
anymore 137:16
anyway 22:11 23:2,5 31:12
apologize 7:20 170:6
appeared 78:8
appears 32:7
applaud 113:9
applicable 107:6
application 27:5 167:9
appreciate 175:19
approach 42:1 61:14
approaches 158:10
approaching 160:19 173:17
appropriate 37:5 51:10 63:8 64:1 72:1
appropriation 46:1
approved 128:6,16
approves 128:9
approving 128:13
April 1:8 153:17,20 156:13 158:15 160:2
Arctic 4:17,20 42:9 43:1 53:13 58:4,13 127:8
area 4:15 15:6 17:1 27:6,13 45:17 74:5 76:15
areas 5:8 25:4,19 151:11 163:3
arguing 131:8
arms 47:1 163:8
ARMSTRONG 1:14 103:3 136:2 138:13 138:17 139:7,20 159:17 164:7 167:3 168:6,20 172:18
Army 10:10,12 13:9 29:11 71:15
arrange 30:12
arranged 30:19
ASHLEY 2:5
Asian 170:16
aside 53:5
asked 35:18 36:10 65:16 87:13,17,19,22 88:3,5 108:12 127:13 130:22 169:5 173:11
asking 34:5 59:15,16 101:10 103:9 113:18 124:13 132:13 134:9 143:5,7 161:14
asks 132:1
ASLAKSEN 2:3 14:12 19:6,12
aspects 16:16 159:11

171:2
aspiration 86:10
assessment 39:20
assigned 35:6 58:14 87:20
assignment 43:15 60:14 87:3 142:12
assignments 3:10,19 32:17 33:1 71:14,21 175:2
assist 144:10,18 145:5 145:5 159:10
assistance 97:3 108:14
Assistant 2:11
associated 107:4
Association 145:17,19 159:7
associations 156:19 159:8 162:5,8,21
assume 160:5
Atkinson 1:14 19:13,16 24:12 25:13,16 27:7 27:11 28:2,5,18,22 29:12,20 30:4 31:2,7 34:14 56:2 66:2,12,15 88:15 120:1
Atkinson's 16:11
ATMOSPHERIC 1:3
attaboy 71:12
attend 106:19 123:17 123:19 124:3 152:17 156:14
attendance 152:13
attending 113:10
attention 57:16 133:11 134:10,22 141:11
attract 78:17 151:8
audible 109:20
audience 164:1
Audio 126:20
Audra 2:8 15:2 18:12 18:19 24:15
Audra's 109:5
authorities 106:20
availability 174:15,16
available 4:19 23:9 30:16 92:22 110:18 123:20 137:4 138:15
avenue 18:17
avenues 18:3
avoid 119:6
aware 29:1 30:13 32:18 122:12
awhile 116:5 119:2 166:22,22 167:19

B

B 89:19
back 5:8 6:1 15:17 17:18 23:7 32:20 35:16 39:2,14,21 40:12 42:21 44:8 45:9 55:16 81:10 83:20 86:10 103:5 104:21 107:1,14,22 109:20 113:21 114:1,2,7,9 115:13,16,19,20 117:7,19 120:13 138:12,14 141:1,22 152:11 157:15,19 168:6
background 18:12 20:4 161:20
backlog 130:20 131:1,2 131:6,16,17 132:7,11
bad 31:6 71:19 134:19 135:22
ball 114:4
ballast 147:6
Baltimore 76:21
bar 162:4
Barbor 1:15 36:18 44:7 47:6 48:9 61:19 96:9 98:13 131:14 132:16 133:9 134:14 137:3 138:3 139:5 141:18 144:15 145:11,15 148:8 150:17 151:13 151:17 153:10 156:16 156:18 158:19
base 17:10 29:8
based 27:20 36:15 150:15
baseline 135:19
basic 17:12 132:10
basically 12:5 65:3 75:4 119:15 132:13
basis 38:9
bathy-topo 5:5
bathymetry 5:7
bay 5:8
Beach 1:10,11 4:6,11 9:7 13:19 23:12 80:21 148:5 150:18
Beach-L.A 71:4
beam 146:18
beautiful 52:1
becoming 23:8
beginning 4:6 90:16 93:22 135:7 152:6
begins 131:22
behalf 113:5 136:13 151:19
behavior 102:4
behavioral 26:16
behooves 103:20
believe 82:9
believed 26:21
bellies 162:4
belly 16:14
beneficial 50:18 67:17 140:1 157:4 158:9 165:9
benefit 83:15 89:1
best 6:17 22:8 54:22 55:15 78:13 156:1
bet 155:22
better 8:15 25:10 31:3,8 41:13 46:15 75:5 80:1 102:4 126:10 132:14 139:19 143:9 149:8 174:20
beyond 58:18 115:21 120:21
BIANCA 2:11
bids 120:14
big 27:8,16 29:5 56:4 79:10 124:7
Bill 39:3 41:7 62:20 68:18 78:13 79:6 135:1,13 153:22
bit 6:6 21:6 36:14,15 52:15 62:22 84:9 87:9 102:20 130:15 141:15 141:20 148:20 159:22 160:11 161:20
BLACKWELL 1:15 19:7 91:4 98:19 99:17 141:10
Blanton 32:1
blinking 144:21
board 51:3,4 74:1,2 75:18 94:12,12 106:20 143:7 162:8
Board's 45:15 69:22 70:11 142:14
boards 82:16 162:17
boat 171:5,10 172:6
boater 171:12
boating 72:9
boats 147:14,16
body 131:12 172:8
bolts 47:9 59:7
booked 171:20,21
Boston 25:18
bottom 43:3 162:2
bottom-up 20:18
Boulevard 1:11
bounded 62:3
Bradley 108:12 157:14
brain 89:15
brainstorming 6:4
branding 46:21
break 32:10,16,20 33:4 170:7 173:2,3
Breakfast 3:7
breakout 5:11,15,19 6:5 7:10 50:17 53:11 87:13 97:10,11,20 98:2,10 99:3 103:13 103:16 109:14,21 110:4 121:17 124:18 125:12,13,17 148:7
breakouts 110:11,13
Brennan 2:4 142:11 148:12,12 149:17 150:11 171:9
Brian 32:1
bridge 167:8 171:7
brief 19:8 90:17 129:16
briefing 4:16,21 51:17 141:12,18 150:2
briefings 33:19
briefly 159:18
Brigham 1:16 42:10
bring 31:17 35:17 77:8 99:6 171:16
broader 65:20 162:22
broadly 58:20
broken 138:1,22
brought 32:1 82:14 109:19
buddy 134:14
budget 51:17 61:15 139:8
budgetary 143:14
budgetary-constrained 87:12
budgeted 139:10
build 14:8 27:8 56:10 89:3 104:7,8
build-out 148:9 149:16 150:21 151:1
building 15:6 83:21
built 31:14 75:8 77:4
bullet 127:17
bullets 16:18
bump 39:21
bunch 22:3
buoy 72:8,16
burden 91:16
burn 155:20
Bushnell 24:3
business 40:13 173:19
busy 9:1 99:7
butt 144:1
button 16:14
buy 11:22
bylaws 88:6 128:8

C

C 89:19

C3 12:8
calculate 25:1
calendar 78:7
California 1:11 2:6 4:6 4:12 80:21 145:16,17 155:14
call 31:9 48:16 64:21 132:16 155:5
called 8:19 10:2 23:2 28:9 51:20 162:12
Callender 48:4 60:8 64:3 169:18
Callender's 9:21 50:16 57:17 58:1
calls 39:13
campaign 172:16
can/should/must 12:1
canceled 51:21
candidate 9:17 10:18
capabilities 17:2 18:7 59:12 132:12 149:4
capability 90:14
capable 138:19
CAPT 142:11 148:12 149:17 171:9
Captain 2:4 150:11
capture 87:1 88:14,16 89:7 90:12 92:10 97:21 99:20 104:2,9
captured 91:10 99:12 100:4 103:15 109:16
capturing 91:20 109:11
care 94:11 115:2
careful 47:13
Carl 21:8
Carnival 80:3
Carol 1:18 65:21 87:21
carp 170:16
carry 103:9
case 16:20 20:6 26:10 87:18 91:17 93:17 120:1 137:16,19,21 139:10
cases 120:5 157:4
cast 121:6
catches 99:2 103:11
Caucus 38:21 68:12 71:1 153:14
cause 55:9
Center 2:8
Centered 41:3 44:11
centrally 170:12
certain 15:6 18:16,16 134:3 136:11 157:4
certainly 6:18 39:20 54:10 56:9 77:9 86:11 92:10 93:2 101:12 110:3 113:8 143:2,5 143:10,12,16 158:16 160:6,10 166:21 168:4,9 171:15
certification 162:12
cetera 147:7,15
chain 78:19 79:2 80:1
chair 1:12,13,13 4:3 7:14 12:18 14:3,7 21:8 24:9 32:9 33:9 34:17 35:20 36:1,3,5 36:6 38:12 39:6,8 40:6,16 41:1,11,18 42:6,16 43:8,18 46:9 46:17 47:12 48:13 49:3 52:8 53:2 54:4 54:19,19,22 55:2 58:12 59:1,6 62:21 63:16 64:13 65:12,21 65:22 66:21 67:10 68:3,6,9,13,20,22 69:2,8 70:5,17 71:18 72:5,14 73:6,12 74:13 75:1,12 80:8 81:10,21 82:11 83:5,22 84:22 88:5 89:17 90:10 104:4 105:10,19 107:22 108:10,18,21 110:8,19 111:17,19 112:1,17,19 113:5,6 114:15,20 115:20 116:13 117:13 118:1 119:4,5,20,21 120:19 121:8 122:3,8,11 123:4,15 124:4,8 125:20 126:7,16 127:6,16 128:12 130:12 131:10,21 132:21 133:7,17 136:4,15 140:1,11,16 141:1 145:9,20 146:9 146:16 147:21 150:9 151:18 152:7,15,22 153:7,16 154:9,15 155:9,18 156:6 160:9 163:15 165:4,18 166:4,13 167:7 172:3 173:1,8,17 174:22
chaired 164:4
challenge 24:4 25:20 171:19
challenges 158:6
chambers 78:9
chance 105:16 106:4,7
change 96:22 127:12 127:17 151:19,20 159:17
changes 26:16 103:2 116:9 146:13
changes/comments/... 122:16
CHAPPELL 2:5
CHAR 78:10,18 79:7,20 124:2,5 126:6 134:12 134:18 135:14 138:6 156:4 165:16 166:1,6 172:20
charge 52:20
charged 98:20 101:13
Charleston 35:13 42:20 43:20,21 46:10 85:21 102:13,14 108:11 109:1,14 111:16 112:19,21 115:17,22 116:21 117:2
chart 12:20 85:3
charter 36:21 37:1 38:7 38:16 128:9
charts 109:6,19 171:8
cheaper 168:17
check 119:15 125:4
checked 171:7
Chicago 106:19 107:20
Chicken 166:5
Chief 2:3,4,10
China 169:18
choices 172:13
choose 61:9 101:3 108:13
chooses 108:14
chosen 101:8,8
Christi 30:19
circle 40:12
circumstances 98:1,4
cities 23:9 30:21 31:21
city 27:8,9 32:4
clarification 62:6 165:1
clarify 39:12 90:11 91:5 123:2
clarity 32:22 111:4 127:18 150:10
cleaned 155:14
cleaner 147:7
clear 4:18 40:14 49:17 55:7 59:14 65:16 74:18 75:19 90:11,13 104:7 108:1 117:21 122:1 128:6 130:8 135:3 136:17 148:3 159:19
clearance 146:14
clearer 41:22
clearly 27:1 45:11 55:11 73:20 88:6 118:4
clerical 88:7 97:4
Cleveland 170:11 172:5 172:15,17
climatology 15:6
clock 120:6
close 30:18 136:3 141:11 173:1
closed 80:19
closely 161:16
closer 19:3
clunky 116:17,19
co-chair 55:3,4 62:7 66:13 118:1
co-chairs 46:11 54:20
CO-OPS 24:3,15 164:12
coach 159:22
Coast 2:4,5,6,10 10:3 13:13,21 15:18 25:19 72:9 85:16,22 136:9 136:13 169:6
coastal 4:22 5:1,2,11 5:12,21 6:1 15:10 18:3,10 19:9 30:14,21 30:21 32:13,14 33:2,2 38:21 57:21 58:7,16 58:16 63:17,18 66:4,4 66:8 68:12 71:1 128:22 145:16,18 153:13 160:19 161:8 166:8
codify 118:18
coffee 20:7
cognizant 100:2
coincide 171:10
collaboration 155:4
collected 5:6
collection 51:1 82:19
collectively 14:21 16:22
collisions 166:8
column 113:20
combination 138:1,21
combined 54:11
combining 58:21
come 21:2 32:20 46:19 61:10,13 64:9,10 78:17 84:7 90:1 94:16 95:19 99:11 129:6 142:12 161:16 169:10 170:4
comes 38:7 93:4 98:14 99:19 103:1 135:6 146:12 158:11 161:6
comfortable 47:4,16 150:11
coming 6:17 19:21 20:15 54:2 88:14,16 147:15
comma 144:16
comment 3:13 50:20 69:10 75:2 80:9,12,13

80:19 105:15 143:3 146:15,19 147:2 151:16 155:10 159:3 168:11 170:10
commented 157:16
comments 12:16 19:5 41:4,11 105:13 112:6 155:8 157:10 163:21
commerce 1:1 9:1 77:8 77:10 78:16 152:16
commercial 11:18,22 12:2
Commission 27:12
commissions 26:16
commit 120:9
commitments 173:18
committee 21:8 22:14 25:14 27:14,15 33:18 34:6,12 38:1 43:12,17 45:18 46:8 47:13,19 48:11 51:12 55:1 60:20 62:10,18 68:10 69:15,21 70:10 120:18 158:10
committees 39:12
commonly 155:19
communicate 45:12 49:21 55:22 73:21 101:4
communicated 49:22 51:8
communicating 160:14
communication 45:3 153:17
communications 44:22
communities 12:12 17:13 18:16 29:17
community 24:16 26:3 68:12 71:1 153:13 165:3 171:12
community-driven 25:9
companies 21:13 22:3 22:7 31:19
companion 62:2
company 85:19
comparing 138:8
competency 131:20
compilation 82:19
compile 91:9
complete 4:18 93:1
completed 100:3
completely 11:17 109:8 109:11
completion 154:2,5,10
complex 142:18,20
compliance 146:22 147:4
complicated 105:1
compliment 156:7
compliments 175:8
compose 172:6
comprehensive 101:16
con 118:17
concern 8:9 11:21 19:1 37:3 79:18 84:18 87:9 92:17 114:8,13 124:11 141:22
concerned 86:20 132:9
concerning 46:6 106:17 120:14
concerns 79:13 94:11
concise 129:5
concluded 5:10
concludes 82:2
concluding 131:22
conclusion 131:13 156:1 173:9,22
concrete 121:7
conducting 99:7
conference 1:11 39:13 62:9 76:14 106:10 163:16 168:19
confirm 75:17
confirmation 39:7
confused 49:20
confusing 159:14
Congratulations 156:5
congressional 45:22 56:16
congressman 39:5 75:9 126:13
connect 17:19 18:2 29:13
connection 78:13
connections 170:1
cons 31:16
consciously 131:15 133:1
consensus 40:14 52:9 90:1 113:2 121:14
consensuses 90:8
consider 9:14 33:17 59:2,17 68:17 153:9
consideration 70:18
considerations 14:2
considering 27:21 76:16
consolidated 109:6
construction 31:19
consumer 159:13
contact 21:11
contacts 21:10
contained 95:4
content 84:3 92:19 109:11,15 110:1 111:10 123:20 126:5
CONTENTS 3:1
context 35:18 54:15 57:22 64:14 65:11 84:3 117:16 150:7
continue 5:15,19 6:6,13 6:18 7:4 32:13 43:5 129:15 154:19
continued 154:9,11
continuing 53:13
contract 132:8
contribute 68:7 123:21
contributed 37:9
contributing 24:18
controlled 22:3
convene 67:12 89:4
convenient 78:8
conventions 172:15
conversation 6:13 7:4 35:17
conversations 6:18 44:19
convey 63:10 156:14
cooperative 71:13 143:9 154:19,20 155:6
coordinate 82:19
Coordinator 2:5,9
copy 110:5 112:22
core 8:11,13,16 14:16 67:21 131:20 132:12
Corps 10:10,12 13:9 29:11 31:17 161:21
Corpus 30:19
correct 33:16 53:5 65:22 67:2 69:8 72:5 85:20 102:14 107:18 122:8 123:4 127:15
correspondence 39:13 112:20
cost-benefit 10:10 13:7
costing 29:4
Council 22:21
counties 30:21
couple 76:1 86:12 91:8 137:6 163:17 165:5 173:18
course 96:21 132:11
court 86:2,13 88:9,10 89:1 91:21 94:18 95:22 98:6 101:17 102:6,15,18 103:19 103:21 106:17 109:9 109:10,16 110:20 122:14 125:12 126:18
covered 19:4
covers 13:14 27:12
CPTN 1:20
craft 62:22 85:3
create 15:19 65:13 111:4
created 92:18 127:9 149:2
creating 56:3 59:2
creation 91:1
Credit 68:18
credited 13:14
criteria 18:11 59:2,17 59:20 64:16 65:2,13
critical 14:18 22:6 82:14 89:18
CRS 29:20 30:6
cruise 170:19 171:2,5 172:1
cruises 170:21
cue 49:4
current 17:7,20 36:17 41:13 113:17 114:8 116:17
currently 36:12 71:8
cursor 144:20,21
cycle 38:16 122:17
cycles 93:10

D

D.C 51:11 53:9 76:15,19 76:22 152:13 153:6 159:3
da 95:6
da-da-da 95:7
daily 89:8 90:11 91:17 107:10
data 5:5,9 9:8 12:1,3 14:3,5 15:1,2,4,4,9,11 15:15,21 16:5 17:10 17:20 20:12 23:7,8,14 23:22 24:22 30:14,16 51:1 79:11 140:17 148:15 149:9 156:20 157:10 161:6 162:13 162:19 163:1,3
database 30:5
date 34:20 152:14
dates 153:4 166:19
Dave 27:19 62:6,19 69:7 77:2 117:22 126:22 127:7 149:14 150:20
David 1:19 29:15 78:20
Davidson 143:20
day 3:2 4:6 5:12 33:13 55:8 80:13,20 84:6,7 84:8,14 89:5,10,14,15 89:17,19 90:15,17 91:10 93:22 94:1,3 104:9 137:15 170:22
days 72:13 75:15 83:1

83:11 90:18 100:11 104:18 105:19 106:2 122:4,13 132:2 134:7 135:7,11 136:11 137:4,15,17 138:4 139:1,4,6,11 140:7 142:5 175:5
deadline 120:2,4
deal 12:10 29:2,5 31:6 38:8 41:17 83:6 114:4 124:7 143:7 162:21 169:8 171:2
dealing 46:1 47:8,9 143:1 163:7,14
debate 148:20
Deborah 87:21
decade 23:11 140:3
decades 15:3
decide 38:3 72:11 77:14
decided 20:6 72:2 77:1 88:2 123:10
decides 27:8
decision 9:2
decision-makers 23:22
decision-making 25:2
decisions 15:7 25:12 120:13
decline 140:3
declined 140:9
declining 140:7
deeper 146:17 156:12
defense 53:3
define 14:16 39:18 155:20,21
defined 22:18 35:3 39:16 41:10
defines 118:4
definitely 34:18 74:13 135:3
degree 146:13
delete 155:9
deliberations 96:21
deliver 15:15 17:2
deliverables 94:15
delivered 119:14
deliveries 15:13
delivery 44:21
demonstrate 16:9,19 26:14 149:3
demonstration 9:6 17:1
depart 42:11
DEPARTMENT 1:1
depending 149:18
depends 118:12
deploy 139:22
deployed 105:4
deployment 148:5
derive 24:22
described 38:13
designated 2:2 5:18 86:22
detail 84:4 134:5
detailed 45:19 74:8 99:2
details 60:20 110:15
determination 70:15
develop 3:7 6:6 11:3 45:18 59:16 60:20 63:7,8 69:17 74:7 157:22
developed 10:3 21:7 28:13 49:1 86:8 95:12 95:13,21 96:14
developer 116:3
developing 86:20
development 2:4 9:8,11
Dewberry 32:2
DFO 85:22 128:6,9,13
dialogue 141:16 159:12
dictating 119:10
difference 126:22 127:3
differences 5:2
different 8:18 11:12 16:15,16 78:5 106:10 131:17 137:6 150:4 151:3 163:7 170:14
difficult 57:19
dig 156:12
digital 15:20
diminished 123:22
directing 59:8
direction 164:13
directly 17:16
directors 33:15 170:13
disbanded 119:8 130:10
discharges 147:6
disconnect 93:9 108:22
discontinue 52:12
discontinuing 42:3
discount 168:16
discover 61:6 121:4
discovering 116:19
discuss 3:10 32:16 44:1 119:12
discussed 8:19,21 29:22 39:11 44:18 59:20 101:1 142:14
discussing 66:7 110:11 110:12 121:19 170:21
discussion 3:15,18 7:15 11:2 12:9 16:4 16:13 17:4,6 18:14 26:13 33:11 35:2,7 37:11 43:11 45:22 53:3 74:12 77:3 78:19 78:22 79:10 87:8 99:11,16,17 123:9 152:4 157:2 165:2 173:14
discussions 6:8 9:22 18:10 64:7 102:20 124:15
display 143:3
dissemination 15:19
dissenting 42:2
dissolve 96:15
dissolved 42:7 96:11
distinction 163:13
distracted 55:19
distribute 70:10 104:13
distributed 36:9 109:7 111:6
District 27:12
divide 97:8
Division 2:3,7,10
divulge 22:8
doable 144:7
Doc 88:18 105:14 111:21
Docs 105:12 116:15
document 43:2 46:4 51:9 55:7 81:16 84:2 85:7 101:8 109:7 110:16 112:9 116:3 117:18 118:3 121:6 127:12,22 128:20 166:19
documentation 114:21
documents 70:3 82:16 116:18
DoD 19:19 29:6
doing 16:2 17:6,11 29:16 31:3 36:12,16 61:16,18 87:2 91:17 98:21,22 104:12 107:7 133:15 143:21 143:22 144:5,6 149:7 159:16 161:17
Dominion 22:2
Doodle 174:15
downward 135:3
Dr 1:16,17,18,19 16:11 19:13 42:10 48:4 50:16 51:17 55:2 57:16,22 60:8 64:3 66:22 68:17 69:1 78:7
draft 63:14 76:3 81:13 85:12 98:15,21 104:11 125:21 128:20 145:10 146:17
drafted 75:13 82:11 101:20
dramatic 135:22
dredge 135:15
drive 104:13 110:21 112:4 163:21 165:21
drop 49:12
due 37:2 118:10
Duluth 167:3,8,12
duplication 101:18

E

E 1:19
earlier 28:19 43:5 45:8 73:18 74:16 112:11 112:16 152:10
early 42:11 72:21 79:5 81:3
easier 34:18 127:16
easiest 10:16
easily 6:9
Easter 174:11
easy 14:13 20:1 78:17 114:4,17 142:16
economy 38:18 147:9
Ed 1:17 10:2 168:12
edification 142:15
editor 155:16
education 17:8
Edwing 1:21
effect 71:16
effective 41:22 71:11
effectively 17:14 63:9
Effectiveness 41:3 44:11
effort 20:12 33:22 50:3 57:4 76:4 157:1
efforts 16:21 17:5,16,20 18:2 29:18 59:18 103:6 154:9
eight 109:5 116:11
eighteenth 153:6
either 124:8 152:20 168:14
elaborated 29:16
elected 20:15 22:15 30:22 32:6
element 78:3
elements 8:18 60:3 120:11
email 39:13 63:7,12,14 68:10 104:13 105:12 111:14,20 114:1,2 169:16
emailed 85:12 110:22
emerging 4:16 42:9 58:13 127:8
emissions 147:5,10
emphasis 65:4
emphasize 65:8

emphasized 8:12
employee 168:16
enable 14:17 15:21
encompassed 10:6
ended 20:8
endorsement 40:11
engage 35:1 38:20,22 39:4 56:13 63:9 116:2
engaged 56:3 119:8
engagement 4:7 33:19 38:19 43:22 44:18,21 45:10,15 46:7,14 48:10,10 49:19 50:7 51:2 52:18 53:3,22 54:2,5,17 56:9 58:5 58:14 62:8,16 63:5 64:22 66:20 67:1 69:1 70:1,11,21 72:8 73:16 73:19 74:2,7 127:5 161:12
engaging 17:13
engineers 13:9 29:11 32:5 137:21 138:2,22 161:22
engines 146:22
enhanced 9:1
enhancement 151:5
enhancements 147:22 148:4,14 149:16,20 149:21 150:1,7,10,19
enlarging 146:5
enlightening 22:5
ensuring 94:11 119:15
entire 84:19 107:17 113:4
entirely 75:22
entirety 33:20 34:4,9,22
entity 11:22 12:2
environment 135:18 164:10
environmental 4:13 20:9
environmentally 145:22 146:21 147:8 147:19
envisioned 47:7
EPA 21:12 23:2 161:21
equally 148:10
equipment 109:18 139:16
especially 44:19 53:19 169:9
essential 158:1
establish 64:15
established 35:12 45:18 74:6
establishing 41:20
et 147:7,14
evaluate 10:9 13:5
evaluating 13:6
evaluation 9:13 13:16 14:6
Evelyn 1:16 36:17 41:7 71:7 124:6 129:5
event 171:19
events 26:19
eventually 46:19
everybody 20:5 28:22 92:10 105:15 115:7 117:11,11 174:3
everyone's 92:20
evidently 52:2
evolved 20:11,14,19
exactly 68:3 77:22 124:4,22 135:8 140:18 144:1 149:18
examination 13:12
example 13:4 15:3,4 22:9 30:17 110:16 114:1 115:15 120:7 138:7
examples 17:9
exceed 104:17
excellent 5:1 52:6 175:7
exceptions 97:13
Exchange 175:8
excited 50:10
excuse 155:17
execute 59:13 135:12
Executed 137:1
executing 82:22 136:13
execution 136:17
existing 10:17 35:11 127:7 151:5
exists 57:2 117:4
expand 36:15
expanded 9:1 56:5
expanding 25:8 26:10 29:9 146:4
expansion 9:16 10:14
expect 112:13 130:8
expectation 39:15 60:14 67:19 92:13 112:10 122:4
expectations 104:18 117:14
expected 9:12 11:16 119:13 129:19
expecting 60:9 116:9
expects 98:9
expedient 34:19
expensive 76:16 107:12
experience 47:15
experiences 18:15
expertise 124:1 132:10
experts 67:16,17
explored 77:13
express 19:5 79:18
expressed 79:14
extension 30:15 159:9
extensive 86:4 87:4,7
extent 8:1 52:7 57:14 118:18 156:21
external 12:11 158:12
extremely 5:7 33:14 51:19

F

F 2:2
FACA 5:18 100:18 156:14 160:16 161:2 163:17
FACAs 164:3
facilitate 55:17 132:14 158:2
facilities 29:9
fact 42:18 59:9 65:8 98:15 110:14 146:21 152:4 175:17
factor 174:14
factors 10:5,11
failing 154:1
fairness 90:7
fall 152:13
Fame 172:5
familiar 83:19 158:2 164:3
families 174:21
far 14:15 77:12 135:1 148:21 150:6 158:18 165:18 169:4
fashion 13:2
feasible 76:1
federal 2:2 5:18 19:21 21:3 33:22 34:7 76:20 162:1,15 163:1,9
federally 11:8
Feds 19:21
feed 120:13
feedback 39:4 133:22 163:22
feeds 161:9
feel 53:15 63:6 105:20 141:20 149:8 172:3
feels 121:8 156:7
feet 146:12,14
felt 18:14 103:13
FEMA 28:13 29:16 71:16 154:6,18
Ferguson 2:6 175:9
fewer 139:4 147:13
FGDC 163:18
Fields 1:16 13:3 36:17 52:10 54:10 58:10 63:22 65:18 66:10,17 67:2,19 68:5 84:5 87:6 93:18 107:15 113:7 114:16 115:1 116:20 121:2 123:8 124:10,21 125:6,10 125:18 129:13 130:1 130:5,11 133:1,20 145:7 148:1 150:13 170:6 173:11 174:1 174:12,17 175:14
fifth 44:4,5 165:21
figure 144:2
fill 115:18,19
filtered 114:6
filtering 21:17
final 23:3 102:5 106:12 106:14 173:21
finalize 3:18 93:5
finalized 96:3
find 64:7 66:8 103:8 167:21
findings 13:21
fine 43:10 80:14 88:11 118:17 141:19 150:20
finished 83:9
finite 104:15
first 5:4 7:17 8:6 9:6 14:15 30:11 48:16 50:12 100:20 138:12 145:10,21 155:16 165:12 168:7
Fiscal 135:7
Fisheries 114:2,6
fishing 156:6
fit 46:15 72:21 108:6
five 106:2 118:8 137:8 139:3
fix 133:15
fleet 70:20 135:15
fleshed 36:14 52:14
flexible 77:12
flip 109:5,19
flood 29:18
flooding 19:18 25:5 28:9 29:3
floor 109:4
flow 85:3
fly 21:18
flyer 69:11
focus 17:1 65:19 157:20 158:15
focused 74:18 140:4
folks 15:22 17:9,15,21 30:2 47:8 69:21 79:21 101:12 113:12 114:13

126:17 170:4
follow 78:19
follow-on 12:20 170:7
follow-up 114:13
follow-ups 112:17
followed 60:11
following 5:15 119:14 159:2
follows 117:20
forecasts 12:8
foremost 14:15
forget 11:9
form 48:6 49:9 112:14
formal 56:1 89:8 117:6 155:2
formally 128:16
format 43:16 149:11
formation 153:14,14
formed 27:13 128:21
former 22:15 164:5
forming 119:7
formulate 35:8
forth 103:12 152:5
forum 31:10,15
forward 16:6 33:3 35:9 46:6 115:15 128:14 152:19,21 153:1 173:13
found 51:16 61:19
four 16:7 25:12 31:9 58:18 106:13 117:2 118:9 128:7,13 137:8
fourth 58:6
frame 24:18 25:8
framework 84:12 85:7 90:22 116:8
Frank 1:17 18:14 37:8 39:8 44:16 46:10 47:2 48:1 62:17 67:1 68:22 69:7 70:7 130:21 144:16
Frank's 131:14
free 63:6
frequent 38:9
frequently 119:10
freshen 42:16
Friday 1:8 174:6
fried 89:15
friendly 145:22 146:21 147:8,19
front 5:14 32:11 57:9 75:2 153:19 161:1 164:21
fruitful 115:21
fuel 137:9
fulfill 8:11
full 5:12 70:19 82:8 94:18 110:10 111:14 132:19 133:12
full-time 20:8,9,10
fully 60:19 128:21 147:22 150:18
function 162:9
funded 11:8 21:20 139:14
funding 5:6 17:20 151:8
funds 163:13
further 41:17 53:2 148:5
future 85:7 99:4 101:14 147:21 148:4,9 149:16 150:10,19 170:18

G

G3 21:18
Galveston 166:10
gap 128:18
gaps 16:3,6
Gary 1:18 30:8 165:18 167:21
gather 38:22
gauges 23:10 24:10
general 8:5 40:4 125:3 160:12 174:18
generalize 155:2
generally 60:3
generic 152:19
Geodetic 2:3,7
geographic 4:15 165:13
Gerd 2:2 5:17 100:9 135:2
getting 20:15 27:4 31:8 84:13,16 94:9 97:3 100:6 112:13 124:16 131:1 163:3 165:1 175:9
give 19:16 43:14 137:14 152:14
given 37:5 48:4 142:22 150:16 158:18
giving 23:3 163:20
glad 75:5 87:15
Glang 2:2 3:5 5:17,18 7:8 9:18 35:10 36:10 42:21 43:9 46:13 49:1 54:12 55:5 56:7 58:19 59:14 60:21 68:15 70:7,16 77:1,22 78:12 81:17,20 85:21 92:2 92:17 100:10 102:22 108:8,16,19 110:3,9 111:12,18,20 116:4 116:16 126:11 128:5 128:19 129:11,21 130:3,7,21 133:14 135:5 136:7,21 152:18 153:3 159:21 160:10 166:15 167:4 167:18 169:3,22 171:18 174:9,14
glue 20:7
go 7:9,19 12:10 14:13 22:16 30:5 35:16 37:2 42:21 43:10,19 44:8 45:9 48:13,21 51:11 52:15 53:8 55:16 61:14 64:5,5 67:4 70:4 74:10,14 81:3 84:17 90:2 97:18 100:8 102:9 107:1,13 107:22 114:7,9,11 115:19 117:7,9 128:3 136:12 139:15 144:19 152:16 156:14 162:13 165:7,11 166:4,9 169:6
goal 6:19 81:4 83:8 104:17
God 52:1
goes 7:16 8:6 46:5 68:18,20 77:12 84:8 103:22 143:3
going 13:20 14:10 17:18 18:1,4 19:20 20:4,17,20 21:19,20 23:5 24:4 25:5,17 27:9,14 29:2 31:14,17 32:19 33:2 34:11,15 35:9 47:22 50:8 51:12 53:4,19 55:12,15 56:17 57:4 61:10,13 61:16,18 64:8 67:9 75:14 76:21 83:11 88:2,3,18 95:15 96:12 96:22 98:6 100:5,6,12 101:13,15,16 102:7 103:19 104:7,8,11,12 104:14 105:9 108:6 109:10 110:20,21 111:5 114:3 115:6,20 116:4,8 117:1 119:10 119:19 123:19 124:9 125:19 126:1,1 128:14 129:18 133:4 133:22 134:1,1 138:13,20 142:4 152:15 153:22 154:20 157:8 160:3 162:11 166:2 168:4 169:1,17 170:9,17,19
good 4:3 5:17 10:18 13:16 14:5 21:14 23:14 28:10 30:5 39:10 48:19 56:7 57:3 57:5 59:22 61:22 68:16 70:5 71:19,19 71:20 76:2 81:4 82:21 88:22 90:1 93:15 94:22 95:17 103:4,17 106:4,7 112:7 113:13 119:22 121:8 126:20 130:18 134:19 145:9 150:20 155:21 156:7 159:11 164:20 165:3 170:1,2,11 171:11
Google 88:17 104:13 105:12,14 110:21 111:21 112:4 116:15 163:21
gotten 72:3
government 21:3,4 27:3 30:13 162:15 163:1,2,10
grant 18:2,9 159:8 162:9
granted 89:14
grants 17:21 18:5 30:2 162:5
graph 140:10,12,13,15 140:17
graphic 141:5
graphs 140:21
grassroots 40:8
great 14:7 15:13 17:9 32:9 34:17 35:21 38:12,12 46:22 51:21 55:2 57:15 61:5 66:21 95:6 108:21 128:3 167:1 169:8,17 170:10,13,13,16 172:21 174:22 175:3
green 31:20
grey 31:20
groundwork 46:18
group 4:17 7:21 8:9 12:22 18:20,22 19:10 22:2,10 33:11 35:6,16 36:12 37:11 38:4,11 38:15,20 40:13,15 41:1,5,9,15,16,20,21 42:3,7,8,12,14,15 43:1,6,12,22 44:2,9 45:15 46:14,16 50:15 50:17 52:11,18,21 53:4,7,17 54:2,5,8 56:9,19,22 57:10,13 57:21 58:4,5,6,6,8,14 58:18,22 60:5 61:9 62:4,8,16 63:1,19 64:1,2,15 65:20 66:3

67:18,21,21 70:1,11 74:2,6 78:20 85:13 88:17 118:1 119:1,7 123:10 127:5,14 129:1,14,19 130:9,10 172:10 173:15
groups 3:11,19 7:2 21:7 22:11,19 32:17,19,21 32:22 35:2,9,12 40:11 43:19 49:14,16 53:11 53:13 55:11 117:14 117:16 118:7 119:16 119:20 127:21 128:7 128:10,14,20 152:10 168:13
Guard 10:3 13:13,22
guess 8:20 38:10 49:13 50:12 60:7,13 79:6,12 86:14 95:11 96:4 97:2 102:11 113:2 124:2 124:17 126:9 150:20 152:17 157:7
guidance 157:3 158:18 160:3
guidelines 18:6
Gulf 23:20 25:18
guys 14:12 57:8 63:15 78:21 79:21 91:7

H

habit 86:2
half 106:4 161:13,13
half-day 82:13
Hall 172:5
Hampton 16:10 19:8,18 25:17 27:12
hamstringing 143:13
handle 95:17
handy 166:16,20
hang 128:5
hanging 118:2
Hanson 1:13 39:6 46:17 47:12 48:13 59:6 68:20 78:10,18 79:7 79:20 124:2,5 126:6,7 134:12,18 135:14 138:6 156:4 165:16 166:1,6 172:20
happen 25:5 26:20 28:14 50:2 113:3 116:6
happened 21:15 28:16 50:5 93:7 108:22 109:8 143:17
happening 99:8 151:9
happens 98:11 149:11
happy 42:11 98:12 111:10 149:6 168:9
harbor 151:10 175:7
hard 14:9 27:14 28:7 66:9 110:5 135:19 157:17
head 22:13 23:1
heads 132:3
hear 7:1 58:19 78:4 102:1 126:18 133:15 158:19
heard 4:8 13:19 38:18 45:2 52:13,16 71:19 73:1,10 79:14 91:7 95:5 101:9 105:18 125:1,18
hearing 53:2
heart 75:12
heavier 175:18
heavy 14:1
heck 98:17
heel 123:16
help 10:18 15:5 21:21 23:14 54:13 55:17,20 56:10 66:17 68:8 96:2 102:4,20 108:12 109:5,5 135:13 143:8 175:9
helpful 35:10 51:6 158:16
Hershner 21:9
hesitant 141:20
hey 55:16 56:12,15 99:19
Hi 24:14
high 16:19 94:1 99:2
high-fidelity 5:7
high-level 87:2 158:22
higher 61:3
highest-level 134:10
highly 13:14
highly-trafficked 9:3
Hill 22:21 47:9 48:14,22 49:8 53:20
Hill-focused 48:12
Hilton 1:10
hiring 20:8
historic 134:12 135:2
historical 169:14
hit 27:22 28:12,15 30:10
hits 162:18
hoc 43:1,5 47:5 48:3,8 54:8
holistic 143:6
honest 16:12
honestly 57:15
hope 84:21 156:10 165:14
hopefully 21:19 90:19 151:6,7
hopper 167:10
host 168:9
hosted 171:5
hotel 15:10 77:12,19 120:14 168:18 171:6 171:19
hotels 76:15
hour 76:22 89:9 160:1 161:1
House 2:7 16:20 81:19
Houston 165:17,19 166:1,10,21 169:16 169:17 170:2
Houston-Galveston 30:10
HR1308 38:19
HSIA 37:12 118:15
HSRP 1:13 2:2,9 3:15 11:7 34:3 36:21 37:18 45:11,13,16,20 51:7 63:11 69:18 71:12 73:21,22 74:3,8 80:20 119:12 127:9 132:1 133:18 141:12 151:19 153:11,12 154:4 158:17 159:10 160:5 160:21 161:5,16 163:9,17
huge 19:19 23:16 29:7 30:1 31:13 171:19
hundred 137:17
hurricane 27:22 28:12 28:13,15 30:9
hydro 70:20
hydrographic 1:4,10 4:5 81:12 132:10,20 132:22 133:2,3,9,12 144:20 173:10 175:13
hygiene 126:20,20

I

i.e 147:14
ICOOS 158:2
idea 6:3 44:4 59:22 78:6 122:1 171:15
ideas 96:14
identifiable 62:3
identified 36:1 45:11,14 54:3 63:10 67:11 70:18 73:20,22 89:18
identify 14:20 17:15 45:19 51:7 56:12 63:7 63:8
identifying 16:3 17:5 65:1
II 6:2
Ike 30:10
immediate 37:3
implement 44:1
implementation 114:21
implementing 26:5 115:22
implications 170:16
implied 72:14,20
importance 71:2 72:7,8 73:15
important 18:14 23:16 26:6 30:7 38:6 65:10 79:19 80:15 98:18 124:3 130:14 140:6 151:3
impressed 75:7
impressive 32:7
improve 158:6
improvements 163:22
in-depth 64:8
inability 33:12
inaccessible 105:9
inappropriate 83:13 171:1
incentive 18:15
incentives 29:17
incentivize 30:1
incidental 147:6
include 18:5 35:6 72:4 97:16 102:2 120:20
includes 15:1
including 65:7
inclusion 73:18 112:2
inclusive 162:22
incorporate 63:14 121:18
incorporates 13:11
increase 30:3 130:20 131:1
increased 19:18 28:9 29:3
increases 131:6
increasingly 9:4
independent 162:8 163:10
indicators 158:4
individual 29:18 57:18
industry 158:7,14
inefficient 131:19
inform 102:20
informal 101:10 169:15
information 4:13 19:11 27:4 38:22 39:2 90:21 91:20 97:16 114:12 125:4 134:15 157:10 160:20 161:6 162:16 169:8 170:3
informational 34:11
informative 113:12

informed 153:12
infrastructure 4:19 10:17 22:2,4,6,13 44:10,12,14
initial 20:12 60:19 83:11
Initially 148:8
initiating 55:16
initiation 120:15
initiatives 36:1 37:18
input 12:7 13:8 33:10 61:3 84:19 92:20 93:14 104:9 160:13 169:5 172:10,11
inputs 104:9 165:15 169:11
insert 144:21 145:12
inside 37:11
install 10:16
instance 56:13 87:11 112:14 118:14 149:1
instruments 20:13
insurance 29:18
integrate 21:2 23:8,21 25:2,11
integrated 9:2,9 15:20
integrates 25:9
integration 9:7 158:6
intelligence 5:1,11,21 7:16 8:7 19:10 32:14 33:2 57:18,22 58:7,16 60:4 63:18 66:4,8,11 128:22 161:8
intense 89:14
intent 12:20,22 45:21 85:6 127:19 149:2
interact 77:7 97:22
interagency 161:21
interest 30:3 168:4
interested 25:7 40:19 50:6 52:5 114:10 157:14 160:17
interesting 4:9,13 51:17
interim 116:13
internal 144:4
internally 163:12
international 1:10 78:21 147:1,5
internet 105:5
interrupt 40:6
introduce 35:4
introduction 131:11
invitations 30:20 120:15
invite 48:1 134:20 152:17
invited 67:16
invites 132:17 133:10 138:8
inviting 45:22
involve 39:12,17
involved 22:21 24:3 27:3 79:10 80:3 108:9 133:5
IOCM 2:5 37:15 39:21
IOOC 157:22
IOOS 77:7 156:13,14 157:16,19,21 158:1,4 158:7,10,12,13,21 159:6,14 160:2,16 161:9,16,20 164:1 165:3,8
Island 168:8
issue 23:17 26:22 27:16 40:4 72:10 79:2 106:18 107:1,6 112:15 114:10 115:2 132:22 134:10 142:18 142:21 165:2 171:1
issued 70:13
issues 13:7,15 113:8 131:18 132:17,18 133:11 135:14 137:7 144:10 157:3 162:17 162:20 163:6,14 164:17 166:2,8 169:8 170:14,17 171:2
it'll 76:4
item 16:4 68:16 72:7
items 10:1 14:20 70:18
iteration 67:5

J

J 1:17
January 163:15
JEFF 2:6
Jeffress 1:18 30:8,8 31:4 40:20 41:6 48:20 165:20 166:9 167:12 171:3
job 82:22 96:16 175:6
jobs 174:21
join 40:20
joined 68:11
joining 71:1 153:9
Josie 159:6
Joyce 1:19 36:5 38:13 39:9 40:16 48:19 58:3 62:17,20 83:2 90:8 103:9 124:10 142:11
Joyce's 85:13 103:5
Judge 22:21
Juliana 1:15 141:9
Juliana's 97:3
Julie 164:8,19
jump 89:20
jurisdictions 21:3

K

Kaine 20:14 32:6
Kaine's 21:15
Kathy 87:12
Katrina 28:12
keep 16:11 22:19 23:5 52:11 72:12 74:17 88:17 140:4 173:3
keeping 88:19 95:9 115:2
keeps 65:18
Kelly 1:17 13:11 14:5 146:20 147:3 151:2 168:12,12
Ken 36:18 71:8 133:7 156:17
Ken's 159:2
KENNETH 1:15
kept 113:17
key 27:3 63:10 88:19 90:12 96:19 104:9 161:8
kick 143:22 168:5
kicked 40:21
kilometers 23:18
kind 6:14 8:6 10:15 17:18 21:14 24:13 27:22 44:14 54:6,13 72:22 84:12 86:10 88:12,19 90:1 92:12 94:1,4 98:22 106:17 118:12 120:2,16 135:19 157:2 161:4 163:19 164:16 168:4 169:11,15
kinds 21:7 162:20 163:6
king 79:11
knew 50:7
know 8:13 11:21 12:6 12:20 13:22 14:2 15:6 17:21 19:9,9,14,22 21:15 22:3,13 23:4,6 23:7 24:12 25:19 26:2 27:1,11 28:8,8 29:14 30:5 31:13,20 32:11 32:12 38:5 40:9,21 44:17 47:17 48:12 49:11 61:10 62:9 63:18 64:12,17,18 68:8 71:21 72:11,11 73:1,7 74:12,15 75:6 75:21 76:18 78:1,15 79:17 82:4 83:18 84:5 84:20 86:5 88:13,16 89:13 93:17,17 97:17 98:7 100:3 101:11,19 102:16 103:18 105:10 105:15,17 109:21 111:19 112:13 114:11 115:8 117:1,12,14 118:9 119:2 120:1,2 124:1 126:4,21 127:14 128:18 132:15 134:1,11,19 139:18 140:19 141:17 142:18 144:2,3 145:20 147:12 148:7,17 150:4 152:8 158:12 158:20 160:5,11 161:18 164:12 165:12 172:4,6,9 173:12 175:2
knowing 83:10 104:17 159:15
knowledge 92:6 96:2 102:19 103:22
known 13:13
knows 142:9 155:22
Kudrna 1:17 26:12 27:10 29:15,21 34:10 39:9 40:3 41:14 43:11 45:2 50:19 60:7 66:19 66:22 69:2,19 70:9 73:17 106:11,16 107:19 120:5 123:1 130:19 131:4 134:20 144:8 154:12,16 159:2 161:19 164:4 170:9

L

L.A 150:18
LA 9:6
LA-Long 13:19
LA/Long 4:11
Laboratory 2:4
lack 4:18 136:17 143:18 154:7
lacking 140:18
lag 82:1
Lakes 167:2 169:18 170:10,13,14,17
land 25:5 27:15,16
landmarks 25:3
language 43:9
laptop 83:3
large 31:19 147:13
larger 117:19 146:7,17 147:9
largest 165:21
Larry 1:14 30:9 56:8 62:19 129:9

latest 147:4 169:13
Laughter 7:18 25:15 69:5 121:12 172:2
law 100:18
Lawrence 170:15
Lawson 1:16 42:16
lawyer 20:9
lay 47:3
layer 17:10
lead 15:7
leadership 48:15 156:5
leading 160:15
leads 32:15 42:19
learn 142:4 161:11,14
learned 56:6 71:3
learning 160:17
leave 60:21,22 65:4 72:17 84:12 97:7 117:20 131:2
leaves 118:1
led 109:12 111:3
left 21:1 28:19 44:22 46:9 63:3 64:3 86:6 92:18
legacy 35:5
legal 106:20
legislation 47:7 70:22
legislative 35:22 37:6 37:18 38:4,11 40:15 46:15 47:10 53:12 58:4,12 68:10 69:14 118:15 127:7 143:12
lengthy 26:12
lesson 56:6
let's 66:14 69:16 81:21 89:21 104:19 111:7 126:3 153:8 160:5 173:2
letter 21:15 70:19,20 74:11,17 75:14,20 79:3 81:5,13 83:9,14 83:21 84:1,15 90:2,22 92:15,18,19 93:11,12 94:7,13,13 95:1,10,13 95:14,18 96:12,20 97:7 98:15 101:6,20 101:22 102:8 104:6,8 104:8,20 108:1,5,6,8 108:11 113:1,4 114:14 120:22 123:2 123:6,11 125:7,9,21 128:1 140:16 151:21 152:10 155:12 156:2
letters 37:16 95:3 112:12
level 17:11,12 23:20 24:11 25:1,8 27:20 28:6,15 39:15 61:3 73:11,12 94:2 157:22 164:22
liability 162:17
Liaison 36:19
liberty 145:11
library 29:13
lifting 14:1
light 44:19 69:3
liked 175:16
limited 147:18
line 12:3 102:17 126:12 135:4 162:2 171:5
link 51:2,15
linked 170:13
links 45:6,9 97:18
list 9:21 10:1 21:12 59:16 113:17,19 127:4 169:14,16
listen 158:17
listened 143:20 167:8
listening 113:7
listing 60:8
lists 10:4 166:18
litigation 162:18
little 21:6 28:19 30:12 35:21 36:14,15 42:22 49:20 52:14 54:13,14 62:22 76:4 81:3,22 84:9 87:9 89:15 102:20 104:22 105:22 128:8 130:15 134:21 141:15 156:9,12 159:22 161:19,20 166:10 173:3
live 166:5
lives 26:8
living 121:6
load 103:9
local 12:12 24:11 30:12 31:5 72:10 73:11,12
localized 23:17
locate 77:11
located 170:12
location 77:17 120:9 165:13,14 169:5 170:11
locations 9:19 172:4
locked 77:16
LOCKHART 1:18 65:3 65:15 66:1,5,14 83:17 89:22 105:22 129:9
logistics 80:1 171:18 175:6
long 1:10,11 4:6 9:7 10:1 71:4 80:20 84:8 84:17 95:5 97:15 104:16 105:2,7 146:12 148:5 150:18
Long's 78:20
long-term 15:2 129:19 131:20
longer 19:17 36:5 37:17 78:12 82:9
longer-term 60:9
look 5:4 8:2 10:17 12:19 13:9 15:15 16:18 19:3 31:16 39:1 44:3 49:5 52:21 56:10 63:15 69:11 70:3 75:20 85:8 86:7 97:18 106:5 107:4 108:15 117:12 143:9,21 144:5 152:19 153:1 166:17 169:11
looked 88:6 128:19 129:16
looking 15:1 16:3 18:22 19:2 25:7 36:2 60:15 61:2 64:17 75:17 79:8 84:16 113:2 114:3 121:10 129:13 134:5 134:18 152:20 173:13 174:15
looks 38:19 80:13 104:1 130:18 134:4 160:21
loosely 96:13
lose 32:12 87:8 98:7 124:9
lost 142:5
lot 9:22 12:13 13:22 17:4,6 18:13 20:4,13 20:17,17 21:13 29:4 32:8 37:7 46:18,21 50:11 52:22 59:4 60:2 79:9 85:20 90:7,9 91:16 106:7 113:18 116:5 134:5 142:13 150:14 168:17
love 19:12
Lowe's 79:21
Lowenthal 68:11 70:22 75:9 153:11,13
Lowenthal's 38:17,20 39:5 153:20
Luettich 32:1
lunch 75:22 81:1,3 157:2 170:15 171:4,5
lunches 20:7
Luscher 24:15
LUSCHER-AISSAOUI 2:8 24:14 25:22 29:10
luxury 153:8
Lynne 2:9 5:21 36:9 46:11 69:22 82:5 86:5 120:8 166:16

M

M-A-T-T-E-R 145:6
ma'am 19:6
Maersk 79:21
mailing 21:12
maintain 11:16 132:12 151:3
maintenance 151:10
major 13:17 26:18,22 144:2
making 84:9 98:20 99:7 150:8
man 76:2
manage 33:12
management 4:14 48:15 158:4
manager 2:6,8 15:10
managers 32:5 169:7 172:12
managing 13:10
mandating 119:22
manner 116:14 117:7 145:5
manning 99:13
Mapping 4:22
March 157:15
Margaret 143:20
marine 22:22 61:20 175:8
maritime 135:18 158:14
maritime-related 168:13
Mark 24:3
market 11:2,13
marketed 11:14
marketing 11:3
MARPOL 147:1
massive 57:4
matrix 12:19
matter 7:11 33:6 67:17 81:7 94:9 111:12,18 123:22 134:16 144:18 145:5 173:5 175:21
Maune 1:19 27:18,19 28:4,11,21 54:21 55:3 55:4 62:5,6,15 69:6 76:13 77:18 89:9 106:9 126:21 127:1 127:11 137:1 139:21 145:4 149:14,14 154:6 155:1,5 167:13 167:15 172:14
max 89:13
maximize 9:3 174:16
mayor 15:10 30:18,20
mayors 22:15,15 27:13
meals 168:18 175:16,18
mean 17:12 19:14 22:5

25:1 28:7 47:16 48:3 53:6 57:2 58:3 66:3 72:21 75:3 79:16 83:18 86:15,19 88:22 89:22 91:12 95:16 96:13 97:14 103:20 105:2 106:1 107:20 116:16 129:3 131:4,6 138:20 139:2 140:17 141:8,15 142:7,13 146:8 147:3 149:1 155:12 161:14 164:17 166:2 171:15
means 135:20 142:4
measurements 21:19
meat 157:17
mechanism 30:3
mechanisms 156:22
Mediterranean 6:2
Medley 46:11
meet 8:22 18:8 41:13 47:22 100:21 118:7 119:7,11,19,22 158:5
meeting 1:6 3:15,20,22 4:4 5:22 11:7 22:22 23:1,3 24:8 37:4,13 40:10 43:7,20 45:3,10 45:20 48:8 52:21 53:9 53:16,19 54:9,17 55:17 57:12,13 60:11 60:16 61:4 64:4 67:6 67:12,14 73:1,20 74:9 74:14,15 77:5,9,10 78:15 80:20 81:11 82:2,6,9,13 86:1,3,8 86:11,18 89:13 90:3 90:19 91:2 92:19 93:5 93:8 94:5,17,20 95:4 95:9,17 97:6,15 98:11 98:21 100:16,19 101:11 102:5,22 104:21 106:21,22 107:1,18 108:22 109:13 110:2,18 111:9,13,16 112:21 113:10,13 115:12,13 115:17 116:22 118:11 118:15,20,22 119:2 119:12,15 120:8,12 120:18,22 121:4,16 121:22 122:5,14,18 123:7,12 124:11,12 124:15 127:22 142:4 142:6 152:20,21 153:1,5 156:8,11 157:16 158:11,16 159:3 160:2 165:8,12 165:12 168:3,10 169:4 170:3,8,20,21 173:9,21 174:4 175:11,12
meetings 39:14 60:12 67:3 86:7 88:8 96:11 96:22 99:4 106:19 107:9,14 113:11 118:9,9 125:3 127:9 153:1 168:7
member 7:19 13:3,11 14:5 18:21 19:7,16 24:12 25:13,16 26:12 27:7,10,11,18 28:2,4 28:5,11,18,21,22 29:12,15,20,21 30:4,8 31:2,4,7 34:10,14 36:4,7 39:3,9,19 40:3 40:5,18,20 41:6,12,14 42:10 43:11 44:3,7,13 44:16 45:2 47:6,14 48:9,20 49:10,13 50:19 51:16 52:10,17 53:6,18,21 54:7,10,21 55:4 56:2,21 57:11 58:2,10 60:2,7 61:19 62:5,13,15,19 63:2,22 65:3,15,18 66:1,2,5 66:10,12,14,15,17,19 67:2,19 68:5,9 69:6 69:13,19 70:9 71:6 72:2,6,17,19 73:4,11 73:13,17 74:10,22 75:3 76:8,13 77:18 79:1,12 83:4,17 84:5 85:15 86:14 87:6,10 88:15,21 89:9,11,22 91:4 92:1 93:18 94:14 96:9 97:2,9 98:13,19 99:14,17 102:11 103:3,10 105:8,22 106:9,11,16 107:15 107:19 112:10 113:7 114:16 115:1 116:20 118:12 119:9 120:1,5 121:2,13 122:6,9 123:1,8,17,18 124:10 124:14,19,21 125:2,6 125:8,10,11,15,18 126:21 127:11 128:15 129:4,9,13 130:1,5,11 130:17,19 131:4,14 132:5,16 133:1,9,20 134:9,14,20 135:1 136:2 137:1,2,3,5 138:3,13,16,17,19 139:5,7,17,20,21 140:6,14,21 141:6,10 141:18 142:3 143:19 144:8,11,15 145:1,4,7 145:11,13,15 146:6 146:20 147:3 148:1,3 148:8 149:14 150:13 150:17 151:2,13,17 152:3,12 153:10 154:6,11,12,16,17 155:1,4,5,11 156:16 157:13 158:19 159:2 159:17 161:3,19 164:4,7 165:20 166:9 167:1,3,5,11,12,13,14 167:15,16 168:2,6,12 168:20,22 169:20,21 170:6,9 171:3,14,22 172:14,18 173:11 174:1,12,17,18 175:14
members 1:12,22 6:10 11:6 35:6,7 36:2,17 38:1 40:18 55:15 56:10 67:16 68:7 82:18 85:7 87:14 93:6 93:11 105:18 110:22 151:20 158:17,20 169:6,13
membership 42:17 127:20 159:7 164:14
memory 154:1
mention 31:8 71:11 79:3
mentioned 26:1,7 68:19 110:6 156:16
MERSFELDER-LEWIS 2:9 57:7 63:13 82:7
message 48:2
messages 52:7 63:10
met 1:10 80:17 101:9 169:14 171:6
method 11:14 61:11 149:7
metrics 140:19
Metro 76:20
Metrorail 76:19
Miami 166:14 170:21 171:4,10 172:6
mic 69:3
Michael 2:3 14:10
microphone 126:17,20
mics 109:18
Mike 21:10
Mike's 109:4
MILLER 1:19 7:19 36:7 39:3,19 40:5,18 41:12 44:3,13 47:14 49:10 51:16 53:18 54:7 56:21 57:11 60:2 62:13,19 68:9 69:13 71:6 72:2,6,17 73:4 73:11,13 74:10,22 75:3 76:8 79:1 83:4 85:15 86:14 87:10 92:1 97:9 99:14 103:10 105:8 112:10 118:12 121:13 122:6 122:9 124:14 125:2,8 125:11 132:5 137:2,5 138:16,19 139:17 140:6,14,21 141:6 142:3 143:19 144:11 145:1,13 146:6 152:3 152:12 154:11,17 155:4,11 167:1,5,11 167:14,16 168:2,22 169:20 174:18
million 31:14
mind 103:10
minds 14:20
minute 104:20
minutes 6:6,16 69:9 75:2 89:12 91:8 100:16,20 101:11 104:22 109:2 111:4 111:10 121:1 122:18 123:3 173:21 174:2
misinterpreted 136:22
missed 71:5 111:2 173:14
missing 79:19
mission 41:2,10 44:10 71:14,20
misunderstood 123:14
mitigate 92:21
mixed 52:7
MOA 71:22 154:2,5,10 155:19
model 10:5,9,12 11:18 25:20,21 148:16 157:11 160:18
models 11:3 12:11 31:22 157:4,10
modern 145:22 146:7
modified 41:12
modify 63:6 88:20
Moffatt 31:18
moment 130:22 166:20
money 19:21 29:4 137:10 162:4
monies 162:6
monitor 37:17
month 31:15 38:16 82:8 92:3 118:22 119:3,5 119:19
monthly 118:7
months 31:9 98:15 116:10,11 129:15

morning 4:3 5:17 6:5 6:17 7:6 48:21 59:21 71:9 89:17 90:16 109:8
Motion 38:18
MOUs 152:5
move 7:3 40:17 42:8 89:21 130:12
moved 36:5
moving 116:12
multiple 60:9
multitasking 166:17
municipal 22:10
municipalities 26:17 27:2

N

nail 23:18
name 20:21 41:6 69:6 105:14 160:6
names 62:11,15
narrow 65:19
NASA 21:12,17
nasty 146:3
nation 150:22 165:22
national 1:3 2:3,7,11 4:22 22:20 61:11 157:21
nationwide 149:16 150:21
natural 79:9
nature 164:19
Nav 14:17 16:14 17:1 17:11 18:2,8,18 61:15
navigation 2:6,10 4:10 8:10,21 9:20 11:4,11 15:20 46:22 49:11 59:4,19 71:3 75:6,7 85:17 146:4 150:2 151:4 164:10,18 166:3 169:7 172:12 172:21
Navy 29:9
Navy-heavy 22:17
necessarily 24:17 47:16 72:20 92:20 174:2
necessity 41:5
need 6:13 8:22 10:22 11:3 14:21 15:14 16:8 17:14 23:7,7,21 32:18 35:1 37:20 38:8 40:7 42:16 44:18,20 45:3 45:11 46:4 47:2 48:5 51:11,13 52:19 53:7 53:10,15 54:19 55:5 55:21 56:14,17 57:3 58:17 66:15,20 73:21 74:10 81:14 87:3 88:11,15 89:8 90:3,11 91:5 94:12 98:2,16 99:15 102:6,18 103:7 103:17 108:9 112:8 116:6 120:12 128:16 129:6 131:21 132:3 132:11 134:6 143:3 144:4 155:15,20 158:1,21 160:3 165:5
needed 52:14 104:2 111:8
needs 10:13 41:13 45:12,16 51:8 73:21 74:4 92:7,7 104:16 118:22 121:5 126:9
nervous 119:18
network 30:15 72:8,16
never 73:14 107:3,13
new 11:3,6 13:18 20:13 20:21 25:18 28:14 41:20 61:11 63:17 71:16 87:17 116:2 117:22 151:12 152:9 154:4
newer 146:22
newly 45:18 58:14 74:6
newly-formed 64:21
news 31:6
NGAC 163:18
nice 4:21 5:4,9 23:4 49:16 118:3 129:5 131:12 135:2 165:7 171:6
nicer 166:10
Nichol 31:18
nine 109:5 116:11
nineteen 153:5
NOAA 1:3 2:3,4,5,6,7 2:10,12 3:8,16,20 9:8 11:14 15:20 17:8,8 18:11 21:12,20 25:16 29:22 31:18 36:18 45:1,16 46:12 48:14 50:21,22,22 51:15,20 52:2 59:15 74:3 78:3 79:8 88:6 91:5,13 96:1 97:3,10 98:5,9 98:20 107:10 113:21 114:6 120:13 131:5,8 131:20 132:12 133:15 137:9 139:7 143:21 144:2,4,5,13 145:2 154:19 157:22 158:12 161:21 162:3,12,14 163:12 164:5 171:8 172:11 175:3,3
NOAA's 30:15 45:14 51:2 59:12 73:22
nodding 38:1
nomenclature 146:10
non-resolution 115:7
Non-voting 1:22
Norfolk 23:10 26:8 29:8 167:13,22
normally 79:22
NOS 8:3,15 12:10 16:2 19:2 71:13 79:9,14 82:18 102:13 108:4,6 125:15 134:11 137:14 151:15,17 156:20,20 157:5 159:15
NOS's 157:10
note 71:7,12 87:18
note-takers 86:22
note-taking 122:21
noted 80:18 154:15 164:7
notes 70:8 71:7 72:13 73:14 86:15,17,21 87:5,7,13,14,19,20 88:1,4,5 89:1,6,8,10 90:4,5,5,9 91:9 92:22 97:11 98:12 99:3 101:13 118:18 121:16 124:20 125:3,16 146:14
notes-taking 121:15
notice 34:1,8 174:12
nugget 84:8
nuisance 28:9 29:3
number 8:5 9:20 16:3,7 17:18 25:6 40:15 41:2 41:5,20 42:4,7,8,15 44:8,9 59:1,11 127:5 134:7 135:9,11 136:11 140:7 143:15
numbering 126:22 127:2
numbers 12:21 107:9 127:18
numerically 13:1
nuts 47:9 59:7
NWLON 24:18,21 30:15

O

o'clock 173:18
O&O 143:18
objection 127:11
objective 36:20 40:9
objectives 5:3 36:11
observation 30:14 159:16
observations 164:9
observing 50:21 145:16 145:18
obtain 165:14
obviously 24:2 113:11
occur 99:4
occurred 26:19
occurrences 107:13
Ocean 1:11 2:11 30:14 145:16,18
OCEANIC 1:3
Oceanographic 2:9
OCM 17:10 18:4
OCS 136:5,19 138:11 151:15
OCS's 136:18
October 30:11 168:1
ODU 20:6
office 2:5,6,10,11 34:20 78:11 106:5
offices 161:5,7
official 2:2 5:18 21:11 74:15 122:18
officially 175:12
officials 20:15 22:15 30:13,22 31:5 32:6
offline 41:17 84:11
oh 22:20 28:2 31:2 41:7 51:22 102:1 132:7 160:16
oil 166:7
okay 5:22 7:8 8:8 10:9 14:3,7 24:13 28:21 32:3 34:16,17 36:7 39:3 40:5 43:8 62:19 62:21 64:13 66:15,15 68:5 69:8 72:6 73:13 80:8 81:10,21 86:14 89:5,20 90:10 95:20 96:15 98:19 99:21 100:5 108:10,21 110:19 112:5,18 120:19 121:8 123:9 128:12 129:12 130:3 130:11 145:7 151:17 152:6 153:15 154:8 155:9,22 167:5,11,15 170:8
old 51:9 62:13,15 146:2
OMAO 136:9
omissions 111:2
onboard 167:6
once 16:4 84:11,11 119:3,5,19
one-page 69:11
one-pager 48:21 49:2 56:14,17 57:1 61:20 62:1 69:20 70:2,12 165:4,10
one-sentence 129:5
one-stop 15:19

ones 37:10 115:18 127:7
ongoing 16:10 17:5,17
online 80:11
onscreen 82:16
opaque 109:8
open 34:8 35:7 67:15 74:21 77:2 171:1
opened 80:19
opening 33:13
operate 139:8,14 140:8
operated 136:9
operating 37:20 39:22 44:15 69:17 93:19 112:9 117:17 118:19 120:21 162:6
operational 2:8 164:17 164:19,22
opinion 42:3 51:14 155:18
opportunities 18:1
opportunity 15:19 16:9 16:17 56:13,16 77:6,7 93:14 103:2 156:3 160:1
opposed 47:11 65:20 121:6 124:11 175:18
optics 170:20
option 33:21
opts 11:22
order 18:8 96:6 125:6,8 126:18
Oregon 167:20,22
organization 162:9
organizations 170:1
organized 6:20
orient 35:14
original 11:15 63:3
originally 95:2
Orleans 28:14 87:18
out-years 18:1
outcome 18:8 49:17 57:13 85:10 110:4
outcomes 14:14 36:11 36:20 94:16 119:13
outcry 51:21
outline 76:3 117:21 120:21 160:11
outlined 39:10
outreach 12:12 45:4,10 46:7 51:20 52:3 63:8 72:7 73:15,19 78:22 156:19,22 158:13 159:4,9,11 160:18
outside 17:8 67:16 163:10
outstanding 175:6
overlay 148:16
overlooked 43:4
Overnight 89:19
oversight 18:5
overview 160:21 163:20
owned 22:6 136:8
owner 15:10

P

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4:1
p.m 81:9 173:6,7 175:22
Pacific 137:12
page 16:8 36:9 43:3 128:4 130:13
pages 82:10 104:1
paid 11:15 141:11
Pam 28:13
Panamax 146:9
panel 1:4,10 4:5,12 5:13,22 6:10,20 7:10 11:6 16:22 18:18 32:12 33:17 35:7,18 42:10 44:20 49:1 55:20 56:15 58:15,20 59:16,17 60:22 61:1,6 61:8,17 67:16 68:6,16 68:21 77:4,8,15,22 81:12 82:13,18 84:19 85:7 87:14 92:7 93:6 93:11 101:3,6,7,19 102:7 105:18 108:13 110:10,22 111:14 113:4,5 117:19,22 118:10 123:16,18 126:8,13 132:17 133:10 144:18 156:3 158:20 160:5,13,16 161:15 167:18 169:5 169:10,20 172:8 173:10 175:13
panel's 33:10 40:11 108:2,8 133:2 157:7
panels 175:10
paper 50:3
paragraph 76:9 145:22 152:7,9
parallel 95:12
parking 12:13
part 13:8 14:6 19:14,19 47:18,20 63:3,5 66:22 67:3,22 72:22 78:21 86:16,19 93:19,21 96:10 99:18 100:18 109:12 110:6,9,14 114:19 131:20 136:18 141:3 161:8,10,20 163:9 173:14
participants 55:13
participate 56:18
participated 167:7
participation 30:3 67:15 112:3 162:22
particular 8:12 84:7 110:16 114:10 120:9
particularly 11:5 174:20
parties 163:11
partly 103:4
partner 10:13
partnership 11:19
partnerships 71:11 75:5
parts 45:16 66:2,6 74:3 143:18 162:14 163:2
party 149:6
passed 36:13
passenger 168:14
path 34:18,19
Paul 108:11 157:14 158:8
Pause 19:15
PAWSA 10:3,11 12:19
pay 57:16 100:13 142:9
paying 168:18
payload 147:10
people 16:15 20:14,16 21:12,13 22:18 23:6 24:2,3 26:9 31:17,19 32:2,4 37:7,8 47:16 48:1 51:22 52:22 55:9 62:12 67:11,20 76:1 76:19 80:4 87:16 92:4 95:6 99:6 100:5 103:11 119:19 151:15 163:17 164:2
people's 14:8 174:15
percent 29:19 75:16 76:6 93:1 107:3,13 126:5 134:16,17 135:6,16,17,21 136:3 136:20 137:3 138:4 139:6,22
perception 168:21 169:1
perfect 49:11 131:11 153:21
period 3:13 69:10 75:2 80:9,19 92:15 104:15 104:16 123:12 130:9
Perkins 1:11,13 3:4 4:3 7:14 12:18 14:3,7 24:9 32:9 33:9 34:17 35:20 38:12 39:8 40:6 41:1,11,18 42:6 43:8 43:18 46:9 49:3 52:8 53:2 54:4,19 55:2 58:12 59:1 62:21 63:16 64:13 65:12,21 66:21 67:10 68:3,6,13 68:22 69:8 70:5,17 71:18 72:5,14 73:6,12 74:13 75:1,12 80:8 81:10,21 82:11 83:5 83:22 84:22 90:10 104:4 105:19 107:22 108:10,18,21 110:8 110:19 111:17,19 112:1,17 114:15,20 115:20 116:13 117:13 119:4,21 120:19 121:8 122:3,8,11 123:4,15 124:4,8 125:20 126:16 127:6 127:16 128:12 130:12 131:10,21 132:21 133:7,17 136:4,15 140:1,11,16 141:1 145:9,20 146:9,16 147:21 150:9 151:18 152:7,15,22 153:7,16 154:9,15 155:9,18 156:6 160:9 163:15 165:4,18 166:4,13 167:7 172:3 173:1,8 173:17 174:22
person 20:9 88:18 117:5
personally 28:5 97:5 171:15
personnel 82:18
perspective 16:15 142:19
pertinent 37:18
PETER 1:21
Philadelphia 25:18
Phillips 22:12
phone 48:16 167:8
phrase 28:6,10
phrases 20:22
physical 119:11
pick 26:4 126:19 149:7
picked 150:5
piece 54:18 120:7 160:18 162:19
pieces 39:2 53:22 96:5 104:5
pile 23:6
pilot 16:10 19:8 20:20 21:21 26:2 147:14,16
pilots 32:5 166:12
pitch 146:13
place 37:21 45:4 51:3

77:10 85:4 91:2 108:5 118:5 154:3 155:13 166:3 172:21
places 10:13 109:17 145:2 166:18
plan 3:7,10 6:7,18 15:18 21:2 23:15 56:11 76:18 77:20 119:22 158:6
planned 10:14
planning 22:10 26:16 27:12 43:5,15 47:18 47:21 54:5,9,16 56:8 58:5,13 62:7,8,16 63:3 66:20 67:1 69:1 74:7 76:13,17 77:19 119:1 120:7,12 127:4 156:10 172:9 175:15
plans 31:13 32:17 142:1
play 146:12
players 27:2 79:10 158:12
plays 161:7
please 12:17 63:13 130:13 133:8 160:9
pleased 71:12 154:13
plenty 172:13
plug 38:10 41:19
point 14:3,6 21:11 36:13 56:7 57:16 82:22 87:16 88:22 90:6,19 97:3 102:2 103:8 115:17 116:1 121:2 131:4,8,10,14 136:22 140:7 148:20 156:1,8 164:13 168:5
pointed 10:2
pointers 156:20
points 21:9 82:14 84:7 84:13 87:2 88:19 89:18 90:12 91:11 94:2,6,6 99:3 123:11 127:17
policy 35:22 37:6 38:4 40:16 58:13 127:8
political 172:14
politics 144:4
poll 169:16 170:4 174:16
popular 51:19
populated 22:12
port 4:11 9:17 10:14,17 10:20,21 13:17 106:19 149:6,13 165:21 169:9 170:13
portal 15:20 163:5
Portland 167:20,22
portray 149:9
ports 9:1,4,15 10:20 11:8,12,14 15:3 59:3 59:16 148:6 151:5,6 165:22 166:11
pose 106:16
posed 9:18 53:11 58:9 60:17 65:7
posing 131:7
position 94:5 123:5 151:11
positioning 9:15
positive 29:17
possible 73:18 74:17 151:10 171:9,11
possibly 151:7,8
post 111:21 116:18 122:15 126:1
post-certification 158:5
post-Panamax 9:16 10:15 146:10
posted 34:15 122:17
potential 29:22 75:14 159:19 164:9 170:18
potentially 10:11 31:6 38:21 47:8 79:16 126:12 143:8 162:17 164:11
PowerPoint 163:19
PowerPoints 97:12,18
practical 162:3
practice 111:13
practiced 102:3
practices 22:8
practicing 126:19
Pre-Scripted 71:14,20
precede 123:7
precise 59:3,18 61:14 79:17
precision 4:10 8:21 9:19 11:4,11 46:22 49:10 71:3 75:6,7 150:1 151:4 164:10 164:18 166:3 172:21
predicted 28:14
predictive 26:19
preference 174:8
premiums 29:19
preparation 53:18 84:1
prepare 83:14 118:10
prepared 67:12 85:13 85:16,18 86:1 109:22 163:19 165:5
preparedness 30:17
preparing 160:7
present 1:12 2:1 49:9
presentation 4:10 14:11 19:17 81:4 148:13 160:7 163:16 164:8
presentations 4:9 33:15 34:2 97:12 99:10,13,15 150:14 150:16
presented 73:15,16 112:20 150:10,14,19 150:22 163:18
presenting 164:2
presently 4:19 49:4 115:16
Presidential 172:16
presiding 1:12
pressing 173:19
pretty 7:3 10:6 11:1 22:16 28:10 29:1 32:7 56:4 57:3,5 59:21,22 75:19 76:2 81:4 82:21 90:1 94:22 95:17 102:8 111:14 145:9 173:1
preventing 133:12
prevention 4:14
prevents 132:19
previous 16:18 32:21 70:3,12,12 71:7 72:7 72:13 87:10 88:5 168:3
previously 41:2
prices 137:9
primarily 27:19
primer 5:1
principal 46:7 162:6
prior 35:6 36:2 69:10 84:1 85:21 86:7 102:12 127:7,9 151:22 152:2
priorities 4:17 12:4 42:9 58:13 61:12 127:8 157:20
prioritization 64:16 65:2,9,13
prioritize 14:21 16:5 59:18 61:11,14 65:14
prioritizing 13:10
priority 8:22 12:8 15:16 17:19 53:20 64:18
Pritzker's 78:11
private 22:1,7 142:19
probably 8:16 49:4,6 77:3 78:13,16 100:8 107:12 116:10 118:16 118:18 120:11 129:7 138:20,21 144:13,13 171:21
problem 75:16 76:6 83:5 96:10 98:14 133:16 136:17 140:5 141:21 142:18 168:20 172:1 174:6
procedure 39:22 86:19 117:18
procedures 37:21 44:15 69:17 81:15 93:19 112:9 118:19 120:21
proceed 6:20 7:2,6 60:1 160:12
process 9:14 14:6 47:10 61:15 81:15,22 85:9 112:9 117:18 118:3 120:21 162:11
processes 161:12
Proctor 2:10 36:18
produce 6:13 86:12 100:19 101:10 102:8
produced 85:10 110:17
produces 100:11
producing 93:10 122:10
product 9:9,14 11:2,12 25:2 49:18 80:5 101:15 110:18 151:12
productive 41:8 54:1 72:22
products 2:9 14:16 156:20
professional 13:12
profile 16:20
program 2:8 12:1 51:20 52:1,6 77:21 85:22 136:14 157:22 158:13 159:5 169:22
program-wide 116:6
programs 4:14 160:21
progress 71:13,20,21 96:20 119:5 121:9 154:7,7,8,14
project 2:7 4:10 16:10 19:8 20:20 21:22 71:4
projects 136:10,13
prompt 55:20
proper 84:3 112:2
properly 33:12 41:21
propose 63:4
proposed 32:21 35:13 36:21 37:10,10 42:19 43:19,21 70:22
proposing 10:7
pros 31:16
PROTIDE 149:7
protocols 26:3
prototype 26:14
proven 85:9
provide 6:12 12:12

14:17 17:2,11 18:6 20:6 26:3 30:1 36:10 44:17,20 59:17 67:13 88:7 93:14 97:10 98:9 157:5,6 158:3,4 162:5 163:21 169:8,12,13
provided 12:7 124:19 175:4
provides 99:3
providing 27:4 41:17 148:22 157:3 158:13
public 1:6 3:13,22 12:1 34:2,8 40:10 51:21 69:9 75:2 80:9,12,13 80:18 97:22 107:18 117:11 141:3 168:21 168:21,22
public-private 11:18
Puerto 163:16
pull 55:6
pulled 157:13
pulling 41:19 163:3
purely 149:3
purpose 41:4,22 43:6 44:2 49:17 54:14 61:15 62:22 63:4,21 64:14,15,21 65:1 67:18 68:8 100:15 101:2 127:20 128:16 128:21 129:6,22 136:9
purpose-fits 173:15
purposes 162:3
pursue 47:1 154:19
purview 133:3 157:7
push 124:18
pushing 16:6
put 12:21 13:4 20:13 24:11,15 35:14,17 39:22 46:10 50:3 57:9 58:15 63:21 69:6,7 73:4,8 76:4 84:16 85:4,14 90:4 97:16,17 104:12 105:14 110:21 112:4 114:4 117:3,8,8 117:17 123:11,12 125:6,8,20 128:1 132:3,8 140:10,12,12 145:2 149:10 153:3 163:4 173:12
puts 141:15
putting 23:9,12 28:8 50:10 68:17 115:10

Q

quality 158:4
question 8:7 9:18 27:18 34:5 46:13 48:9,10,11 49:14 52:10,13 56:15 57:8 59:1,15 60:8,13 79:5 83:16,18 86:15 88:20 95:11 102:12 122:20 130:22 155:11 158:20 174:8,10
questioned 87:21
questions 6:9,11,21 7:5 8:3 12:7 24:7 31:22 32:3,13 41:16 48:4,5 50:11,14,16,17 53:11 53:15 57:14,17 58:1,8 58:15,22 59:9 60:3,10 60:12,16 63:19 64:3,7 64:18 65:7,11,16 80:11 99:10 160:15 160:19
quick 12:18 49:5 69:11
quickly 7:3 20:14 62:22 88:12
Quintrell 159:6
quite 52:5 116:10 166:22,22 167:14,19 174:10

R

R 1:13
RA 155:21
Rachel 46:11
RADM 1:15,16 3:5 5:17 7:8 35:10 42:21 43:9 46:13 49:1 54:12 55:5 56:7 58:19 59:14 60:21 68:15 70:7,16 77:1,22 78:12 81:17 81:20 85:21 92:17 100:10 102:22 108:8 108:16,19 110:3,9 111:12,18,20 116:4 116:16 126:11 128:5 128:19 129:11,21 130:3,7,21 133:14 135:5 136:7,21 152:18 153:3 159:21 160:10 166:15 167:4 167:18 169:3,22 171:18 174:9,14
raise 157:20
raising 142:9
ran 137:13
RASSELLO 1:20
rate 13:1 57:6 168:16
rating 18:11
Ray 20:8 21:4
re-brand 151:7
re-morphed 44:9
reachable 76:18
reached 52:8 108:11
read 45:8 71:9 73:18 94:21
ready 7:19 10:13 48:21 102:9 138:3,17 165:7
real 5:4 16:17 26:15 49:17 96:19 157:17 171:19
realize 85:15
realized 6:9
really 5:9,9 8:17 12:4 12:14 13:12 14:16 15:16 16:8,8 17:15 19:10,12 22:5 23:15 23:16,18 25:7 26:6,17 27:14 29:1,3 30:6 47:2 48:12 50:4 55:20 61:7 66:9 76:21 77:3 79:4 87:15 91:18 93:15 99:18 108:1 130:18 131:19 134:6 142:18 146:8,11 156:7 159:14 164:18 171:20
realtime 23:14,15 98:22
REAR 2:2
reason 60:5 103:15 129:16 139:13 140:8 142:13 143:17 169:19
reasonable 105:2 108:15,19
reasons 143:14 169:10 169:12
reauthorization 158:3
rebuild 116:8
recall 101:1,5 129:5
recap 3:2 70:17 89:17
receive 33:19 34:21 102:22
received 4:16,21 42:13 49:22 50:8 68:10 136:5 153:15,17
recipient 162:10
recognize 40:10 80:15
recommend 10:1 70:15 115:9 126:7
recommendation 11:20 18:17 70:6,19 73:3,7 75:10,13,14 79:17 81:2,5,13 90:22 96:12 96:20 97:7 98:8 113:1 116:21 145:12 156:2 159:18
recommendations 37:13 44:21 45:7,19 74:8,19 95:8,14,19 97:1 113:17,19 115:3 115:4,14 116:14 117:2,8 123:13 150:15 151:21 152:1 152:2 157:12 158:3,5
recommended 11:8
recommending 16:22
reconvene 3:10,18 7:1 32:16 33:5 81:6 173:9
reconvening 4:4 110:11
record 7:12 24:6 33:7 66:21 81:8 82:17 89:2 110:7,10,12,14 141:4 146:15,19 147:2 151:16 155:8 168:11 173:6 175:22
recorded 110:4
recorder 85:18 98:5 101:17 107:8
recording 85:19 100:16 103:17 107:8 109:18 124:15
recordings 107:16
recreate 17:16
recreational 72:9 171:12,17
red 69:3
reduce 29:18 73:2 131:2 132:7,11
reducing 84:18
reference 15:17 24:18 25:8 84:2
referenced 15:8
referencing 18:7
referred 83:20
refined 8:1
reflect 8:15 66:22 92:20 128:10 129:22
reflected 127:21 173:20
refresh 44:18 49:7 165:5
refreshed 165:7
refueling 147:17
regarding 41:4 42:3 70:21 71:2 72:15 147:5 156:1
region 4:12,20
regional 145:17,18 156:18 159:8 162:5,7 162:21 165:14 169:7 172:12
regions 26:15
Register 34:1,7
regularly 26:10 89:4
regulations 147:5
reinvent 24:5
relation 151:8
relationships 5:3
relatively 38:9
release 162:16

released 163:4
relevance 79:8
relevant 25:3 63:9
reluctant 119:20
rely 55:20 86:13,17
relying 86:2
remain 40:16 41:10
remarks 23:3
remember 14:14 92:9 98:17 135:8 152:3,6 168:3
reminder 126:16 156:11
Remote 2:3,7
renewal 38:16
reoccurring 64:19
reopen 56:14
repeating 9:14
replacing 35:4
report 3:15,20 6:14 39:2,13 45:15,19 70:1 70:11,12 74:3,7,14,15 74:20 75:6 82:8 91:2 101:3 104:22 110:2 111:5,9 117:19 118:10 119:5 133:18 133:19,21 134:2,3 141:2,22
report-out 12:15 67:13 68:17 142:3
reported 141:4
reporter 88:9 91:21 95:22 98:6 100:10 102:6,15,18 103:20 103:21 106:17 109:9 109:10,16 110:20 125:12 126:19
reporter's 86:3,13 88:10 89:1 94:18
reporter-provided 122:14
reporting 75:4 101:2
reports 32:10 42:13
repositioned 168:15
represent 93:13
representative 38:17 70:21 93:3,7 153:11 153:13,20
represents 93:12
request 126:8 133:19 153:12
requested 126:8,13 153:11
requesting 133:18 141:2
required 25:12 88:7 107:16 122:21
requirement 80:16 100:19,20,22 101:3
requirements 147:4
requires 147:13 164:18
requiring 162:12
research 50:22
resilience 2:8 5:2,12 6:1 7:15 14:10 20:21 30:16 32:14 33:2 57:18,22 58:8,16 60:4 62:1 66:4,11 128:22 158:2 160:19
resiliency 8:7 14:18 15:5,16,22 17:3 18:3 18:11 41:16 63:18
resolution 115:6
resolve 153:8
resolving 144:10
resounding 11:9
resources 107:5 171:16
respect 61:22
respond 6:11 35:19 41:15 61:1
responding 6:21
response 7:7 41:17 42:5 60:10,15 63:19 72:3 113:20 114:11 117:9
responses 3:8 60:19 112:11,14
responsibilities 105:4
responsibility 67:11 91:19 96:17 108:2 114:19 116:7
responsible 87:4 125:16 164:22
restate 70:8
resubmitting 152:1
result 138:10,14
resulted 33:13
resulting 128:13
resumed 7:12 33:7 81:8 173:6
retain 35:3 42:15
retired 22:12
retrain 100:7
review 1:4,10 4:5 13:21 14:1 36:21 37:11,12 49:7 69:10 81:12 83:15 92:7,8 93:4,16 103:2 104:14,16 105:16 106:12,14 108:4,6 111:8 118:15 118:16 120:22 122:15 122:17 123:21 126:2 133:10 141:22 173:10 175:13
reviewed 13:13 56:17 111:2
reviewing 70:14 122:1
revise 36:21
revised 37:1
revision 37:11 106:13
revisit 55:9
rewriting 71:8
Rhode 168:8
Richard 1:21
Rick 2:4 32:1 142:11 148:12
Rico 163:16
rid 127:17 153:19
right 7:20 12:2 27:2 28:8 31:7 39:1,1 55:6 58:11 65:12 66:3 67:10 68:2,3 72:4 75:12 80:8 84:4 100:8 101:21 104:5 109:4 112:15 113:22 114:5 124:6 125:10,22 126:10 128:7 134:19 136:8 139:12 141:4 143:22 144:6,20 146:9,9 151:11 164:1 166:16 167:6 172:22 173:8 174:9,17
rise 17:12 23:20 27:20 28:6
risk 10:5,14 13:6
risk-based 12:19
roadmap 8:4,9,12,15 16:2 19:2 79:15 117:21
Roads 16:10 19:8,19 25:17 27:12
robust 11:1 84:9
Rock 172:5
Roll 172:5
room 1:11 5:22 20:3,6 20:16
rooms 109:19 171:20
routine 8:10
row 155:7
rule 174:19
run 28:20 29:10 32:2 64:11 88:17 137:10 137:12
running 29:7 31:21
runs 159:6
Russ 2:10 36:18
Russell 9:21 169:18
Russell's 8:6 10:21
rusty 146:2

S

safe 175:11
sail 134:7 135:17 139:12
sailing 134:8
sake 41:19 90:5
salads 175:17
SALVATORE 1:20
Sandy 5:6 27:22 28:19
SAR 21:18
satisfied 93:12 173:15
satisfying 143:16
Saturday 174:7
save 107:5
saw 127:4 131:18
saying 19:2 51:22 53:4 75:4 93:19 101:5 132:21 138:7 139:5 144:16 145:4 146:11 149:15,18 164:21
says 9:15 32:16 68:11 72:22 82:12 88:6 104:2 113:20 154:4
scale 23:17 142:9 147:9
Scan 21:6
scanning 22:19
SCCOOS 145:14 155:21
scenario 28:13,19
scenarios 26:11 27:21
scene 29:1
schedule 33:13 34:1 80:9 120:15 121:21 174:19
scheduled 34:21 173:2
scheduler 23:2
school 62:14
science 21:5,8,18 45:14 51:3 69:22 70:10 74:1
scope 56:5
Scott 1:11,13 3:4 34:10 49:2 50:19 55:6 59:10 59:15 62:17 66:19 69:19 83:18 84:5 121:13 123:1 126:6 130:19 157:15 158:9 159:22 160:3,7,8,14
Scott's 161:1
scrambled 37:16
screen 43:19 81:17 85:14
scroll 152:11
sea 17:11 23:20 25:1 27:20 28:6 51:20 52:6 75:16 135:6 136:11 137:14,15,17 138:4 138:15,20 139:1,4,11 142:5,7 159:8
seasonally 168:15
Seattle 167:16,17,19
second 9:7,13 20:8 100:22 108:1 126:1

128:5 161:10
Secretary 78:11
sector 142:19
Security 22:20
see 15:11 17:15 21:1 23:13 29:8 34:8 35:6 36:2 37:12,22 54:1 56:2 69:16 70:4 75:5 79:12,19 92:8,14 94:7 96:7 107:11 114:17 114:18 123:3 124:6 137:6 157:11 158:9 166:12 170:4 173:2
seeing 7:8 137:11,12 137:13 143:21 144:5
seeking 72:15
seen 49:15
segment 82:13,15
sel 2:4
selecting 59:3 169:4
sell 12:3 79:8 166:2
selling 80:5,7,7 151:12
Senator 20:14 21:15 32:6
send 30:20,21 69:22 83:9 113:14 172:8
sending 113:9 123:2 142:8
senior 22:14 48:14,15
sense 14:8 38:14 64:20 74:21 84:21 85:1 94:22 163:8
Sensing 2:3,7
sensitive 144:4
sensitivity 143:2
sensors 11:15,22 164:8
sent 112:20 113:4 114:14 157:14
sentence 63:5,21 65:5 69:14 129:11 130:4 131:22 136:16 138:6 138:12 144:9,19 151:19 154:4
separate 66:9 91:21 94:15 96:5
September 30:11 37:2 67:14 152:14 153:4 156:11 165:11 170:8 174:13
series 170:17
serious 58:21
serve 66:19 156:3
server 148:14
service 2:11 148:22 149:3 175:1
services 1:4,10 2:9,10 4:5 8:10 14:17 16:15 17:2,11 18:2,8,18 81:12 85:17 88:7 133:3,10 173:10 175:13
session 6:4 7:4 29:16 34:12 40:10,21 45:8 55:8 68:1,1 75:22 81:1,3,11 84:6 87:14 90:16 97:11 99:1 100:2 103:14,16 110:17 125:12,13,17
sessions 3:7 5:11,16 5:19 6:5 7:9,10 87:11 90:17 97:10,20 98:3 98:10 99:4 109:15,22 110:4 121:17 124:19
set 53:4 55:17 60:10 67:4 104:14 106:6 117:6 139:14
setting 117:5
seven 75:1 105:5,19
Seventeen 153:5
shallow 5:5,8
shape 93:15
share 90:14 111:20 149:10 156:13 170:3
shared 19:1 81:18 111:13,15 112:2
sharing 112:22
sheet 166:15 167:21
Sherry 166:12
shift 135:22
SHINGLEDECKER 1:20 18:21 36:4 44:16 49:13 52:17 53:6,21 58:2 63:2 72:19 79:12 88:21 89:11 94:14 97:2 102:11 119:9 128:15 129:4 130:17 134:9 135:1 148:3 157:13 161:3 171:14 171:22
ship 75:11 132:20 133:4,12 137:4 141:7 141:9 147:13 170:20 170:22 172:1
shipping 170:16
ships 105:5 132:15,22 133:2 134:7 135:10 135:12 136:8,10,12 137:10,18,22 138:3 138:14,16 139:3,8,11 139:13 140:8 142:7 145:3 147:8,15 168:14
shoes 161:1
short 32:10 74:17 92:14 170:7
short-term 120:13 154:1
shorter 173:3
shot 63:2 78:12 137:9 151:12
shoulders 7:16
show 32:4,6 113:12 171:11 172:6
showed 31:1 110:1 127:10 135:3 148:14
showing 20:16
side 49:19 77:19 97:6 161:13 162:1 171:17
sides 161:4
sight 32:12
sign 93:5
signatures 113:3
signed 39:7 71:22
significantly 45:17 74:4
similar 13:1 107:9 109:14
simple 107:8
simplicity's 41:19
simply 153:17 174:10
Simultaneous 76:12 126:15 154:22 155:3
single 16:14 60:5 118:17 130:4
sir 108:18 150:12
sit 67:7 76:1 125:11
site 114:5 116:15
sits 50:4
sitting 7:15 87:7 98:14
situation 119:6 142:22 143:8,11 144:12
six 9:20 12:6,7 23:11 48:5 53:15 58:21 64:17 117:3 129:15
Sixteenth 153:6
size 146:8
Skanska 31:18
sleep 124:9
slow 95:15 96:7
smaller 61:9
smarter 164:1
smartly 96:20
smoke-bellowing 146:3
socially 25:3
Society 23:1
soft 134:21
solicit 157:9
solution 19:20 126:3
solutions 142:16
solve 109:11 141:21
solved 172:1
somebody 11:15 77:18 92:6 97:16 100:13 103:22 105:9
someplace 76:22
somewhat 82:1 86:4 152:19
soon 82:5 153:2
sooner 61:3 92:3
SOP 85:12
sorry 43:10 141:10
sort 8:5 12:13 54:18 55:8 67:13 77:11,20 77:20 92:6 101:8 121:18 164:12
sorts 151:14
sounds 53:10,12 59:4 123:5 158:2
South 166:14 172:6
Southern 4:11 145:15 145:17 155:14
space 20:7 77:10 155:20 168:19
space-constrained 9:4
speak 77:16
speakers 113:10 114:9
speaking 76:12 126:15 154:22 155:3
speaks 10:15
specific 24:16 46:20 49:14 52:4,19 65:1 73:3 129:17 149:2
specifically 4:9 39:16 50:7 52:18 160:13
specifications 18:6
speed 164:6
spell 145:13 146:7 155:15
spend 52:22 81:14,21 130:15 156:9
spent 6:17 50:15
spill 4:14
spills 166:7
spin 61:9
spot 141:16
spreadsheet 113:16
St 170:14
stab 56:22 57:5 153:10
staff 85:22 91:5,14 96:1 98:9,20 100:4 101:13 102:13 106:22 107:10 115:10 124:19 125:15 137:19 153:20 163:12 172:11 175:3
staffer 38:21 39:5
staffers 46:1,12 51:12 56:16 78:17
staffing 139:15
stakeholder 165:15 175:9
stakeholders 4:12 17:5 24:1 63:9
stand 88:3

standard 37:20 39:22 44:15 69:17 112:9 117:17 118:19 120:20
standardization 24:10 26:1
standards 162:14
standing 38:14 121:9 121:10
standpoint 84:10
stands 153:15
start 13:5 21:18 22:8 26:4 33:10 61:16 84:13 91:14 115:12 116:21 121:3 161:2 164:5
started 5:20 19:17 20:2 20:5 22:16 107:7
starting 115:17,22
starts 116:12 152:8
state 21:4 103:5
stated 72:1
statement 8:6,8 44:2 54:14 63:1,4 65:6 70:20 71:2,9 72:15 73:17 82:12 83:16 127:19,20 128:17,21 129:17,17,22 131:7 140:2 150:8 152:16 158:1
States 9:17
stations 24:21
status 115:4
statutory 100:19
stay 21:5 172:1
steadily 140:9
step 15:21 34:7 68:7,7 82:22 84:1
stepping 21:21
STONE 1:21 141:3 159:13 164:15
stopped 101:22
storm 32:5
story 25:4 136:1
Strategic 15:18 41:2 44:10
strategies 8:20
strategy 4:22 8:22
straw 76:2
stream 15:5 23:20
streams 15:2,2 16:5 17:20
strengthen 45:17 74:4
stretch 106:3
strictly 72:10 137:14
strike 126:7 151:22 152:8
strikes 54:6
string 161:22
striving 101:15
strongly 172:3
struck 165:6
structure 8:3 27:8 36:10 57:17 162:9
structured 8:2
structures 31:13,20
struggling 66:7
stuck 89:6
study 29:7
stuff 21:17 24:6 26:8 29:13 113:18 147:19 164:20
subject 67:17 123:22 159:18 162:18
submit 151:22
submitted 80:12
subordinate 24:21
subsequent 39:14 60:12
subsidence 23:16,19 27:20
substance 140:19
substantially 59:21
subtitle 159:20
succeed 55:12
success 52:20 75:8
successful 175:10
succinct 74:18 86:9 140:4
suffice 34:13
suggest 69:21 105:11
suggested 26:15 43:4 60:5 69:20 173:16
suggesting 40:3 54:4
suggestion 69:20 74:21
suggestions 58:17 144:17
Sullivan 51:18 68:18
Sullivan's 78:7
summaries 82:17,20 86:8,9 88:11,12 97:15 109:22 121:22 124:16
summarize 82:14 89:10
summarized 99:15
summary 7:22 19:8 82:7 85:16 86:1,3,11 86:13,18,21 91:13 92:2,5,14 94:19 95:4 95:10,13,20,21,22 96:2 97:6 98:16,21,21 100:11 102:5,13,21 103:1,11,19,21 104:1 104:21 106:22 107:10 108:22 109:13 110:2 110:20 111:5,9,13 120:22 121:15 122:5 122:7,10,14,18 123:7 123:20 124:12 127:22
summer 13:20 61:17
Sunday 174:10,11
Supplemental 5:6
supply 78:19 79:2 80:1
support 9:2 15:5,16 17:3 55:21 82:18 87:15 91:5 97:4,6 98:9 102:4 140:19 147:14 149:15,15 150:18 156:22 157:21 158:1 160:7 175:4,6
supported 16:20,21 26:13
supporting 147:22
supportive 25:10
supports 148:9 158:14
supposed 94:16 118:4 120:3
sure 24:13 40:7 41:10 48:14 54:21 59:12 66:14 84:2 86:1 91:10 91:19 98:20 99:8 100:4 102:10,17 111:15 119:16 125:15 126:4 127:2 133:20 134:6 136:16 145:15 149:13 150:5 154:12 166:12 168:16 173:20
survey 2:3,4,5,6,7,10 15:18 61:12 70:20 85:17,22 132:20,22 136:13 169:6
Survey's 136:10
surveys 131:1 132:8
Susan 1:20 36:1 46:11 52:14 62:17,20 63:13 72:18 96:9
synergy 164:11
synthesis 148:19
system 9:12 145:16,18 146:2 148:4,9 150:20 150:22 151:4,4 163:4 165:22 166:11
systemic 132:17,18 133:11 142:17
systems 15:3,14

T

table 3:1 87:8 88:4 157:3 171:16
take 8:13 14:2 19:3 26:2 33:21 34:7,11 37:5 43:13 45:4 49:5 56:20 56:22 62:4,21 64:8 69:11 76:4 77:9 83:11 84:10 87:13,14,19,20 88:1,4,5 89:9 91:2,9 94:11 96:16 97:11 98:12 100:6 115:2 116:5 118:4 120:14 124:20 125:22 153:10 157:12 159:10 165:8 172:10
takeaway 4:18 110:5
takeaways 90:12 92:22
taken 49:9 108:5 121:16
takes 48:11 85:3 106:2 122:4 142:8,8 162:15 174:3
talk 17:14 32:8 46:1 51:12 60:18 84:14 104:19 111:7 117:13 118:6 141:14 149:19 158:22 159:9 166:6,7 166:8 172:21
talked 15:9 26:20 46:21 70:1 93:3 112:11 133:1 148:13,15
talking 17:22 76:14 81:22 103:14 112:15 118:8 146:8 149:19 149:22 150:1,3,6 159:4 160:4 162:1 170:7,15
tangible 140:19
tape 106:21
tapes 107:5
target 15:22 79:21 83:10
task 5:14 56:4 62:3 65:12
tasks 35:18 57:8,11
tax 151:10
Teacher 51:20 52:6
tease 96:2
technical 15:14 32:3 92:6 96:1 102:19 103:22
technicality 126:12
technically 136:7
technology 23:1 148:2
teeth 163:3
telephone 118:17
tell 25:4 132:6 136:1 141:20 144:6 157:17
temporary 57:12,21 58:11 63:22 64:11,22 65:19 129:14 173:13
ten 115:14
term 37:17 60:14 64:22 149:20 150:5,7
terms 45:5 73:9 79:7 121:22 148:2,10 150:21 161:11

terrific 50:22 51:1
TERRY 2:11
test 26:15
TEU 147:15
Texas 30:14 166:5,14 169:21 172:6
thank 14:7 32:9 34:17 35:21 38:12 55:2 67:1 70:16 81:6,20 84:22 113:10,14 114:14 156:11 174:17,22 175:3,15
thanking 112:21
theme 64:19
theory 94:19
they'd 7:2 77:15 78:1
thing 13:16 21:14 22:5 23:7 28:1 33:10 37:14 56:5 77:20 87:3,6 91:22 94:3 96:4 97:14 107:11 113:3,13,22 128:8 151:14 156:18 165:3 168:2 171:1
things 14:14 18:16 19:4 23:19 28:16 29:2,21 30:9 31:14,16 38:6 48:11 60:18 66:6,9 77:13 89:6 90:2 91:17 94:22 95:6 96:7 97:6 97:21 99:8,11,12 102:17 103:12 109:12 109:19 120:16,17 132:6 138:22 143:12 145:1 146:12 148:17 150:4 151:9 157:11 159:10 161:17 163:11 174:21
think 6:8,16 9:10,16 11:13 12:22 13:15 14:19,20 19:1 20:20 21:10 25:6,19 26:1,6 27:1 34:12,15,18 37:19 38:5,13,17 39:11,16,18,19 40:14 41:8,9,18 42:11 43:7 43:9 44:7,17 46:17,22 47:6 48:4,8 49:10,15 50:13 51:6,10,10,13 51:14 52:7,19,22 53:4 53:6,20 54:12,15 55:3 56:8 57:4,5,11 59:8 59:20 60:2,22 61:2,21 62:7 65:10 66:6 67:8 68:15,18,22 69:2 70:5 71:18,22 72:19 73:6,8 74:13,16,20 75:19,22 76:7,11 77:2,14 78:1 78:7 79:9,22 82:21 83:13 84:6,8,17 85:1 85:3 88:21,22 89:3,12 90:4,4 91:4,15,16,18 92:5,12,17 93:7 94:10 95:2 96:5,10,19 97:9 98:1,2,4,13 99:9,14 100:1,7,8 101:11,14 101:19,21 102:3 103:3,7,16,20 104:6 106:4 109:12 111:12 113:7,13,15 114:20 115:16 118:21 119:9 120:5 122:3 123:15 124:21,22 127:6,9 129:2,4 130:7,14,17 131:10 132:5,13 134:20 136:4 138:8 139:12 140:6,18 141:16,18 142:14,22 143:1,2,5,16,18 144:11,15 146:16 149:5,20 151:2 152:8 153:16,19 154:3 155:21 157:1,8 158:8 159:13 160:1,3 161:3 161:18 164:6,11,18 165:2,8 166:16,20 167:6,18,21 169:9,17 170:10,18 172:12,16 172:18 174:18 175:10
thinking 64:13 76:21 148:1
third 9:8 80:20 87:22 109:4 149:6
thorough 129:7
thought 37:4 46:6 47:20 52:5 79:4 85:16 96:11 98:18 107:15 131:16
thoughts 114:19 165:11 166:13 172:7
three 4:6 8:18 9:5 31:1 31:9 35:11 90:18 94:6 94:17 98:15 105:18 129:20 137:8 138:1 151:21 161:7 163:8 175:5
three-day 4:7
three-hour 165:20
Thursday 174:20
tie 24:21
tied 25:3
ties 138:12
Tiffany 2:7 12:11 85:13 125:20 144:15 146:17 151:18 153:18 154:3
tight 171:20
time 11:6,6,10 12:14 30:19 33:13,22 34:20 36:22 47:19 48:18 49:9 50:11,15 53:1 61:8 62:22 64:9 71:17 75:21 80:10,14 81:15 81:22 84:11 86:16 87:12,20,22 92:15 93:4 98:3 106:7 107:3 107:6,17 110:8,10 111:1 112:22 130:15 132:20 133:4,8,13 135:17 139:22 143:20 153:8 155:16 156:8,9 165:9,17 166:22
time-line 37:1
timeframe 82:4 84:18 108:3,7,15
timeline 83:7 111:8
timelines 85:4
timely 154:2,5
times 144:17
Timing 10:16
tires 168:5
title 49:16
titled 41:2,21
toast 36:8
today 8:1 90:20 93:15 101:20 109:3 110:1 112:11
told 51:4
Toll 20:8 21:5
ton 147:10
tonnage 165:21
tool 13:16 14:18 30:16 30:17
tools 9:2 26:19 63:8
top 70:3,12 151:13 152:11 155:7
top-down 20:17,19
topic 12:9,13 50:6,14 70:2
topics 43:13 46:14 94:12
total 106:14 135:11
tough 14:13
town 141:13
track 88:19 115:2 116:14
tracking 117:15
Trade 78:21
transcribe 107:2,21
transcript 82:3,5,8 83:12,15,20 84:2 91:22 94:19 99:21 110:20 122:5,7,15 123:7,20 127:22
transcription 98:17
transferring 90:21
transitioned 168:15
transits 147:13
transportation-centric 61:21
travel 39:17 105:3 106:2 173:18
traveling 106:2 174:6
travels 175:11
trend 135:3
tri-service 33:15
tried 30:12
trouble 159:15
true 112:3
truly 164:19
truncating 33:14
try 13:1 14:14 32:22 33:16 63:17 66:12 83:6 85:2 90:10 97:15 115:14 126:3 140:4 153:8 161:19 171:15
trying 8:2 11:13 17:14 73:2 74:17 78:6 81:4 87:1 88:14 93:20 97:21,21 98:14 100:17 102:10 118:8 119:6 121:18 130:2 136:1,15 143:18 145:21 162:21 163:1 166:17 174:16
Tuesday-Wednesday 174:19
Tuesday-Wednesday... 174:5
tugs 147:14,16
turned 28:19 69:3,3
turns 64:6 168:17
twice 52:4
two 5:3 9:11 12:4 13:19 16:5 29:2 32:10 35:13 37:22 38:8 43:19 44:4 46:12 51:22 66:2,5,9 76:10 83:1 94:6,15 96:4,13 104:5 106:11 106:13,14 107:11 108:16,16,17,17 109:17 112:5,6 117:3 119:2 122:16 126:2 130:13 137:17,18 150:3 151:21 161:4
two-page 109:6 110:16
two-week 122:17
tying 79:13
type 39:17 91:22
typically 135:21 136:2 147:12

U

U.S 1:1 10:3,10,12 13:9

29:11 71:15
unable 123:17,19
unclear 121:14,19 149:11
uncomfortable 106:1
under-keel 146:13
under-utilization 75:15 140:20
understand 79:11 80:1 85:8,18 113:8 135:19 143:19 154:14
understanding 67:3
understood 58:3 123:9
underway 152:5
unfamiliar 158:21
UNH 168:4,6
unified 126:9
unit 21:4
United 9:17
universities 21:13
unpack 130:21
untenable 143:11
update 43:1 57:3 169:13
updates 116:5
updating 115:10
upstairs 6:1 109:4
urge 134:21 154:2,11 154:19
urgency 101:21
urges 134:21 154:4
USACE 155:6,19
usage 75:11 132:14 134:13 141:8,9
USAID 71:15
use 27:15,16 51:9 85:8 107:8 134:21 137:20 138:11 139:18 141:5 155:16 156:21
useful 43:7 50:9,14 54:6 63:20
user 80:7
users 15:22 80:4
uses 162:19
utilization 70:19 76:6 132:19 133:12
utilize 137:2

V

validating 12:11
validation 9:12
value 164:9
variety 57:8 175:16
various 43:13 76:20 124:14
Vegas 169:1
vendor 80:6
venue 47:1 120:9
verb 39:1
verbatim 88:13
verification 162:13
Verizon 22:2
version 106:14
versus 31:20 44:21
vessel 147:6
vessels 146:1,3,18,20 147:9,14
viable 84:10
vice 1:13 39:6 46:17 47:12 48:13 59:6 68:20 78:10,18 79:7 79:20 113:6 124:2,5 126:6,7 134:12,18 135:14 138:6 156:4 165:16 166:1,6 172:20
view 81:17
viewer 17:12 148:16,19
views 6:12
VIMS 21:9
violent 143:10
Virginia 23:12
virtually 96:11 170:4
visibility 114:22 157:21
vision 21:1 75:19 104:7
visit 169:10 175:7
visiting 170:22
visual 135:2
visualization 5:9 15:11
visualize 149:9
volunteer 54:20 62:12 62:18
volunteered 56:4,22 67:20 69:1,2 117:22
volunteers 66:16

W

W 1:16
wait 88:10 135:17 165:10
waiting 86:13
walk 35:11 49:8 157:9
want 6:10,11,20 7:5 19:2,5 24:5 29:7 32:11 35:3,3 43:14 44:1 49:20 52:3,22 53:7 54:16 55:9,16,22 57:9 58:19 61:1 66:13 67:7 68:16 69:10 75:20 76:5 77:14 79:2 80:6,6 83:6 84:14 85:2 90:2 91:13,13 93:13 94:7 97:1,4 99:20 100:4,11 115:18 117:17,20 118:21 119:3 120:8 121:15,20 123:11 127:13 129:12,21 130:5 132:5 134:4,6 138:11 140:3 146:10 146:16 150:9 152:16 153:3 160:12 164:21 172:19 175:2
wanted 41:16 49:21 50:1 92:2,3,14 134:14 149:21 174:3
wanting 148:18
wants 24:17 56:18 101:4,4 173:19
warranted 62:2
warrants 49:6
Washington 53:9 76:15 152:13 153:6 159:5
wasn't 103:14 129:18 136:17 139:1 148:3,6 156:6
wasted 48:17
watch 166:4
water 5:5,8 25:8 32:5 147:6
water-level 23:10
wave 148:16
way 6:19 8:2 13:5 15:9 15:12,15 20:5 42:1 51:5 52:15 55:11,14 56:1 61:6 65:18 67:9 78:10 92:21 98:1 100:5,8 101:22 103:8 105:17 111:15 115:13 117:10 128:11 136:7 143:6,9 149:1,8 152:20 169:3 170:3 171:11,17
ways 13:10 18:3,17 25:6 79:8 84:9,17 111:22
we'll 5:19 6:22 7:8 21:17 32:20 34:19 42:6,8,15 55:17 56:10 63:14 73:8 81:14 82:5 107:13 116:14 120:3 151:6 160:6 169:6 170:3
we're 4:4 17:13,22 25:7 28:8 31:2,15,17 34:11 42:11 45:5 51:12 53:4 53:4,19 56:17 59:7,16 61:2,17 69:9,12 72:15 73:1 75:1,4,7 76:11 77:16 79:8 86:20 88:18 90:20 93:15,16 95:9 96:22 98:12,14 100:12,16 101:10,16 103:19 104:7,8,11,11 104:12,14 110:12 116:7 117:1 120:3 121:19 122:10 124:5 125:2,19 126:1,17 129:13 130:16 132:9 132:13 134:16 139:5 141:2,13 142:4 143:1 145:20 146:11 147:22 149:13,18 150:3 151:15 152:1,15 154:12 157:8 161:17 166:5 170:7 173:1,17
we've 14:15 16:13 21:1 21:9 23:18 24:2 28:18 28:20 29:12 32:10 35:18 36:16 39:11 40:14 44:19 48:17 49:8,15,15 53:12 56:15 70:18 75:13 82:21 89:22 94:5,8 95:17 97:12 100:13 102:3 104:6,10 109:3 109:5 117:2 125:4 126:4 131:11,11 142:14 149:1 155:12 156:1 158:18 166:18 168:14 169:3,5,14 172:9,12 173:4 175:18
weak 51:2,14
Weather 135:17
web 117:5 148:14,16,19 149:2
webinar 33:20 81:18 99:7
webpage 10:4
website 34:3 49:3 50:4 113:16 114:12,22 115:10 116:2,3,5,7,10 116:17 117:4,11 140:22
Wednesday 42:14
Wednesday-Thursday 174:5
Wednesday-Thursda... 174:13
week 30:11 105:8 106:4 106:6,10 107:11 129:10
week/two 107:11
weeks 86:12 106:11,13 106:13,15 108:17,17 112:5,6 119:2 122:16 126:2
welcome 3:2 40:19 81:10 152:12
welcomes 144:17
went 7:12,21 14:15

21:15 33:7 81:8 86:5 109:3 111:1 158:8 166:21 168:8 171:7 173:6 174:4 175:22
weren't 87:15 109:20 137:15 164:2
West 1:11 72:9
whale 112:15 113:22 114:5
whales 72:4
whatnot 147:17
whipping 54:13
white 16:20 50:3 82:16
whole-type 33:19
whys 143:15
wide 151:1
widely 13:13,13
wider 146:17 165:3
WILLIAM 1:13
willing 10:12 55:12 66:17 91:8
Willis 159:4
window 146:4
winds 148:16
wise 170:1
wish 140:9 175:11
women 87:19
wonderful 102:18
wondering 28:17 174:4
word 64:18 126:10 128:13 136:4 138:11 144:21 154:3 155:20 159:19
worded 132:4 136:16
wording 153:8
words 47:10 76:5,8 150:21 153:18
wordsmithing 102:9 108:12 130:15
work 3:7,10,19 5:11,15 6:7,17 7:22 11:16 14:9,15 17:16 18:4 19:22 32:13,17,18 34:19 37:22 40:1 42:12 55:15 59:4 65:1 80:22 85:10 115:13 115:14,16 130:10 136:12 158:10 161:5 170:2 172:10 175:1
workable 114:21
worked 115:5,6 120:17 161:15
workgroup 119:14
workgroups 117:18
working 3:11,19 4:17 7:1,9,20 12:22 16:16 20:10 21:4,7 32:17,19 32:21,22 33:11 35:2,8 35:11 36:12 38:4,11 38:15,20 39:12 40:11 40:13,15 41:1,5,15,19 41:21 42:3,7,8,12,14 42:15 43:1,6,12,19,22 44:2,8 45:15,18 46:14 46:16 49:14,16 50:15 52:11,18,20 53:3,16 53:17 54:2,5,8 55:11 56:9,19 57:10,13,21 58:4,5,5,6,8,14,18,22 60:5,20 61:9 62:4,8 62:16 63:1,19 64:1,2 64:15 65:19 66:3 67:18 70:1,11 71:8 74:2,6 75:5 76:10 81:14,15 85:13 117:14,16 118:1,7 119:7,16,20 127:5,14 127:21 128:7,10,14 128:20,22 129:19 130:8 152:10 161:12 164:12,15 172:10 173:15
works 136:8 146:2
workshop 30:12,22
worst-case 27:21
worth 157:1
wouldn't 47:8,15 73:4 133:14
Wow 14:12
wrap 47:1
wrap-up 90:15 173:22
wraps 99:1
WRDA 151:9
write 101:6 134:1
writeups 94:10
written 128:17
wrong 133:18 155:6 170:20
wrote 131:20 157:19 169:18

X

Y

yeah 14:5 17:18 28:2,2 28:3,7,22 29:12,14,20 30:6
year 21:1 28:12,16 39:21 49:2 64:11 135:8,22 137:18 138:22 139:4 140:5 142:5 172:15
year's 171:10
years 9:11 13:18,19 28:11 38:8 50:22 115:15 135:15,16 137:8,8,13 139:3 165:6 166:21 168:9
yesterday 4:8 5:10,13 5:20 8:1 36:13 42:13 89:12 150:2 156:17
yesterday's 6:4,8
York 13:18 25:18

Z

Zdenka 159:4
zoning 27:5
zoom 35:20

0

04 168:7

1

1 40:15 59:10 60:3 127:6,10 146:13 159:18
1,000 146:12
1,800 82:10 104:1
1:13 81:9
10 1:8 50:1 69:9 70:3,12 89:12 153:17,21
10-minute 89:5
10.74 146:14
10:16 33:7
10:30 7:3
10:42 33:8
100 32:3 93:1 136:3
11 159:7 162:5
11:45 80:19
11:46 81:8
144 76:8
15 89:12
15-minute 33:4
150 76:5
170 137:13
173 3:20
180 139:4

2

2 3:2 41:2,5,20 42:4,7 44:8,9 127:5,6,10,14
2.0 11:12 151:6
20 10:20 59:3,10,11
20-some 23:12
200-year 131:17
2003 168:7
2008 30:10
2009 167:12
201-year 131:16
2010 20:4 167:4,22 168:1
2011 167:4
2012 35:12 167:22
2014 135:8 138:10,14
2015 1:8 37:2
2016 165:12,13
223 137:12
224 137:13
24 105:5
29th 4:4 81:11 173:9 175:12

3

3 42:8,16 80:13 127:14 147:15
3:26 173:6
3:30 173:2
3:50 173:7
3:53 175:22
30 21:13 83:11 100:11 104:18 122:4,13 156:13
300 59:11

4

4 3:4 28:15 173:17
4,000 147:15
40 135:16
45 6:6,16 29:19 122:13
45-day 83:10
48 38:15

5

5 3:5 29:19 48:9,11 60:3
500 20:16
58 134:16,17 136:19 139:5,22
58.6 75:16 76:6 135:5 135:12 137:3 138:4 140:20
59 59:10

6

6 3:8 59:1
60 132:2

7

7 3:11
701 1:11

8

8:30 1:11
8:35 4:2
8:39 7:12
80 3:13 126:4 135:16,21
80/20 126:3
81 3:16

9

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Hydrographic Services Review Panel

Before: US DOC/NOAA

Date: 04-10-15

Place: Long Beach, CA

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Neal R Gross

Court Reporter