

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL

JANUARY 26, 2006

Reported by: An N. Chau

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX

	PAGE
Mr. Dave Zilkoski.....	13
Mr. Mike Snyder.....	57
Panel Deliberations.....	96

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. RAINEY: Good morning. I'd like to
2 start out, and a large thanks to Captain Nick Nurkin
3 (phonetic) with the Houston Pilots Association for the
4 reception last night.

5 MS. BROHL: Thank you, Sherri.

6 MR. RAINEY: Welcome to our public meeting.
7 We have a sign-up sheet so that will help us. I'd just
8 like to start out kind of following up on last night's
9 recognition of Captain Parsons. We have something we
10 would like recognize him today. So the Helen, can you
11 give me a hand with that? Thanks to Helen for pulling
12 this together. I'll just quickly go over part of the
13 citation here.

14 "To Captain Roger L. Parsons, Director of
15 NOAA's Office of Coast Survey and Designated Federal
16 Officer of the Hydrographic Services Review Pane:
17 Whereas, the Hydrographic Services Review Panel is a
18 federal advisory committee under the National Oceanic
19 and Atmospheric Administration, created by Congress in
20 the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 2002;

21 Whereas, the Panel was established to
22 advise the Administrator of NOAA on hydrographic
23 services provided by the National Ocean Service; and

24 Whereas, the Panel has provided
25 recommendations to the Administrator of NOAA in support

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 of navigation safety and the protection of valuable
2 coastal areas to ensure the vitality of these programs
3 and functions; and

4 Whereas, the Panel owes a debt of gratitude
5 to Captain Roger Parsons for his ongoing leadership and
6 tireless support of the establishment of the Panel and
7 its fulfillment of the Congressional mandate to advise
8 on hydrographic services; and

9 Whereas, Captain Parsons has been an
10 advocate of safe navigation and the protection of our
11 natural resources through his professional duties with
12 NOAA and the Panel;

13 Whereas, the Panel members have developed a
14 deep respect and admiration for his dedication and
15 friendship;

16 Now, therefore, the hydrographic Services
17 Review Panel commends Captain Parsons for his years of
18 steadfast service to NOAA, the Panel and its members
19 and recognizes his significant contributions to the
20 navigation services programs of the United States."

21 And then we have our names listed.
22 Captain.

23 MR. PARSONS: Thank you very much. This is
24 nice. I appreciate. It certainly was not necessary.
25 I've enjoyed my interaction with the Panel and the

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 individual members. I think this Panel certainly took
2 a while to get some traction, but I think it has a lot
3 to offer to NOAA, and I think in the coming years and
4 coming months, certainly we'll see that reflected. I
5 appreciate this. I appreciate your support for our
6 programs, and I think we're going to see better things
7 ahead for navigation services. Thank you.

8 MS. BROHL: If we could, why don't you take
9 a picture of this. Take a picture in front of the NOAA
10 stuff and get a photo.

11 MR. RAINEY: Thank you so much. Roger, I
12 decided we're going to stipulate that the mission here.
13 I think we've gone over that real quick. I'm going to
14 jump right into -- just quick review of the last
15 briefing I have with. If you look under Tab 0, also in
16 your notebook, that's the package that went for.

17 This is coming out of our New Hampshire
18 meeting and the subsequent Congress call we had to vote
19 on those recommendations. Frankly, it's a clean
20 package with essentially just those recommendations. A
21 very short cover letter -- just to -- as a transmittal
22 device.

23 Helen and I were discussing, and that she
24 had an important meeting she attended, and I attended,
25 and also with the Vice Admiral John Swallow, and Mike

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Snyder, who has joined us today, who will present
2 briefing. Michael Dutackus (phonetic), he's Captain
3 Lautenbacher's policy adviser on the committee for
4 transportation. So I got a chance to meet Mike, and we
5 went over our recommendations, and I certainly won't
6 read it all to you. It will be presented.

7 I had a chance to walk through with the
8 Admiral. We had a very lengthy meeting, so we did get
9 some of the details in what I thought, and I tried to
10 hit the highlights of many of the recommendations, and
11 we had the meeting forwarded in New Hampshire. And,
12 again, we had basically three sets.

13 We had the ones on mapping, charting,
14 contracting policy. And included in that were some
15 fairly detailed recommendations on the -- and the
16 expansion for contracting and also the CORS
17 capabilities and the notion of both NOAA's CORS
18 capabilities and the view for contracting that's
19 legitimate and supported by the Panel.

20 We talked about the -- went over -- The
21 second one is hydrographic survey cost analysis, and
22 some of the different recommendations we had. There,
23 again, we had appended to that the methods and
24 procedures that we were given. So that was part of the
25 package. And then the roles and the integrated Ocean

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Service System, and talked about our clear vision of
2 the existing navigation services.

3 Again, out of that meeting, Mr. David
4 Zilkoski joins us today. He has a very good role in
5 the relation to NOAA. I think we've got some good
6 timing discussions falling out of that briefing today
7 with Mike and Dave. That will be part of our
8 discussion. The Admiral asked me to express his
9 appreciation to the Panel for their work. And I do
10 believe that our efforts have kind of grown in his
11 perception and input. I think that he sees that we're
12 making some headway.

13 So we keep that open. I know the Admiral
14 has mentioned that to set this up would be -- with the
15 helping idea that he could be here, and I know he had
16 plan to do that but something else came up. So
17 Mr. Keeney was here, and I think that was a positive
18 thing. Essentially, that was the briefing, and if
19 there's any questions on that. I'll go ahead and turn
20 it over to Roger, then, to update where we are as to
21 the recommendations on the agency at this time.

22 MR. PARSONS: Two items in particular I
23 want to bring to your attention. One, is on your input
24 for the Mapping Contracting Policy and Expansion of
25 Contracting Strategies. We have revised the 1990 NOS

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Mapping Charting Contracting Policy. It is being
2 vetted through NOS at this point. And the goal is to
3 have it. If you recall, it required us to place the
4 revised policy of the federal register.

5 We will do so in mid-February, permit three
6 months public comments. And then based on the public
7 comments, do whatever revisions are thought best by the
8 organization, and then republish the final contracting
9 policy of the federal register. So we're talking May,
10 June time frame final policy. So within two weeks,
11 roughly mid-February, the revised policy will be posted
12 of the federal register.

13 Most of the comments that were provided by
14 the Panel were incorporated in that draft that's
15 circulating NOS right now. With regards to the
16 hydrographic survey cost analysis, again, we
17 incorporated the comments of the Panel in the finalized
18 statement of work. Unfortunately, we've had to put
19 that on the back burner due to cuts in coast survey.
20 The estimated cost for contract for the study was in
21 the neighborhood of 100 to 120 K.

22 Coast survey suffered nearly two and a half
23 million dollars in unexpected cuts in '06. This is
24 after the '06 appropriation. So what I will do is wait
25 until the end of FY '06 to determine what the

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 discretionary funds remain. Hopefully, I will have
2 sufficient funds at that time to award the contract and
3 obligate the funding for that. If not, we will then
4 hopefully do that early '07. I do have folks that
5 there will be sufficient funding in the end of '06 to
6 award that contract and continue that study.

7 If you recall, the survey cost analysis was
8 one of three pieces of the study that the Office Marine
9 Aviation Operations has contracted for perspective
10 fleet alternatives. The third part of that study was
11 going to be the cost analysis. The first two parts,
12 which directly address a fleet alternative, is under
13 way right now. I don't know when that will be
14 complete, but we can at any time add our staple work
15 and obligated funds for that piece we are involved in.
16 Comments or questions?

17 MS. BROHL: Scott, what was your sense of
18 the administrator's reception at the meeting? I ask
19 that only because the first meeting you had you
20 couldn't tell whether he was up to -- you know, had
21 enough information about the Panel. I wouldn't say
22 lack of support for the Panel, but we kind of felt as
23 if we're going to do a little more work to get him to
24 recognize how we could be value. And I'm just curious
25 what you thought his response was at this meeting.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. RAINEY: Well, my sense was it was a
2 very sincere meeting. And going back to the comments I
3 made, I do feel like that we've -- I think we have
4 provided some comments and the work and the feedback I
5 think that he's been through with Roger and through the
6 agency. I think it has given him a more positive
7 outlook on this, and I think encouraged by the work
8 we're doing.

9 There are certainly challenges in the
10 overall budget. I know we'll talk a lot about that
11 today. We're going to try to make some time in the
12 agenda today. We're going to try to focus in on some
13 of those things, and I would really appreciate the
14 members' inputs and the talks last night about some of
15 the ideas we might be able to keep to improve on.

16 But I felt and I think others -- and
17 Admiral Wesley (phonetic) put me in the briefing -- but
18 I do believe that there is not -- I think there's a
19 sincere interest in that and appreciation for the work
20 that we're doing, and I think if we keep that -- keep
21 kind of striving to contact with the various elements,
22 and understand the workings of the agency. Again, like
23 I said, having Dave and Mike here today I think is
24 really great. I think having Mr. Keeney here yesterday
25 and Roger's continued support in our work and all our

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 program office working with us, I think we're making
2 progress. That's my honest sense.

3 And I think, equally though, that we need
4 to keep expressing our concerns in some of the areas
5 that we talked about. As we measure our progress --
6 one of it is obviously the budget and appropriations.
7 Look at the challenges and the look at the program. So
8 I think that there's a good relationship, standards are
9 improving.

10 MS. BROHL: I appreciate that -- I mean, I
11 think if there's something that relates to line office,
12 you know, to Roger, to Mike, and now Dave, I think that
13 they clearly hear it, see it. It doesn't have to go to
14 the administrative and then hand it back to them and
15 say, "Hey, these are good."

16 I think they can hear it directly. It's
17 only when it comes to overall NOAA policy issues that
18 I -- I -- you know, it's extremely important that there
19 be serious consideration of them, because we're going
20 to be doing -- you know, be dealing in a more broad
21 policy aspect. I think that's where I get nervous.
22 That perhaps they can just become part of -- just lost
23 in the huge mandate that NOAA has. And it's huge. It
24 isn't just our portion. So as we watch it --

25 MR. RAINEY: I share the concern. One of

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 the things -- In fact, I took advantage of Mr. Keeney
2 being here the other day, and I asked him questions
3 along those lines. I had some concerns. A couple of
4 things we would like to do is explore the opportunity
5 to bringing the policy shops through DFO or whatever is
6 the appropriate mechanism, and the strategic planning
7 office.

8 We just learned Tuesday that they're doing
9 a change in course in the stakeholders' meeting. I
10 think that -- I can follow up on that and find out what
11 the inputs are. There's been a recent change where the
12 Goal Team leaders are now going to be meeting on a
13 regular basis with Vice Admiral. There seems to be
14 things in the work that will continue to improve and to
15 integrate the policy shop with the line offices.

16 We're certainly working to try to find out
17 how fast we can interact and contribute to the BBS
18 (phonetic) program and the policy, long term,
19 critiquing things and not just -- obviously, we work
20 most closely with the line office, but I think we are
21 striving to also see how we can be effective up on that
22 chain. One of the things the administrator did suggest
23 to me, and I haven't followed up on it is -- I should
24 say I attempt to follow up on, in the process of
25 following up on -- is that Dr. Gary Nass (phonetic),

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 who is on the Science Advisory Board, to find out or
2 coordinate a little bit about some of their activities
3 and some of the things we've been through. So we are
4 trying to do something from there, continue to work on
5 that.

6 MR. ZILKOSKI: I don't know if you guys
7 talked yesterday, but you know you have a new LSNH
8 (phonetic), and that will be good to have some of the
9 leadership here to go in and talk to Jack and getting a
10 briefing. Now, Jack, seems to have it once a week so
11 that those -- you had Steve Barnum here with the Corps.
12 Once, again, trying to bring those pieces together and
13 move forward. But I highly suggest you get in with
14 Jack as soon as possible.

15 I have a meeting with him Friday afternoon,
16 and I will bring it up that you guys will do that
17 because he's asking all offices to talk about what's
18 important. I'll bring it up.

19 MS. BROHL: Will there be a briefing -- I
20 know he's got lots of things to learn and lots of
21 briefing to get, but if the -- I don't know who would
22 be responsible from the Panel to actually get to
23 Mr. Donogan (phonetic) a package of our recommendations
24 at this point.

25 MR. PARSONS: That's where it's been set

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 up. Tim Keeney has asked for a similar history and
2 recommendation. He's very interested in it. And we
3 prepared one for Jack, as well. As I mentioned the
4 other day in my meeting with Jack a week ago, he's very
5 much interested in participating and attending very
6 future -- near future, I should say, future HSRP
7 meeting.

8 MS. BROHL: And, Dave, I don't know if you
9 had the chance to notice that in the -- if you have a
10 book, in the -- under "O", where it has a list of the
11 findings from last time, the recommendations, we do
12 actually address IOOS and.

13 MR. ZILKOSKI: I read it.

14 MS. BROHL: I just want to make sure you
15 saw that, and perhaps when you have some time you'd
16 like to read it.

17 MR. ZILKOSKI: I think we're going to talk
18 a little about that.

19 MR. PARSONS: In fact, I recommend, before
20 we move out to Mike's presentation, I know there was a
21 number of questions about FY '06 discretionary items
22 funds, and what the processes is for allocating those.
23 I suggest before Mike comes on board, Dave, if you take
24 some time to discuss that right now?

25 MR. ZILKOSKI: Sure. Now, IOOS, first off,

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 is not just NOS. It is NOAA. And it involves many
2 different programs in NOAA. 45 programs, and 28 of
3 them are IOOS related. The part that many people are
4 hearing about is the portion that does come directly to
5 NOS. It gets assigned NOS. Now, inside the NOAA,
6 because of the IOOS's activities, they've been pretty
7 proactive in trying to organize so that we can handle
8 some of these issues that come up.

9 They named an IOOS project -- Well, first
10 of all, they named IOOS as a major product inside NOAA,
11 which means that record files that meet certain
12 requirements, thoughts or forms that would be important
13 to the NOAA executives in certain way. But in that,
14 one of the things that's required is implementation
15 plans and schedules of cost and so forth.

16 But that was a big thing. In doing that,
17 they named the project, which was me. We also named a
18 deputy, which is Mike Johnson out of our OAR research
19 arm of NOAA, to handle because he is the climate --
20 global climate manager. IOOS is used both global and
21 coastal. So they had a deputy they named. And then
22 they also named Kirch Donnelley (phonetic), which is
23 out of NESDIS, NOAA's Demat (phonetic) focal point.
24 Demat is one of the major and most important aspect of
25 trying to implement the IOOS.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 So NOAA has actually tried to set up a
2 structure to help with this kind of process. But it
3 was still not having enough momentum. So what they did
4 is gave a briefing to the leadership, and they asked us
5 what we needed. So they assigned a small group called
6 focal groups right now, representing the lines and the
7 goals. It's a group about seven individuals working
8 together. They started working on this implementation
9 plan, if you will.

10 What's needed? What are the observations
11 we need? How many? How many PORTS systems do we need?
12 How many buoys do we need? And how many different fish
13 service? Remember, it's -- You're talking about -- in
14 IOOS it's dealing with biological, chemical, all of
15 these type of -- more than just the physical
16 observations that you have. So we have a lot of
17 different programs that have these different elements.

18 So in putting that together to try to build
19 a plan so it wouldn't be a cost schedule so that we
20 would have a mechanism to go up to NOAA leadership and
21 say, "These are IOOS's priorities. These are the
22 priorities and we're moving down through, and these are
23 the ones we think are important." And they're asking
24 for it. I just briefed the -- what's called the net in
25 NOAA, which is all of the administrative, the Deputy

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Administrative System, the DAA.

2 So along with these line offices, the
3 second in command. That was why I couldn't be here
4 Tuesday. And then Wednesday they said, "Well, we need
5 you to go to the next", which is all of the NAAs. So I
6 did. That's where the Admiral was, and Scott Rader and
7 Jack Kelly, which are the top three people of NOAA.
8 And they're recognizing the need. So that's a little
9 bit of history where we're at, at this point.

10 Now, in the money that comes to NOS,
11 there's some money that's called POTS, Postal Ocean
12 Technical Service. That money comes in, and that's
13 basically what people are saying what they call
14 regional money. It's money that goes out to regions.
15 And they're through grants and so forth. Approximately
16 \$25 million. But those are the earmarks in our budget
17 that goes out.

18 There's another series of money that comes
19 to NOS of about \$4 million that goes to NEBC (phonetic)
20 for 40 upgrades. So if you look at NOAA's budget,
21 you've got -- I don't know how many earmarks but it's
22 pretty well detailed of what we've got going. And then
23 there's another pile of money that's labeled about \$16
24 million. That's the money that comes in and says,
25 "Okay. We have to use that." That's where you have

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 some discretion of where you're going.

2 Now, NOAA is trying to take the lead role
3 in how to implement IOOS, but IOOS is not just NOAA.
4 There are ten agencies that are involved. It's called
5 external. So these agencies were all part of trying to
6 say what IOOS is about and the priorities; Congress and
7 the President and others are. You have to -- We're
8 leading by example, but we're also leading by trying to
9 work together.

10 And there's an implementation plan at
11 www.ocean.us. In there there's an implementation plan
12 or development plan. That's what we use as our
13 guidance. There's a lot of guidance in there of saying
14 what IOOS should be and what the federal government
15 should be trying to do. In there it talks about
16 standing up these [ocean.us](http://www.ocean.us) and the infrastructure,
17 building the regional associations up to build some of
18 the infrastructure. Demat was talked about.

19 And so their higher priorities are trying
20 to get those things in place so that you're able to do
21 the first thing first. And that's getting things that
22 are out there already in the system interoperable
23 (phonetic) so people can use them, and then focus on
24 getting things integrated, and then focus on getting
25 things built up to where you need them, and try to

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 figure out what you really want. Where are the gaps?
2 Where you need them?

3 So in that -- this money that we have
4 inside NOS, those are the kind of things that -- and
5 that's where our priorities are. Standing up to RA,
6 negotiate ideas, Demat, and then some things that
7 basically -- where we have our major gaps that people
8 say we need to be able to get.

9 How are we going to try to make the
10 decisions about that? We have some things that we
11 already agreed to do. Like the ocean.us funding that
12 regional associations that the infrastructure funded,
13 and all of those things. And so Demat probably agreed
14 to do about what all the other agencies do. So out of
15 that 16 million, you end up with something around 3.5.,
16 3.6 million dollars left that you really got the
17 discretionary funding.

18 So in that process inside NOAA, we have set
19 up a group that are out there in this focus group
20 that's going to evaluate proposals that come in to say,
21 "What is the best things that we can do to help move
22 IOOS from a NOAA perspective". And they're working
23 with their partners. That's what the regional
24 association and other federal agencies come with these
25 actual plans. How can we work together? How can we

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 leverage existing funds, and move items based on
2 priorities set forth in this development plan?

3 So we're having a retreat -- These
4 proposals are coming in and due by the end, the 31st.
5 But we're having a retreat next week to talk more about
6 that. But really, deep down in black white from a NOAA
7 perspective, what's -- what is the national backbone?
8 What is it that we really need to do now, today? How
9 do we make -- how do we make these decisions that
10 you're talking about? How do we gather support for
11 some of the programs that aren't getting support that
12 we think we need? How do we move it forward? And this
13 group inside NOAA is putting that together from a NOAA
14 perspective.

15 So our first goal is to get NOAA act
16 together and start in on it. At the same time, the
17 federal. They were doing the same thing with the Owe
18 federal agency by, "Here's what we've done, and here's
19 what we think it is. What do you think of U.S. Corps
20 of Engineers? How do you bring your stuff together?
21 How do we work together to accomplish that?"

22 So that is sort of how it is and how we're
23 trying to work through the system. I think maybe if
24 you've got specific questions, I can address those.

25 MR. RAINEY: I'd like to start. I'm sure

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 we have probably a little bit. One of the things is
2 they structured our analyst, they got us set up and
3 designate this stuff with special government employees,
4 and I don't know if you'd be willing or able to share
5 the information from your briefings, but as far as the
6 priorities or would that be possible?

7 MS. BROHL: Well, we're in a public
8 session.

9 MR. RAINEY: Well, I don't mean today, but
10 down the road that might be helpful. The other idea I
11 have is any briefing we be -- we could provide you with
12 a package of all of our IOOSs-related recommendations.
13 Would you carry that forward to the retreat in the next
14 week, and have that as an input, if that would be
15 possible?

16 MR. ZILKOSKI: Yes. I believe that is my
17 role. My role is to try to gather all the requirements
18 and recommendations and take it to this group and say,
19 "Here's what this community is saying." And there's
20 other people that are on this. Ridge Edway (phonetic)
21 works for Mike, who is the NTS. He's on this focus
22 group. I definitely will bring it to him.

23 After the briefings, once -- once I go
24 through the -- that, I go through the Net (phonetic),
25 then I can start taking it out to other -- I've got to

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 get clearance to even talk and say some of the things I
2 can't even say to my own employees until they buy into
3 it and say, "Yeah, that's what -- We agree with it."
4 That's not a problem. I think I can get them to agree
5 to that before I brief them, but I am getting on the
6 next agenda. That was a recommendation by deputies.
7 So generally, when they make that recommendation, it
8 happens fairly quick.

9 Certainly, your next meeting I can come
10 prepared to talk about all these things. Lay down our
11 priorities and sit through what we've done, how we've
12 done, what we've spent, and some of the future stuff
13 that basically I can talk to my employees about, and
14 I'm willing to do that-

15 MS. BROHL: What frustrates me in what you
16 said is we had \$16 million, and after we gave it to the
17 people we had predetermined a long time ago should
18 always get it, then we have a couple of million dollars
19 which, "Oh, by the way, you -- we don't believe should
20 go to the backbone programs, or we're going to talk
21 about that." So does industry have to come with a
22 proposal and can get a piece of the pie, too, in order
23 to get it into these backbone programs?

24 The frustration is -- and I -- and I -- is
25 that I know ocean.us has its origins, and I understand

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 that when industry finally realize what IOOSs was, they
2 were two years down the road in creating this entity,
3 had been to the Hill. The Hill allot proposed IOOSs,
4 which had a very small vision at that time. And
5 industry says, "Well, wait a minute, if there are truly
6 seven sides of the goals, then where are the other six
7 interests in this? It seems like only one of those
8 goal interests were in the -- on the playing field.

9 So I think that that ocean.us go back and
10 kind of re-examine their implementation as a result of
11 having some outside -- some of these other interests.
12 Somebody may say, "Hey, you know, it truly is supposed
13 to be more broadly based." So my concern is a little
14 bit if you say, "Oh, we got \$16 million, but ocean.us.
15 already told us how to spend it." I get nervous that
16 it's just more of a saying, and that predetermining
17 where it goes without still looking at the -- what
18 the -- looking at the big picture first.

19 And Admiral West said something yesterday,
20 which is really true; that results we somehow get off
21 of how it's been done before, we're all going to be ---
22 a lot of elbows in the kitchen trying to grab money,
23 which isn't productive at all. So me, I still think
24 there's \$16 million out there that was, know you --
25 that absolutely should be applied to the backbone

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 programs that we talk about all the time, applicable to
2 the HSI, which does subject to appropriations, and
3 those are appropriations that should be applied to
4 those programs.

5 It's inexcusable that Congress cuts the
6 PORTS administration right in half. It's kind of
7 inexcusable that you get \$16 and don't look at the
8 baseline program and say, "Wow, this is huge." If we
9 lose these backbone programs, then we can't even move
10 forward to expand on them or go to regions. So I hear
11 what you say, and I'm really glad to hear that there's
12 going to be a pow-wow, and that you got representation
13 from a broad base of people. It isn't just one person
14 making the decisions anymore.

15 That's great. And we look forward that the
16 message in your retreat is that can we fix what we have
17 already before we create them, or how can we be
18 holistic about this, and address all the seven goals
19 under IOOS and not just those that have the best
20 lobbyist, which clearly is not industry right now.

21 MR. ZILKOSKI: Yeah. I -- I guess the only
22 thing I can say is that we're -- I personally, because
23 I'm the project manager, am trying to move this in a
24 slightly different direction and get us to where you
25 want to be. It takes time, it does, to move us

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 forward. Because it's not that ocean.us. is telling
2 us -- it's not really that they're telling us. It's
3 basically this is what all the federal agencies are
4 saying. Really, ocean.us. is just all the feds, and
5 NOAA is trying to weed it, but you can't do it alone.

6 But there's over \$1 billion spent in IOOS.
7 And NOAA, in particular, spends six or seven hundred
8 million dollars. So when you start talking about
9 people saying they've got a shortfall here or there,
10 everybody has a shortfall here or there. It's the
11 decision people make in terms of realigning. My goal
12 is to address what really is the backbone. What is the
13 national backbone? What is it that we should be
14 funding and how do we fund it? And then that's
15 outright -- it's not really outright. They're still
16 talking about it.

17 And I've heard this over and over again.
18 And as a matter of fact, there's another meeting with
19 the Goo (phonetic) Steering Committee that's saying,
20 "The things that you're asking, though, what is it?"
21 People say this is what it is. It's everything. It's
22 big. How do you really identify that this is what the
23 backbone is, this is how we're going to -- who is going
24 to do it.

25 This is the federal role, this is the state

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 role, this is the regional role, and outright the goals
2 and responsibilities, and then you can come in and
3 start making those decisions and those priorities. You
4 can say, "Well, we didn't get the funding here. This
5 is -- this is where it goes."

6 So I hope to, in my time now this year,
7 move that group forward to be able to make those
8 decisions and have the infrastructure inside NOAA such
9 that when anyone make these decisions, any priorities.
10 We're never going to have that money to do everything
11 we want to do. But we don't have an outline. There's
12 no written document inside NOAA that clearly says that
13 these are --

14 This briefing I put together defines it.
15 We basically wrote the program and said, we're trying
16 to get our own program, again, to say, "We're part of
17 IOOS, and these are our priorities." And we'll take
18 the water level of the PORTS. They've got NWLON,
19 they've got the tides and currents. They've got PORTS
20 in there, and money in the whole programs, \$30 million
21 or whatever it was.

22 So it's a mission that we need to
23 rethink -- in my mind, we need to rethink some of our
24 way of doing business. Maybe some of the things we
25 need to do that we -- inside our own organization, look

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 and prioritize some of that. Look at how -- in this
2 case we're talking about PORTS right now -- I mean,
3 you've got tides, waterways and currents. And it's all
4 part of PORTS. So there isn't there a way we can look
5 at how inside our own thing, first, what are our
6 priorities, and just keep adding money that we could be
7 able to do more and more. We have to -- we're not
8 going to get more and more money. We have to rethink
9 about that.

10 The other thing I'm going to try and push
11 is regional groups and working with NOAA and the other
12 agencies, and how do we really change the way -- what
13 the federal government does to what the private
14 industry does, as well as the states and locals, and
15 the processing of data and the data acquisition and the
16 QAC (phonetic). I probably didn't answer your
17 question, Helen.

18 MS. BROHL: I wanted to express the ongoing
19 frustration. And here's a real day-to-day problem
20 right now with the way in which NOAA kind of
21 presupposed how IOOS should look by creating regional
22 associations, because we all agree that the idea of
23 regional strategic planning is an excellent idea.
24 Clearly, you're going to have different needs in
25 different areas, and I think we respect that concept.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 But from a practical point of view, NOAA
2 gave money and said, "Okay. Here, pick some people
3 around the country," and said, "Now, you create a
4 regional association. We'll give you money to do
5 that." Now, they did it in the Great Lakes, and it
6 went to an organization that I respect, the Great Lakes
7 Commission. But then Great Lakes Commission hired
8 somebody to be their Great Lakes Observing System pro.
9 A person who actually understands the maritime
10 components pretty darn well. Maybe even better than
11 most regional association who come really more strictly
12 from a university research. So that's a good thing.

13 But in the practical side here -- Now, the
14 Great Lakes Observing System thinks that they need a
15 big -- "Hey, man, I see observing system people.
16 Regional associations is getting earmarks and money."
17 "Well, I want my piece of the pie." So now they've
18 gone to Congress without talking to any of the steering
19 committee people and said, "We want \$4 million in '07."

20 So now, every year the Great Lakes has
21 built an incredibly good observing system on very small
22 money, unfortunately by earmark, which I hate, by the
23 way. And I'd love to see it somehow, you know, rolled
24 into NWLON. I think that's the way to go. But, the
25 fact is -- Now, from a practical point of view,

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Congress, or the leaders that have helped us out, to
2 help build this observing system, this backbone
3 observing system, are going to go, "Well, why do we
4 need to give \$2 million for that observing system,
5 which goes to NOAA, to provide a good backbone when
6 we're going to give it to GLOSS (phonetic) now for \$4
7 million?"

8 So now that will shut down our observing
9 system, and giving it to some people to build a
10 bureaucracy because that's what \$4 million will go for.
11 And they talk about, "Well, we'll allocate some of it
12 out." Okay. That's great, but I can tell you, it's
13 not going to go \$2 million back to NOAA.

14 So here in a practical point of view is
15 that the creation of this new bureaucracy, new money,
16 is now in direct competition. It wasn't meant to be
17 that way, and I don't think they mean it to be that
18 way. But the confusion now I'm dealing with is, "Oh
19 my, God, I'm going to have to go back and say, 'Don't
20 give them \$4 million. Really, give us two" -- you
21 know, not "us", but it goes to NOAA to support a really
22 good --

23 It's such a great example of how you can
24 build almost a PORTS-like system for pennies, which
25 we've done in the Great Lakes. So the practical side

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 of this is it's killing us, and that's unfortunate
2 because they really don't want to be in competition
3 with the development of a regional strategic planning.
4 But it all comes down to saying, you know, "Oh, hi" --
5 Sea grants, and they're saying, "Hey, I want some of
6 that money." And it's like, "Wait, wait, wait."

7 The physical observations from these
8 programs, the backbone programs, everybody uses. All
9 the stakeholders use them, but the Congress is not
10 true. If you're going to do some invasive species
11 observations, maritime is not going to use that. But
12 all those physical observations that maritime needs are
13 used by the resource men, are used by the research
14 people, are used by the recreational components.

15 So the frustration is, "Oh, man," you know.
16 It's kind of created this bit of a monster,
17 unintentionally, that those of us in it, you know, in
18 maritime -- And there are a lot of maritime people
19 getting involved with the regional associations. I
20 respect that. We really did bang on the door and
21 worked our way in. So that's the concern.

22 MR. ZILKOSKI: Yeah, I hear you. And it's
23 my concern, also. And I -- I see the monster every
24 day, and I don't like earmarks either. And you come in
25 and you've got to spend it a certain way then you know,

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 you have to listen to what they want. One of the
2 things that NOAA keep saying is we've got to get rid of
3 these earmarks, and comes in to us that we couldn't put
4 the money out in the way we think we see fit.

5 But, also, we need to develop this plan of
6 where would we spend it? If the money came, how would
7 you spend it, and with some details. And that's sort
8 of where we're trying to get at. And it's good to see
9 that we're getting engaged with the regional
10 associations. And, once again, I may be able to help
11 in that aspect because I talk to a lot of these groups,
12 and I have been pushing for them to more and more to
13 the implication to look at all of their requirements
14 and their users, and then see how that fits.

15 It's not a perfect world, I agree. But
16 once again, this is what we dealt with. This is what
17 we've got to work with. I mean, our goal should not be
18 here. We should be there. And the thing is that
19 here's the money in the pot, here's the priorities that
20 we're doing, and this is where it's going to be spent
21 at the time.

22 So we have to and if this is where it's
23 going to spent try to work through -- working together
24 at this. And others can try to help and try to get
25 that money rolled up into NOAA or USGS or someone's

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 budget to make this thing happen. But until then, it's
2 a hard thing. Once you get earmarks, it's hard to get
3 people to move those earmarks to something else.

4 MR. DASLER: I just want to comment. We're
5 all worried about the CORS capability and CORS mission
6 within NOAA is woefully underfunded. It's critical.
7 It's not just to support the survey backlogs. A lot of
8 companies is being underfunded. We try to do
9 integration and we try to merge the money in and spread
10 it out. And then the other day when we were over at
11 the Coast Guard -- they're being hit a lot in bringing
12 Homeland Security. And one of their key statements
13 that really struck home is, "Okay. We know we have to
14 take on these new roles and new tasks, but don't mess
15 with our budget." We need to maintain that funding.

16 It just seems to me that what's happening
17 is a lot of the CORS -- the funding for the CORS
18 mission for NOAA is being impacted in support of all of
19 these new things that are coming on line. It's in a
20 downward spiral. Something's got to happen to bring
21 that up.

22 MR. ZILKOSKI: Yeah, and you're right about
23 that. That's where some of -- Sometimes it becomes a
24 game. You're throwing so much money out there. NOAA
25 is very load in today's world of budget, budget cuts

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 and so forth, but they've also been earmarked to say
2 this is where you're going to spend the money . So
3 that doesn't help.

4 Once again, I go back to this -- this
5 inside NOAA saying, "How are we going to spend it and
6 agreed upon", and NOAA making it a major project in
7 developing a cost schedule. We can gain within inside
8 NOAA, but when will we be able to say, "These are our
9 priorities, and these are where the money needs to
10 come. And additional money, this is where it goes"?
11 That's not really done. I mean, everybody has it.
12 You've got this development plan and it double have
13 specifics. We're developing the specifics.

14 And if I -- in this briefing that I put
15 together talks about the number of PORTS, the number of
16 biological. It talks specifics about what it would
17 take. It goes out to -- Like in the biological world,
18 they talk about fiscal 2047. So you get a reality
19 check-up. What does that really mean? How can you
20 move forward? So you focus on a couple of years so
21 this group is tackling.

22 And once I -- once the NOAA leadership sees
23 this -- And they're starting to see it. In this last
24 meeting they said, "We need to make sure that get the
25 right people working together to develop this." That

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 they see this, that they will support it more.
2 Although they are supports IOOSs and all of NAS, as
3 you've said. Something's got to give eventually. So
4 as a group, if they see a plan and they see this is
5 where it's going, they'll feel comfortable going up and
6 defending. And right now, a lot of people don't feel
7 very comfortable defending. "Well, why do I need it?"
8 They're going to be asked questions that they can't
9 answer.

10 We're providing, as a group inside NOAA,
11 that sense of confidence to that person going up to the
12 Hill and say, "We are going to" -- "This is what we're
13 doing, this is what we need, and here's what it's going
14 to get you. Here's the method, and we're building it."

15 It's a slow process to try to get there,
16 but from inside NOAA -- Now, I got to deal with a lot
17 of federal agencies, but inside NOAA, we are getting
18 our act together, and this process will be much better.
19 Next year coming up, this next fiscal year. It's been
20 slowly getting better, but it is getting better. And
21 it will be even getting better.

22 MR. RAINEY: I want to comment. If I could
23 be so bold as to characterize it or try to sum up our
24 progress on that. I think you get a sense that we've
25 grappled with this considerably, and the Panel, and we

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 will certainly get that package to you of our comments.
2 But as I have gone back and looked at it in all of
3 this, I would suggest that possibly a summation of our
4 support, our work on this.

5 We have supported this, the Panel has, as I
6 said. Rapidly strong with their support for IOOS, but
7 I think maybe one message from the Panel would be is
8 precisely because this is such a grand idea, such a
9 large major project that we're talking about, and is
10 somewhat considerably undefined, that it's
11 strategically important and imperative to not let -- I
12 mean, NOAA is primarily a service agency. And these
13 programs that we represent, again, I understand are
14 small pieces of NOAA's portfolio, but an extremely
15 essential and critical fundamental piece, I think, in
16 our view.

17 And I think it would be -- I think we have
18 a very strong feeling that we need to maintain these
19 programs. They are identified in the back burner, and
20 I realize that that's basically a catalog, like a phone
21 directory of every federal programs and others that are
22 out there. There absolutely must be some
23 prioritization. And we commented, I think, in New
24 York, was that it matters in the IOOS game, whether
25 you're the first dollar in or the last dollar in

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 because the horizon on this project is way off into the
2 future. So I've got some things to -- we'll take a
3 look at that later today.

4 But my look at the totality of our
5 conversation on this and the recommendations, I think
6 they're supported thereby, and I think that it's
7 continued along some assurances we've had along the
8 way. And by being identified as part of the backbone,
9 that these existing services will be continually
10 supported.

11 I think our hope is as that money comes in,
12 that has a high consideration. I think if we lose some
13 of these existing services, we run the risk of losing
14 support of the bigger picture. That's what we find and
15 have been struggling with this as a Panel. We try to
16 get our arms around it and support those programs.

17 MR. WEUST: I try to sit here and be quiet,
18 but I can't. First of all, what office of NOAA
19 sponsored this RFQ (phonetic) to get this thing
20 operated? Who? I'm trying to pin out --

21 MR. ZILKOSKI: It actually -- I mean, you
22 can trace the money back into a program. It's out of
23 the -- one of our programs. But it came to NOS, and
24 it's sponsored by the IE group, which is IOOS project,
25 which would be me. But it's me -- as I said earlier.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 It's me, it's Mike Johnson, Mitch Dudley (phonetic) and
2 this focus group that is put together that we thought
3 we need to have this -- RFQ to go out there.

4 MR. WEUST: I actually agree and
5 congratulate for doing that. It's a huge step for NOAA
6 to step up and do that. But you have to be very, very
7 careful. I also heard you say a minute or so ago, and
8 I've hear this before, that there's already been spent
9 in the billion dollars in IOOS. I don't believe that,
10 and I don't think you can justify saying that that's
11 what's being spent. There's real danger doing that.
12 If you're already spending \$1 billion -- I mean, my
13 gracious, what are the projects? That's one hand.

14 The other hand is you're going on for an
15 hour or two for the architecture of it. So you've got
16 to be very careful what we -- what state we say IOOS is
17 in. For example, if you say we're spending \$1 billion
18 in IOOS, what the heck happened to a million and a half
19 for PORTS, for example? So I think you have to be very
20 careful how you use that. I've seen that figure once
21 before.

22 Ocean.us. is a planning office. It was all
23 it was ever established to do. It's done a wonderful
24 job. You've got to stay on the program office to
25 define IOOS's cost schedule and performance. The three

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 major factors of any acquisition program. I think you
2 started that with this RFQ because industry has to be a
3 major partner of this. So you start the process, which
4 I think now is it yours? Is it ocean.us? You know,
5 whose running the leader for defining IOOS? And until
6 you define it, I would suggest not making comments like
7 we're spending a billion dollars on IOOSs. That's not
8 a good statement.

9 MR. ZILKOSKI: That's a good point, and I
10 will try to clarify something on that. The definition
11 of IOOSs and what they say about the billion dollars is
12 the existing system that people call part of IOOS.
13 Remember IOOS? IOOS is the integrated Ocean Observing
14 System. We have ocean observing systems, that's what
15 the billion dollar they're talking about.

16 They say that the Ocean Observing System --
17 data needs to be collected. People are saying they're
18 spending that kind of money. It's a good valid point,
19 and I should be careful about it and I will be. It's
20 the integration of this. And we had the same
21 discussion at the NOAA leadership. They said the same
22 thing you said about the fact that what does it mean
23 that we're spending that much money, and why do you
24 need more if you're spending all of that? That's a
25 good question.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 But it's really bringing the pieces
2 together and integrating, and making them interoperable
3 so then you really do that. And IOOS is not just a
4 whole series of Ocean Observing System. So I hear what
5 you're saying, and I am trying to change some of that
6 process of that, and we'll see what we can do.

7 MR. WEUST: One of the things the we're
8 talking about, "All right. Here's what I'm supposed to
9 do. I've got a billion dollars. And prioritize it.
10 You're going run out of money some day." Nobody has
11 ever done that. You may say you're spending one
12 billion dollars, but it may not be in the right place
13 to support what most people think is an observing
14 system. So that's you have to be very careful saying
15 that. If it is NOAA saying, "I've got one billion
16 dollars for IOOS", that's great. Tell me where it's
17 going, what's it doing, and what products are you
18 doing.

19 MR. ZILKOSKI: Actually, NOAA is not
20 spending a billion, but they're spending about six or
21 seven hundred million. The group is spending. To
22 determine who is spending, we're trying to do that.
23 That's what NOAA is trying to do right now. We're
24 trying to identify exactly what you said; where are we
25 when we're spending this? And what do we need more to

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 build implements. So we're putting all of that
2 together.

3 Ocean.us., NOAA's working with the federal
4 agency to try to do something -- just like you said.
5 What are they putting in? How are they doing, so that
6 we can actually put in a cost schedule. Here's what
7 we're spending. So we do just that. Well, where are
8 the priorities? Where is the innovation that I'm doing
9 something today this way -- I'll give you an example.

10 I've got buoys and I've water levels that
11 are in the same area. All right. Well, we're going
12 through and we say, "We don't need a boat." And Mike's
13 group is doing this today. We've got a buoy. You've
14 still got to have an infrastructure. You still need
15 water, but you don't have them both there. That's a
16 saving, and it's still part of making IOOS stronger.
17 You save money in terms of the infrastructure. You've
18 got -- people can download and submit the data, be able
19 to send it. That's inside NOAA itself.

20 So we're trying to put this planning
21 together. And when we do things, we've got to do
22 things inside NOAA to try to be able to say, "This is
23 what we're doing." Then we're taking it to ocean.us.
24 and the other agencies. And you've dealt with all of
25 these agencies. You know who they are and what they're

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 doing.

2 But we're pulling together and saying,
3 "Here's what we're doing. Let's see what you're doing
4 and how we're trying to put this together." So the
5 goal is that NOAA will step up, show us internally just
6 what we're doing and how we're doing together, start
7 trying to make priorities based on that. Get the other
8 agencies to do the same thing, and then the Excom
9 (phonetic) or the ocean.us. Works for the Excom to put
10 this total picture together, and then ultimately start
11 doing what you say.

12 What are our priorities? And there's a lot
13 of money. Maybe we do some shifting of one thing from
14 here to another, based on all of the priorities of
15 putting it together. It's not an easy task to do. But
16 we'll -- So we're trying to go down that road. And
17 it's been a tall task work in the past.

18 I think that the agencies now, you know,
19 slightly have a different frame of mind than they've
20 been in the last couple of years. I think things are
21 starting to work closely together to see some of these
22 things out. Now, they don't have as many observations
23 and many programs that NOAA has, but they have less
24 work than we do. So ours is a little bit more
25 complicated inside NOAA. So we're starting to there

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 doing that.

2 MS. HICKMAN: Dave, I find it pretty much
3 insulting as a member the Panel and as a member -- a
4 U.S. tax paying person that here we're talking about
5 this huge picture, and we've got to figure all the
6 pieces of the pie, yet, one small but great piece of
7 the piece is this backbone. It's going to crumble in
8 -- within the next year. So all of this talk, are we
9 going to be able to do all of this talking to figure
10 out how to save this one piece of pie, before it
11 crumbles, for our system?

12 MR. ZILKOSKI: Yeah. I think we need to
13 rethink some of the way we may do. I don't think -- I
14 hope it won't crumble. We're going to try to work to
15 make sure it doesn't crumble before we could get some
16 things to help. See, but I think there's other ways of
17 looking at this in just saying, "We need to dump money
18 into it." Maybe there's other ways of getting some of
19 the QA, QC, realigning some of our existing resources,
20 getting some of our regional partners to participate.
21 I mean, yeah, there's -- there's -- PORTS is one
22 program that didn't get funded. There's a lot of other
23 programs that didn't get funded at
24 all --

25 MS. HICKMAN: Why are we looking at

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 extended part of that program into a bigger picture
2 when we're not even going to have that piece next year
3 if we're not careful?

4 MR. ZILKOSKI: I'm not sure I understand
5 the question.

6 MS. HICKMAN: Why are we going to continue
7 integrated -- You said "integrated", and you
8 highlighted that as you it, but we're losing part of
9 the integration. The PORTS program is a major part of
10 that integration. We're not going to have it.

11 MR. ZILKOSKI: Well, there's --

12 MS. HICKMAN: I just -- I can't believe
13 that we have this program. It's not funded. Other
14 things got cut, but why are we going to continue to
15 fund it further outside of that when we won't have
16 that? Are we going to go back later and put that back
17 into the puzzle?

18 MR. ZILKOSKI: Well, it's actually -- It's
19 not actually that we're not funding -- It's not that
20 we're funding other things. We're funding the --
21 Whether the -- Making things integrated and
22 ^interoperable. So those are the kind of things that
23 will still bring things together.

24 And I think there's a lot of other aspects
25 of this that will continue, that will make things move

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 that -- In terms of priority level our -- Not that
2 they're any more important than PORTS, but I think
3 they're also just as important. So there's a lot of
4 other things that other systems that are going into the
5 same -- same activities. They're going out and
6 figuring out, "How can I bring and leverage all the
7 resources to make this happen?"

8 And I think that's part of what we're
9 trying to do. So PORTS can still look at that and say,
10 "How can I get some of my regional leverage in doing
11 that? How can I get some leveraging from the other
12 partners to help support the internal PORTS system in
13 this process?" And that's what we're looking for, what
14 we're trying to do in this whole thing.

15 So it's not that they can't and they won't.
16 We're just trying to look at how do we look at the --
17 all of the programs that didn't receive funding, and
18 how do we bring leverage, all of the other resources
19 that we have to be able to try to accomplish that. So
20 PORTS is just one of many that's involved, and it will
21 be given the same consideration as the other ones. I'm
22 not sure in terms of what Mike is putting forth, and
23 how he's doing it, and how we're looking at
24 alternatives, and how we're changing the way we do
25 business inside NOAA as well as inside the --

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. LAPINE: Dave, let me help you out
2 here. You know, we're fortunate. We're concerned
3 about the safety and well-being of marine
4 transportation. We're talking about ships carrying
5 dangerous cargo into busy harbors, like Houston here.
6 You know, if that ship runs the ground, you don't have
7 to worry about counting fish because there won't be any
8 fish left for them to count. We are the
9 infrastructure. We provide the addition and the
10 elevation upon which all other data is going to be
11 correlated.

12 And so we think this is something that's
13 not being paid attention to. Personally, I think it's
14 never been paid attention to by the NOAA
15 administration, being 28 years I was there. We always
16 begged and borrowed for the little pieces we got. The
17 reason we have earmarks is because NOAA doesn't listen
18 to us. So we've got to put our own pieces in there to
19 make sure critical elements get done.

20 We think we might know a little more about
21 what needs to get done than NOAA. And that's why you
22 have earmarks. The other thing is we listened for two
23 days about the wonderful things, fantastic work that
24 NOS did after Katrina and Rita. There were agencies
25 and corporations up there that lotted everything we

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 did.

2 You didn't get one red cent from FEMA or
3 anybody else for all that work. So now we are six
4 months further behind on the hydrographic backlog.
5 NGS, whatever they spent on the aircraft or whatever,
6 that shoreline is not going to get flown because of
7 Katrina. Not that it wasn't important, but the backlog
8 continues to grow because of a lack of funding and
9 interest from NOAA and IOOSs and everywhere else.

10 And, you know, somewhere along the line,
11 we've got to get a piece of the pie to help the
12 infrastructure. And, again, this morning, I kind
13 counted up 50 million bucks here. Maybe 3.6 of that,
14 maybe a small piece after the Whether Service Station
15 takes three million of it. Maybe there will be a
16 little piece left to keep a couple of tide gauges
17 running. I mean, that's my perspective. Former NOAA,
18 economist, Panel, and it's very frustrating for
19 everybody in this room. And I'm much more outspoken.
20 So I'm telling you the way I can tell you how
21 frustrated we are.

22 MR. ZILKOSKI: Yeah, I can tell you're
23 frustrated. Now as for the recovery, I mean, some of
24 the way the federal government worked on the recovery,
25 they were looking at response, and they were looking at

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 recovery. They separated the two. And NOAA comes more
2 into a post-recovery type thing than they're doing in
3 the what's happening immediately. That's sort of why
4 many of the things did not occur inside the NOAA.

5 Saying that though, once again, as a
6 group -- we've got two -- I think we need to change the
7 way we think about things. In other words, you can't
8 wait for them to come to you and say, "It's real
9 important. I need the money." You need to be going
10 out there and telling them that this is important. And
11 apparently, in some of these cases we did.

12 An example, in trying to do the recover, we
13 didn't get any money. You can't give me recovery
14 without having infrastructure. You just can't do it.
15 But we didn't get paid. I'll tell you that. They
16 didn't stop us. Who got money? FEMA got money.
17 Homeland Security got money. But down to FEMA, the
18 Coast Guard, they got money, the ER services. So what
19 did we do? We go to FEMA, you say, "What do you need
20 to help? What do we need?" So we do. We built that
21 case. Money came back and the coast survey got done to
22 the thing -- to be able to do some of the issues of
23 looking for obstructions and risks.

24 And NOAA probably will get some money
25 dealing with this -- trying to help from a geodetic

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 standpoint as well as some water level information.
2 But we had to go to them and say, "This is what you
3 need. It's important." Some federal government said,
4 "We're going to put a pile of money out there. We're
5 going to have someone manage it, and they need to know
6 all these different aspects, but you need to get to
7 them." I think that's a good recommendation
8 standpoint.

9 One is how we do that in partnering and
10 working with other agencies than we go and not wait for
11 them to tell us. That we go to them. That's what's
12 happening on the geodesy side of it, which we did
13 include water level looking at that aspect of it. And
14 it's moving through the system. So we're allowed to
15 get some funds to be able to do that. To be able to
16 get the money in there to put the infrastructure in so
17 when they go to do the recovery, rebuild it, they
18 actually have control and they know.

19 But it wasn't given to us. We couldn't get
20 it into the system. And I say that. That's the same
21 thing that we've got -- the same thought process has to
22 be done. And I'm going to take this message to the
23 IOOS community and push the NAV agenda because I've
24 been used to trying to push the geodesy agenda
25 everywhere I go because nobody appreciates geodesy.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 You know, they don't even know what it is about.

2 So for 31 years, going on 32, I've been
3 pushing geodesy. And NOAA -- by the way, NOAA knows a
4 whole lot more about geodesy than NGS only because I'm
5 in the IOOS role, but not because I'm NGS director
6 role. It's the IOOS role that I speak out. And you'll
7 hear more and more people say, "Yeah, we need that."
8 So we're pushing it, and I'm willing to take that other
9 risk.

10 But what I need, though, as part of the
11 system here, is the message that, "Okay. These -- this
12 is important to us, and these are our priorities."
13 Realizing, though, that you have many priorities,
14 yourself. Okay. You do have geodesy that's part of
15 that priority, which probably hasn't come out of this
16 community also. And you can't relate your shipping and
17 your positioning unless you have control. But you
18 don't think about that as a priority. You're focussing
19 on something else right now because, "Hey, I need the
20 funding and I need it."

21 What we have to do as an overall thing is
22 say, "Okay. These are our priorities. This is how it
23 fits in." And I'll take that message and try to
24 integrate it into the IOOS world. I will get with the
25 regional association that I have been working because I

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 really think that they -- and you're right, Lou.
2 They're getting some of that money, and we're not
3 thinking about the activities of the NAV community.
4 I'm going to try and change that by working with them a
5 little bit more. But I need, "Okay. These are our
6 priorities. Here's how we see it."

7 MR. MCBRIDE: Dave, if I may. One of our
8 frustrations obviously is -- well, at least from me, is
9 I keep hearing people say "Why don't you tell us what's
10 important. You need to tell us what's important." We
11 have done that. We have expressed a view that the
12 PORTS system is part of the backbone of an IOOS system.
13 We've expressed that plainly and clearly as a group,
14 and, yet, we see that particular program being eroded
15 and disappearing and not getting the kind of attention
16 it deserves. It should not be falling away. It should
17 be growing. And it should be available at all those
18 ports where it's necessary.

19 Similarly, the NRT system -- and I know I'm
20 down to small line objects here, but the NRT -- I work
21 at a port, Dave, and they were absolutely fundamental
22 to us bringing back online, in a very short period of
23 time, 4 percent of the nation's refining capacity. Gas
24 prices were going past four bucks. And we had to get
25 open. And those navigational response teams were

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 fundamental to it. And, yet, again, that's a program
2 that has no funding going forward, as I understand it
3 right now, or at least it's declining.

4 We've been saying the message, we've been
5 saying what the Nav community, and what the Charting
6 Maps (phonetic) community thinks as priorities. But
7 nobody is hearing us. We -- and forgive me for saying.
8 We've had several officials come from Washington and
9 say, "Well, tell us what you think. We look forward to
10 hearing from you. We're interested in your input."

11 You've had our input. How come there's --
12 I guess the other message they bring to us is, "Oh, by
13 the by, you should go to Congress and get us more
14 money." But nobody likes earmarks. Guide us on how we
15 can get some attention at the upper levels of NOAA so
16 that we can work cooperatively with them and make
17 something happen on the Hill, or wherever it needs to
18 happen because we're seeing vital programs disappear,
19 and we're getting people telling us, "Well, gosh, we're
20 interested in your input. Why don't you sent us
21 your" -- I mean, we know what the priorities are.
22 We've told you what the priorities are. Let's go and
23 do them now.

24 MR. ZILKOSKI: Yeah. And I know you have,
25 and I appreciate all the things. But I guess it comes

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 down to is you've got different -- sometimes mixed
2 messages. PORTS is a priority -- and I'll use this as
3 an example, because there's others. NWLON is a
4 priority. The surveys are a priority. If you look at
5 the funding that you got, if you add it all up, there's
6 a lot of funding going up there.

7 In the minds of the President and the minds
8 of Congress, they're looking at it and say, "Well, wait
9 a minute. Which one is your real priority?" If you've
10 got to choose, NWLONG or PORTS? Or what's some of the
11 difference? Are you willing to put a priority? I'm
12 not asking that now, but that's the kind of things that
13 comes back to people because they're saying, "Let's put
14 all of that money into it. Why can't you do what
15 you're doing and make it happen based on the funding
16 that you're receiving already?"

17 I don't know if it happened with PORTS or
18 not in this case, but someone may have looked at that
19 and said, "Well, we've got all of these NWLONs. We've
20 got this stuff. Why don't they absorb it somewhere
21 else in there?" That's where the tough decision comes
22 inside NOAA, if you will. And that's what, to me is a
23 glean on everybody's priorities, and saying, "Okay.
24 Now, as a group, if we get this much money, where do we
25 go? Where are these priorities? How does it happen?"

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 It's a diverse group. Then they have to weigh it
2 together, and it's always easier to say, "Give me more
3 money and I'll make it happen."

4 MR. PARSONS: Dave, we've got two more
5 comments, because we're running off schedule here.
6 Mike and then Helen.

7 MR. SZABADOS: Dave, I just want to bring
8 some attention to you. There are seven goals, sided
9 goals. One of them is safe and efficient mean of
10 transportation. This Panel was established to give
11 NOAA guidance on navigational services in that regards.
12 I strongly recommend that in your setting requirements
13 behind you is that you utilize, at least work with this
14 Panel in whatever those requirement is. This is the
15 industry. They know best what they need. I recommend
16 your group, IOOS, arrange, coordinate what you think is
17 a requirement for this industry.

18 MR. ZILKOSKI: We'll do that.

19 MS. BROHL: Just a quick question. I
20 understand that the Coastal Services Center hired
21 someone by the name of Chris Ellis to do, quote, "An
22 IOOS regional association needs assessment." Have they
23 also hired someone to do a CORS capability assessment?
24 Because you go to regional associations, they're -- you
25 know, they all say, "Yeah, we support CORS capability."

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 So they're not going to say, what really it
2 is, is how much money I need to operate my regional
3 association. So I'd like to know, did they also hire
4 somebody to do a CORS capability needs assessment
5 because we certainly could have some input?

6 MR. ZILKOSKI: I can't answer if they did
7 or did not hire someone to do the CORS capability. I
8 can tell you what we're trying to do with the CORS
9 capability, regardless of what CS does. It's not a bad
10 idea to try to hire someone to do that. But that's
11 part of what I've been asking this group and what we're
12 going to identify is what is -- what do we maintain and
13 how do we maintain our CORS capability? And I can only
14 use my geodesy experience, if you will.

15 And that's what I bring to this table. I
16 bring that same experience as IOOSs. Some of the
17 people like it, and some people don't like it, but I
18 look at what we're doing in changing the way we do
19 business. And I've done that inside geodesy, by the
20 way.

21 Part of what we do differently is that we
22 train people, and we get partners, and we engage people
23 in trying to do the same work that we do. Perform GPS
24 surveys, if you will. Do shoreline mapping. So
25 reducing my infrastructure inside of what I'm doing,

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 and increasing my outreach in growth. Now, saying
2 that, I am extremely concerned, and have been for
3 years, about losing my CORS capability. I have a lot
4 of people that came into geodesy at the same time I
5 did, back in the '70s. So we have a very high rate of
6 people that are leaving and retiring, and I'm losing
7 their knowledge.

8 So I look at this in terms of we have done
9 some inside GPS. What do we need to do to make in that
10 CORS capability. So we did our own little study. I am
11 asking -- that's one of the things -- I'm going to ask
12 this IOOS group that same question, "What should be our
13 CORS capability, and how do we maintain it?" As we go
14 out and do these regions, and they're going to do
15 something, how do we maintain what we need? Because
16 they may go away. We've been around for a long time,
17 and we'll continue to be around for a long time.

18 Our mission and the way we do business
19 changes, but how do we go with what really needs to
20 happen, implementing things that are regional basis,
21 but maintain our CORS capability? That's not defined
22 yet, but we're going to define it. And I'll talk to
23 Coastal Service Center. Maybe they can hire someone
24 that can help with that process. But to be honest with
25 you, that's an internal thing. So people, like myself,

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 say, "What do I need to maintain? What kind of
2 expertise do I need to be able to do that?"

3 For example, vertical datas. I've got a
4 lot just stuck in my head about vertical data and
5 inside NGS. But being the expert, there's very few
6 people left that know anything about vertical data. So
7 we're hiring people to be able to do that. And that's
8 what we look at. When we put a plan in place, we say,
9 "These are the things we need to do." So that's what
10 we are going to look at.

11 And once that gets identified, that will
12 also help you find your priority and say, "This is what
13 I need you to do. This is my priority. Here's what it
14 is." Once we do that, we have that, that will help you
15 going up to the Hill or wherever you want to go,
16 whoever you want to talk to about this, "Well, here.
17 Here's what they have. This is what they think as
18 their CORS capability, and here's their plan and say
19 this is what they're going to move out and what they're
20 going to do. And here's where the federal government
21 fits, where the regional fits, and the state. And
22 here's where the industry fits. Here's where it all
23 fits." And if this happens, and you can -- they have
24 this kind of funding, this is the kind of things that
25 could be done.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. PARSONS: Welcome to the Panel. This
2 was a good discussion, and I'm certain Dave will
3 incorporate a lot of this in the interaction with IOOS.
4 The Panel had asked at the last meeting to get a
5 briefing of what is NOAA's role in the Marine
6 Transportation System. A number of the Panel members
7 have been involved with previous Interagency Committee,
8 which had suddenly come to a halt after 9/11. Mike
9 Snyder is Admiral Lautenbacher's policy adviser on NCS.
10 And thought we could give the Panel an opportunity to
11 listen to Mike, and his perspectives on NOAA's role and
12 his perspective on the CMTS in general.

13 If you give me about 30 seconds, I'll try
14 to bring Bill Gray, who is in Connecticut into this
15 conversation as well.

16 (Mr. Parsons calling Mr. Gray on
17 teleconference)

18 MR. SNYDER: Thank you for that
19 introduction, Roger. Before I begin, a couple of
20 things I just want to mention. First of all, I think
21 it's very good for me to be here today and to have
22 heard this discussion. My role within NOAA, as policy
23 adviser, is, for lack of a better term, kind of
24 nebulous, but it's also very critical because I serve
25 in many ways as a liaison between the NOAA

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 administrator and programs within NOAA, also, with the
2 line office administrator within NOAA, and then finally
3 with the public, folks such as yourself.

4 And that's a critical element, the public
5 element, that I would like to hear more from. And so
6 as I was listening to everything that was being said
7 and hoping that maybe the time will lapse and I
8 wouldn't have to come up and talk. I sent an e-mail to
9 Scott Rader (phonetic), the chief staff over at NOAA.
10 It says, "You and I need to talk when I get back." And
11 I mean that, and I will talk to him, and I do talk to
12 him daily, if not hourly.

13 And so I want to let you know that at least
14 from my perspective, I'm hearing you, and I would like
15 to hear more from you and continue hearing from you.
16 And I will do my best to relay that message back to
17 Scott, and also to the Admiral, Admiral Lautenbacher.

18 So hopefully that gives you at least a
19 sense that I do take very seriously what you're saying,
20 and look forward to trying to work with you to find
21 some real solutions. Having said that, I don't want to
22 get into too much detail on that but I do also want to
23 say I intend to leave business cards with Barbara, so
24 please feel free to take it them before I leave for my
25 plane later today, and please feel free to give me a

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 call. I am a big proponent of providing as much access
2 as possible, although my time is divided into the
3 seconds these days, but I still would like to hear from
4 you, and I mean that very genuinely.

5 I'm not here to tell you that I can solve
6 all the problems that everyone is facing, but what I
7 can tell you is that I'd like to hear from you and
8 continue hearing from you. And that it is important to
9 myself, and it is important to Admiral Lautenbacher.

10 As Scott was saying, when he came into that briefing,
11 the Admiral did have and does continue to have genuine
12 concern for the recommendations and the thoughts of
13 this Panel.

14 The work that you're doing is very
15 important, and it's important not just to Roger and the
16 program, but it's important to NOAA to keep up on track
17 with our mission, and to make sure that we hear from
18 folks who are using our products and services, and NOAA
19 support for that. So, please, continue to do the good
20 work you're doing.

21 The reason that I'm here today is to talk
22 about something a little bit bigger in scale on the
23 committee on Marine Transportation System.
24 Essentially, what I'd like to kind of highlight for you
25 is where we are with this Interagency Committee, a

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 little bit where we've been, but also what brought us
2 to the current state of play. And I think it's
3 important for the folks to know what's going on, and
4 why I think it's a good idea. It's something that we
5 continue to grow and be productive.

6 To, essentially, what I'd like to do as I
7 go through this -- I know my talk is at least not only
8 on NOAA's role, but I'm here as NOAA policy adviser.
9 So you're going to get the NOAA perspective, and I
10 think that's probably the best service I can do
11 throughout this talk to kind of give you a flavor, a
12 sense of what is important to NOAA as we've been
13 building this Interagency Committee.

14 I won't go into too much detail on the
15 history of the old Interagency Committee on Marine
16 Transportation System, as I'm sure many of you are very
17 familiar with it. It was established in 2005, and our
18 view, there were 18 agencies that signed. And it also,
19 at that time, the Marine Transportation System and the
20 National Advisory Council was also created. This
21 council reports to the Department of Transportation.

22 I think that's important, relatively
23 subtle, but an important distinction. And it does not
24 report to The Interagency Committee, in general at
25 large, but to specifically the Secretary of

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Transportation. And this Interagency Committee
2 followed the 1999 report that I'm sure you all are very
3 familiar with, the Marine Transportation System.

4 But, essentially, the committee had from
5 the very get go, until it kind of faded into the
6 background, it had a strong focus on outreach awareness
7 building and conferences and things of that nature.
8 The ITMTS structurally was a little bit more, but it
9 did have four co-chairs. One of those co-chairs was
10 NOAA. The other three were Myriad (phonetic) Public
11 Transportation, Corps of Engineers, and Coast Guard. I
12 think it's very important, historically but also
13 currently, that NOAA has been recognized as being a
14 lead player with this Interagency Committee.

15 I think we can all quite easily can see why
16 the Corps, the Coast Guard and DOT were there, but it's
17 also important to know that within the larger scheme of
18 federal government, NOAA does have recognition for its
19 capabilities and services that it provides. That has
20 been true since the days of ICMTS.

21 Having said that, this group did face
22 several obstacles. What I call obstacles of success.
23 I think that may be deem a little generous. One of the
24 key and critical obstacles the group faced was the lack
25 of high level involvement. And this was high level

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 involvement, not just within the agencies and partners,
2 but also from the White House. The group never really
3 seemed -- to my knowledge, and I have to confess this by
4 saying I wasn't involved in the old ICMTS, but the
5 group didn't really have much visibility and profile
6 beyond the program level. In some cases, it did have
7 some visibility up to system administrator for the
8 agencies, but never really beyond that.

9 Maybe a more important obstacle to this
10 group's success was the lack of accountability from
11 agencies. There was no fear of failure. There was
12 nothing that kept the agencies coming back and wanting
13 to work together in a cooperative way to try to improve
14 the way the federal government supports ICMTS.

15 Another key obstacle to the success of this
16 group was the lack of action-based measurable outcomes.
17 There was a very strong focus on the process, there was
18 a strong emphasis on strategy, and there was a strong
19 emphasis on outreach and awareness. I'm not here to
20 say those are not important, because I think they are.
21 I think they're fundamental to ensure you have a
22 successful interagency effort. But at the same time,
23 it can be just about that.

24 The federal government's role in saving
25 ICMTS is too hard and too critical to not focus on

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 raise, to actually increase and make better support and
2 services that our government provides. So what
3 happened with the ICMTS? I don't really know. It just
4 kind of faded away. There were a number of causes, and
5 I'm sure many of you are very familiar with them.
6 There was -- again, going back to some of those
7 obstacles. The lack of high-level involvement. There
8 were also some very significant role events that were
9 happening at the time, September 11 be one of them,
10 increased focus on national security, other priorities,
11 budget funding, and all things like that. And for
12 whatever reason, the group never really got past some
13 of these hurdles.

14 That all changed, or at least started to
15 change, with the release of the Ocean Commission's
16 report. Within the report, one of the recommendations
17 of that report, they revisited the idea of this
18 Interagency Committee. One of the key elements that
19 they proposed within the Ocean Commission's report was
20 to copy (phonetic) the Interagency Construction for
21 congressional action.

22 Having worked on the Hill before, I know
23 the Hill is not really a keen on how to find
24 interagency task force and committees. But I think the
25 point here was to somehow increase some of the buy-ins

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 and some of the recognition for what the group was
2 doing. One of the other proposals within the Ocean
3 Commission Recommendations was to place this ICMTS
4 group within this proposed National Ocean Council
5 Structure. And within that structure, place it
6 underneath the committee on Ocean Resource Managing.

7 The significance of that, in my viewpoint,
8 is that you're adding layers of bureaucracy, although
9 it's high level, you're adding levels between this
10 group and the White House. This group and the most
11 senior policy makers within the federal government.

12 And then, finally, another key
13 recommendation of the Ocean Mission in terms of
14 structure was that the group would be chaired by the
15 Department of Transportation. So this is kind of
16 getting away a little bit from the co-chair, the
17 co-chair structure that had been placed in the old
18 ICMTS.

19 In terms of function, what this committee
20 would be envisioned to do. The number one function
21 was -- and this is carried out until today, what the
22 Corps is doing -- is improve internal coordination
23 among federal agencies. There is a recognition,
24 externally and internally, within the federal
25 government, that there needs to be a better

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 communication. There needs to be a better dialogue.
2 There needs to be more coordination between federal
3 departments, federal agency, even within some agencies,
4 in terms of the good services that the federal
5 government provides to the MTS and MTS users in order
6 to make it better and more useful and more productive,
7 more of what, folks as yourself, need.

8 Another key element that was proposed
9 within the Ocean Commission was to promote the
10 integration of marine transportation within other
11 boats, but also not to just other boats, but other
12 coastal commission uses. This could extend as far as
13 coastal and land decisions on coastal zone management.

14 So it's increasing the scope a little bit
15 to not just focus entirely on ports, but also the
16 regions around ports. Old port, building new ports,
17 critical waterways, critical infrastructure. It
18 intended to increase the scope of what this group look
19 at, and to get through that increase in scope a greater
20 dialogue and to incorporate many of the factors that
21 previously hadn't been considered.

22 And then in terms of the recommendations
23 that this group would come forth with, there would be
24 strategies and plans, recommendations on strategies and
25 plans. We're informing the public, developing funding

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 scenarios, matching federal revenues with the funded
2 needs, which I think is a pretty four-sided way of
3 looking at it, and certainly has some merit for
4 discussion. And then, finally, delineating short and
5 long-term priorities.

6 Again, there's still some focus here on
7 strategies, plans, because it is an important element.
8 And in terms of interagency process, I think it's part
9 of how you get to that end result. Those in's and
10 out's. You have to have some kind of strategic
11 visioning and some sort of per planning, and have an
12 open dialogue between all the various players.

13 Following the Ocean Commission
14 Recommendation, the administration proposed -- well,
15 didn't propose but released the Ocean Action Plan in
16 May 2004. Again, shortly prior to my coming onboard
17 with NOAA. The Ocean Action Plan items are not
18 recommendations. These are actual actions that the
19 administration pledges to carry out. Included within
20 the Ocean Action Plan was a whole chapter on marine
21 transportation. And I just wanted to take out a couple
22 of what I feel the key phrases within that chapter, the
23 introduction to that chapter, that really get at, and I
24 think some of the commitment that the administration is
25 showing towards Marine Transportation System.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 First, the MTS is a vital public/private
2 partnership. I don't need to tell you that. And I
3 think more the important thing here is that it's within
4 this Ocean Action Plan, this recognition, this level of
5 recognition that not only is it a federal government
6 investment or private investment, but it's a
7 partnership.

8 The second major point that I feel is
9 critical to this introduction is the recognition
10 that -- the importance of our marine transportation
11 structure is only going to grow. And I think you can
12 swap out the phrase "greater international trade
13 federal organization" with any number of things.
14 Improve attention to national and port security.
15 Greater wise on imports from Asia. I think there's any
16 number of things that really fit into this overall
17 concept. But the end bottom line is that marine
18 transportation infrastructure its significant to the
19 nation's economy. It's only going to grow over time.

20 MR. WEUST: Question. Does that cover
21 ports?

22 MR. SNYDER: Ports? All the caps' ports?

23 MR. WEUST: Yes.

24 MR. SNYDER: Yes. I think it can be -- I
25 think you can say that that applies to not just the

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 physical pieces, but also the services.

2 MR. WEUST: Back up. I've listened to you
3 guys from NOAA tell how important NOAA stuff is, but
4 it's falling down around your ears. I went to pine
5 (phonetic) a week a ago. The "0" is falling out of
6 NOAA. That was that day. Today, we're talking about
7 hydrographic service plans. You're saying
8 infrastructure is important, the key pieces of IOOS,
9 and then we look at the budget? It's going away. And
10 the answer we get is "Go to the Hill and talk to your
11 congressman."

12 Sorry, NOAA, there's a missing piece here.
13 Your federal agency is supposed to promote this stuff.
14 They've got to take the message back. They've got to
15 do it. What's the hydrographic services total budget?

16 MR. PARSONS: The map and the charting
17 piece is about \$95 million.

18 MR. WEUST: What's the ramp on that in the
19 last five years?

20 MR. PARSONS: Slight increase. Essentially
21 a flat line.

22 MR. WEUST: Inflation or not?

23 MR. PARSONS: No address.

24 MR. WEUST: So it's going down?

25 MR. GRAY: (Via telephonic) I would ask

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 about going back five or ten years when the marine
2 transportation and natural resource is the additional
3 future. I think they came up with the fact that the
4 (inaudible) NOAA function was something like one and a
5 third, or two-thirds of 1 percent of NOAA's budget. I
6 know there's two weather forecasting and tornado and
7 all these kinds of things, but it's quite fair when we
8 see what has not been done that many people, and myself
9 included, the general report that precipitated the
10 whole MTS report that NOAA has been terribly funded on
11 safety functions.

12 MR. SNYDER: I certainly appreciate the
13 comments there. And, again, what I can say is that I
14 will continue to look for ways to improve not just the
15 external bylaws, but NOAA's internal bylaws.

16 MR. GRAY: (Via telephonic) I would say --
17 listening to this. (Inaudible) The problem were with
18 the situation out of the 1999 MTS report came out of
19 the governmental group and the industry group -- this
20 got to be a talk about -- this is not going to be power
21 to do anything. That simply is true. I guess one of
22 the reasons we have this recommendation about a year
23 ago that the President supported the Ocean Committee
24 that maybe now the higher level of it might be that as
25 you put the coordination and the bylaws (inaudible) of

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 the dialogue functions between the more important ones
2 which is Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers, I don't
3 really think -- very much at all for navigational
4 safety at all. Most of those company -- harbor, port
5 and navigational safety. They don't have any role at
6 all.

7 The Coast Guard, Army of Engineers, NOAA,
8 those are the people that really try to make it happen
9 to make our ports as safe as they could be, which is
10 not being done now. And (inaudible) is this report
11 that Roger sent out. There are lots of people have
12 Coast Guard finish their investigation of the incident
13 in Philadelphia a month.

14 As I say back in my paper back in
15 September, Roger says, "No, we can't say that." Well,
16 we can say it now because now we know what it would.
17 Now was it a government-caused error. And I would like
18 the fact that there stimulant to this new higher level
19 of rule to recognize that not dealing with the accurate
20 hydrographic work in our ports and waterways, and not
21 funding Ports for all the 40 or 50 or 100 types that
22 they're supposed to be are a major huddle in the safety
23 structure of ship coming in and out, and moving around
24 our waters. And there are other things being done in
25 some of these federal groups that are spending large

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 amounts of money that NOR has ever had had any chance
2 of getting, that makes U.S. harbor safer and getting
3 them to a level that is where it should be.

4 MR. ZILKOSKI: I hear you. You're right.
5 We need to take this message back. And part of what I
6 think to do is -- we have to keep our goal for CT,
7 which he's hearing all of this. And inside NOAA,
8 they're trying to establish a system that you can get
9 your process and your priorities. As you said, you
10 said to Admiral Lautenbacher, the "0" has fallen out.
11 The navigation part of this. He's hearing it from
12 everywhere, too. It's different priorities he has, and
13 he's got a lot priorities and stuff that he's hearing
14 from everywhere.

15 So I think from our standpoint, what we can
16 do, is come together as this group can get, into NOAA's
17 process and the program managers that -- like Rich
18 Embling (phonetic), which is NTS, and myself, which is
19 geodesy. There's other things that fall into play. We
20 need to get better organized inside to be able to tell
21 our story, and what are our benefits. Your diagrams
22 says you've got action oriented out. What's the
23 benefit? What happens if you're not going to get this?

24 And I'll go back to it. Sub-division
25 inside, realizing some of our own resource, because

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 there's not a whole lot of new money that's going to be
2 pumped out into the CNT goal, if you will. So inside,
3 getting more priorities. Steve knows that better than
4 others. When he starts trying to look at cuts, he's
5 got everybody in the world telling him how great their
6 program is, and why it's necessary why you shouldn't
7 cut. But I think you're right. I think inside MTS and
8 CNT, the goals, we, as a group, need to do a better
9 job. We'll see what we can do.

10 MR. SNYDER: Along those lines of
11 increasing recognition internally, the ocean -- getting
12 back to how we came to this -- the current state of
13 play, the Ocean Action Plan has a specific action item
14 to not only establish but re-establish this Interagency
15 Committee, but to elevate it. And not only elevate it
16 within the agency, but elevate it within the department
17 so that now, along the recommendation of Ocean Action
18 Plan, this committee has cabinet level, secretaries.
19 These are the named representatives to the committee.

20 MR. GRAY: (Via telephonic) Now, Mike, one
21 important thing I said, because Roger said the budget
22 recently is \$95 million. Is that right, Roger?

23 MR. PARSONS: That's the mapping and
24 charting piece. There's other in there, NGS, CO-OPS
25 and the NGS.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. GRAY: (Via telephonic) But that's for
2 mapping and charting. That one accident though, I
3 mean, it's about \$150 million -- it's absurd. The fact
4 we have this backlog, and it's taken 20 years to get
5 done, and the fact that PORTS systems is funded
6 federally, that there are only ports employees in about
7 10 or 12 places that have been designated. There's no
8 programs, really, that I'm aware of correct those
9 NOAA's deficiency, to get a (inaudible) support
10 Delaware, east coast where they've (inaudible). They
11 had some -- a year or two ago. They had to shut down.
12 It's absurd. I hope people recognize these things. It
13 doesn't seem like it's getting through.

14 MR. SNYDER: Well, I'm certainly hearing
15 what you're saying. For my part, I will take that to
16 heart and --

17 MR. GRAY: (Via telephonic) I did a paper
18 for the Scot (inaudible) in September of last year in
19 which essentially what I said was you've got all of the
20 federal agencies concerned with marine system, the
21 infrastructures we had. Look at all those activities,
22 Army Engineer, Coast Guard, NOAA, and look at the role
23 these things that teaches them do that -- the safety of
24 our PORTS system and coastal waterway system, and money
25 between the various one shifting around in a way to put

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 the money where it's most needed.

2 And the event was used a couple of times.
3 I've lived out in Long Island most of my life, but I
4 think the (inaudible) is a manmade Long Island town --
5 the swamp. We don't do all of those navigation MTS
6 these days. And the fact that the United States have
7 over half legitimate navigation aids in the entire
8 world, that tells you something about how inefficient
9 we were allocating money for marine safety in this
10 country.

11 MR. RAINEY: Maybe I can suggest. If we
12 let Mike go ahead and go through his presentation.
13 But, Mike, I think -- I know the question that I'm
14 waiting to ask, and I would like to talk with you with
15 the time we have today, and I think the committee would
16 be interested to hear. The first thing I want to open
17 with you is if you could tell us, hopefully somewhere
18 in your presentation or the end, what your near-term
19 priorities are, as a NOAA policy adviser to the MTS,
20 because we'd really like to know an input into that,
21 and see if it kind of lines up with where we think.

22 We literally have got one of the books over
23 there on the table on the federal role of MTS you
24 alluded to, the 1998 study. Many of us have
25 participated two years previous to that task force.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 There literally have been books and studies written on
2 our input. And so let's let Mike go ahead and go
3 through his presentation, and then see if we can follow
4 up with a discussion on the near term, immediate goals,
5 and see how we can continue to hopefully have an input
6 in that process.

7 MR. SNYDER: Absolutely. I'd be happy so.
8 Just up front, we don't have time to really -- I'm
9 guessing we're not going to have time to fully get into
10 that discussion, but, again, I'd like to encourage
11 folks to reach out to me in the future and continue
12 that dialogue. Just quickly getting back to where I
13 was on the Ocean Action Plan, the action item of the
14 committee on Marine Transportation System and elevating
15 it to the secretary level.

16 Some of the functions that were outlined
17 within the Ocean Action Plan for this interagency
18 group, again, to improve the federal coordination and
19 also -- not just coordination of the services, but also
20 the overall policy of the federal government. Again,
21 increasing the scope here to not just focus on the
22 program level, but to the high level. The high level
23 interest intersection and also dialogue on the federal
24 government support for the MTS.

25 Again, the Ocean Action Plan reiterated the

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 support of promoting integration of MTS with other mode
2 and of the uses. And I think this third point is even
3 more critical. The emphasis on building outcome base
4 goals for the MTS, and a method for monitoring progress
5 for those goals. Something that I don't think the old
6 ICMTS ever really have. It wasn't that focussed on
7 what is the outcome at the end of the day, and what are
8 the resources we need to build to, to get there. From
9 a federal government level, from a very high level
10 viewpoint.

11 Another focus for the group within the
12 Ocean Action Plan is coordinating federal budgets.
13 Something that we have trouble doing within
14 interagency, but something that is recognized as being
15 critical for the overall of federal government
16 provision of services from MTS to users. And then
17 finally, recommending, again, the Ocean Commission has
18 suggested recommending strategies and plans to maintain
19 and improve marine transportation.

20 The agencies that we're involved at kind of
21 the ground level, the working groups setting up this
22 area. Again, we have that CORS group of CORS agencies,
23 which NOAA was one. Also, Costar (phonetic), Marah
24 (phonetic), and Corps of Engineers. But then other
25 partners started to come to this groups and said, "Hey,

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 we have not only a authority for a legal requirement to
2 support the MTS, but we're users of the MTS." And I
3 think that's a real key distinction here.

4 Again, the high level federal interagency
5 policy viewpoint. It's key to have -- even within the
6 federal government -- a recognition that we need the
7 end-users' viewpoint in shaping how we're providing
8 goods and services. So USDA and Transcom just came
9 kind of out of the blue and said, "Hey, we recognize
10 there's some -- We know that" -- Or from USDA's
11 perspective, "We're trying to bring down Mississippi,
12 and we're dealing with the infrastructure and we want
13 to try to help the Corps try to get some federal
14 alignment with what they're doing so that it affects
15 our policy with how we're trying to promote the
16 internal agricultural needs and abilities of the U.S.
17 So it's this end-user recognition of the importance of
18 the MTS that's really, I think, new and very critical
19 to the success of this interagency group.

20 Some of the early challenges that the
21 working group faced; who is interested, what is the
22 purpose of this group going to be, what model do we use
23 to always focus on process here. But I think within
24 the conversation of what model would be used, what
25 resources can agencies dedicate to this committee in

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 terms of not just budget, but also staff time to make
2 sure that we have a true dedication to getting better
3 coordination between the agencies.

4 And then, finally, what's different, what's
5 changed since the old ICMTS. But I think some of what
6 had changed, as I pointed out earlier, was this
7 recognition from not just the Ocean Commission, but
8 also through the Ocean Natural Plan, and also the
9 agencies themselves were coming to the table saying,
10 "We want to be a part of this. We have a stake. We
11 have a role. We recognize it and we want you to
12 increase our involvement on the other level."

13 Just a quick list of the parties who are
14 involved, and who are listed in ICMTS charter and
15 signed. Probably most critical and key are the last
16 two; White House Office and Management Budget, and
17 White House Council Environmental. This is something
18 the old ICMTS never had. It never had this
19 participation, this buy-in, this recognition there
20 there's something here that needs this high level of
21 involvement, and something that the White House needs
22 to be a part of in terms of discussion.

23 The purpose of the Interagency Committee is
24 to ensure the development and implementation of
25 policies consisting, the national, and report to the

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 President views and recommendations for improving the
2 MTS. Government-wise. Not just NOAA, not just Coast
3 Guard, but across the entire spectrum of the
4 government. Some of the central concepts within the
5 purpose and within the charter. Again, I'm focused on
6 outcome based goals, utilizing budget coordination.
7 Not just within an agency but also across agencies, and
8 then recommending strategies and implement plans.

9 Structure, again, always have to have some
10 kind of process. At the top is the committee. This is
11 the cabinet-level folks. Directly below that is the
12 policy committee, which is called the coordinating
13 board. These folks are at the administrative level.
14 So this is Admiral Lautenbacher who sits on this board.
15 And then this coordinating board is really kind of the
16 decision-making body that recommends decision up to
17 secretary level.

18 Within NOAA, Steve Barnum, who is head of
19 NOAA's Public Transportation Goal Team serves as
20 Admiral Lautenbacher alternate. So within NOAA we
21 recognize that we need to have a cross-cutting kind of
22 look, and cross-cutting strategy for interacting with
23 other agencies, and have them prioritize in coordinate
24 MTS activities. And then these coordinating boards --
25 the coordinating board would then, in determining what

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 items and actions we would carry out, would be able to
2 develop some integrated action teams, staff at the
3 program level who would be able to work together to
4 achieve those goals.

5 One of the key things within the structure
6 is this kind of side body executive secretarial, which
7 is dedicated full-time staff with a relatively small,
8 but still an amount of dedicated resources in terms of
9 budget, to go out and to help facilitate this
10 interagency effort. This is something, again, the old
11 ICMTS never had, and something that was viewed as being
12 very critical in making sure that the discussion and
13 focus on outcome base goal, end products wasn't lost.

14 So just to sum up some the elements of the
15 Churner (phonetic), which were critical and critical
16 department from the old CMTS is cabinet level is not
17 subordinate to any other structure with the federal
18 government. There's still some discussions right now
19 as to how the Bay Enrika (phonetic) case system is
20 going to interact with the Bay Ocean (phonetic) policy,
21 which is also at the secretary level. But the key part
22 here, the key element is that they're not -- it's not a
23 subordinate.

24 Again, White House is at the table. One of
25 the things that we incorporated with CMTS charter that

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 came from the Ocean Commission is that DOT would be the
2 chair. The reason that DOT is the chair is more
3 because Secretary Keneta (phonetic) has a personal
4 interest in the group and has devoted his own time and
5 energy to meet to see this group stand up, rather than
6 any other reason. Within the coordinating board
7 structure, that group is chaired by -- actually, a
8 rotating chair from the Corps members, the Coast Guard,
9 Corps of Engineers, NOAA, a myriad.

10 So the current -- what is for this current,
11 the Corps is going to be the first chair of the
12 coordinating board, but it's expected over the next
13 year. At some point, NOAA will be placed into that
14 cycle, too. So NOAA will have a role as the chair of
15 this policy coordinating board body, which is just
16 below the secretary level, and across the federal
17 government and is helping to make decisions about MTS
18 support.

19 The group right now is still kind of
20 working through what its initial activities are going
21 to be. Again, there's -- there's kind of this
22 pull-back, focusing somewhat on assessment. Some folks
23 are feeling there's still a need and some things have
24 changed. The late '90 report to revisit some of those
25 things. But at the same time, with doing so with an

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 emphasis on deliverables, focus on having specified
2 timetables and deadlines and identifying not just
3 partners, not just interagency partners, but also one
4 agency that will be the lead for each of the work plan
5 items, and will responsible for making sure that it's
6 delivered on time, and that it's assessable.

7 So to kind of wrap up. Some of the
8 challenges this group has faced and continues to face
9 is continued support for recourses. The recourses here
10 are, again, relatively small and are devoted more
11 towards staff efforts, staff time, but still very
12 critical to have those specifically devoted such for
13 this effort. Another challenge is generally
14 institutional change. Am I going to sacrifice
15 programs? Am I going to have my programs move in with
16 somebody else's agency or department?

17 That's not really the goal of this. The
18 goal of this is to increase coordination, not to redraw
19 lines. Another key challenge is focussing on action
20 outcome base goals versus getting caught up in the old
21 way of doing things, focussing on process. And then,
22 finally, something that I think the group needs to do a
23 much better job of in each public input in all of this.

24 The MTS advisory council is the -- is still
25 kind of the named public council group that's devoted

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 towards ICMTS. But they -- they -- as I noted earlier,
2 they are the responsible director to the Department of
3 Transportation. So I think there's opportunity here,
4 but we're still trying to not just process-wise but
5 also legal-wise try to figure out how we can best
6 engage public input because I think it's going to be
7 very critical now that this group as finally stood up,
8 it has kind of this high-level volume to get them down
9 the road where we're going to be doing things useful,
10 folks such as yourself. The last few slides summarize
11 some of what said. I know there's some desire to have
12 some discussions, so I'll end there and kind of open it
13 up at this point for folks who have questions.

14 MR. RAINEY: Mike, thank you, very much.
15 Could you share with us what NOAA's near-term outcome
16 base goals are for the MTS?

17 MR. SNYDER: Well, I'll tell you,
18 personally, my number one priority within the MTS has
19 been since I came to NOAA and continues to be to
20 increase recognition, not just within the agency, the
21 importance of these programs, but also within the
22 department of Congress and also on an interagency
23 level. I've devoted a lot of time to this group not
24 because I love bureaucratic process, but because I
25 think it's important that NOAA continues to be a key

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 player here.

2 Once we lose our position, our seat at the
3 table, we get marginalized, not just internally to
4 NOAA, but marginalized from the federal government. So
5 I understand this is -- there's a lot of structure, a
6 lot of process here, but the real critical piece at the
7 end of the day is that NOAA continues to have a seated
8 table. This is important. And this is a table where
9 ONB is also sitting. And so it's an important way for
10 us to be able to internally really be able to say,
11 "Hey, this is what we're doing. This is why it's
12 important." And this is how we play in the large
13 federal government.

14 So one of the other things I'd like to
15 mention, which I failed to in my presentation, but it
16 raises a good point here. Through this process,
17 because this has been elevated to secretary level, I
18 have actually agreed with Secretary Dugaris (phonetic)
19 on NOAA's NGS capability. And Steve Barnum was there
20 as well, as was Gary Magastine (phonetic), who is
21 NOAA's representative on the secretary.

22 The secretary was very engaged, and was
23 also very aware of this growing problem. And I think
24 we're at a point now where it's partly to me to
25 determine and to find the best way to leverage that

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 interest and engagement from the secretary, and to
2 support for NOAA's programs. It's something I
3 certainly wanted to mention because that's something
4 that the old ICMTS never dreamed of. But it's also
5 something that, internally to NOAA, the secretary have
6 even more conflicting priorities than the NOAA
7 administrators.

8 So Russ (phonetic) needs to get some of his
9 time and to be able to convey to him what needs to be
10 done and why NOAA is important, and why it's important
11 for us to support this group. I think that was
12 critical.

13 MS. BROHL: How will the committee interact
14 with the Industry Advisory Committee, the MTS Advisory
15 Committee?

16 MR. SNYDER: Again, because -- This is an
17 issue that -- I didn't want to put anything on the
18 slide because we're still trying to work this through.
19 And to some extent, it's DOT's council, at least
20 through the charter, and DOT's chair of this
21 interagency group, it's kind of, to them, to really
22 focus on that.

23 What we've been doing for our part is kind
24 of ringing that bell as often as possible and saying,
25 "Hey, now that we're here, now that we're starting to

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 talk about these things, as we go through these various
2 actions that we're deliberating on, we need to engage
3 the public.

4 MS. BROHL: The MTS Advisory Committee, it
5 makes recommendations to the Secretary of
6 Transportation, technically?

7 MR. SNYDER: Yes.

8 MS. BROHL: Is there any benefit to trying
9 to have that changed to advise the CMTS as a whole?

10 MR. SNYDER: I think that's an excellent
11 question for discussion. It's one that I think you may
12 see some resistance from DOT to having that done. But
13 there -- I think there certainly benefits to that. I
14 don't know necessarily what the process is for doing
15 that, but I'd certainly be interested in looking into
16 it and seeing if it's within the realm of possibility.

17 MR. GRAY: Could I ask two more questions?
18 How often does the group meet. And I'm also curious,
19 is safety along our waterways on the agenda at every
20 meeting? And the contacts of that, do they even take
21 time to assess things like what happened with the
22 Admiral. Does Admiral Lautenbacher know about these
23 things?

24 MR. SNYDER: Yes, to all of those things.
25 This group does include safety. It is incorporated

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 within the charter, and purpose of the group -- for the
2 sake of time and not boring everybody with kind of the
3 whole. Charter, I just think, has some key elements.
4 But one of the key elements is promote safety and
5 navigation. Another one is from a NOAA perspective and
6 from EPA's perspective, something we wanted to get in
7 there, environmentally sound goods transportation.
8 Promotion of that aspect as well.

9 So I think through this whole process,
10 everybody has really advocated in their own specific
11 viewpoint of what they bring to the table. The Coast
12 Guard advocated very strongly for -- including safety
13 and navigation as one of the key things they support.

14 In terms of the response and recovery
15 efforts from the NOAA perspective, yeah, Admiral
16 Lautenbacher is aware of those things. And I can
17 absolutely say he is, and I can say that the chief
18 staff of Scott Raber (phonetic) is aware, and I know
19 I'm aware of it. So there is certainly an awareness of
20 the significance and importance there, and that that --
21 that there is a NOAA role within that. There is a NOAA
22 role within response and recovery efforts. So I guess
23 the short answer is "yes".

24 MR. GRAY: Thank you. I hope it keeps that
25 way because I want it to be absolutely crystal clear

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 from the industry's point of view. The Senators from
2 New Jersey and Pennsylvania usually don't rely on
3 tankers. When it the tanker's order is full, that's
4 the owner's fault. And that's what we see now,
5 continually. It's the government's fault.

6 MR. PARSONS: Other comments or questions?

7 MR. LARRABEE: Have they met with NOAA?

8 MR. SNYDER: Yes, they have. They've had
9 two meetings. The first one was just pretty much on
10 charter. The second one was kind of an outline of what
11 the function of this group was going to be, and kind of
12 a near term, and starting to look at. And the result
13 of that meeting was to go down to the coordinating
14 board and say, "Okay. Let's start looking at some of
15 these near term things that we can do. Some of the
16 assessment, some of the interagency collaboration.
17 Right now. Let's see what we can do."

18 One of the other things that we came up
19 within the cabinet level was coordinating emergency
20 response. That's something on everybody's mind,
21 especially in light of last year. And one of the
22 outputs of that is that the group is going to start
23 looking at is are there lessons learned from last year
24 and how the government responded? Well, yes, there
25 are. But what are those lessons? And in terms of

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 looking at the MTS perspective, are there things that
2 we can do better, and what are those things, and how
3 can we do it, and let's do it?

4 So I think we're still in kind of -- It's
5 still in kind of contingency, but we get to really look
6 at what's in the near term items will be, and also try
7 to get some initial successes for this group, because
8 there's always going to be some hesitation because
9 you're talking about dedication staff time and
10 resources. And so we want to demonstrate that this
11 group is successful in achieving some goals so that we
12 can carry that over into other larger items.

13 MR. LARRABEE: How do we keep up with the
14 progress this group is making?

15 MR. SNYDER: Probably -- Well, one of the
16 things the group is starting to do is work on its
17 outreach. And CMTS has a booth with the TRB this week.
18 So I think that is a great first step. That is
19 supported by all of the agencies and the various
20 members from the executive secretary have been there,
21 and educate about what's going on.

22 I think it's going to take certain efforts.
23 And admittedly, more so than we have done up to this
24 point. But it's one that I know from NOAA's
25 perspective and from the perspective of the other

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 agencies, and certainly from Secretary Neder's
2 perspective, something that's critical. He's talked on
3 it numerous times in the speeches he's given.

4 I think that's a good question and a good
5 point. It gets back to what I was thinking, educating
6 the public and getting public input. I think we need
7 to do a better job on that, and make sure that's
8 integrated into our discussions in what we're doing.

9 MR. DASLER: Several meetings developed
10 when we're doing the strategic plan. One of our big
11 concern was that marine transportation safety and
12 navigational needs. And when you read strategic plan,
13 it's buried way down.

14 Even though there is a lot of awareness --
15 I mean, sometimes I think some of the CORS capabilities
16 and CORS needs kind of put down at a lower level
17 because they feel it's just not part of the programming
18 level. When it's not up at an upper level strategic
19 plan, the problem is that -- I don't think it helps
20 bring in funds and make that awareness. I think we
21 tried, at one point, tried to address that. We need to
22 have more emphasis in that strategic plan of those
23 meetings.

24 MR. SNYDER: I think within the terms of
25 the strategic plan, part of the goal is to look at

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 whole NOAA, and where can we draw linkages, and where
2 is NOAA supported, what we support, what are our major
3 objectives, what are the requirements and authorities?
4 And so I don't think I can answer your question
5 directly. But what I can say is some of that may be --
6 some of that may be drafting. Some of that may be
7 intentional. I don't want to say that it is
8 intentional because I wasn't part of that process,
9 necessarily, so I can't necessarily say that.

10 But I certainly hear the concern, and I
11 appreciate and understand the concern because
12 perception is important in whether or not perception is
13 within NOAA or within these strategic plan and how
14 people read and perceive what NOAA's priorities are. I
15 think that's certainly something we need to be mindful
16 of.

17 MS. BROHL: Mike, you indicated you worked
18 on the Hill. And I'm curious of your thoughts on the
19 way which NOAA has been reorganized. What or how the
20 subcommittee or committee is handling NOAA now that
21 it's been lumped separately out of the DOC kind of
22 heading, and it's now -- it's National Science
23 Foundation? Admiral Weust indicated yesterday that he
24 thought it was a negative. Kind of now NOAA is getting
25 subjugated under other -- Any thoughts on that with

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 your experience?

2 MR. SNYDER: Yeah. I think -- As with any
3 restructuring, there's pros and cons. Some of the pros
4 to that are that -- I think there's -- there's a better
5 dialogue internal on the Hill for folks to be able to
6 look at things and comparing apples to apples. Some of
7 the problems that NOAA had had in terms of dialogue has
8 been trying to get people educated on what it is that
9 we do, and how we support missions.

10 Not just NOAA's mission, but also
11 Department of Commerce mission. And I think from the
12 Hill perspective, having a dialogue, looking at not
13 just NOAA but also these other agencies, not similar in
14 what they do, but similar in how they go about doing
15 it. I think that will be beneficial.

16 We've got to speculate as to how it's going
17 to impact from a NOAA perspective. It may end up being
18 something where, as folks on the Hill look at programs
19 across these various agencies, now they are comparing
20 respect apples to apples. And then they say, "Well, X,
21 Y and Z are all doing this. What's the difference?"

22 It's incumbent on NOAA at that point to go
23 and educate folks on why it's critical. The biggest
24 thing on the Hill is education because it's so
25 short-staffed, and folks -- they have backgrounds in

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 various things, and it's not always a background in
2 oceanography and its environment. They may have a
3 background in law enforcement. They just have to be
4 here for whatever reason.

5 So I really think it's critical, not just
6 from a NOAA perspective, but from folks who are working
7 with them, that those folks are being educated. So we
8 really, from a NOAA perspective, we work on making sure
9 that we keep folks up to date with what we're doing and
10 why it's important. We have instances and
11 opportunities do that. It's a complicated
12 relationship, as you know, between the Hill and agency.
13 So we try to provide information.

14 MS. BROHL: It's funny because we talked
15 yesterday briefly how -- on the side -- that
16 legislation is made by 24-year-olds, and the other
17 countries -- The hard part is when you call up and they
18 say -- personal office, and they say, "Hey, who is
19 doing NOAA now? Who is doing transportation now?" You
20 wouldn't find that on some of the other major issues.
21 So if it's apples and apples and you're going to get
22 qualified people dealing with the issues, that would be
23 a positive thing.

24 MR. SNYDER: I think that will be my help.
25 And, again, speaking from a kind of apples to apples.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. RAINEY: Thanks, Mike. The one
2 observation or maybe suggestion I have is that I know
3 what you say is absolutely true. It's essential and
4 imperative and significant that NOAA has a seat at the
5 table, and is in that rotation of the leadership. And
6 it's excellent that you had the opportunity to brief
7 the secretary on -- I think, too, is real important,
8 though, as early as possible, this would be my
9 suggestion, to try to get a focused list of the
10 near-term priorities or outcome base goals, as you say,
11 and put that on the table, and maybe help frame that
12 early in the discussions with the members.

13 Sometimes it seems a little bit like we
14 gauge success by meetings and the level, how high we
15 went up the interest there, but to this group I think
16 it should be expressed earlier. If we have our times
17 over the years understanding why all the information in
18 95 percent of the country's commerce by volume comes
19 through the system, we just, I think, take it on faith
20 the Secretary of Commerce would be interested in Marine
21 Transportation System.

22 So having the opportunity to brief them on
23 that is good, but I think we want to help, through this
24 Panel. And it's something we tried to focus on with
25 some success, and we're trying to be balanced and to

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 also do the same thing. Focus on the deliverables we
2 can pass to the administrators so you can carry it
3 forward. So we really welcome you to be -- the piece
4 of your substantive message to that community.

5 If we can do that any more effectively or
6 efficiently and provide that input, which Adam said
7 earlier, see your guidance on that. Because I think
8 that's what we're all signed up to do here. So we
9 would like to continue that dialogue with you on that.

10 MR. SNYDER: Absolutely. And as I've I
11 tried to mention, I encourage that dialogue. Part of
12 the downside of my position is that some of what I do
13 is react in a crisis mode. And I really -- I want so
14 much to get out of that and to start thinking more
15 strategically and proactively, and much less, "Okay,
16 well, now this is the hot issue of the day. This is
17 how I have to spend my day." And it's very difficult.
18 It's a difficult cycle to break. So I would certainly
19 encourage your input into that kind of more proactive
20 way of looking at the policy level.

21 One of the key things -- you know, and I
22 know I'm actually fairly critical measuring success by
23 meetings, but at the same time, having the exposure
24 gives you the ability to leverage interests. And if
25 I'm able to -- out of that meeting with the Secretary

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 be able to speak with folks at the Department of Budget
2 Office, and say, "Hey, the Secretary is involved in
3 this, and we're doing this, and it's important, some of
4 the programs within NOAA that brings us to the table,"
5 I think that's where the real value comes from.

6 You know, it's needs to be you and me at
7 the table with the Secretary, but I think the outcome
8 of that -- that's kind of the means. That's not the
9 end. So I appreciate what you're saying and certainly
10 take it to heart. So that's kind of the next step for
11 this group is to be able to -- get the group internally
12 in NOAA to leverage that interest and kind of bring
13 that message and say, "This is from the very top level
14 of the department, and this is interagency. So now we
15 want to be able to bring some discussions along those
16 lines."

17 MR. PARSONS: Mike I appreciate your
18 participating yesterday and today. The Federal
19 Advisory Committee will provide you that input as well.
20 Let's take about a 15-minute break. There's one more
21 discussion before lunch before we deliberate, the
22 recommendations that we put forward.

23 (Break was taken.)

24 MR. RAINEY: We're going to have a change,
25 and I want to take a second to thank Dave, again, for

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 being here, and reassuring a couple of things. We're
2 going to move into some panel deliberations and
3 discussions on most of the material we've been
4 presented over the last couple of days. I know some
5 people need to get out this evening, and we don't want
6 to run late. We want to have extra time for us to
7 discuss. So we're going to change the agenda and
8 schedule presentation. We have materials. And also I
9 just --

10 I want to tell everyone the work that NGS
11 has done. We have some great things. Charlie was on
12 board when we went to Silver Spring. So we have had
13 some exposure, and I understand the importance of
14 those. The Corps helped us.

15 And this meeting, we talked quite a bit and
16 had some demonstration, carried the flag on an remote
17 sensing and shoreline. And, again, I apologize for the
18 adjustment, but it's the work that you guys are doing
19 at NGS is certainly critical and of great interest to
20 the Panel, and want to make sure I say that. I'm not
21 brushing it aside in any way. I want to try to give a
22 little more time so we can focus on something on where
23 do we go from here.

24 MR. ZILKOSKI: I've talked to several of
25 you, and we'll follow with my -- I just want -- It's

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 pretty clear what it is. I will follow up, and the
2 next time I'll come with some more things. I'll put in
3 front of you and I'll work the system until I get your
4 -- some recommendations, but I'd like to see you work
5 on it. But not a problem.

6 MR. RAINEY: All right. So we're going off
7 a little uncharted here off the agenda a little bit.
8 But what the -- What Barbara and Steve and Monica has
9 put together is we have -- sort of captured some of the
10 recommendations out of yesterday's presentations.

11 Also, I distribute yesterday some of my early thoughts
12 for some possible recommendations, and we're working to
13 be able to display those and we'll have a copy of that.

14 But what I'd like to do is just by talking
15 with the folks, listening to the meetings, and dinner
16 and sometimes during break here is maybe open it up and
17 try to get some discussions on some of the broader
18 issues. Some of the recommendations, proposed
19 recommendations that I just jotted down -- and, again,
20 this will probably give us a start, give us some
21 frame -- I think our target at some of these broader
22 issues.

23 Others are more into the week, so to speak.
24 So I'd like to try to open it up to a broader level
25 about where we are as a Panel, try to poll in members'

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 feelings on how we want to proceed here. It seems like
2 we end up in a rush at the end of the meetings. We're
3 trying to get our next steps together and we're out the
4 door. We're going to adjust the agenda to go to about
5 noon, and then we'll resume after lunch. We have some
6 flexibility to allow us more time and for the Panel's
7 deliberations.

8 If I could, just to give us a little more
9 structure, let me just refer to the things I had
10 written up, and just do a real quick run-through. The
11 first page is on contracting. I'd like to defer that
12 one. I know there's some issues there. On the second
13 page -- again, this is just something I made up. This
14 is the basis of what my thinking was.

15 The second one is NOAA navigation services
16 response to natural and man-made disasters. The
17 thought behind here was that NOAA has a significant
18 role in their response and recovery. And that there
19 are going to be future significant events that are
20 going to require that kind of a response. And from
21 what we heard and seen for the budget, these programs
22 are losing ground and -- going -- looking ahead, it
23 seems like NOAA is going to have to identify these
24 extra burdens on these things, or we're just going to
25 further diminish our capability to execute their

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 ongoing missions. So that's the intent on that.

2 The other recommendation below that, the
3 intent behind that was from some of the dialogue we've
4 heard about contracting, that it's very necessary and
5 just a suggestion aimed at to have some vehicle in
6 place that kind of allowed for, when necessary, a quick
7 and expeditious to deliver contract for emergency
8 hydrographic surveys in that sort of a major quick
9 response. So that's sort of the idea behind that
10 proposed recognition.

11 On the third page, I had suggestions on the
12 continuity of operations for NOAA navigation services
13 identified as the components in IOOS backbone. This is
14 includes but not my limited support. My intent here is
15 to talk about mapping and charting, ENCs. All of these
16 services that we're talking about and the critical
17 importance of these services is a suggestion to throw
18 out as a point of discussion.

19 What I was looking at here was that as we
20 work together to -- from what I heard -- the capacity
21 building phase of IOOS is we try to go through all the
22 figuring out what IOOS is going to be. That in this
23 interim, especially in this interim, that there's
24 critical importance for NOAA to maintain all of these
25 navigational services and not letting them disappear or

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 fall through the cracks, you know, as we're trying to
2 build this paradigm which these services have all been
3 identified as critical components of the backbone. So
4 I'm trying to get going to that.

5 There is a particular importance leg of
6 that. It's the third one down. What that target is --
7 I just point that out because I'm not -- this should
8 all have some consideration. And this does get a
9 little bit into specifically the PORTS, the 2002
10 amendments of the Hydrographic Service Improvement
11 Act changed the language to say -- and I didn't have it
12 in front of me, but it's subject to available funding
13 or subject to sufficient appropriations, something
14 along those lines, that NOAA shall fund for for getting
15 improved the operation maintenance.

16 So by the law of the lane, PORTS is not a
17 partnership being at this point. Subject to that
18 contingency appropriation. What I put in here are some
19 food for thought to be deliberated on. What we want to
20 take it up is should NOAA, deem IOOS's funding, which
21 PORTS have been identified as a piece of IOOS, as
22 available funding to sustain the PORTS program in
23 accordance with that law, with that act. I want to
24 particularly highlight that because that's where we
25 want to have suggestions in there. But the intent of

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 the overall recommendation on my part was to say, "We
2 need to maintain in NOAA's existing operation and
3 navigational services, at the same time build capacity
4 for IOOS for bigger and greater, more inclusive.
5 That's the basic intent with what I write.

6 Below that is specifically more for
7 electronic navigational charts. We were presented with
8 information that shows that given the rescissions,
9 costs, adjustments that are in the projected budgets
10 that the electronic navigational charts -- you know,
11 the projections may not be that that program is
12 sustaining. This one, what I was simply trying to get
13 at, and it may be -- again, this is my opening to
14 discussion, possibly -- but if the community feels it's
15 valuable to comment on the NCs, this is -- and we had
16 talked about it -- enacted into law, a mandatory care
17 (phonetic) requirement for NCs for the industry that is
18 on the horizon.

19 It seems to me that there -- if vessels
20 hauling in this country is going to have to use the
21 NCs. And if NOAA is the NCs of the initial part, which
22 they are, there needs to be official (phonetic) hands
23 used before even more people to use them.

24 So this may already be happening, but my
25 intent was that we need to take a look at that and do a

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 projection on the NC development capabilities to
2 develop and to sustain them and maintain them. If
3 there looks like there's a gap or shortfall in ability
4 to do that with the strategy. And by doing that, that
5 seems to be the Goal Team leads and the FEMA leads and
6 PPBS (phonetic) and all that. Try to heighten the
7 awareness that this is happening before it becomes a
8 crisis that can't be recovered from. So that was our
9 EMT (phonetic) behind that language. But I wanted to
10 run through the intent that I had there.

11 And, again, some of those are more into the
12 details. I think some of the bigger notions are that
13 NOAA has got to recover costs, missions from these
14 programs to be able to stay -- the programs in the
15 future. Some of those may be a be a hierarchy of
16 goals. Again, beyond this, we do have listing specific
17 quality points. This was prepared from the various
18 presentations.

19 So that's sort of a little bit of what we
20 have written down, but just as important or more
21 important is in the open discussion of the Panel, and
22 how we want to attack this. I even propose or suggest
23 that we take a break here and go let you talk. But the
24 other thing I'd like to do today is maybe suggest that
25 you, near term outcome base goals, we could suggest to

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Mike and Dave, perhaps maybe coverage, surveying of
2 federally controlled channels. We know there's all
3 kind of stuff down there, yet, nobody has taken the
4 time to survey that and in facet remove it. Maybe that
5 will be in your near-term goals for the MTS at large.
6 I mean, obviously, that's outside of the NOAA. Those
7 are the kind of things that we maybe can start in on.
8 Let me stop and open it up for the Panel to comment
9 about how we're going support that and get some
10 deliverables to David before y'all depart and go.

11 Does anybody have any -- Let me ask this
12 then. That was clearly too much to throw out on the
13 table at one point. Would there be any objection to
14 picking up -- well, starting with some of the
15 suggestions I drafted up. If we took -- again, I'd
16 like to defer to contracting because I think -- If we
17 started a discussion, is there a consensus on the Panel
18 that there's a need for NOAA to recover their
19 unbudgeted expenses from the responses like Katrina and
20 Rita? Is that certainly what we would need if that's
21 the recommendation we want to deliver?

22 MR. LARRABEE: Scott, you know, one of the
23 things that I think we're searching for is the way the
24 structure on the conversation. Not only amongst
25 ourselves, but with NOAA. You know, we had a brief

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 conversation this morning and, you know, when you look
2 at our mission, we're talking about navigation services
3 and the operative where we're service.

4 And when you pick an agency and its role in
5 commerce and the other things it does, services -- and
6 this is an agency that delivers products. And I think
7 we need to begin to sort of structure our conversation
8 with the agency around that notion of service, and how
9 the agency begins to understand how to prioritize its
10 services. And then the other conversation then becomes
11 not only what's important with services, but how does
12 the agency best provide those services.

13 And I think we can help with both cases.
14 Just as an example, the discussion we heard for the
15 first two days was all about how NOAA participated in
16 the response and clean up of two major hurricanes. And
17 the idea that now we have to look at NOAA, not just in
18 terms of its normal services, but in those kinds of
19 scenarios, it has to step up and provide additional
20 services, and it has to be done under certain criteria.

21 The idea that NOAA begins to look at that
22 in a more proactive way just says, "Gee, I can no
23 longer hold my -- you know, I can no longer depend on
24 my people how to do this." We actually have to look at
25 what services have to be provided and what time frame,

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 and how do I provide those services, and how do I
2 ensure that those services are going to be available to
3 us when the next hurricane hits, when the next crisis
4 hits.

5 Because it's not just a matter of
6 recovering the money you spent, it's a matter of
7 proactively saying, "Here's how we're going to provide
8 services. Here's the plan. Here are the resources
9 necessary, both in terms of money and people. And
10 here's our agency policy guideline to support all of
11 that." And I don't know that any of that's been done
12 to the aftermath of Katrina.

13 So we've heard some great things about
14 what's been and it's cooperative effort with a lot of
15 the people, but I suspect that an awful lot of that was
16 done because there were some very innovative people out
17 in the field to figure out a way to make it happen. I
18 don't know that it was necessarily a systematic
19 approach to doing this.

20 And if NOAA is going to provide those kind
21 of services in the future, NOAA has to think about how
22 it's going to -- how it's going to define that service
23 and how people are going to rely on it, and how they're
24 going to support those services so that they're there
25 when the next incident occurs. So I think if we just

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 think in those terms, you can certainly begin to
2 structure your conversation in a more defined way, in a
3 more appropriately frame work that's clear for you.

4 A point of discussion we had with Mike
5 about providing input to that very important process,
6 it has to be done in a very clear and concise way. And
7 I think that will be much more helpful, perhaps, than
8 some of the other approaches we've taken in the past.

9 MS. BROHL: I presume if we're looking at
10 the recommendation regarding asking NOAA to get --
11 identify and recover significant ways to get more money
12 when they've had to spend it unexpectedly, so you're
13 proposing, really, this be rewritten in a way that make
14 sure that NOAA understands -- You're asking to rewrite
15 this in a way with that perspective that it's not just
16 trying to get money, finding ways, but understand the
17 service aspect of your business and how you be prepared
18 and provide that service?

19 MR. LARRABEE: Yeah. I mean, let's assume
20 today that one of NOAA's services is to be involved
21 in -- there's other aspects of what NOAA does, but what
22 we're concentrating on is it has to do with kinds of
23 services that we've heard were provided with Katrina
24 and Rita. And we need to define those services and
25 qualify it with what will NOAA do, you know, in the

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 event that a hurricane scenario, like the Gulf, and
2 created the kind of devastation it did.

3 What is NOAA's function in that role. What
4 sort of resources are necessary to support that? How
5 do you get prepared to do it. How do you sustain that
6 level of effort. And how do you make sure that when
7 that event happens again, NOAA is going to be relied on
8 to be able to actually provide those, and it isn't
9 going to be one of these, "Okay. Let's figure how to
10 do this."

11 I don't think that's the approach you take.
12 That's not what ultimately becomes successful service
13 to anybody. If we're relying on NOAA -- I mean, in
14 just very straight terms. An agency which continues to
15 look like it's not able to handle its core mission,
16 certainly isn't going to be able to step up when it has
17 to in an extraordinary situation like that.

18 MS. BROHL: Scott, could we then suggest
19 that since this one goes directly to testimony we
20 received yesterday, that instead of trying to -- that
21 it may need some more massaging such that we want to
22 take what we learned yesterday and incorporate
23 everybody's thoughts and comments, and so make it one
24 of the tasks as compared to trying to do it today,
25 because it is important?

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. RAINEY: This is the tremendous
2 challenge we're always under, which is to grab these
3 ideas and translate them into recommendations. I
4 absolutely agree. And again, this is just from where
5 we're starting from. I don't know whether it's
6 something -- the HSRP recommends that NOAA navigation
7 services programs develop strategic operating plan for
8 response and recovery operations.

9 MR. LARRABEE: I wouldn't make that the
10 first step, Scott. The first step, I think is -- you
11 know, just thinking in terms of the plan check cycle of
12 how we all behave. We're in the check cycle right now.
13 We've been -- I'd like -- Where's the after action
14 report from NOAA on their response to Katrina and Rita?
15 And this should break out, not only what they did, but
16 what they'll do again in the future.

17 What it cost them in the way of resources.
18 Did they recover those resources. What resources, as a
19 result of learning about this event? What additional
20 resources will they need the next time? And that has
21 to be done in a very systematic way. And then you plan
22 for that. You go out and exercise it, and make that
23 it's there. That's sort of the cycle.

24 MR. RAINEY: I know it's undertaking, and I
25 know that we did request it, and I know Captain Parsons

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 has forwarded that. So that was one of the first
2 things we did.

3 MR. PARSONS: The after-action report is
4 due to the General Kelly's desk on the 31st of this
5 month. And that will be brief. I'm not aware at this
6 point whether it will be made public, but it can be
7 made available to the Panel.

8 MR. WEUST: Does it include cost?

9 MR. PARSONS: I couldn't answer that.

10 MR. DASLER: It seems to me just
11 legitimately that the NRTs should receive some funding
12 from some of those costs that could get recovered,
13 especially to use side scan. The side scan has other
14 uses of detecting objects that are important to
15 Homeland Security.

16 MR. LARRABEE: I think what we need to
17 avoid doing is making those sort of tactical
18 recommendations. I think we need to stay a level above
19 that and say this looks like a function that needs to
20 be provided. You need to think about how you're going
21 to provide in the future. I have no idea if that's the
22 right way to do it or not. I don't know about it.
23 That's NOAA's responsibility.

24 They need to look at that issue and decide
25 do we continue to do this very function? How do we

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 provide the resources for it? Is it something we
2 actually do? Does NOAA have assets or do we contract?
3 We've heard people for two days say there is this
4 capability out there. Should I pay for this capability
5 365 days a year. I think that's the kind of analysis
6 that needs to be done.

7 MR. DASLER: And that's great. But as of
8 now it's coming out of operating budgets, pulling funds
9 from other areas in the service being provided at no
10 cost.

11 MR. LARRABEE: Yeah, but if we can take
12 that issue -- if you take that issue and we take it to
13 the conversation Mike is having in the cabinet level,
14 that's the sort of thing that flows up to a level that
15 people are saying, "Okay. We need to look at the
16 Marine Transportation System in terms of reconstituting
17 it after an accident because we're all thinking about
18 Katrina. It's a good time to talk about that." That's
19 NOAA's opportunity to say, "One of the critical issues
20 is doing survey, because if you can't do the survey,
21 you have no idea what is underneath that channel, and
22 it's the whole notion that it's a critical part of that
23 process."

24 That's not understood by people, and it
25 wouldn't have been understood had we not had those two

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 events. But I suspect at the level that Scott talked
2 about, they don't have a clue as to how these channels
3 are surveyed or who did that.

4 MR. SKINNER: I guess going through this,
5 Scott, I don't see -- The things that really came up at
6 the meetings -- this meeting were the lack of some sort
7 of reimbursement for the work that NOAA did during
8 hurricane recoverage. At least this is what came up to
9 me. And the fact that PORTS is not being funded. The
10 funding is going downhill. And it's sort of hidden in
11 here a little bit. And I think we're at the point
12 where we have to really focus on what's important.

13 I think this is the first meeting where
14 there's been some action or activity that has resulted
15 in some real serious impacts to hydrographic services.
16 Whether it's financial for funds being diverted to
17 other activities or actual cutbacks. And I guess a
18 sense of frustration of going through making a
19 recommendation or looking at things a little bit longer
20 and submitting things so that information flows up or
21 down or sideways, I think we really need to spend some
22 time on how -- how something like this gets
23 communicated. I'm not making much sense here except
24 that the frustration that this is sort of more of the
25 same and that's -- I think we need to work on that.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. RAINEY: Tom, thanks. And that's --
2 that's exactly why we wanted to have this discussion.
3 That's precisely right. The reason I drafted this is
4 because we have to have something to look at. But we
5 need to say, "No, this isn't right." We need to get
6 past that. That doesn't do it. We've got to figure
7 out, "Okay. What is the way to look forward here?" We
8 need to get input, and we need to be able to say, "How
9 do we turn this into action instead of just, again,
10 quite noticeably, paperwork trail?"

11 So that's the point of this is so we can --
12 you know, try to throw some thoughts out there and put
13 it on the table. And believe me, as I did it, I
14 understand the impairment weakness in some of this, but
15 we have to have something to focus upon that we can
16 deliver forward. We have to find some way what we're
17 going to do. So I was trying to articulate our
18 recommendations. I'm not quite sure, other than to
19 start some point and then work from there or -- I'm not
20 quite sure whether we're saying --

21 MS. BROHL: Can I just interject? All of
22 these recommendations are great, and they are great for
23 talking points. Some of them are great as is, and
24 some, as you say, needs a little more in the weaves
25 (phonetic). But we all learned a lot yesterday. And

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 it seems to me one alternative to this, instead of
2 trying to come up with something succinct -- you know,
3 here's one, here's one -- is maybe we have a record of
4 information. We all heard it yesterday.

5 We basically took testimony, a public
6 testimony that we can talk about. Maybe we should --
7 if we have a letter, rather than a bunch of separate
8 recommendations. A letter to the administrator can
9 discuss that. We had a public meeting. We received
10 testimony from these people. It was incredibly
11 helpful. We also had a field trip, and we got to see
12 some of these NOAA services in action, which was very
13 helpful. And as a result, these are the observations
14 and things of need. And they all come together.

15 In some respects, you might be generic,
16 might be general. Talking about the fact that there
17 needs to be more clear plan for how you're going to
18 handle unexpected recovery issues, or diversion of
19 resources. You could be very specific about the fact
20 that we're concerned that the electronic navigation
21 charts seem to be, you know -- we learned that the more
22 charts you have, the more money you have to spend to
23 maintain them, and you have less than for creating new
24 charts. We recognized over and over again that the
25 PORTS program was indispensable.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 Because, again, we could spend an hour
2 talking about is it -- I guess, do you feel it's so
3 important that we actually have some things that we
4 vote on today? And I understand the whole point of
5 deliverables of a meeting. I really appreciate that,
6 and I think it's important. But the testimony we heard
7 speaks for itself, and let that speak for us, maybe, as
8 compared to trying to plod through the wording, because
9 I know it's important to have a recommendation.

10 But I think what we heard yesterday was
11 some powerful information. I'd just hate to get bogged
12 down here on how we're going to express it. I would
13 like to move forward, but not also hold back the idea
14 that you might want something to vote on today.

15 MR. RAINEY: A couple of thoughts. One of
16 the things that -- My biggest thing I've been trying to
17 figure out is how to best do that. We talked about
18 that in the past, how to articulate it. Frankly, it's
19 all going to -- How do we get our message to the
20 community and act upon it?

21 MS. BROHL: That's a different issue.

22 MR. RAINEY: So, again, I took advantage of
23 Mr. Keeney being here yesterday. We talked about that
24 a little bit. But essentially, one of the insights he
25 shared with me is it's the same things with many of the

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 members are sharing with me. He pointed out that his
2 sense is that there's -- with the Admiral, there's a
3 limit to the need for sort of informational groupings,
4 and we need to get more action.

5 He would probably be more interested in
6 things that are actionable items. Recommendations that
7 he can act on and make decision on, rather than just
8 kind of background information. I think that goes true
9 for our Panel as well, and to try to get this into --
10 Many of the difficulties are -- is to focus that down
11 to these are the few actionable items that we really
12 are focusing on the priorities and turn them into
13 actions.

14 The only thought, I guess, I have for
15 proposing, having the testimony speak for itself is I
16 don't -- clearly, it's compelling, but I'm not sure
17 how -- other than we have that transcribed, and we have
18 copies of some of the slides. But I don't know how
19 that carries up to the Admiral, other than these
20 representatives here.

21 MS. BROHL: I'm just trying to help get
22 this moved forward because I don't see us getting
23 anything. If you're asking for a motion, then someone
24 can make a motion and we can begin a discussion to
25 actually have something done. But if -- it's not a

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 problem. I'm just trying to move -- This issue of
2 getting someone to pay attention is a whole another
3 issue.

4 MR. PARSONS: I would also like to remind
5 the Panel that the folks that need to pay attention are
6 sitting in this room now, and turn to the directors of
7 NGS Post CS CO-OPS. And, certainly, we are the eyes
8 and ears and action officers, as well, for the Admiral
9 for these programs. So I wouldn't be overly concerned
10 with expecting the administrative to act on it. The
11 folks that have acted on it are in this room.

12 MS. BROHL: Again, I wasn't trying to have
13 a debate about -- I think there's two separate issues.
14 One, you're trying to move something forward, and I'm
15 respecting that in saying, "Okay. Let's just do it.
16 If what you want is to go through these one at a time,
17 let's do it, and let's not" -- We all recognize that we
18 might want some of these to get more attention now.
19 That's another discussion, though, I think.

20 So if what it is comes -- I don't
21 want -- I don't really want to have a long debate on
22 structure. How do we structure this. I'm just trying
23 to move it forward. So if what you really want is for
24 us to take this first one, or the first one talking
25 about natural and man-made disasters, and take it as is

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 and vote on it, we could do that. I'm not sure if I
2 understood how to incorporate the Admiral's comments
3 into that is all.

4 MR. RAINEY: I apologize for the way I kind
5 of laid this out, because I think that puts some hold
6 to the way we started out. I was trying to identify
7 all the pieces of stuff that we have in the wind here.
8 What would be most helpful to me for this time before
9 lunch would be to understand -- I mean, it seems like
10 we work this every meeting. Then now what?

11 And if we can discuss do we think -- I
12 mean, I think the message is we don't think we've been
13 as effective as we hope we could be in our process or
14 in our communication. So what I'm trying to get from
15 folks is, "Okay. How do we make it better, our
16 process?" I'm trying to struggle how do we do the
17 process. So I would be -- I would be happy to turn it
18 over and entertain a motion from any of the Panel
19 members on recommendations on the vote. Get a second
20 and discuss it and pass it or not, or take a minute and
21 if anybody has ideas to improve our process. That's
22 what I'm asking.

23 MR. LARRABEE: Scott, we came here with an
24 agenda. The agenda was NOAA's roles to two major
25 catastrophes. We spent two days listening to people

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 and watching things and learning an awful lot. And
2 from that we came up with some very clear thoughts
3 about our concerns. Whether they're being done or not,
4 I don't know. The fact that there is an after-action
5 report being written, I'm encouraged.

6 I don't know what the next steps are in the
7 process. I don't know what it includes, whether it
8 includes critical issues, but it seems to me that we
9 could easily take this issue and say, you know, you
10 could proceed your recommendations with a paragraph
11 that says, "Here are the major issues that we learned.
12 We learned that NOAA is critical in the aftermath of
13 these two events. And here are the things they did.
14 We believe that this is going to be a service that NOAA
15 is going to be asked to provide in the future, and our
16 concern is that NOAA is capable of providing that
17 service. And here are the things that we think ought
18 to be done. And one of those is to make sure we get
19 the money back from the amount we spend. It has a
20 tremendous affect. And NOAA is doing this with this
21 very small budget." That's a critical element.

22 Now, I'm sure that the administrator knows
23 that. But getting it sort of put back in a form where
24 he can point to and take with him is important. I
25 mean, that could start the discussion at the cabinet

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 level.

2 MR. RAINEY: And I would vote for that
3 exactly, but my problem is I can't get that written
4 down and we can't vote on it.

5 MR. LARRABEE: Well, I don't we have to do
6 it today. I mean, I think what we did in New Hampshire
7 was basically put that in motion. We had a vote after
8 we left. The end product, I think, is something we're
9 all very proud of. Why would we want to force
10 ourselves in two hours to put together that sort of a
11 product when we don't have to do that, I don't think?

12 MR. RAINEY: All right. I concur with
13 that, and the only thing that I don't know -- I mean,
14 at some point how does that get captured and
15 communicated? I mean, who does that? That's been my
16 struggle for two years is trying to capture that and
17 then articulate it the action of all that's happened,
18 and brief the Admiral and see -- I've been trying to
19 connect that process. That's where I struggle.

20 MR. LARRABEE: The only action -- I mean,
21 we don't do things. We don't take actions. We make
22 recommendations. You make the recommendations. If
23 it's accepted, great. It's not, okay. I mean, that's
24 our job. It stops there. The fact that we're clearly
25 articulating your recommendations, which you do in a

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 written form and we did it in a verbal form through the
2 presentation, that's another detail.

3 But the fact of the matter is what we did
4 in New Hampshire, and what I hope we can do here, is
5 the same sort of thing. It's frustrating when you
6 think that somebody is not listening, or you don't
7 think you're communicating in a way that's effective.
8 That's something we need to work on. But you're not
9 going to actually do anything.

10 MR. RAINEY: No, I understand.

11 MR. SKINNER: I guess there are a couple of
12 issues I wanted to raise. One, Helen, I just disagree
13 in that the message and how it's delivered, I think the
14 terms were, that you thought they were two different
15 things. I think that they're so closely intertwined,
16 and we've had some experience to go on that you can't
17 separate the two. I think we really have to work on
18 that. It doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to
19 continue making recommendations when they don't seem to
20 be acted upon.

21 I think the second thing, Roger, to your
22 comment, I think NOAA is a great agency. I really do.
23 I've worked most closely with OCRM. What I've in
24 hydrographic services and some of the other services,
25 I'm really impressed by who works there and what

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 they're able to do, and I think we saw some pretty good
2 presentations on the response to the hurricanes.

3 The problem is -- and it's great having the
4 people who are going to make the decisions here -- but
5 I think there's an institutional problem at NOAA that I
6 think the Admiral at one point referred to in New York,
7 that is at the root of a lot of the problems, and I'm
8 not quite sure what you can do to change it. But I
9 think that there's something going on. The Admiral's
10 comment was something about having 100 mom and pops
11 stores or something like that that he oversees.

12 And I think -- It's not -- It may be beyond
13 the role of this organization -- or this backup to try
14 and address that. But it seems that that is preventing
15 a lot of the things that we're talking about from
16 actually getting acted on. So there seems to be a lot
17 of frustrations among some of the members that we make
18 recommendations and they don't seem to go anywhere.
19 They're going to the right people, but is NOAA just an
20 agency that needs some -- something to occur there so
21 that it can actually get out of its own way. I don't
22 mean that critically to any of the programs here
23 because I think, as I said, they do a great job.
24 They're very sort of defined in linear, and the
25 integration doesn't seem to work.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. PARSONS: Well, that's my fault. I'm
2 not sure I can answer that now. What I would say is I
3 do understand the frustration of this committee.
4 Certainly, one of the ways most facts measure success
5 is in terms of increased budgets and improvements of
6 the programs. I certainly would say if you take a look
7 at the wide level of recommendations and advice you've
8 been provided -- and most of them have been acted on
9 within the ability the program office to act.

10 That's certainly the recommendations that
11 have been put forth by this committee on improvements
12 and needs for PORTS and NWLON and IOOS and so forth.
13 We certainly post the message uphill. The problem with
14 the difficulty of the disconnecting becomes, "Do you
15 see that -- those recommendations supported by NOAA and
16 supported by commerce and reflected the President's
17 budget? If it is, what occurs to it when it goes to
18 the Hill?" So this is a long process. We spent a long
19 range. It doesn't have immediate response, but I would
20 say don't get too frustrated.

21 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'd like to go back to
22 something Admiral Larrabee said is we had an agenda
23 here for this, and this was hurricane response. In
24 your first point here, your first set of bullets, I
25 think is a good set of whereas, and Admiral Larrabee

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 said as well, NOAA is critical in this process. It
2 will happen again, and we're concerned that there may
3 not be -- NOAA may not be capable of doing it again.

4 Therefore, and again back to the Admiral,
5 the first step is to make sure that an appropriate
6 after-action report is done. We know one is in the
7 pipeline, but we don't know what's in it. So I think
8 we should ask or recommend that this after-action
9 report include a description of what was done, an
10 accounting of what it cost, what costs were recovered,
11 and what the plan is for next time, including what
12 assets are going to be used, what funding will be
13 required, and what strategy are -- is the agency going
14 to use to accomplish those particular missions. So I
15 think that's fairly straightforward, and we should ask
16 that it be done.

17 MR. MCBRIDE: Is that a motion, Andy?

18 MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, I'm not a voting
19 member, so I can't make a motion.

20 MR. DASLER: I make a motion.

21 MR. WHITING: I second.

22 MR. WEUST: Where are we? I popped the
23 bubble here. I'm just going to ask the question. By
24 the way, I absolutely agree. That's the intro and
25 that's what we're here to do. We're frustrated with

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 NOAA systemically and we can't solve it today. But you
2 heard -- First, my question. There's got to be money
3 in this after-action report. Who is putting it
4 together? It's got to be you.

5 MR. PARSONS: This is a NOAA wide.

6 MR. WEUST: Yeah, but your input.

7 MS. BROHL: Right. Did they ask of
8 your --

9 MR. PARSONS: This is from Weather Service

10 --

11 MR. WEUST: Yeah, but is there dollars in
12 there so we can --

13 MR. ZILKOSKI: We've been asked by many
14 different people for how much money we're spending.
15 We're still not sure --

16 MR. PARSONS: I don't know any reported.

17 MR. WEUST: Well, the report is due next
18 Tuesday, folks. Is there God damn money in there or
19 not?

20 MR. PARSONS: We'll find out now.

21 MR. WEUST: We need to know because that's
22 part of what we're here to help you work on. The other
23 thing is if you remember, Katy Yesdayer (phonetic),
24 Tim, you said, "You've got to start rolling." Well,
25 the long-term frustration with NOAA is they have to sit

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 down and have budget house. It's awful, and that's
2 their problem. I don't know how to get out of that
3 except rolling things up in to more important things
4 for the nation.

5 PORTS is now hanging out. There's a one
6 point or five or whatever the heck it was -- it was an
7 easy picking thing, and that's what they do. They pick
8 it. It should be part of a larger, national thing that
9 we've seen here for the last two days. It's absolutely
10 essential to this country. So the long-term systemic
11 solution to NOAA is get rid of all the budget house,
12 not budget lines but it's an important mission for the
13 nation.

14 Back to my job. The Corps. They earmarked
15 the crap out of IOOS. They have for years for lots of
16 reasons. I finally got on this board meeting in
17 October to unanimously vote it will stop earmarking --
18 and this was a stuff meeting. I almost got fired.
19 Will stop funding earmarking NOAA if NOAA will step up
20 to the plate. Do you have a copy of this, David.

21 MR. ZILKOSKI: (No response.)

22 MR. WEUST: I delivered it to Admiral
23 Lautenbacher. He's got to step up to the plate to our
24 ocean agency. I got IOOS. I'm going to define what it
25 is, and I'm going to put some significant money in it.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 And then you do that, then we support you 1000 percent,
2 and we'll stop earmarking. We'll see what you can do.

3 Here's a chance for you to help yourself
4 systemically get better. The same thing with
5 hydrographic services. You've got to roll these
6 things. So when you're sitting there 2:00, 3:00 in the
7 morning in the last committee meeting, "Oh, I can't
8 touch that. It's important." But almost all the lines
9 in there are 1.5, 60 K, 400 K. They're too easy to
10 trim off.

11 One, for example, the last two days to make
12 a case for hydrographic services. It's an important
13 part of the mission. So I absolutely agree with the
14 intro the Admiral gave. If we get that in, I'm happen
15 with the last couple of days.

16 MR. RAINEY: Thanks for that. We're going
17 to break for that, or we're going to lose our lunch.
18 How about after the break then we will take -- we'll --
19 Andy is suggesting that there be a motion after lunch
20 and see if we can pass on that.

21 (Lunch was break.),

22 MR. RAINEY: Picking up from the discussion
23 before lunch. I would like to suggest to this
24 committee. We talked about the number -- some of the
25 important projects. And my suggestion would be to

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 organize this around three primary concerns or issues.
2 Obviously, the primary agenda was to the hear from the
3 federal agencies and stakeholders, and to take a look
4 at and evaluate in recover -- response and recovery
5 that the navigation services had.

6 One of the things I'd like to do is we've
7 got a tremendous amount of testimony. I'd like to have
8 a group of members volunteer. I suggest that we have
9 three major things to take a look at. One of them
10 would be the Navigation Services Emergency Response
11 Plan. These titles we can characterize it. The idea
12 is -- the primary goals there is these navigation
13 services have a tremendous role and contributions to
14 those sorts of activities and needs to be looked at, a
15 systematic way so they can continue to play that role
16 and sustain their ongoing operations.

17 The second group, if you will, issue group
18 will be the role I have, my title, continuity of
19 operations within NOAA Nav services. The issue there
20 being that the group to take and focus and to look at
21 the budgets of the state of those programs that need
22 for NOAA to maintain its operating services as
23 essential and critical mission. That will be the
24 second major area.

25 The third one that I thought would be

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 beneficial for us to do would be to organize a group of
2 volunteers who would take a crack at what I'm going to
3 copy Mike Snyder's term, what I would call the
4 near-term outcome base goals. In other words, to my
5 mind, this is a new way of saying what I proposed
6 sometime earlier. This would be suggested that there
7 be inputs from this Panel to go up through the NOAA
8 chain and carried forward as a substantive list of
9 priorities to put on the bigger table of agenda through
10 that committee.

11 And my suggestion would be we look at those
12 three issues. We have a lot of paper and we've had a
13 lot of testimony, and all of that support. We can
14 organize that and support it along those three board
15 issues and use those as inputs. That's our foundation
16 for discussion of that.

17 When we look at the next meetings, Roger
18 and we look at the schedule, we look like we're a go
19 for an Alaska meeting sometime in August or
20 congressional recess. That's a pretty long jump
21 between where we are today. So I propose we have like,
22 per se, a one day meeting, maybe mid May, in
23 Washington, D.C. The primary object then would be for
24 these issue groups to have take a look at these major
25 issues, put it into something -- this would all be an

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 interim working process.

2 So it will be, hopefully, be prepared in
3 advance before the meeting, and then we can bring it to
4 the public meeting, and we can all discuss these ideas
5 and then kind of wrap these major groups up, and then
6 maybe wouldn't have a bunch of -- it would not be a big
7 presentation meeting. This will be our public meeting
8 to report out on these major issues and come to our
9 conclusions and recommendations on those things, and
10 then pass that forward. And then, again, also
11 hopefully be well thought through for our meeting in
12 August and subsequent to that.

13 MS. BROHL: Do we need a vote on that?

14 MR. RAINEY: No, I don't think so. It
15 seems to me that would give us a frame work. It seems
16 to accommodate the discussion we had this morning about
17 -- instead of trying to ram something through the
18 meeting here. I guess we can do that with a time line.
19 Physically, a target in mid April to get things tied up
20 in time for our mid May meeting and be able to do that
21 in our public form.

22 MS. BROHL: Scott, the three topics, I want
23 to make sure I have them down, are navigation services
24 in emergency response is the first one, continuity and
25 support of map services, the continuity programs, and

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 then near-term outcome base goals is the third one? Is
2 there another area? Does cover the different aspects
3 of what we learned? Because if there's --

4 MR. WEUST: I think a couple of things that
5 are going to come up here will influence what we're
6 going to say, and that is the report, which is due next
7 Tuesday. Then a week after that the budget is rolled
8 up. See where we are with those. Quite honestly, as a
9 Panel we want to comment on that. It's public
10 knowledge. It can be used on the Hill or wherever. I
11 think if it continuously erode, like we've seen in the
12 last couple of years, based on what we've been seeing
13 here and what it can do the last two days, we
14 definitely should comment on it. I don't think we
15 should wait until May.

16 MR. RAINEY: Likewise, we heard we should
17 be getting contacted soon from the strategic planning
18 office folks. So those may be three events that we can
19 take action on in between. Any other thoughts on --

20 MR. WHITING: Can we have a motion on the
21 floor? Do we need to make a motion for these groups?

22 MR. RAINEY: What's going on with that is
23 not so much I was feeding input into it. We have
24 previously, before the meeting, made a request to -- if
25 that was available. That's happened already. It's

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 still being prepared. It's internal hot wash at that.
2 So we -- there has been a request.

3 MR. PARSONS: As soon as that report is
4 available, we'll make it available, the NOAA request
5 for input. It's an internal report that we will make
6 available.

7 MS. BROHL: But I think specifically the
8 motion had to do with demanding that NOS have some
9 input into the report, right?

10 MR. PARSONS: NOS does have input.

11 MR. WHITING: In other words, our motion is
12 out of order?

13 MR. WEUST: I think our motion was on what
14 Admiral Larrabee and what Andrew is talking about is
15 something of one unit. My question on the report was
16 one unit. And if it's due on Tuesday, we've got to
17 know if there's money in it.

18 MR. PARSONS: No, there's not. We checked.

19 MR. WEUST: Then we need something else.
20 What kind of report is it?

21 MR. PARSONS: The best we can tell, it's a
22 report that will result in recommendations and lessons
23 learned. It was certainly forwarded up to those folks
24 putting it together.

25 MR. WEUST: Does it specifically talk about

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 hydrographic services, map services and stuff like
2 that, the role they play, et cetera?

3 MR. PARSONS: I don't have any idea. We
4 certainly have provided that. What the final outcome
5 will, I couldn't comment on that.

6 MR. RAINEY: My point is this, and maybe I
7 misunderstood your question. But we made the request.
8 They said they would give it to us. And as soon as we
9 get it. We'll get it to the group. That's taking all
10 of what we heard here today. That will be another
11 significant input. That's why I requested it in
12 advance to our deliberations. And once we can actually
13 see it, then absolutely. That will be an input to our
14 comments on that, and it will go back forward. I
15 mean --

16 MS. BROHL: But there is a motion on the
17 table that either has to be withdrawn, or it has to
18 be --

19 MR. LARRABEE: I don't remember there being
20 a motion.

21 MR. ARMSTRONG: I don't recall there's a
22 formal motion.

23 MS. BROHL: Maybe informal motion.

24 MR. ARMSTRONG: I don't recall it was a
25 formal motion. However, the sense of my suggestion was

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 that it didn't necessarily involve the upper management
2 of NOAA, but that the navigation services folks,
3 regardless of what the NOAA after-action report said,
4 that the navigation services groups of NOAA should
5 prepare that information. I would still suggest that
6 that happen. I would think that work on that could
7 begin before the meeting in May. And it may not --
8 should go at least -- should go in parallel with this
9 working group.

10 MR. PARSONS: We'll certainly provide that
11 information.

12 MR. WEUST: I think we missing an
13 opportunity. And it's too late to get involved in the
14 report. If NOAA doesn't highlight what we've heard in
15 the last two days and all of that, they've missed a
16 golden opportunity to make a point of important
17 decisions. But just as important is when the '07
18 budget comes out. Congress is going to start working
19 on it in this spring. If we need to comment on it
20 based on what we know or here to do, we need to do it
21 pretty quick and not wait until the end of May.

22 MS. BROHL: But we have to -- I understand
23 that we have to be physically present to have a public
24 meeting to vote on a recommendation.

25 MR. DASLER: When Andy said that he

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 couldn't put something out on the floor, that's when
2 Admiral Larrabee and I seconded it. It was mostly just
3 trying to put something together along with what Andy
4 and Larry put out.

5 MS. BROHL: So there is a motion on the
6 table that has to be can addressed.

7 MR. RAINEY: Could you repeat that for me,
8 Don?

9 MR. DASLER: I'm afraid you were going to
10 ask me that.

11 MR. RAINEY: The motions. And that's -- I
12 can try to rephrase it. I understand the intent of it.
13 There seems to be an equal sense of we need to wait.
14 But you're absolutely right. Get working on that. I
15 think Roger already committed he would get that to us.
16 But let's go ahead and articulate it.

17 MR. DASLER: That's when Admiral Weust
18 mentioned the reports coming out Tuesday that we might
19 not have time. I think that's when we kind of got --

20 MS. BROHL: Should we get someone to maybe
21 sit up front and

22 MR. RAINEY: Is it possible for the
23 stenographer to find that before lunch? Is that
24 possible.

25 THE REPORTER: I can find it.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MR. RAINEY: Is it an acceptable paraphrase
2 to say that HSRP request that co-survey NGS and CO-OPS
3 provide an after-action report analysis, including
4 costs and resources spent on response and recover
5 effort to Hurricane Katrina and Rita to the HSRP?

6 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'd also conclude something
7 about planning for the next one.

8 MR. RAINEY: That's the intent of this
9 group that we're trying to set up to move forward, I
10 think.

11 MR. DASLER: Another option is put the vote
12 on the floor. Do we want to construct something like
13 that right now? Whether we do that right now to vote
14 on, or does it make more sense to wait? I think that's
15 somewhat the question on the floor.

16 MS. BROHL: And would you like, Scott,
17 since you have proposed what you had proposed going
18 overlaps a little bit with what you guys are talking
19 about, and do you want that --

20 MR. RAINEY: Somebody articulated a motion
21 -- and I apologize for the procedural error -- before
22 lunch. If you have a motion, we'll articulate it.

23 MR. LARRABEE: I see no reason for doing
24 this. I mean, I thought we have decided we are going
25 to designate a group of people who are going to work on

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 the recommendations, and then that recommendation is
2 ready. I mean, you can't vote outside the normal
3 process that we have a meeting to vote on. I don't
4 know why we have to do that.

5 MR. PARSONS: It's part of the Federal
6 Advisory Committee role any recommendation be
7 deliberated and voted on --

8 MR. LARRABEE: We didn't do that in New
9 Hampshire.

10 MS. BROHL: We pre-voted, didn't we?

11 MR. PARSONS: No, no. We held a conference
12 call that was available to the public.

13 MR. WHITING: I commented to second that
14 motion.

15 MR. RAINEY: Let me do this. Can I see the
16 list of names on the major group who is willing to work
17 on those issues? And in particular, if somebody that
18 would be interested in leading that effort with the
19 idea of pulling what we have our information we have
20 prepared and other information to bear. That would get
21 the hot wash end, and additional availability of the
22 budget, and that will go immediately to those issue
23 groups.

24 But are there members that would be
25 interested in participated in working on the navigation

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 services response and recovery efforts? I'll just
2 start here and go around. Larry Whiting, Andy
3 Armstrong, Helen Brohl, Jon Dasler, Admiral Larrabee,
4 Sherri Hickman. Is there anybody interested in taking
5 the lead on that? Let me go to the other groups and
6 see.

7 The issue of -- the continuity efforts of
8 existing to continue and support and delivering the
9 operating services with the various programs we work
10 with, and looking at the budget levels and sustaining
11 the effort and delivering the services. Any members
12 interested in working on that issue? Elaine Dickinson
13 and Helen Brohl and Adam McBride.

14 The third that I had suggested was to try
15 to come up with a list on near-term outcome base goals.
16 And that would be looking at suggestions from this
17 committee of actionable items that we could carry
18 forward, NOAA's participation in the committee on
19 maritime transportation. Any members interested on
20 that? John Oswald, and Larry Whiting. I will talk to
21 Bill Gray about this, and see if he may be interested
22 on that.

23 Again, I think the best thing we can do
24 then is to force out the information we have, get those
25 to those groups, and I'll try to coordinate a role in

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 that.

2 MR. LARRABEE: A suggestion. Would it be
3 useful for us to get together as groups for half an
4 hour and outline our approach and bring it back?

5 MR. RAINEY: That was my intent and -- It
6 will be useful that would end up being --

7 MR. PARSONS: No. We can do that. We can
8 suspend the public meeting and break up in work groups
9 and come back. Sure. No problem, which is what I
10 presume you're asking for.

11 MR. LARRABEE: Yes, unless there's another
12 suggestion.

13 MR. RAINEY: That's the only way we can do
14 that. Let's go ahead with that. I think it would be
15 good since we're here and we have the time. That's
16 what I would like to do is kind of get us organized as
17 we can. We do have one other piece of business.

18 Helen has prepared an initial
19 recommendation on the HSIA, which is a whole business
20 continuing and we have that. And I think we'd have to
21 reconvene the public meeting to address that. I would
22 like to have that and see if we have public comments or
23 questions.

24 MR. WEUST: I thought I would ask Roger to
25 evaluate the '07 budget, the impacts on hydrographic

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 services. I would ask David to do the same thing on
2 IOOS, the '07.

3 MR. PARSONS: Will do.

4 MR. RAINEY: Are there any other comments,
5 otherwise, what I'd like to do is adjourn into those
6 issue groups. And it would be extremely helpful to me
7 if there is an individual member that I could work
8 with.

9 MR. LARRABEE: We'll come back.

10 MR. RAINEY: Let's adjourn.

11 MS. BROHL: Do we need a motion to adjourn?
12 I move we adjourn.

13 MS. HICKMAN: Second.

14 (Break was taken.)

15 MR. RAINEY: What I'd like to do is get a
16 report out from the three issues that we just broke
17 into. We have to vote, approve that the minutes from
18 the last meeting. First, I'd like to do that and get
19 it out of the way. And as I mentioned, Helen has some
20 work product on the HSIA that she would like to
21 introduce and get a motion on that.

22 So if I could, let's -- are there -- let me
23 try to see if we've got representatives in the three
24 issue groups. I know we did from the navigation
25 services and emergency response group. Mike, if you

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 could start that out, and we'll get some ideas on that.
2 And if there's folks from the continuity operations,
3 and lastly the NAV services emergency response plan,
4 near-term outcome base.

5 MR. DASLER: It's pretty straightforward
6 what we're looking at. It's basically starting with
7 what's happening and outline as a base, and reworking
8 that. And then Admiral Larrabee will work on getting
9 our preamble. And Andy Armstrong will work on
10 capturing some of those comments. But one thing that
11 we're doing is request as soon as it's available is the
12 after-action report put on Tuesday. We can comment on
13 that. And then we'll work on putting something
14 together, circulating it back around to the group, and
15 set a goal of March 1st.

16 Preamble is basically going to capture
17 everything we've heard. Yesterday and today we
18 basically heard a lot of good information that is going
19 to get captured in the preamble report. And Admiral
20 Larrabee is going to put that together. And then we're
21 going to take the outline that Scott had started and
22 then try to capture some of the comments that Andy
23 Armstrong had, and kind of put together some action
24 items or recommendations.

25 We'll circumscribe that back around, after

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 we feel we have something put together, for the Panel
2 members, and then try to put it to a vote before March
3 1st. But one of the things that we request is the
4 after-action report that's due out next Tuesday. So
5 when that's available.

6 MR. RAINEY: Members from the continuity
7 operations of the NOAA Nav Services.

8 MS. DICKINSON: Somehow I was tagged to do
9 this. I'll give it my best shot. Our group talked
10 about the need for integrating the components of
11 resistance into the IOOS backbone. And we need to
12 define the problem a little bit more as far as what we
13 see as an aversion of some existing programs. And we
14 want to incorporate the -- or at least remind the
15 language in HSIA that says that "subject to available
16 funding, this shall be done," and reinforce that.

17 And also support the idea that NOAA -- we
18 feel should be a lead agency for IOOSs. It's not
19 official yet, but it is also recommended by the Ocean
20 Commission, and I think that would strengthen our
21 position as far as supporting these programs that NOAA
22 be the lead agency. And to stress the need for a more
23 holistic approach as far as packaging these programs so
24 that they do become part of IOOSs or get the benefits
25 of some support of the funding that IOOS is getting

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 that these programs aren't, particularly PORTS.

2 And stress the importance of marine
3 observations that are used by numerous by stakeholders.
4 So somehow I'll but that together. Anyone who has
5 input can help me out.

6 MR. RAINEY: Who is in that group?

7 MS. DICKINSON: Helen, myself and Adam.

8 MS. BROHL: And we're going to use a lot of
9 the verbiage that Scott provided, so it's a base we're
10 drawing off of.

11 MR. PARSONS: Can I suggest that a
12 non-voting member part of that group be provided
13 assistance, if required?

14 MS. BROHL: We should probably have Mike, I
15 suppose. I don't think you're on a committee right
16 now, are you? ATAKS (phonetic)?

17 MR. SZABADOS: As a non-voting member, can
18 I give an opinion?

19 MR. PARSONS: Sure.

20 MR. RAINEY: As far as timeline, is there a
21 particular target time for people to have? Did you
22 have one in mind or just --

23 MS. BROHL: No. It's based on her
24 schedule, Elaine's schedule because of the magazine
25 deadline. Once she's into that, at some point I think

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 we'll vote fairly rapidly.

2 MS. DICKINSON: I can work on it in
3 February.

4 MS. BROHL: So I suspect because we had
5 some good verbiage to start with and ATAKS (phonetic)
6 is not that large that we'll probably have something to
7 work with in the next month, and something to the
8 members after that.

9 MR. RAINEY: The other one is near-term
10 outcome base goals. Again, looking at priorities for
11 those involvement in CMTS.

12 MR. LAPINE: We elected Bill Gray. I'll
13 take a crack at this, but I hope my other members chime
14 in. Ours aren't quite as formulated as the other two
15 groups. I'm sorry to say. We picked three goals. And
16 we defined "near term" as a three to five years. And
17 the first one is to accelerate the reduction of the
18 survey backbone. Any problems with that from my team?

19 Some of the things we'd like to look at is
20 not just the hydro shorelines, vessel replacements,
21 aircraft replacements. All encompassing. Look at that
22 goal. The other one is -- We have three. The second
23 one is the role of height modernization to support the
24 contract service and their goals. We'll come up with
25 some specific goals.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 The third one which is -- I just really
2 can't put it into words, but it has to do with looking
3 over CO-OPS from the point of view, maybe building
4 goals that are more sellable, more sustaining. I don't
5 know exactly how we want to do that. We talked about
6 the term PORTS. Maybe how we can eliminate that and
7 still provide goals and the necessary -- the importance
8 of the overall program. We wrestled with that to the
9 ground. Go back and forth on e-mail and see if we can
10 come up with a better explanation.

11 MR. LARRABEE: I think yours is a little
12 bit more challenging in a sense that you have to sort
13 of go out and put yourself in a place of that group of
14 people who is going to sit around that table, and has
15 talked about the large strategic issues of the maritime
16 transportation. And I think if you aren't careful, you
17 certainly will get into sort of subsets of providing
18 something larger.

19 What I think we will be looking at is
20 something more in a sense that is, you know -- an
21 essential element of the maritime transportation system
22 is accurate and timely realtime information to make
23 decisions on ships' navigation. That's the whole
24 notion of this information being critical to efficient
25 maritime transportation system, rather than some

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 element. I mean, I don't think that the -- how you
2 deliver the service is necessary. It's defining that
3 service in a way where it fits in with the rest of the
4 pieces of the maritime transportation.

5 I'm not articulating this very well. I
6 think you have to think up at least one or two levels
7 above of some of those suggestions because I don't
8 think it's going to get you where -- you're going to
9 have secretaries of transportation and DHS and others
10 sitting around and talking about some fairly
11 down-in-weeds kind of activities.

12 MR. PARSONS: Yeah. I would follow up on
13 the Admiral's comment, particularly on the accelerate
14 survey backlog. You've sort of thrown out some topics
15 that are pretty darn immediate. Are you
16 suggesting that you -- I'm not sure what you are
17 suggesting. Elaborate on that a little bit? Well,
18 what do you hope to look at and what kind of guidance
19 do you hope to provide?

20 MR. LAPINE: And my Panel can weigh in
21 anytime.

22 MR. SZABADOS: It came about from somewhat
23 of the discussion of Captain Barnum, and that he -- at
24 the end of his slides he had some futures that was on
25 the top of the list. It ties in with so many of these

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 other, tides, CO-OPS and OCS. Currently, as he
2 reported, NOAA is doing about 2,500 square nautical
3 miles a year?

4 MR. PARSONS: Roughly.

5 MR. SZABADOS: He's done like 500,000
6 square nautical miles in areas of plans we've approved
7 about a year ago. And I think it's probably feasible
8 if we want to build a system up, let's more rapidly
9 reduce it. We could go to 5,000. Some of these slides
10 suggested 10,000. I mean, that's a waste. But if you
11 raise -- if you reduce the survey backlog, you've also
12 got to catch up with the data possessing, shorelines,
13 tides, and current to the tide aspect. So tides is a
14 few things.

15 MR. LARRABEE: When you talk at that level,
16 you have to start asking yourself some "why" questions.
17 Why is this important? That's the end result.
18 Eventually, I think you're going to get to a point
19 where you link it to the whole notion of the maritime
20 transportation. That's the way you have to sort of
21 phrase it. I know where you start the conversation,
22 but you've got to keep asking yourself why do I want
23 this. And once you can answer that question and go up
24 the high level. That's where you want to be.

25 MR. LAPINE: I think I captured your first

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 sense, which -- it's something like delivery of
2 accurate, timely and realtime navigation services for
3 the MTS?

4 MR. LARRABEE: Yeah. I think it's on that
5 order of magnitude you have to enter in with that
6 conversation with the secretary's level. The "how" you
7 deliver that service is not necessarily what they're
8 interested, nor should it be part of the goal.

9 MR. LAPINE: That's a pretty high level
10 task, I think.

11 MR. LARRABEE: Well, I'm just trying to --
12 I mean, what we're trying to do is provide them with
13 NOAA's input to that high level strategic. And if
14 you're talking in terms of surveys, I think people are
15 going to look around the table and say, "What the heck
16 are you talking about?" We're here to talk about the
17 notion of accurate information. That's understood. I
18 mean, when you talk about the MTS system, you're
19 talking about deep channels, you're talking about the
20 terminals, large amount of cargos, you're talking about
21 landside infrastructure. It's a much higher level of
22 agenda you create.

23 MR. RAINEY: One idea that I have and my
24 thinking on this, and see if this sort of answers the
25 bells is when I look at the symptomatic, there's one

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 thing that's apparent and it's the split of the
2 jurisdiction between the Army Corps of Engineers over
3 the federal maintained channels, and NOAA outside those
4 channels and their approaches. It seems to be a
5 systematic challenge to the MTS system that the ships
6 are coming in with minimal tolerance with accurate
7 information, another is the need for that accurate to
8 make that safe.

9 But also something NOAA could put on the
10 table would be the need for physical confirmation that
11 we're getting the best we can out of these channels.
12 In other words, we all can agree that we -- NOAA was
13 down there. Possibly some efforts, some coordinated
14 efforts across jurisdictional lines to have some
15 conference to these channels and the project without
16 hard things, all these debris on the bottom. Somebody
17 needs to go through.

18 And so that's a priority from the system.
19 Because dredging is so expensive. We've got -- we're
20 running these tolerances and we need to come up with
21 cross agency coordination to have whatever is the
22 acceptable level. I think most of us feel running the
23 center line, it may not be efficient, and we should
24 have a condition study. That might be a high road for
25 the cross-cutting multiple agencies, but it's a

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 systematic problem where we're now having the
2 consequences for not having done that. Atlas 1 is one
3 of the most recent thing that's come up.

4 But systematically, if we could get a
5 federal effort to get a baseline on our channels with
6 confidence that we've looked there and so we know we've
7 got and maintain those channels across the depth so we
8 know we're not going to hit anything. The goal would
9 be to have clear channels. Not have debris.

10 I know the -- as pointed out on that case
11 study, the response so far is look at heightening the
12 penalties, so to speak, if somebody does hit something.
13 And also there's a new reporting requirement that if
14 you lose an anchor, you're going to have to report it.
15 But there hasn't, to my knowledge, been somebody
16 saying, "We need to go down there and survey these
17 federal maintained channels to make sure there isn't a
18 bunch of us -- theses hazards there."

19 That would be a suggestion that's a high
20 level problem systematic to the country and it crosses
21 agency jurisdictions that NOAA won't be able to say
22 this is something that this panel needs to look because
23 you cannot solve it with NOAA because it's outside of
24 our ability to solve it. We are adjacent to those
25 channels, but we all have to get that kind of thing

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 organized in order to coordinate it. That was my
2 thinking. Maybe something along those orders.

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: I guess I would say that I
4 think it would be good to have something stated at the
5 high level, and then to support it some for instances.
6 That way that it's more than just some hollow kind of
7 words that say something, and then the secretary,
8 "Well, do we know what that means?" And in turn we
9 say, "Yes, here are some things here. And two or three
10 of those kind of things that we think are highest to
11 kind of go with this."

12 MR. LARRABEE: You can get into the whole
13 discussion about semantics, but there's goals, there's
14 subjectives, there's milestones, there's projects.
15 There's this whole hierarchy things, that as you get
16 down closer to the bottom, you talk about concrete
17 activities which require money.

18 So the recommendation could be, "Here's the
19 high level goal, but here are the things that would
20 have to get done. Here are the gaps that right now
21 needs to be filled to achieve that goal." It has to be
22 part of the discussion because you can establish the
23 goal but without understanding the -- that -- the rest
24 of that. It really is kind of hollow.

25 MR. RAINEY: Thank you. I will -- after

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 saying that, I would like to say with all these groups
2 and help us coordinate, and I'll certainly work with
3 y'all on that. I'd like to give this at least a shot,
4 and we may decide this is what we can do, but maybe we
5 can come up with some things that -- as we go forward
6 and provide substance to that work that Mike Snyder is
7 going to be doing. Any other comments on these issues?
8 Next, I'll turn over to Helen on HSIA.

9 MS. BROHL: It's in the books. It's under
10 Tab D. It hasn't changed since we've talked about it
11 two days ago. The real question is are you guys
12 comfortable with having a generic statement of support
13 of HSIA as compared to breaking it down into its
14 components and comments on the components, or coming up
15 with a bill? Which is more much difficult and would
16 take up more time.

17 MR. PARSONS: If I might add. This is up
18 for reauthorization again of '07. NOAA has not yet
19 completed its review of what it wants included in.
20 Keep in mind HSIA, as it's written now, will likely
21 include some additional requests for NOAA. At that
22 time, certainly, we will provide copies or summaries of
23 those conclusions to the Panel for their comment, but
24 those aren't available right now.

25 MS. BROHL: That's interesting. Seeing

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 that we can't comment on NOAA's proposal -- This really
2 has to be initiated this year. The problem is this is
3 the second session of the Congress, so if it doesn't
4 pass this year, then it has to be reintroduced next
5 year. But it has to be completed and passed by
6 September 30t of 2007, otherwise it all dries up.

7 They could fund these line items through
8 continuing resolutions. That's probably what would
9 happen. I don't know if the Panel will still exist,
10 but this is simple. We're not trying to say NOAA
11 should analyze it. Just saying they should support it
12 to get a move on it because it has to be brought to
13 someone's attention soon.

14 Any comments or thoughts about a generic
15 one? I mean, we can wait and see what NOAA comes up
16 with and comment on their one, but again --

17 MR. PARSONS: Let me commit by the next
18 meeting -- and presumably we'll discuss that later --
19 but probably the May time frame that we will provide
20 the Panel with a list of changes that NOAA will be
21 pursuing.

22 MS. BROHL: So do you want to wait and see
23 those and comment on the proposed changes, or support a
24 general reauthorization so at least then should this
25 make its way to the Hill where there's absolutely no

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 enthusiasm for doing anything about it whatsoever, that
2 there's something to hand and say, "See, it just so
3 happens that through public information act, we happen
4 to have a copy of a recommendation the panel made to
5 help able" --

6 MR. MCBRIDE: I'd old like to see what NOAA
7 is going to propose.

8 MS. BROHL: Adam said he'd like to -- you'd
9 like to hold off until we see what NOAA proposes?

10 MR. DASLER: Is it feasible to comment? In
11 other words, show our support of the way it is as it is
12 now, and then make comment after NOAA's proposal.

13 MS. BROHL: I don't think the statement
14 would -- this statement doesn't say -- doesn't break
15 all the parts. It's just a little generic. And I
16 don't know if there's anything here that automatically
17 says we're disapproving. That we want it to be just a
18 simple reauthorization. We're just saying we want it
19 to be reauthorized.

20 MS. HICKMAN: Roger, you say you'll have
21 that next week?

22 MR. PARSONS: We can certainly have that by
23 next meeting.

24 MS. BROHL: Which would be May.

25 MS. HICKMAN: You're talking about May?

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 MS. BROHL: I just think that it's going to
2 be a lot harder -- take more time to comment -- I
3 presume. We don't know what the changes are going to
4 be like. If they're going to be voluminous. But if
5 there are a lot of changes, it's going to take more
6 time to come up with recommendations and comment on
7 those.

8 So then we're getting into May, June,
9 waiting for August to have something to respond to what
10 we might get by May. Frankly, that's too late for
11 trying to get something introduced this year, such that
12 if it doesn't make it all the way through it can be
13 fast tracked at the start of the next year because the
14 chances of getting something through and waiting until
15 2007 and trying to get it passed through pre-session of
16 a Congress by October 1st of that year is pretty slim.
17 If it had gone through previously and got pretty close,
18 then they pretty much can dump the bill. Same bill
19 back in. It could fast track.

20 MR. LARRABEE: Helen, you're making these
21 recommendations to the administrator who's already
22 doing it. We're not making these recommendations to
23 Congress.

24 MS. BROHL: I understand, but these
25 recommendations, despite the fact that they are not

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 just for -- they're for the administrator, our public
2 record, and that public record can make its way to
3 Capital Hill. Somebody might have an interest in doing
4 that. I think that's really the motivation.

5 MR. RAINEY: I personally -- I strongly
6 support the HSIA. I think the difficulty is there
7 wouldn't be anything at all precluding us, individually
8 or collectively or other navigational coalition or
9 whatever to voice those concerns. I think we are doing
10 that.

11 In our role as HSRP we may need to maybe --
12 I don't know whether we're going to -- how much help
13 this would be to the administrator, and see what input
14 he has, and we could separately and immediately and
15 continually, you know, go to Congress and advocate for
16 further reauthorization. I'm not sure we lose
17 anything. We're not ---

18 MS. BROHL: In thinking about it. If it
19 goes -- given the fact that the administrator is
20 working on this, NOAA is working on a bill, and
21 obviously probably supports reauthorization -- I don't
22 think that's the thing -- then do we look kind of
23 stupid. And that would be the downside. But it is
24 nice to have something -- It would be nice to think
25 that somehow this could make it up to -- get itself up

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 to the Hill where there's absolutely nothing going with
2 this legislation. But I don't think it's worth having
3 any -- having to make us look stupid, I guess.

4 MS. HICKMAN: Roger, what is your thoughts?

5 MR. PARSONS: I would suggest that you wait
6 until you see what NOAA is going to push as far as
7 changes. We can probably get that before the May
8 meeting, but no later than that.

9 MS. BROHL: Everybody just want to wait?
10 Okay. Any comments? Next subject?

11 MR. RAINEY: There's one matter about this
12 we've got to officially vote on the summary of the
13 minutes under Tab A. If I can entertain a motion to
14 approve?

15 MS. BROHL: I move that we approve the
16 minutes of the meeting.

17 MR. SKINNER: Second.

18 MR. RAINEY: All in favor?

19 (Aye)

20 Now, the discussion on the meeting summary.
21 I would like to vote then possible because there's a
22 New Hampshire meeting, which is a short summary of the
23 public voice to approve the proceedings of the
24 recommendation out of New Hampshire. Discussion? I
25 see none. All in favor of the adopting the minutes?

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 (Aye)

2 MR. RAINEY: Oppose?

3 (None)

4 MR. RAINEY: Any other old business?

5 MR. Whiting: Where does it come in on the
6 comment about Mitch Ross's Brooks Act (phonetic)? I
7 know Mitch Ross isn't here to defend himself. I don't
8 know how much of the history of Brooks (phonetic) you
9 people know, but most of that law has resulted in
10 safety problems, building collapse, surveys being
11 completed completely wrong that affected the public.

12 So the Brooks Act and the licensing laws of
13 the various states -- this is what has resulted over
14 the years from a safety point of view. Good for the
15 public. That's why the Brooks Act was enacted in
16 1940s, somewhere in there, and allow the QBS (phonetic)
17 selecting the contractors based on their
18 qualifications.

19 Whenever you take and put in a price
20 system, as in this one, what the low bid -- even under
21 the QBS, you're going to be raising the overhead of the
22 contractors. It costs a lot of money to put in a bid
23 as such, especially where NOAA does not have a specific
24 surveying plan that delineates the miles that will be
25 out there, exactly how to survey it. And it also would

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 not allow the contractors to have an input into the
2 specifications of that project.

3 Everybody that I know of here, CMT surveys
4 differently. Terraston (phonetic) surveys differently
5 than Fugro. I'm sure everybody surveys differently
6 than David Evans. So whenever you start a low bid
7 situation, you're going to raise their cost. It costs
8 \$20,000 or more to put a proposal as NOAA asked from
9 them now. That's just on the passport (phonetic).
10 That doesn't include how much to be qualified.

11 So whenever you put in a requirement for a
12 low bid and you're competing against the others, you're
13 going to take that \$125,000 cost analysis that NOAA
14 turned out, and you're going to make it a half a
15 million dollars that's going to cost contractors. So
16 we have to remember that these Brooks Act, the QBS and
17 the IBIQ have culminated from 100 years of safety
18 problems in the past, and that we are using it now to
19 illuminate safety problems and accidents in the future.
20 Is that enough?

21 MR. PARSONS: Let me just add for the
22 record. I don't believe the last three days anybody
23 from NOAA had suggested that we not award contracts of
24 the Brooks Act. It is part of the federal acquisition
25 regulations, and there's no hence that we were backing

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 away from it.

2 MR. WHITING: But he didn't point out why
3 it became. It started in 1907 in Wyoming.

4 MR. RAINEY: All right. Thanks.

5 MR. MCBRIDE: Scott, I have one question.
6 Could we get -- Roger, you could help with this, I'm
7 sure -- the specific committee and subcommittee
8 memberships in Congress both authorizing the
9 appropriation for NOAA?

10 MS. BROHL: You can actually get it online.

11 MR. PARSONS: We can certainly work on
12 that.

13 MS. BROHL: You can get the information
14 committee list on -- on their web site. Thomas dot
15 something.

16 MR. PARSON: We'll provide a list to the
17 Panel members by middle of next week.

18 MR. RAINEY: One of the first orders of
19 business is we'll get back to the Panel member for
20 proposed window in mid May for a short briefing in
21 Washington, and then also with proposed dates checked
22 for the August time frame meeting in Alaska.

23 MR. PARSONS: There was a suggestion that
24 the summer meeting be held in Alaska. I believe both
25 Larry and John, correct me if I'm wrong, suggested mid

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 August in Anchorage; is that correct? Between early
2 and mid August?

3 MR. WHITING: Yes. That is correct.

4 MR. PARSONS: That would coincide with the
5 congressional recess. Hopefully get some interest by
6 the last delegation they just had?

7 MR. WHITING: Yes, I believe that Mr. Young
8 would be available. I don't know about Senator
9 Stephens. I know that Don is tied up on the 10th of
10 August. He decided that. And he usually goes home
11 after the 15th, and goes back to Fort Hugon after the
12 15th or 17th of August. So it's going to have to be
13 the first two weeks of August.

14 MR. PARSONS: We'll throw out an e-mail and
15 get folks responding by next week. As Scott pointed
16 out, from now to mid August is a fairly long period of
17 time. There was a suggestion that the Panel meet for
18 one day, either in person or via some sort of
19 teleconference capability, sometime in the early part
20 of May to deliberate and discuss on the issues brought
21 up here on the Panel. So we will throw out some dates
22 here as well for the early part of May in the D.C.
23 area. I think, again, it will be an opportunity to get
24 the new NOSAA (phonetic) to that meeting or perhaps
25 even to the Anchorage meeting.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. DASLER: American Counsel of Engineer
is having their award May 2nd. I'll be back.

MR. PARSONS: You're getting an award?

MR. DASLER: Sherman Lake. Up for a
national award.

MR. RAINEY: Any other old business? All
right then. Thank you very much. I'd like to
entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. MCBRIDE: So move.

MR. DASLER: Second.

MR. RAINEY: All right. Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:08 p.m.)

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL, JANUARY 26, 2006

1 THE STATE OF TEXAS :
2 COUNTY OF HARRIS :

3 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
4 TO THE HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES
5 REVIEW PANEL PROCEEDING
6 TAKEN ON JANUARY 26, 2006

7 I, An Nhu Chau, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and
8 for the State of Texas, hereby certify that this
9 transcript is a true record of the proceeding given by
10 the witnesses named herein.

11 I further certify that I am neither attorney nor
12 counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
13 parties to the action in which this testimony was
14 taken. Further, I am not a relative or employee of any
15 attorney of record in this case, nor do I have a
16 financial interest in the action.

17 Subscribed and sworn to on this, the 24th day of
18 February, 2006.

19 An N. Chau
20 An N. Chau, Texas CSR 7021
21 Expiration Date: 12/31/06
22 Wendy Ward Roberts &
23 Associates
24 Firm Registration No. 216
25 1205 Main Street
Garland, Texas 75040
Office: (972) 494-2000
Fax: (972) 494-2269