

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL

PUBLIC MEETING

DAY 2 - VOLUME III

LOCATION:

PAGES 255-400

Marriot Providence

1 Orms Street

Providence, Rhode Island 02904

Acting Chair: Ed Welch

Vice Chair: Ed Welch

May 6, 2010

8:33 a.m. - 4:46 p.m.

1 if that ship's going to come in or not.

2 ED WELCH: Captain Andy McGovern.

3 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: Just to keep
4 beating you up on this Gary, the activity
5 talked about the resumption of the waterway
6 use, not -- this is not pre-storm, this is
7 after.

8 And the resiliency of the MTS I think is
9 the primary concern of I know the last
10 administration and I'm assuming this one,
11 especially after the storms, you know -- this
12 could be from any -- whether it's a storm, an
13 oil spill, you know, TSI, whatever.

14 It's getting that system back up and
15 running. And whatever -- obviously there's
16 going to be a lot of interagency coordination;
17 but as Sherri said, the -- anything the locals
18 can do, too, is very important.

19 And maybe that's what's missing from this,
20 is, all right, you've got this interagency
21 cooperation, but it's also got to be
22 interagency and, you know, state and local.
23 And I think you're missing that from the --
24 from the picture.

1 GARY MAGNUSON: Well, you -- Andy,
2 insightful as ever, you put your finger on a
3 weak link within the CMTS, is that the extent
4 to which we've engaged stakeholders.

5 We've been limited in our ability to do
6 that. I think it's certainly an area that we
7 need to improve in the future. We had a
8 stakeholder workshop before this document was
9 developed to -- I think you participated, if I
10 recall, and to get some ground-truthing into
11 this document.

12 We were also going to take the
13 implementation plan, which is essentially the
14 activities, a have a similar workshop with the
15 stakeholders and say, hey, are we doing the
16 right thing?

17 Are there other things maybe we should do
18 instead of it. And that workshop, should I
19 use, in a kind word was postponed by the
20 Secretary's office.

21 So we're hoping that that still happens,
22 but it's looking less and less likely. But
23 it's an area that the CMTS needs to -- needs to
24 better include in its work, because we don't

1 have the -- the Feds don't have all the
2 answers.

3 ED WELCH: Okay.

4 Gary, we appreciate -- Jon?

5 JONATHAN DASLER: Again, just one class
6 comment on --

7 GARY MAGNUSON: Yes, Jon.

8 JONATHAN DASLER: -- keeping the waterways
9 open.

10 An example of that not too long ago is
11 just a few years ago with the incident on the
12 Mississippi, oil barge collided with the bridge
13 and there was a spill and it basically shut
14 down commerce on the Mississippi.

15 And then there was a group that was stood
16 up -- and I know it was the Coast Guard and I
17 think a member of the Department of Commerce,
18 but it was realized that there was a desperate
19 need to get -- to prioritize the traffic,
20 because by then, there was a large backup of
21 traffic sitting off of the Mississippi River
22 Delta waiting to get upriver.

23 And a lot of the terminals -- oil
24 terminals were going to shut down, and there

1 was going to be a significant economic impact
2 to the United States.

3 So there was a select group that was
4 picked to prioritize shipments of what was
5 going to keep the US economy going, and they
6 would prioritize those ships moving up the
7 Mississippi.

8 And there's a good chance this is going to
9 happen again within a few days, and the CMTS --
10 it seems like they should play a role in that,
11 get on that panel. And I don't know if they
12 were involved in that particular accident

13 GARY MAGNUSON: No.

14 JONATHAN DASLER: I can see this coming in
15 a few days later.

16 GARY MAGNUSON: The CMTS, again, it
17 depends, depends, Jon, on an agency willing to
18 champion the activity and get the other
19 agencies' support for it.

20 As I mentioned, the conference that was
21 sponsored by Commerce and Transportation a year
22 ago, that was last May, on that particular
23 somewhat related issue of bottlenecks and
24 identifying those bottlenecks, and they were

1 very good as far as including stakeholder
2 involvement in that conference.

3 The -- the downside is that nothing has
4 come from that yet. We're hoping that --
5 because it's listed on our activities, the
6 International Trade Administration in addition
7 to DOT haven't stepped up yet.

8 I think they're planning to do that, but
9 they haven't stepped up to focus on what
10 activities they are going to do, but you raise
11 a good point.

12 ED WELCH: Andy McGovern.

13 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: Jon, just to
14 answer your last concern, since the storms,
15 every Coast Guard sector has been required to
16 stand up what's called an MTSRU, Marine
17 Transportation System Recovery Unit, which is
18 made up of local stakeholders and any of the
19 agencies that would be -- you know, NOAA is
20 obviously one of the players in the Coast Guard
21 and the Corps, you know, et cetera, and that is
22 to get the system back up and running as
23 quickly as possible and potentially to
24 prioritize shipments, et cetera.

1 But they did learn from that, and that is
2 now part of each sector command as -- and
3 again, it's made up of both industry and
4 agencies, local and federal and state.

5 ED WELCH: Okay.

6 Gary, thanks for the report. As you know,
7 this panel has been supportive of the CMTS and
8 I think a couple of years ago made some
9 recommendations to the NOAA administrator about
10 continued participation and CMTS's role been
11 the federal structure.

12 So we -- we appreciate it and convey our
13 good wishes back to your colleagues on the CMTS
14 secretarial staff.

15 GARY MAGNUSON: I will do that. Thank you
16 all.

17 ED WELCH: Okay.

18 Our next topic --

19 MINAS MYRTIDIS: Just off the record.

20 (Off the record.)

21 ED WELCH: Our next presentation updates
22 on NGS CO-OPS and OCS offices, and I think Rich
23 Edwing is going on first.

24 Captain Lowell gave us the Office of Coast

1 Survey yesterday, so it's Rich and Juliana
2 today.

3 RICHARD EDWING: Okay, Jill, I'll try to
4 be your friend here. I can talk pretty fast,
5 too, but hopefully we'll get along.

6 Good afternoon, everyone. I am Rich
7 Edwing, acting director of CO-OPS. I know you
8 all knew Mike Szabados, who, after about ten
9 years as director of CO-OPS, decided to step
10 down and retire at the end of this past year.

11 Very difficult decision for him. He had
12 actually been thinking about it for a couple of
13 years, was really wrestling with it right up to
14 the end, but he did decide to retire to spend
15 more time with his grandkids and enjoy life,
16 so -- so just a little bit about me.

17 I was actually just thinking at the end of
18 this month, I'm going to hit 34 years of
19 service with NOAA, so pretty good, I think.

20 I did start off as a GS5, not a GS4, like
21 Laura Furgione pointed out. I'll that rub into
22 her face a little bit, although she's worked
23 her way up a little higher than me, so we'll
24 see.

1 I started off with CO-OPS, what they
2 called it back then, at the water level
3 program, working with the National Water Level
4 Observation Network.

5 Did that for about 20 years and kind of
6 worked my way up through the organization. I
7 then took a detail up to the NOS headquarters
8 level and learned to do the legislative affairs
9 and budgeting and strategic planning and all
10 those sorts of things, as well as the
11 administer side.

12 After a few years, I actually -- I took a
13 permanent job and became the division chief for
14 the policy and planning division.

15 And in 2002 when the deputy position
16 opened up in CO-OPS, I came back to CO-OPS, and
17 so here I am today. So enough about me.

18 Okay. Next slide.

19 So under recommendation one, CO-OPS does
20 the map. We don't chart, but we have our
21 sister navigation offices that do those things,
22 and we provide some critical support.

23 We provide that -- the title datums that
24 are needed by both NGS and Coast Survey. Coast

1 Survey is mapping and putting soundings on the
2 chart to mean low level water. NGS is backing
3 shoreline to mean high water and mean low
4 water.

5 So -- and that's why we have the National
6 Water Observation now, because of that
7 basically vertical control.

8 But then when we both do projects, there's
9 lots of other things we do both before and
10 after they do their hydro and photogrammetric
11 projects.

12 So I thought I would just highlight this
13 in terms of how many projects we're doing in
14 2010. And for OCS, we have some projections of
15 that, FY11.

16 So I won't go into too much detail on what
17 we do there, but I thought I would highlight
18 that under this section.

19 Next slide.

20 And getting back to the NWLON, we're at
21 210 stations presently. And after Rita and
22 Katrina, most of our Gulf Coast stations were
23 either wiped out or heavily damaged. And ever
24 since then, we've been doing something called

1 hardening, which is where we're just trying to
2 work our way through and elevating them and
3 strengthening them so the next time around they
4 can survive, but more importantly than survive,
5 to continue to provide data when it's most
6 needed during those extreme events.

7 I'm sure during one of the previous
8 presentations, Mike must have highlighted the
9 sentinel stations that we built for them, those
10 big, large piling structures that were designed
11 to specifically withstand Category 4
12 hurricanes.

13 You know, they're four foot in diameter,
14 one-inch stick steel, driven 68 feet in the
15 bottom. They're pretty impressive structures.
16 And they were put into service right -- just
17 right before Hurricane Ike and Gustav hit and
18 did really well.

19 But in FY11, I think we have a couple more
20 coming on. And actually, we're working with
21 the Corps, and the Corps had some tide stations
22 wiped out, and they got some funding to rebuild
23 those. And they had -- had put large elevated
24 structures out there before, which got wiped

1 out.

2 So they actually came to us, said we'd
3 like to use your design, and -- which we're
4 doing. We're doing design for them. They've
5 got money to pay for the construction. We're
6 going to give them our equipment. They're
7 going to put the equipment on there, and when
8 it's all said and done, they're going to turn
9 those stations over to us and they will become
10 high water level observation networks, so
11 that's kind of a good deal for everybody.

12 Those are right off of Houston-Galveston.
13 One is Houston-Galveston and one is off Sidney,
14 Texas.

15 Moving on to the next recommendation,
16 again, we've heard a lot of discussions about
17 the need for common vertical datums. We've
18 been doing a lot of work with the Corps.

19 This is kind of the golden age of
20 collaboration with the Corps, I think. I'm
21 sure Mike had told you probably last year the
22 Corps issued a policy, it's -- you know,
23 basically requires them to use our title datums
24 and national special reference system

1 information for coastal projects.

2 And then more recently they also issued
3 another policy that required them to
4 incorporate sealable change, consider sealable
5 change in coastal projects that they're doing.

6 So they issued their interim policy in
7 July of 2009. And as I understand it, the
8 Corps when it issues policies, it kind of
9 issues them for two years to see how they work
10 and then after two years, modify them to --
11 with any lessons learned.

12 So just a few weeks ago we actually hosted
13 a very large meeting for them where they
14 brought in people from all over the country,
15 and as well as from other federal agencies, to
16 start looking at how well these policies are
17 have been working for them and to start doing
18 what they need to do to get to a final version
19 of this policy, and NGS was involved in that as
20 well.

21 Next slide.

22 VDatum. Juliana will talk more, I think,
23 about kind of the broader VDatum program. And
24 as you know, the group over, the VDatum program

1 manager.

2 But this year and next year we're doing
3 some tide gauge surveys to collect information
4 to help improve the output of our VDatum models
5 or develop new VDatum models.

6 I know the local VDatum model was
7 discussed a little bit earlier. We
8 actually have gauges in right now in Maine and
9 Massachusetts collecting information for the
10 VDatum model here in the Northeast.

11 There's also gauges in -- going into
12 Alaska for the eventual construction of VDatum
13 models up there, and we'll probably be doing
14 some additional surveys in Jordan for the same
15 reasons, and we do pretty much all these
16 through contract, contract surveys, so...

17 Next slide. Okay.

18 So onto our Recommendation Number 3, one
19 thing we do under this recommendation is we're
20 always -- we're doing tidal current surveys
21 every year to update the tidal current
22 predictions and the NOAA tidal, you know,
23 prediction tables, tidal current prediction
24 tables. That's another carriage requirement.

1 Our metric is we need to update at least
2 70 locations every year. And you can see
3 FY2010, we're doing surveys in Long Island
4 Sound, Dutch Harbor, Alaska, and up Glacier Bay
5 and Cross Sound, Alaska.

6 Actually, the meters were just deployed a
7 week or so ago in Long Island Sound, so that's
8 ongoing right now. And the last will be done a
9 little bit later this year in the better
10 weather.

11 And in FY2011, doing surveys in Hawaii,
12 Boston and Mobile Bay. And actually, we just
13 found out we're doing a collaborative project
14 up in Homer, Alaska, for a renewable energy
15 product assessment.

16 I think the university up there got a
17 grant from the state, and we're contributing
18 some current meters and they're going to deploy
19 current meters, and we're going to help them
20 out with some analysis to do an assessment for
21 potential renewable energy project up there.

22 We operate in outcast forecast models.
23 Coast Survey develops the models, and they pass
24 them over to us for operation. We just got a

1 funding increase last year to start expanding
2 the system.

3 We had been kind of stuck at nine for a
4 number of years, so at the end of this year,
5 we're rolling out new models for Delaware Bay
6 and Tampa Bay. And actually, we're going back
7 and retrofitting some of the older models to
8 just update them to -- to -- to do procedures
9 and things like that.

10 And what's on store for FY2011 is the
11 northern Gulf of Mexico. That one's already in
12 development. I'll just mention they
13 accelerated that a bit to be able to use this
14 matter for the Deepwater Horizon event, they've
15 been able to get some output for that model and
16 help with that so...

17 Next slide. Okay.

18 The PORTS system. There's 20 ports in
19 existence right now. We are in the process of
20 establishing a new one in New London. It's a
21 pretty small one. It's just one or two current
22 meters.

23 It's actually being funded by the Navy for
24 the Groton sub base. I guess when they're

1 bringing the subs out of -- out of the bays and
2 having to make a turn into the river, currents
3 can be pretty nasty, and they don't want to be
4 spending around too much. It's not advisable.

5 So anyways, we're installing a few current
6 meters for them later this year, and they're
7 making that one operational -- as always, it
8 will incorporate whatever NWLON stations are in
9 the area.

10 In 2011, I am going to say we potentially
11 have Humboldt Bay and Jacksonville. You never
12 know until we kind of sign an agreement whether
13 it's going to happen or not.

14 But right now, both of these two ports
15 have expressed strong interest. And Humboldt
16 Bay, actually, has identified at least the
17 funding to establish the PORTS system.

18 They're looking for the -- how they can do
19 the long-term, you know, recurring O&M, so
20 we'll see if those happen.

21 Next slide.

22 We're about to publish Columbia River
23 PORTS economic study. We've been doing these
24 economic benefit studies, the first one was

1 Tampa Bay, Galveston, New York, New Jersey.

2 And we have done Columbia River as a fourth
3 one. And again, it's kind of helping build
4 that business case for this system.

5 And our economist tells us that with the
6 completion of this one, he's kind of sampled
7 around the country enough that he should be
8 able to do a pretty good national projection if
9 we had a full-blown PORTS system, so we're
10 going to look forward to that.

11 Again, this will be coming out in print I
12 think probably within the next month.

13 ED WELCH: Rich, can could I interrupt?

14 RICHARD EDWING: Sure.

15 ED WELCH: Do you have any -- other than
16 printing it and putting out a press release, do
17 you have anything else in mind for this
18 release?

19 I'm wondering if you can have -- if you've
20 given any thought to an event in the Pacific
21 northwest where you had some -- Washington
22 state and Oregon state public officials and,
23 you know, Port Authority people and various
24 types of folks.

1 RICHARD EDWING: We -- we always did an
2 event with the dedication of the new ports, but
3 I guess we never thought about, you know,
4 taking that sort of approach to a new study.

5 We do a press release and those sorts of
6 things.

7 ED WELCH: Now that I'm thinking about it,
8 we've got a meeting in Portland in September.

9 TOM JACOBSEN: That's right.

10 MATT WELLSLAGER: Perfect time to
11 introduce --

12 ED WELCH: We, you know -- let's figure
13 out a way to toot NOAA's horn and toot the
14 system's horn somehow or another.

15 Sorry to interrupt.

16 RICHARD EDWING: That's okay. Thank you
17 for that observation.

18 Do I hear another question? No.

19 ADMIRAL WEST: It's more on this topic
20 here. In the Tampa Bay study had as been out
21 for quite a while.

22 RICHARD EDWING: Yes, it was published in
23 2005, I think, right.

24 ADMIRAL WEST: There's one danger in this,

1 of course. If you're sitting in OMB or
2 administration and you're looking for money, if
3 you show this kind of economic return, then the
4 port ought to pay for the operational --

5 RICHARD EDWING: Right.

6 ADMIRAL WEST: So be aware. I mean,
7 that's one of the challenges.

8 RICHARD EDWING: Right. This can work
9 both ways.

10 But to go forward and ask for funding for
11 anything nowadays, you have to be able to show
12 economic benefits, try to work within the
13 system to get -- at the President's request,
14 this is a necessity.

15 ADMIRAL WEST: I don't mean -- you really
16 need to do this to justify putting the systems
17 in to begin with.

18 The flipside of that, of course, is if it
19 really shows good economic benefit, then a
20 tight budget is going to say use some of that
21 to maintain --

22 RICHARD EDWING: You're absolutely right.

23 ED WELCH: I'm just thinking, though,
24 Admiral, that I bet the majority of the

1 congressional delegation and the two governors
2 of other people out there in the Pacific
3 northwest, I suspect it's -- a distinct
4 minority of these people even know about the
5 installation of the PORTS system.

6 And certainly the --

7 On the one hand, I've got OMB saying let
8 folks pay for it itself. On the other hand,
9 you build in a constituency of folks that
10 aren't necessarily going to have to kowtow to
11 OMB to -- to say let's come up with a steady,
12 dependable funding source.

13 ADMIRAL WEST: I didn't mean to make my
14 comment in relation to yours. You're
15 absolutely right.

16 Just as a reminder, by the way, that these
17 studies do have good and they have a bad. You
18 know that up front.

19 RICHARD EDWING: No, sure, I am fully
20 aware of that.

21 ADMIRAL WEST: And I think the study will
22 prove that you need more of them.

23 RICHARD EDWING: Right.

24 DICK WEST: And we will do more, but the

1 downfall is, well, your study probably may say
2 that there's some burden on -- on the port
3 that, you know, gains from this, has to do
4 something, too, so...

5 SHERRI HICKMAN: And you're right, because
6 they did the study in Houston as well. But for
7 Houston, it's pretty easy.

8 California, as we know, it isn't, because
9 there's more than one group of users. And then
10 they want to say, well, if we're going to pay
11 for that, we only use ten percent of it and
12 we'll only want pay ten percent, and there's
13 others -- so it's not as easy as it seems.

14 Houston, we pay for it all, even though
15 Galveston uses it. Galveston probably choose
16 it. They don't pay for any of the operation
17 and maintenance.

18 TOM JACOBSEN: Maybe you can pay for
19 California, too.

20 SHERRI HICKMAN: California can pay for
21 themselves.

22 ED WELCH: Well, we -- we managed to
23 disrupt your presentation, so you go back to
24 it.

1 RICHARD EDWING: That's okay.

2 And the thing I just pointed out about
3 Columbia River, I don't know if you've ever
4 gone to their website, but they actually have
5 done something pretty interesting. They
6 developed this software is called Loadmax, and
7 you can go to their site -- the Port of
8 Portland is 100 miles up the river, and so
9 that's a long transit.

10 And so there's kind of a tidal wave that's
11 either coming up or coming down, and they've
12 developed a tool that allows you to kind of
13 say, okay, here's what I'm going to -- leaving
14 Portland or coming into the entrance and here's
15 how fast I want to go and here's my depth, and
16 it actually kind of gives you some, you know --
17 gives you some information how to best make
18 that transit. Let me leave it at that.

19 But it's a pretty nifty value-added tool
20 I've not seen done with other ports, but it
21 might be a benefit, so --

22 All right. Next slide.

23 Technology infusion. This is in the next
24 slide. We're adding two new parameters to the

1 PORTS suite, and it will be ready for prime
2 time in FY11.

3 And these are really the two longstanding
4 requirements we've never been able to meet for
5 our PORTS users.

6 People have always wanted visibility for
7 fog and they've always wanted wave information,
8 okay, so it's taken us a long time to find the
9 right visibility sensor and test it. We were
10 doing that in collaboration with FAA and the
11 Coast Guard, because they weren't happy with
12 what was out there either.

13 But we finally identified one that was
14 going to stand up to the marine environment.
15 And, you know, we didn't have to run through a
16 lot to service. And there's a picture of it
17 down there in the right-hand corner.

18 Now, the thing you realize with this, it's
19 a point measurement. You see those two -- two
20 sensors, if you will, pointing at each other.
21 It's looking at the air in between, seeing
22 what's there. Okay.

23 So if you're going to deploy these, you
24 have to put a number of them in to be able to

1 get measurements along the waterway.

2 But I'll be -- we deployed one down in
3 Mobile, because we've done our testing and our
4 next step in our process is put one out there
5 and let people use it and throw rocks at us and
6 tell us if it's meeting a purpose or not and
7 try to customize some of the displays.

8 But you can see that graph up in the
9 right-hand corner. And good visibility is
10 always defined at a little over five nautical
11 miles. We never try to say it's better beyond
12 that.

13 But then they had some fog and the local
14 nav manager took this picture, I think, out his
15 window or something at the time this event was
16 happening. You can see how the visibility
17 dropped right down almost to nothing over this
18 time frame. So it seems to be doing pretty
19 well.

20 But, you know, before we put this in, we
21 engaged with the local weather forecast office
22 and the Corps and all users down there and said
23 this going in, please use it, throw rocks at
24 it, you know, tell us if it's doing what we're

1 hoping it's doing.

2 So we've actually got a second one going
3 in that was supposed to be in by now but got
4 delayed by some construction issues.

5 So that's one, I think, thing that --
6 that's been going on. Go to the next one
7 there.

8 And so waves. And I think Jack Holland
9 mentioned the CDIP program, and that's a core
10 wave observation program, and I don't know what
11 the acronym stands for.

12 But we're actually working with SCRIPPS,
13 who is the Corps contractor for that system, to
14 be able to pull the data in from them and
15 display it to the -- just provide that through
16 the PORTS system.

17 So wherever CDIP has wave buoys -- and
18 there are quite a few off our -- where we have
19 PORTS systems. We're going to be integrating
20 that in our information and providing that, and
21 that's kind of a freebie, because there's no
22 cost to anybody other than the Corps and
23 SCRIPPS.

24 So that we should have done by the end of

1 this year, too, integrating into the PORTS
2 display by FY11.

3 Next slide.

4 Okay. So moving on to No. 4, and this one
5 could have gone under a number of them. We'll
6 actually be finishing this year a three-year
7 project of adding meteorological sensor to the
8 NWLON.

9 As I said, and we have 210 stations. At
10 the end of this year, we'll have 185. Kind of
11 a differential. Those locations just aren't
12 suitable for adding sensors. And it was really
13 done to not just help provide information to
14 the local navigation users, but the weather
15 service needs them to do better marine
16 forecasts or whether it's hurricane events.

17 And, you know, [inaudible] events
18 information comes in very valuable as well,
19 so...

20 Next slide.

21 So can we go to the Web for this one? I
22 just wanted to show a product that we -- so
23 don't click on it yet.

24 So when a hurricane starts approaching the

1 coast, typically down in the Gulf we throw up a
2 product called Storm QuickLook that uses the
3 weather-service generated, you know, graphic
4 everybody sees, the hurricane approaching the
5 coast and the, you know, the -- the percentage
6 of where it might go.

7 And, you know, people want storm surge
8 information, they can come get it in realtime
9 from our stations, but they kind of have to
10 look at them one at a time, which isn't very
11 useful.

12 But what Storm QuickLook does is it kind
13 of looks at any station that's being impacted
14 showing storm surge activity. And we kind
15 of -- pull them all underneath this graphic.

16 So when the oil spill happened, they
17 wanted the same thing, but we didn't have time
18 to change the graphic or the name. And you can
19 see remnants -- it usually says remnants of
20 hurricane so-and-so. We just haven't had time
21 to change those.

22 Go ahead and click on one those.

23 So we're able to slide the OR graphic.
24 It's the main one being used to show where the

1 oil is. It's kind of some summary level text
2 information on the right.

3 Then scroll down and show them some of
4 the -- here's where we pull in all the water
5 level information and the meteorological
6 information that's going on.

7 That isn't necessarily an extreme water
8 level event going on, but this just gives the
9 responders kind of a summary level presentation
10 of the information.

11 And as soon as we did this for one area,
12 we got requests in from the Navy and the Coast
13 Guard, and they said, well, give us some for
14 these other areas, and that's why you see
15 multiple ones up there about, because everybody
16 kind of wants their own snapshot, if you will.

17 Now, what this doesn't do is it doesn't
18 pull in the current meters, because when
19 there's a hurricane, people are concerned about
20 the storm surge and not the current meter, not
21 the currents.

22 So we actually had -- we're actually
23 providing kind of a snapshot of all the current
24 meters down in the Gulf using the MyPORTS

1 function. I don't know if you ever used it,
2 but you can actually customize your PORTS
3 screen by grabbing different sensors and
4 building your own display.

5 Well, you can grab sensors from all the
6 different ports and build your own webpage.
7 And once you build that webpage, you can save
8 it, email it. You can do lots of things with
9 it.

10 But we built those webpages for different
11 people with current meters, and I'll point
12 the -- I don't know how many there are. There
13 are 20 or so current readers all along the Gulf
14 there supporting this effort. They're all
15 partner-funded current meters through the PORTS
16 system.

17 So just -- this is probably the biggest --
18 probably one of our biggest contributions to
19 the Deepwater Horizon event. Okay. You can go
20 back to the presentation.

21 Okay. So this last fall we did some major
22 upgrades to our tide predictions on our
23 website. A lot of them were kind of utility
24 sorts of features that were added. Kind of

1 customize you know, you want a day's worth of
2 predictions, a month, a week. Or do you want
3 to display your predictions above mean low
4 level water or mean -- relative mean high water
5 or kind of a lot of those types of features.

6 Probably the biggest feature was -- or
7 improvement, I should say, is, you know, if
8 you're familiar with the tide table, we publish
9 hourly high heights or highs and lows and times
10 for about 100 reference stations. Then we have
11 thousands of locations in the back, called
12 Table 2.

13 If you want to know what's going in in
14 that area, you kind of have to take the
15 correctors that are provided back there and
16 apply them to the reference stations which
17 could be --

18 It's a manual process, and you can make
19 mistakes and -- and it was kind of that way on
20 our website, too, but now we've -- we generate
21 on-the-fly predictions for all those thousands
22 of locations to just modernize that for the
23 user, so...

24 Sea levels online, you saw this referenced

1 earlier. I mean, this website has been up for
2 a while, but every -- every couple of years we
3 go through and update it, add more information,
4 and we just did that recently. Published it
5 hard copy as well.

6 We had about a half dozen back there.
7 They're pretty thick, so we didn't bring up a
8 ton of them.

9 But again, this is, you know, you can
10 click on any one of those arrows, and it's
11 going to bring up a record from that location
12 and give you the local mean sea level and then
13 the trends over the -- however long we've been
14 measuring in that area.

15 Go to the next one.

16 Okay. I think John mentioned this kind of
17 at the end of his slide, and you will --
18 there's been some discussion of the ebb and
19 flow of, you know, the prominence of the
20 hydrographic services with NOAA and the next
21 generation strategic plan.

22 So we've been trying to broaden our
23 portfolio, so to speak, in terms of showing how
24 our data can be used for many other

1 applications.

2 And you saw a lot of the marine spatial
3 planning presentations relied upon this type of
4 information. So we've been doing a couple of
5 small projects to really highlight those sorts
6 of things and --

7 And I have this one slide here that we're
8 all contributing some things down in Mobile
9 Bay, because there was already a lot of
10 information there, but we're really trying to
11 do is bring all the geospatial information up
12 to the same level in terms of, you know, having
13 been updated recently.

14 So OCS is contributing a hydrodynamic
15 model. Click again. They're doing some
16 bathymetry in the area. They're deploying a
17 GPS tide buoy that's actually still kind of in
18 the development stage.

19 They're doing some CTT casts using an AUV.

20 Click again.

21 NGS is doing some LiDAR surveys and some
22 RTK GPS. And there's kind of in the corner
23 down there, doing some of their SETs [phonetic]
24 observations probably in that -- I think

1 there's just the one, the Weeks Bay. Is there
2 another one in there?

3 VIRGINIA DENTLER: There's Weeks and
4 Grand --

5 RICHARD EDWING: Grand Bay, okay, all
6 right. Keep on clicking.

7 All right. So we've got a lot of
8 infrastructure in the area. We have some water
9 level gauges. We recently established a PORTS
10 down in Mobile Bay a few years ago. And
11 actually this year we got an earmark to add
12 more water level gauges down in Mobile Bay.
13 Actually, it's a partnership but for storm
14 surge. It's kind of like PORTS, except it's
15 for storm surge and not navigation safety,
16 because most of those gauges are going up the
17 river there and kind of inland a bit where
18 there really is no commercial traffic.

19 Go back. That was it.

20 So we started doing this. This is a
21 project to continue into FY11. We're going to
22 start generating some non-navigation products
23 and services out of this.

24 We're also hoping with such a great set of

1 geospatial data, this is going to become a
2 testbed for many other things. We know there's
3 already interest in it for that reason.

4 So we're, again, we're looking to broaden
5 the portfolio and demonstrate the value of our
6 services beyond the basic navigation and safety
7 mission to make sure we can continue to support
8 the navigation safety measurements, so...

9 Okay. Next slide.

10 All right. So getting into my last couple
11 of slides here, the next slides are budget
12 slides. I -- we -- you saw in John's slide
13 yesterday of the \$40 million of ARRA funds,
14 there was two and a half million dollars for
15 water levels. It didn't really explain what it
16 was.

17 But this is actually all for an IT
18 contract to take the tools and things that we
19 use internally to process data once it kind of
20 comes in from the water level gauges and from
21 the -- the geodetic surveys that we have to do
22 to monitor the vertical stability, and that we
23 use to kind of generate our suite of products
24 and services, tidal datums and predictions and

1 other things. It's going to put it up on the
2 Web and allow other people to put their data in
3 there and kind of run it through that system.

4 Obviously, it's got to meet certain data
5 formats and other types of specifications, but
6 one of the big reasons we're doing this is --
7 is to help the contract communities, because
8 when -- like for when a -- Coast Survey does a
9 hydro contract, part of that contract is for
10 contractors to put in tide gauges and they
11 process the data and they do certain things and
12 then that gets sent over to us.

13 We have to validate that data, and that
14 can sometimes be a challenge, because sometimes
15 something is done a little differently or it
16 doesn't quite fit into our pipeline quite
17 right.

18 Sometimes we spend almost as much effort
19 having to validate that data as the contractor
20 probably had to do processing it, and that's
21 not good for anyone.

22 So the whole concept is here, you know,
23 build as fully automated process that's
24 Web-accessible, and it's going to save us a lot

1 of work and the contract -- we'll be able to
2 validate things much more quickly for Coast
3 Survey and our contractors.

4 So the contract was awarded in 2009.
5 September 2009 they began the work on this, and
6 just a couple of other milestones there. I'll
7 probably report to you periodically on as we go
8 along.

9 So the last slide.

10 So there's our baseline across the top
11 there. Some earmarks. You can see the PORTS
12 O&M, we've been getting some additional funding
13 for PORTS O&M the last two years. The reason
14 the one is in brackets in 2008 is because they
15 had the language in there, but they didn't put
16 the money in there. So it was kind of there,
17 kind of wasn't. Well, it really wasn't.

18 And I think I explained earlier, I note at
19 the bottom, you know, so as always, the
20 President's request always drops out earmarks
21 on anything that was provided by Congress that
22 was over the President's request, so that
23 \$3.796 million that was provided for PORTS O&M
24 in 2010 was not in the President's request.

1 But within that baseline, there is
2 \$5 million that kind of supports the things
3 that we need to do, like the 24/7 quality
4 control, you know, that new technology
5 infusion, things that you just saw. You know,
6 our people that work kind of on a daily basis
7 with the PORTS, all the data management
8 activities, IT stuff, all those sorts of things
9 get supported by the \$5 million, so....

10 And I think that's --

11 VIRGINIA DENTLER: That's it.

12 RICHARD EDWING: -- probably it.

13 So any questions?

14 ED WELCH: I think what we ought to do is
15 have Juliana make her presentation, and then
16 we'll -- any questions we have we'll put --

17 RICHARD EDWING: Juliana can answer mine?
18 Is that what you're saying?

19 ED WELCH: However you want to do it.

20 JULIANA BLACKWELL: I'll be calling you
21 back up.

22 Okay. Basically, I'm going to go through
23 some updates on the most-wanted recommendations
24 and tell you a little bit about what NGS has

1 been doing in the past six months to a year.

2 Highlighting some of the standard things,
3 such as recommendation Number one, aggressively
4 map the nation's shoreline.

5 The National Geodetic Survey is not just
6 about the coast. It's about providing the
7 National Special Reference System from coast to
8 coast. And so the first -- the first image
9 that you see here is -- is one of our
10 performance measures of being able to -- to
11 show the percentage of the US counties, this is
12 how we do our metric, rated as fully and able
13 or substantially enabled with accurate
14 positioning capacity.

15 So we do this on a yearly basis of setting
16 goals for ensuring that this is making
17 progress. And a lot of times, the way this is
18 done is through people submitting projects to
19 NGS which then get incorporated into our
20 upgraded database, as well as using our
21 products and services, which include the
22 Continuously Operating Reference Stations, the
23 CORS network, or using our Online Positions
24 User Service, OPUS, to be able to -- to

1 position their survey marks for their needs.

2 And then the other three items relate to
3 updating the US shoreline, updating shoreline
4 priority ports, as well as analyzing priority
5 ports for changes.

6 And so for what we do on an annual basis
7 of setting goals for ourselves, we are
8 basically on track a little ahead of schedule
9 for completing those. And again, those are
10 regular goals that we have year to year.

11 Next.

12 Highlighting again what we've been doing
13 with the ARRA funding. NGS had a little bit
14 over \$2 million that went out to six different
15 contractors. There are seven listed, but there
16 are six different contractors on that -- on the
17 vendor column.

18 Basically, these folks were contracted to
19 compile the shoreline from data that was
20 previously collected and paid for by NGA,
21 National Spatial Intelligence Agency, DMA, for
22 the Department of Homeland Security uses.

23 So everything that was collected along the
24 border for their needs was then provided to us

1 so that we could use that same data and have it
2 compiled by these contractors.

3 And the result of that effort will be 8600
4 statute models of new shoreline which would end
5 up updating 142 nautical charts.

6 This also provides baseline data needed to
7 manage coastal resources and help define the US
8 territorial limit.

9 So there are a lot of -- of cost benefit
10 in doing it this way, as well as providing the
11 original need, which is to get the money out
12 there and to get folks working. So we're very
13 happy with that.

14 The one lake that you see there, Lake
15 Michigan, because it is not part of the border
16 here, that is actually going to be collected
17 with NGS assets, and that's scheduled for later
18 this year, to have that fund.

19 Next.

20 Okay. So here's -- so recommendation
21 number two, integrating coastal mapping
22 efforts, this is where I put the VDatum update,
23 under this initiative.

24 VDatum, the goal of which is to have a

1 seamless integration of geospatial data.

2 So taking the vertical datum -- it's a
3 vertical datum transformation tool that helps
4 integrate the bathymetric, topographic and
5 coastal data from different sources and from
6 different reference frames, so basically making
7 it seamless from water to land and making it as
8 accurate and easy for people to -- to make that
9 transformation no matter, you know, what --
10 which of several different datums they may have
11 their data in.

12 So some progress this year in looking at
13 VDatum with a new set of eyes, I would say, and
14 looking at what we've been doing for research
15 and trying to get to an operational status for
16 this. There are models that are out there that
17 are available from our website, but the three
18 offices -- because this is something none of us
19 can do individually between CO-OPS, Coast
20 Survey and NGS, pulling all of our efforts
21 together to provide this product, we said we
22 need to look at this.

23 We need to look at how are we going to do
24 this nationally. How are we not only going to

1 create these models but be able to maintain
2 them and ensure that we have accurate
3 information and that we're -- we're making the
4 best product available.

5 So this year, we have determined that
6 we're going to have a program manager that was
7 going to be -- we selected Doug Brown, who is
8 with NGS, to lead this effort.

9 He's the interim program manager trying to
10 pull this together and help develop a national
11 plan. And he certainly has the assistance of a
12 number of people throughout our offices to make
13 advancements in VDatum.

14 So far this year we've been able to
15 complete the regional model from South Carolina
16 to Florida. That's been completed. Plans for
17 the next year, as Rich was alluding to the work
18 that CO-OPS has to do in support of these --
19 these efforts, so his dates might not line up
20 with the final product here.

21 2011, having the Texas and Northeast from
22 Maine to Massachusetts models complete. And
23 from 2011 and beyond, being able to update the
24 existing models, realizing that things that

1 were done several years ago, we need to take
2 another look at those, need to update them in
3 some places because data has changed, whether
4 it's the bathymetric, the topographic, the
5 geodetic information, and make sure that those
6 are up to date.

7 2012, plan is to have the Puerto
8 Rico/Virgin Islands model complete and also
9 highlighting the fact that as a result of this
10 relook, having the information regarding the
11 Alaska, Hawaii and Pacific territories, we
12 don't have the information that we need to be
13 able to allow timely model development in those
14 areas.

15 Some of the other notes to make on VDatum
16 and where it is now, we need to develop
17 maintenance procedures so that we can continue
18 to provide this service and do it in a right
19 way and then also to validate the VDatum models
20 and have that information available.

21 Next.

22 Regarding the most-wanted recommendation
23 number three, modernizing heights, this is
24 something that usually gets reported on the

1 height monitorization program update.

2 This is a program that NGS has been
3 leading and has been -- it's a partnership
4 effort. We've had great success in the past.

5 Funding is a challenge each year, we do
6 have \$2.54 million in our base budget to manage
7 the national height modernization program. But
8 as you'll see, the money that comes in through
9 hard earmarks and soft earmarks is a lot
10 greater than what we have for NGS to manage the
11 national program.

12 So, so far, there are 17 states that have
13 been funded it at various levels through
14 various years, and our plan this year within
15 our own base budget is to be able to make small
16 grants of up to four grants this current year.

17 The long-term goal is to help develop or
18 is to develop a national plan and focusing on
19 our regional approach, getting people to work
20 together to show -- to show what height
21 modernization can do and how best to implement
22 it.

23 Other activities that fall under the
24 height modernization program include work that

1 we've mentioned a few times here, trying to
2 integrate within NOAA, within the National
3 Weather Service and amongst other federal
4 partners, such as the USGS and the US Army
5 Corps of Engineers, trying to get them involved
6 in producing the most accurate height
7 information possible for their -- their
8 products that they put out.

9 The update of the stream gauge datum is
10 one area that we're making some progress and
11 trying to get some pilot projects done so we
12 can demonstrate the value of having stream
13 gauge data all relative to an updated national
14 vertical datum.

15 Speaking of vertical datum, I'll talk more
16 about this at the end of my presentation, but
17 preparing the country for the datums of the
18 future which are going to be, you know, based
19 on global navigation satellite systems, GNSS,
20 which is the big picture of global positioning
21 system, as well as an update for vertical
22 model, GRAV-D, and what that's going to mean.

23 There's a federal geospatial summit.
24 Again, I'll mention that at the end. And being

1 able to look at areas, especially areas of
2 subsidence, areas where there is a lot of
3 change relative to other places in the country,
4 and determine how to best display that type of
5 information, let the -- let the users of
6 heights beware of areas where things are
7 changing probably more rapidly than people are
8 realizing so that when they do their flood
9 plane certificates or looking at having control
10 over their projects, that they see that these
11 are areas that they really need to go back out
12 there and resurvey before they start using
13 information to make sure it is accurate as
14 possible, and height modernization is part of
15 the GRAV-D initiative.

16 So GRAV-D is -- this year we're very happy
17 to say that we had \$3 million added to our
18 budget to be able to really kick off the
19 collection phase of collecting airborne gravity
20 in support of this new initiative, new vertical
21 datum, which is eight to ten years out and
22 finalized.

23 The area that we're concentrating on this
24 year is Alaska. We have a GRAV-D plan that's

1 available in our website that details this a
2 lot more than I'm going to get into.

3 But basically, the green and the blue
4 areas that you see shaded in here are areas
5 where we've done work on the past couple of
6 years, just basically as a -- as a
7 collaborative effort, because there are other
8 federal agencies that were going to be in these
9 areas, and we all together and put on an
10 airborne gravimeter on the aircraft so that we
11 could -- we could prototype this.

12 This year is the first time that we're
13 really starting on an operational mode to try
14 to get the amount of -- and the orange box
15 collected in FY10.

16 Next.

17 While we're talking about Alaska, we've
18 also recently been able to incorporate 20
19 Continuously Operating Reference Stations into
20 our CORS network.

21 Again, these are not owned by NOAA, but
22 NOAA is bringing the data in and providing it
23 back out to users.

24 The stations are owned and operated by the

1 Plate Boundary Observatory, so this data,
2 again, is coming into NGS and being provided
3 through our website.

4 You heard yesterday, talk about the ocean
5 Policy Task Force and talking about NOAA's next
6 gen strategic plan and the need on the focus on
7 the Arctic. Well, just because we have these
8 20 stations that have just come into our
9 network recently, it doesn't mean that our work
10 is done.

11 This is a great start, but around the
12 northern part of Alaska, you can see there's
13 still big gaps here, and this is the one area
14 that we're really trying to figure out how
15 we're going to get stations up there, how we're
16 going to be able to maintain or create and then
17 maintain a special reference system in the
18 Arctic. And we, again, are making progress,
19 but there's still a lot of work to be done.

20 These areas are critical to have
21 continuously operating stations so that you can
22 collect data over a long period of time and see
23 what the changes are.

24 If you want to measure sea level change

1 and you want to see what the effects of the
2 land motion relative to the water levels, you
3 really need to have stations that can
4 continuously collect information that we can
5 assess over a long period of time just like you
6 do you with water level information to see what
7 the changes are, are they seasonal, annual, is
8 it static.

9 So we've got -- we're happy to have as
10 many stations as we do right now, but there's
11 still work to be done.

12 Next.

13 Moving on to recommendation number four,
14 strengthening emergency response and recovery
15 efforts.

16 I just want to highlight a couple of
17 things that we've done, in response to the
18 January earthquake in Haiti, NGS was able to
19 collect almost 3300 aerial images of Haiti
20 following the earthquake.

21 We did this in collaboration with DoD,
22 Department of Homeland Security, USAID, USGS.
23 Everybody was involved.

24 The great thing about being in NOAA is

1 that we can get this information. We can
2 collect it. We can provide this unclassified
3 data for all these different agencies to be
4 able to use and get this information out there
5 quickly so that people can start looking at it
6 and immediately assess where things are, where
7 things aren't, and help look at transportation
8 routes, look at ports, look at whatever,
9 whatever their needs are, make this information
10 available.

11 We can also -- we've also been partnering
12 with Google and other entities to be able to
13 put this up there in areas where, you know,
14 people can easily access this information.

15 In other words, it's not necessarily in
16 some off-the-wall website, one that nobody has
17 access to. We want it out there because we
18 want people to make the most of this as
19 possible.

20 Next.

21 Don't worry about the fine print. This is
22 just up here so that I can remember what I'm
23 supposed to say. No.

24 Actually, what it is is to show you in the

1 red boxes, red versus blue, a secondary use of
2 the data that we collected over Haiti was
3 looked at by the USGS, and they determined this
4 tectonic movement.

5 So that's not NGS's role and
6 responsibility, but here's what the USGS got
7 out of the same data we collected.

8 They were able to determine in these areas
9 where there were changes based on the
10 earthquakes. And some areas went up, so many
11 area went down.

12 So they sent us this graphic that shows,
13 you know, what they were looking for. So
14 they're able to look at fault lines, hinge
15 lines, and I don't know their lingo too much,
16 but then be able to identify where coral reefs
17 have uplifted and then where other reefs have
18 subsided.

19 And then, again, just the basic use of
20 being able to see where pre-earthquake and
21 post-earthquake the changes to the shoreline
22 and the infrastructure.

23 Next.

24 So this is just a blowup of one of those

1 sections and the fact that, you know,
2 they've -- talking about partnerships, you
3 know, when they start to see the relevance to
4 their mission of the data that we collect, we
5 really start to open the communication between
6 the federal organizations.

7 So while you might say, well, this is an
8 NGS mission per se, the fact is, we are doing
9 the right thing, and we're getting the word out
10 there, and we're making partnerships through
11 many different unforeseeable ways of how our
12 data can help and get the recognition from
13 there -- their researchers and geologists for,
14 you know, helping them with our data.

15 Next.

16 And then the current issue again, what
17 we've been talking about in the last couple of
18 days, NGS is doing the same type of thing of
19 being able to collect the imagery in the areas
20 around the coast that are going to be impacted
21 by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

22 So as of two days ago, these were areas
23 that were flown to get pre-oil imagery of the
24 wetlands and the shoreline associated with the

1 southeast mouth of the Mississippi River and
2 along the islands [inaudible] Islands, I
3 believe.

4 So that's -- those images are available
5 now. I can't say exactly where they are.
6 They're on our NOAA website or if they're
7 actually at this point in time still just
8 available through the USGS hazard data
9 distribution service. I'm not sure what -- how
10 that's working out realtime.

11 But next slide.

12 Just a little bigger view of this area.
13 In addition to those lines that we've already
14 flown on our King Air, NOAA-owned aircraft run
15 by the OMAO pilots, we've done the work that
16 you see in the red -- the red-shaded area is
17 complete, and that was what was in the previous
18 slide.

19 The green and then the other purple the
20 areas, I believe, around the coast are areas
21 that are planned. And so it will depend on
22 what the Office of Response and Restoration and
23 others need us to fly pre-oil.

24 We will take our assets and collect that

1 data, starting with the priority area number
2 one, which is on the bottom part of the screen.

3 So my understanding is that there is
4 potential that they'll be collecting data today
5 and tomorrow. It's all weather-dependent and
6 based on the needs of the other agencies
7 involved in this response effort.

8 Then again, you know, once -- once oil
9 hits the land, we'll probably be out there
10 flying the same lines again to show again the
11 pre and the post effects of this spill.

12 Last thing is my understanding is tomorrow
13 there's a good possibility that Dr. Lubchenco
14 will be going onboard the NOAA King Air and
15 going up in the plane to be able to take a
16 look.

17 I don't know if they will be collecting
18 imagery at that point in time or not, but if
19 she's not here, it's good she be on one of our
20 NOAA assets to be able to take a look firsthand
21 at what we can do and what we can see while
22 we're out there.

23 Next.

24 Just real quick, just to show that NGS led

1 milestones that are sort of down in the weeds
2 here, but some of the things that we set goals
3 for ourself this year in order to accomplish
4 the bigger picture during the cost analysis of
5 our GRAV-D, developing these
6 prototype-Go8-based models to show individuals
7 what it's going to mean to start depending on a
8 gravity-based Go8 through our GRAV-D
9 initiatives, as well as using the COR stations
10 to -- to show the vertical velocities, start to
11 show people how things are moving in these
12 areas where we have continuously operating
13 reference stations.

14 And then the last bullet, being able to
15 work with CO-OPS and Coast Survey and other
16 parts of NOAA, as well as our other
17 stakeholders outside the government, to get
18 them trained on the uses of datums and geodetic
19 control. And that includes NERRSs.

20 We heard earlier yesterday from Dr. Dionne
21 about how -- you know, the importance of having
22 geodetic control, having the land information
23 so that they can accurately and precisely
24 measure the changes at the NERRS sites.

1 Next.

2 And the ending -- I think this is the last
3 one, the budget. Just to give you a snapshot
4 of FY10 and the FY11 President's request for
5 NGS.

6 We have two main areas, the geodesy and
7 the MTS portion of it. So our base this year
8 was the top number there, 26. -- I guess that's
9 the FY11. 26.895 million, which includes the
10 \$3 million for GRAV-D. Basically the same as
11 last year, plus a little bump-up for the cost
12 of living.

13 And the height modernization line, that's
14 the same as FY10. And then the MTS line,
15 there's no change in either of the mapping,
16 charting base or the shoreline mapping from
17 FY10.

18 Next.

19 Here's my last. This is federal
20 geospatial summit that I referred to earlier in
21 my presentation. This is the kickoff event.
22 We're still taking attendees, so I know there
23 are one or two individuals who -- who asked if
24 they could still sign up.

1 The event is taking place in Silver
2 Spring, Maryland. The primary target audience
3 is other federal agencies that are involved in
4 mapping and charting.

5 This is a -- again, a kickoff to talk
6 about the datums of the future, the reasons
7 behind it, what the scientific and technical
8 challenges are to it, to hear from them what
9 their concerns are and their questions are, as
10 well as to talk about when we've changed datums
11 in the past, what were some of the lessons
12 learned from that.

13 This is available via webinar or WebEx, I
14 don't know what the right buzz word is, but
15 people can view this remotely as well as show
16 up in person.

17 So if you didn't know about that, there's
18 some information for you.

19 Next.

20 Okay. So any questions for Rich? Feel
21 free to ask. Just kidding.

22 ED WELCH: Thank you, Juliana, and thanks
23 to Rich.

24 Okay. Questions or comments from the

1 panel?

2 Gary, please.

3 GARY JEFFRESS: Gary Jeffress.

4 Juliana, you mentioned in your
5 presentation that you've been doing a lot of
6 collaboration with the Corps and USGS, but you
7 didn't mention FEMA.

8 FEMA is doing a lot of trying to update
9 their flight insurance rate maps and got a huge
10 budget for that. And I'm getting the sense
11 that it's garbage in, garbage out, because
12 they're not coming to see you about good
13 control and elevation that's critical for them,
14 they seem to be ignoring it, all the way down
15 to the fact that they don't even put a datum on
16 their maps.

17 So I was wondering if you made any attempt
18 to education FEMA in geodesy.

19 JULIANA BLACKWELL: This has been a
20 multiyear project in trying to get to the right
21 level to make progress in educating.

22 There are individuals within FEMA who are
23 very supportive of what we're trying to do and
24 the importance of it, mainly, the mitigation

1 division.

2 Changes in personnel, changes in, you
3 know, leadership there I think have been a
4 challenge for us to continue to get that
5 message up higher in the chain of command.

6 It's something that every chance I get
7 when I run into somebody from FEMA, I, you
8 know, bend their ear about this. And
9 everybody, you know, agrees that this is a
10 problem and there hasn't -- it's not that we're
11 not trying, but to collaborate means that there
12 are two people that are -- two groups that are
13 working together towards the same goal but
14 we're not there yet and we're trying.

15 We're also trying to engage a NOAA
16 leadership to make that connection at the
17 higher level, too, realizing that the technical
18 information and the work will need to get done,
19 you know, in the ranks, but in the different
20 regions and trying to break through to have
21 that occur.

22 So at least educating them on the fact
23 that the data that they're using to -- you
24 know, for their map modernization and now their

1 risk map products can be questionable in the
2 areas that haven't been surveyed or in areas
3 that are very dynamic. That message continues
4 to be communicated to them.

5 And unfortunately, I think they look at
6 the surveying community and some of the other
7 local areas as it's their obligation to update
8 that base information.

9 So if you have other suggestions on how we
10 can say something different that will make
11 progress along these lines, we would love to
12 hear that from you.

13 GARY JEFFRESS: I just would like to see
14 FEMA follow the same model used with the FAA,
15 where they've come to you and said you're the
16 experts, here's some money, go do it for us.

17 I think that's a good model to follow with
18 FEMA.

19 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Anybody from FEMA
20 here?

21 ED WELCH: I saw Michael Brown down the
22 street.

23 Jon Dasler.

24 JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.

1 I think one -- I mean, a lot of the --
2 they don't collect a lot of the data
3 themselves, so they're contracting out with the
4 surveying community.

5 But I think maybe some guidance in terms
6 of specific indications may be helpful, and
7 metadata that they could help in compiling
8 that.

9 You're right, I think they rely on the
10 survey community to take care of that for them.
11 But, you know, I think it depends on who's
12 doing it, and I think there's been a real mix
13 of things.

14 I guess I just wanted to comment on that.
15 You had the slide of all the PORTS stations
16 throughout the United States, and I think NGS
17 is a unique line office in that they're pretty
18 broad-reaching throughout the United States.

19 I mean, they're responsible for the
20 national spatial -- the reference system and
21 for the CORS and OPUS, and it's being used for
22 a lot of inland mapping efforts. And I guess
23 I'm afraid that it's not being captured in the
24 strategic plan.

1 You know, they talk about the eight years,
2 eight regions they would look at, and whether
3 that's -- NGS's effort is being captured.

4 I don't know if you have any thoughts or
5 comments about that. It was kind of a thought
6 I had.

7 JULIANA BLACKWELL: I thought you put me
8 on the spot.

9 As far as capturing, that -- the
10 importance of that in the big NOAA strategic
11 plan, we are -- I think we're everywhere in
12 trying to support not only NOAA but other
13 federal state and local users and geospatial
14 positioning, and it sort of gets lost, well,
15 this is just part of what somebody is doing
16 somewhere.

17 And it's not highlighted to the point
18 where it's going to raise up to be an objective
19 or sub-objective unless you talk about the
20 geospatial infrastructure, and that becomes a
21 very small line or small mention in the big
22 scheme of what NOAA does.

23 I will say that I think that the track
24 that we're on to update the way we do the

1 vertical datum and the GRAV-D initiative,
2 people's eyes glaze over, and I understand
3 that, because it's a very hard thing to -- to
4 explain and to understand unless you're in the
5 business.

6 The fact of matter is, what the end result
7 is, that people are going to be able to use
8 GPS, which many people are using, although not
9 everybody, obviously, be able to use GPS, apply
10 this model and get a height that's relative to
11 a local mean sea level height and have that be
12 accurate to within a few centimeters.

13 And so it's going to make checking those
14 heights easier on everybody and anybody who is
15 trying to do that type of work. Surveyors are
16 certainly the main benefactors of that as far
17 as flood plane mapping and flood certificates
18 and things.

19 So making that -- making it easier on
20 folks to check information and then use that
21 accurate information for their geospatial needs
22 is several years off. But that's how we're
23 trying to address it internally to make that
24 information available, make it accurate so that

1 it's widely used.

2 JONATHAN DASLER: And then I guess
3 probably for both of you, but I know there was
4 strategic plans, we were presented those in the
5 past for both CO-OPS and NGS, had like a
6 strategic five-year plan.

7 Is that -- does that get incorporated into
8 the strategic plan that's being worked on
9 with -- how did that --

10 RICHARD EDWING: We each have our own
11 strategic plans, but they don't really -- when
12 they were doing the next generation, they
13 didn't reach down and pull those up. They
14 really looked at the -- start kind of almost a
15 fresh and take a whole new look, so...

16 ED WELCH: Matt?

17 MATT WELLSLAGER: Juliana, I've got a
18 question for you.

19 The funding for GRAV-D, I mean, how far
20 along are you in the implementation of that and
21 do we need more money for that?

22 JULIANA BLACKWELL: I think the GRAV-D
23 plan talked about \$4 million a year for ten
24 years, basically, to be able to accomplish the

1 project.

2 So every year that we're not funded at
3 \$4 million means the time is extended.

4 So in other words, this is the first year
5 where we've gotten additional monies in our
6 budget to do this. We've been doing it in a
7 hide in a sense, small levels up until this
8 year.

9 The \$3 million is a good start. We
10 expect -- again, it's in the President's
11 request for next year, and so, you know, we'll
12 see what happens there.

13 But at the \$3 million a year level, it's
14 going to take us more than ten years to
15 complete GRAV-D.

16 We've also -- this answers a little bit of
17 your question as well as John's. We sent out
18 letters asking for collaboration partnerships,
19 joint initiatives, sharing of resources from
20 other federal agencies to help with the GRAV-D
21 and brief different agencies on the benefits to
22 them, including FEMA, in sort of opening up the
23 conversation and how -- and maybe they could
24 contribute, you know, some sort of resource,

1 whether it's aircraft, time or personnel or
2 funding or whatever in order to support the
3 GRAV-D initiative.

4 So those are conversations that we'll
5 continue to revisit, but the -- you know, we'd
6 like to be able to get it done sooner rather
7 than later.

8 MATT WELLSLAGER: Yes.

9 And has any thought been given to MIS/GIS
10 possibly? If you can get the GIS community in
11 on that with accurate heights, they're pretty
12 powerful, and they could probably help with
13 some funding if you are able to, you know,
14 cross over and talk to them possibly.

15 I don't know if you've done that or not.

16 JULIANA BLACKWELL: I have. I have talked
17 to them.

18 MATT WELLSLAGER: Okay.

19 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Thank you.

20 ED WELCH: Any other comments?

21 Rich, Juliana, thanks very much.

22 We are scheduled for a break. We're a few
23 minutes behind schedule. I wonder if perhaps
24 we might just take a five-minute break,

1 everybody run to the refreshment table and come
2 right back.

3 And also, Tiffany, other than me, are
4 there other people that haven't given you the
5 form you need?

6 You don't have to call them out, but --

7 TIFFANY HOUSE: I don't think so.

8 ED WELCH: I'm half filled out, okay.

9 Good. All right. Let's come back in five
10 minutes if we can, please.

11 (Recess.)

12 ED WELCH: Okay. Here we go. The one
13 thing we don't want to do is run beyond when
14 we're scheduled to adjourn, so let's fit
15 various things in.

16 What I would like to propose to do, we're
17 scheduled to move into some administrative
18 business right now, but we're also very close
19 to when we were scheduled to have our second
20 public comment period.

21 And we've had several people very
22 patiently sitting here, so rather than subject
23 them to our administrative business, could we
24 open it up for our public comment now for

1 everybody and then we will just have one
2 straight session of administrative business?

3 Okay.

4 Let's do that.

5 Did we have anybody that signed up, Kathy?

6 KATHY WATSON: I don't think so.

7 ED WELCH: And if we didn't, do we have
8 any people that didn't sign up that would like
9 to address us?

10 Come right on up to the microphone, and
11 welcome again.

12 Please introduce yourself for Jill.

13 CAPTAIN HENRY MARX: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Henry Marx --

15 Hi. I'm Captain Henry Marx from Landfall
16 Navigation. We're one of the larger chart
17 agents located in Stamford, Connecticut. And
18 I've been active with what used to be called
19 the Chart Agents Association back in the '80s
20 and '90s when we worked with NOAA on nautical
21 charting to straighten out some problems we
22 used to have in the chart business.

23 I think -- my comments are somewhat based
24 on what Howard said today and some of the

1 questions you folks have asked.

2 You all have, I believe, my letter that I
3 wrote which summarizes most of the problems
4 that I've seen in the last six months to a year
5 come up.

6 It is true that Coast Survey has never
7 really paid any attention to distribution.
8 We've always been an aeronautical charting, now
9 FAA charting, agent. So they've worked with
10 us, but distribution hasn't been their problem.

11 I wonder as a chart agent if is isn't time
12 for them to take command of where their
13 products are going.

14 I was fascinated to hear the lady this
15 morning say that the datums are an issue. I
16 was on the Marine Board Committee from 1992 to
17 '94 that studied NOAA's chart-making. And one
18 of the first things we discovered from a
19 gentleman from USGS who was on the committee,
20 that if you had a legal case with a -- a real
21 estate case on the water, you could get the
22 USGS map and the nautical chart.

23 One of them would support you and one of
24 them would support your opposition, and it left

1 the judge in a very difficult position, and I
2 see things really haven't changed much. Sorry
3 about that.

4 One thing we tried to do in '92 and
5 failed -- and I talked to Elaine about it, and
6 she's not too optimistic -- I don't see why the
7 Coast Guard can't have a carriage requirement
8 for recreational vessels.

9 now, I don't mean an extensive list, as
10 you pilots are familiar with, all the charts
11 you need to come in and out of New York Harbor,
12 but they could have a simple requirement.

13 They have that blue pamphlet that says you
14 have to have a fire extinguisher, you have to
15 have a life preserver, you have to have a frame
16 arrestor. Why not say a current chart suitable
17 to the voyage being attended? In other words,
18 have something on the boat to tell you where
19 home is if things come apart. That might be
20 something you could recommend.

21 The current distribution situation, as you
22 heard this morning, is a mess. By cutting out
23 the small agents, they've severely, I feel,
24 restricted the ability of the recreational

1 boater to find a NOAA chart.

2 Now, there are chart kits and numerous
3 private products that are available, but
4 they're not NOAA charts. And similarly, most
5 of us now have chart plotters even in the cars,
6 but there are times when the chart plotter will
7 not do the job for you.

8 I don't know if any of you are sailors and
9 sail out of Buzzards Bay, but most screens you
10 can't get Cleveland Ledge and Cuddyhunk on the
11 screen and still see whether you're going over
12 a rock or not. We'd still need those paper
13 charts.

14 There's a movement afoot at FAA to reduce
15 the price of paper charts by about a half. If
16 that happens, nobody will carry them.

17 As a businessman, paper charts are very
18 labor-intensive. I have to get them in, we
19 have to put them away, then we have to pull
20 them out for the customer.

21 When a new edition comes out, we have to
22 take the old ones out and send the corners
23 back, put the new ones in. And with today's
24 labor rates, this is expensive for something

1 that right now only costs \$21.

2 Similarly, FAA adopted a policy that I
3 don't subscribe to. They changed their agent
4 system last year. You have two choices in
5 agents. You can have the 40 percent margin
6 with return privileges we always had, or you
7 can have a 50 percent margin and not return
8 them.

9 Well, let's think about this as a
10 businessperson. I have six charts that just
11 went obsolete that I paid for. What am I going
12 to do with them? Am I going to throw them out?
13 I can't return them anymore. What am I going
14 to do? I'm going to sell them. So this is not
15 in the interest of safe navigation.

16 Right now, the chart agents only need
17 FAA -- the big agents that have the
18 print-on-demand printers from OceanGrafix. The
19 only thing you can't get from an OceanGrafix
20 printer is a US post pilot and the training
21 charts which are litho charts that are used for
22 training purposes.

23 If OceanGrafix gets a book printer, we can
24 get them from them, and we won't need the FAA

1 distribution system.

2 Now, Howard referred to being nervous
3 about having a sole source of supplier with the
4 OceanGrafix. If they were to go out of
5 business, nobody's distributing his charts.

6 I concur with him on a safety basis, but
7 the problem is that there isn't enough market
8 for NOAA charts today to support two
9 OceanGrafix in the industry. So I don't think
10 that -- I personally don't think that's a
11 viable alternative.

12 Similarly, Howard was complaining about
13 the British Isles insurance. Now you pilots
14 have a better feel for this than I do, because
15 you're on the bridge of many, many big ships
16 every day. When was the last time you saw a
17 non-US-flying vessel have anything but a
18 British Admiralty chart on the bridge?

19 My shipping agents tell me that's all they
20 request, because, first of all, what do we
21 have, 200 US-flag deep draft vessels left
22 maybe?

23 When the ship wants a British Admiralty
24 chart, that's what the shipping agent buys from

1 the chart agent. He doesn't buy another chart.

2 It's a matter of, I believe, their
3 training.

4 The US Army Corps of Engineers charts, we
5 really need to get those where we can get them.
6 Right now if I want a chart of New York Harbor,
7 Miami, Houston, I order them all from FAA, and
8 they come in a couple of days.

9 If I want a chart of the Mississippi
10 River, I go to the New Orleans command for the
11 lower Mississippi. I go to St. Louis for the
12 upper Mississippi. If I need the Tombigbee,
13 I've got to go to -- it's all over the lot.

14 And two years ago, I believe it was, one
15 of those Army Engineer offices ran out of
16 charts in May or June and said, oh, we won't
17 get any new charts until January because we
18 don't have any money to print any until we get
19 the new budget.

20 The Army Engineers don't really pay
21 attention to their charts, and they're very
22 difficult to obtain.

23 And some of you may remember a couple of
24 years ago when a tugboat took the Amtrak bridge

1 out and dropped a train from the river. Charts
2 would have been good.

3 That's basically my only two hot buttons.

4 I know the DMA NGA issue is technically
5 not a NOAA issue, but my customers don't
6 differentiate. When they want a chart of
7 Bermuda or they want a chart of Boston, they
8 want a nautical chart. They don't know who
9 made it. The US Government publishes it.
10 That's all they know.

11 Just as a point of reference, a NOAA chart
12 costs \$20.75 right now, the government price.
13 I'm selling British Admiralty charts for \$45 a
14 copy.

15 Thank you.

16 ED WELCH: Okay.

17 Thank you, Howard. Thanks for being --
18 putting in the time with us and your comments.

19 And Gary -- wait a minute, don't go away.
20 I think Gary Jeffress has a question or
21 statement.

22 CAPTAIN HENRY MARX: Yes, sir.

23 GARY JEFFRESS: Would it make business
24 sense for someone like you to have their own

1 plotter and then plot out charts on demand?

2 CAPTAIN HENRY MARX: Basically, we have
3 those now. The OceanGrafix print-on-demand
4 system is, as Howard said, I think 47 chart
5 agents, and I'm getting mine next week
6 actually, it's on order. We'll have a -- a big
7 printer which is hooked into a computer which
8 is hooked into OceanGrafix, and about once a
9 week they transmit new software to us that puts
10 in the NOAA updates.

11 So basically, what you'll do to input
12 landfall a month from now is when you come in
13 and want a chart of Boston Harbor, I will print
14 you a chart of Boston Harbor that will have up
15 to last week's notice to mariner's corrections.
16 Right now I give you a paper chart.

17 But I would assume if the printing system
18 is working and I'm comfortable with it, other
19 than immediate local area where I get a high
20 volume of people wanting charts, we won't stock
21 any charts, we'll just print them as we need
22 them.

23 GARY JEFFRESS: And you can sell them for
24 \$45, right?

1 CAPTAIN HENRY MARX: No. I sell these for
2 \$25 because they're on-demand charts.

3 GARY JEFFRESS: Can't you charge whatever
4 price you like?

5 CAPTAIN HENRY MARX: No. The -- NOAA has
6 always said that we can charge less than the
7 posted price but we can't charge more, and
8 OceanGrafix says the same thing.

9 Plus today, any of you that are used to
10 e-commerce, the Internet has set the price on
11 everything, and the margins are very tight.

12 ED WELCH: Okay. Thanks again. All
13 right.

14 Let's -- if we would, please -- actually,
15 we've got one substantive item that Jon Dasler
16 would like to bring to our attentions can.

17 JONATHAN DASLER: Thanks, Ed.

18 It was brought to my attention in US News
19 yesterday there was an article that was called
20 Gulf Oil spill, A Slow-Motion Hurricane.

21 And they had a quote in there from Ioannis
22 Georgiou, who is an oceanographer at the
23 University of New Orleans.

24 And basically, one of quotes out of the

1 article, "It's very hard to say when, where and
2 how much oil will reach any particular part of
3 the coast.

4 "The seabed topography and depth help
5 determine the nature of local currents, their
6 speeds and the degree to which water either
7 stratifies or mixes. All are features that can
8 play a big role in what happens to any oil that
9 water transports. Unfortunately for
10 spill-trajectory modelers, the last fairly
11 complete bathymetry of the northern Gulf's
12 seafloor took place in 1927.

13 "Some patches of the Gulf's seafloor have
14 been periodically resurveyed since then. But
15 the depths to the seafloor for most of the area
16 over which the slick is predicted to travel has
17 not been comprehensively mapped in more than 30
18 years, he notes -- in many places for more than
19 70 years."

20 So I think this really is highlighting the
21 need for the update of bathymetric maps.

22 ED WELCH: Didn't you leave off the last
23 sentence of his quote? This is why I think
24 NOAA should include a supplemental

1 appropriation request for...

2 (Laughter.)

3 ED WELCH: Thanks, John.

4 Okay. Now we've got some administrative
5 items to deal with, starting with the status of
6 the chairmanship of the panel.

7 As you all know, at some point towards
8 the -- back in the fall, Tom Skinner
9 relinquished his post as the Chair, and I don't
10 think since he was able to -- he wasn't able to
11 attend our meeting in Duluth that the panel as
12 a whole in any way recognized his service.

13 So, Tom, thank you. And I would suggest a
14 round of applause is in order.

15 (Applause.)

16 ED WELCH: And so with --

17 MR. BLUMENSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Current
18 Chair.

19 ED WELCH: So with Tom having served out
20 the time as Chairman, he -- you know, I've been
21 acting Chairman since then, and it's probably
22 appropriate at this point for the panel to
23 decide what they want to do about a permanent
24 chairman, at least for another year or two.

1 Tom, did you have something you wanted to
2 comment on?

3 TOM SKINNER: Yes. thanks, Ed.

4 There have been a lot of sidebar
5 conversations at this meeting with the number
6 of new members that will likely be coming in or
7 hopefully be coming in in the next eight months
8 or so, whenever that happens.

9 And the discussion on making sure that
10 there is a -- there's a continuity among the
11 chair and vice chair and the panel was one of
12 the primary topics that came up.

13 I wonder if I could just spend a minute on
14 perspective my two years here, with perhaps a
15 recommendation as a way of explaining why it's
16 important to have that continuity.

17 I think when I became chair, we had just
18 finished with the HSRP most-wanted report. It
19 had just come out.

20 We had spent all of our time, four years
21 in the group, sort of working towards that
22 goal. And our new goal was not really
23 well-defined.

24 We started off by trying to do some

1 meetings to highlight some of the issues, and
2 that worked reasonably well, but there was no
3 sort of end goal for at least the first couple
4 of meetings we had.

5 And it wasn't until relatively recently
6 that we realized that we needed an updated
7 report.

8 I would suggest to this panel and the
9 people who will be continuing on, and I think
10 Ed has another FACA panel, members, I've seen
11 this elsewhere, that the HSRP get on a fairly
12 regular two-year revision cycle for the report,
13 that that be the constant goal, to update and
14 keep current the recommendations.

15 And that other activities that either come
16 about through that or new issues that come up
17 can also be addressed.

18 My reason for mentioning that is that in
19 that context, I think it's very important to
20 have someone who has some institutional
21 knowledge of the panel from the panel's
22 perspective, crossing over the different -- I
23 don't know what you'd call them, group A, group
24 B, group C, classes on the panel and making

1 sure that there's continuity from one year to
2 the next.

3 So I would -- I guess as a recommendation
4 and -- I would certainly, given the fact that
5 Ed is at the helm and I think doing a good job,
6 would nominate him for the chairmanship.

7 That's part one. Part two is we have to
8 fiend a vice chair.

9 And last night there was some reluctance
10 in spite of very persuasive arguments as to why
11 certain people should join, and I have to admit
12 that currently our pool is fairly limited with
13 two of the classes leaving potentially at the
14 end of this year.

15 There are only four or five people that
16 will be carrying over, so we have a very
17 limited group.

18 I would ask rather than sort of put people
19 on the spot, that this is not something where
20 you should hide behind the curtain or be modest
21 about it.

22 This is really important for the
23 continuity of the group and someone really
24 needs to step up to the plate.

1 Thank you.

2 ED WELCH: Well, thank you Tom.

3 If I could just make a comment on the
4 situation with the vice chair and also Tom's
5 nomination, which we'll dispose of one way or
6 another in a you few minutes, I -- when I came
7 onto the panel, it didn't take long before Tom
8 and the panel drafted or designated me vice
9 chair. So I've been serving as vice chair
10 under Tom's leadership for a year and a half to
11 two years, and that has been extremely valuable
12 an experience to help me perform as acting
13 chair.

14 So I think one of the real keys in looking
15 for a vice chair is -- is not necessarily the
16 certainty that person will eventually become
17 chair, but the quite strong possibility that
18 that person might eventually become chair, and
19 that serving as vice chair helps prepare for
20 that additional role.

21 Now, I became vice chair almost -- you
22 know, pretty quickly into my term, and we could
23 look forward, given the fact that there
24 probably will be a very large pool, larger pool

1 of candidates, with perhaps as many as 11 new
2 people coming on by -- within a couple of
3 meetings to look to that pool for a vice chair,
4 and that person would still have a couple --
5 you know, close to two years before possibly
6 being tapped to be the chair, so...

7 But even if that's the case, we still have
8 to bridge the gap between now and I guess the
9 spring meeting of next year.

10 So we have a couple of choices. As far as
11 vice chair, we can be really persuasive with
12 our extremely limited pool of people that will
13 be continuing or we could sort of defer the
14 decision, so to speak, that if we had an
15 individual that -- even somebody that might be
16 going off the panel within the next year who
17 would be willing to serve as a short-term vice
18 chair.

19 Tom?

20 TOM SKINNER: Just a clarification,
21 limited in terms it of numbers, not ability.

22 ED WELCH: So those are my thoughts, and I
23 guess I open it up to the panel for any kind of
24 thoughts about their preferences.

1 JONATHAN DASLER: And I think that's a
2 good point, probably making a final vice chair.
3 So maybe during that gap we could contract out
4 to fill the gap. You could have maybe an
5 acting vice chair.

6 ED WELCH: Well, we've actually had -- and
7 I won't designate the person, because maybe the
8 person's had second thoughts, but one person
9 sort of rashly said that they could be a
10 short-lived vice chair, acting vice chair.

11 And I don't know if that person would want
12 to make that statement publicly or not.

13 ADMIRAL WEST: Is he sober?

14 (Laughter.)

15 ED WELCH: He's a Navy man. What do you
16 expect?

17 ADMIRAL WEST: A Navy man that has been
18 sober all week? Have I had drink with you
19 folks this week?

20 SHERRI HICKMAN: Yes.

21 ADMIRAL WEST: I did often do that,
22 because I'm a short-timer. And I think -- I
23 think this panel has -- and this is more for
24 Juliana to take back, and I'm going to talk for

1 a minute.

2 I'm almost a professional FACA member now.
3 I serve on several of them. And in my stage of
4 my life, I like to because I like to transfer
5 to wherever the hell I'm going at the time.

6 But we got something good going here, but
7 I think we're about to trip all apart in a very
8 short period of time, which I don't think is a
9 good idea.

10 I serve on the National Sea Grant College
11 Program FACA. In fact, I just finished as
12 chairman. We just said goodbye to two
13 members --

14 By the way, let me back up a minute. The
15 FACA usually says in language one four-year
16 term. You can repeat it for another four-year
17 term. But there's a little statement in that
18 paragraph that says "until relieved by a proper
19 relief" or words to that effect.

20 We just said goodbye to two people on the
21 Sea Grant FACA that have been there 15 years.
22 So, I mean, there's no -- you know, so this
23 fine line in the sand is crap.

24 And Andy has been on a lot of FACAs, too.

1 So it's a guideline. And you just don't throw
2 away because it's two terms.

3 So Juliana needs to take this back,
4 because all of a sudden you've got about over
5 half of us about to disappear at a key time,
6 and I don't think that's the right way to go.

7 I think you phased us in somehow over a
8 period of maybe a year or two, and you have
9 that flexibility in the law to do that, and
10 that's what I recommend you do.

11 I do think that a vice chair ought to be
12 somebody new. And I did say to Ed that I'd be
13 happy to work with him in the next few months
14 or so to -- as a whatever, to help him get
15 through this. Because I do want to work with
16 NOAA because I -- I brought this up with Sally
17 Yozell after John's email, want to be up front
18 with everybody, because I was a little
19 concerned about how the administrator of NOAA
20 was -- it appeared without telling us it looked
21 like we were changing our colors a little bit,
22 and I was -- my question was --

23 And I think she has a right to do that to
24 some extent, but we are Congressionally

1 mandated, as is the Sea Grant, by the way, as
2 is the research FACA I was on.

3 So you have to be a little careful,
4 because you don't want to piss off the folks
5 that told you to do your job.

6 So there's some issues. So I'd like to
7 work with Ed and Juliana and John to work
8 with -- maybe sort this out over the next, say,
9 six months.

10 And I do think that the vice chair you
11 pick ought to be somebody who can work with Ed,
12 if we pick Ed, you know, for a couple of years
13 and then move in. But it ought to be somebody
14 from the new crowd.

15 I do think that this crowd, as you see us
16 here, ought to be doing this -- the latest
17 update. I think we all ought to be part of
18 that, and I think it ought to be done before
19 this group leaves.

20 And I think that's -- in the timingwise
21 that I watched NOAA bring new members in, I --
22 there's clearly not going to be anybody here
23 for the fall meeting, and I think you're lucky
24 if you can do it for the spring meeting, for

1 the first group.

2 So I think you have to be reasonable with
3 that when you go back, to kind of -- don't go
4 up there and say okay we're read. Go up there
5 with a plan of how you think based on your
6 input in this group how you ought to phase in
7 the new folks over, let's say, 18 months or
8 something like that.

9 So to answer your question, I'll volunteer
10 to be the acting vice chair. You don't have to
11 vote me in. I'll just work with whoever you
12 vote in as chair, and I second the nomination
13 of Ed as the chair.

14 LARRY WHITING: I'll make that nomination.

15 ED WELCH: Thanks, Dick.

16 Okay. Any other comments or discussion of
17 the whole leadership situation?

18 JONATHAN DASLER: Again, I just wanted to
19 point out -- because we also act underneath the
20 charter, and in the charter under membership
21 and designation under F, it does say that a
22 voting member of the panel may serve after the
23 date of the expiration the term of office for
24 which appointed until his or her successor has

1 taken office.

2 So that's in the charter. And then also
3 in the charter, there's a description of
4 duties. There was some concern it was going to
5 be watered down. But at least in the charter
6 it is pretty clearly outlined what services we
7 should be evaluating.

8 ED WELCH: Good.

9 ADMIRAL WEST: Good point.

10 And that charter it is supposed to be done
11 every two years, and I don't know what the
12 latest date of our charter --

13 KATHY WATSON: It was June of 2009, last
14 year.

15 ADMIRAL WEST: Okay.

16 So by next summer, you got to have a
17 revised charter. So I think you update the
18 charter as we go through the process in the
19 next few months, how Jane wants to run her
20 Federal Advisory Committee.

21 But the charter about staying in until
22 you're relieved is taken right out of the
23 Federal Advisory Committee Act, so it's legal.

24 ED WELCH: Andy.

1 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: Thanks, Ed.

2 I want to say to both gentlemen -- you as
3 chair, Ed, and the Admiral as vice chair -- and
4 I think something that also should be thought
5 about when you're picking a vice chair from the
6 new group, nothing against anyone from the left
7 coast, as we say, but logistically it works
8 better, because the chair and the vice chair,
9 especially the chair, has to work with NOAA,
10 and NOAA is in Silver Spring.

11 You know, just as a thought to look
12 forward, you know, our previous chairs have
13 been fairly close to DC, and that works better.

14 If you have a chair, from Alaska, you
15 know, they may do a great job, but to get back
16 and forth is a pain. Even phone calls, you
17 know, because of the time difference are a
18 pain.

19 So just realistically, I think, you know,
20 I've been in -- DC is perfect and the Admiral
21 right here on the East Coast, it works -- you
22 know, you have to be realistic about this
23 thing, and it just works out better way, too.

24 ED WELCH: Well, if I can make a comment

1 on that, that certainly is a slight help; but I
2 will tell you that I'm in Alexandria, Virginia
3 and Kathy and company are up in Silver Spring,
4 and it is a pain in the butt for me to go to
5 Silver Spring or for her to come to Alexandria.

6 So we do 99 percent of our business by
7 phone or email, so --

8 But it is true, that if there ever were a
9 need to get together or to go to departmental
10 headquarters, that it could be arranged. It's
11 not like a cross-country flight.

12 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: On the Hill.

13 ED WELCH: That's right. That's right.

14 So it's -- it would be far easier now than
15 it was a decade ago to have people in other
16 remote locations, and I don't think that ought
17 to be disqualifying, but we also know there are
18 times when it's convenient to be close.

19 Matt, did you have something?

20 MATT WELLSLAGER: Actually, I did. I was
21 going to offer -- I will be reapplying to come
22 back on for my second term and would like to,
23 if appointed, work with you and Ed and possibly
24 take over as vice chair, if that would be

1 appropriate.

2 ADMIRAL WEST: I nominate you for vice
3 chair.

4 LARRY WHITING: I'll second that now, too.

5 TOM JACOBSEN: All in favor.

6 ED WELCH: Well, it is true, Matt's making
7 a point, there's no assurance that he will be
8 reappointed. He --

9 You are interested in being reappointed,
10 right?

11 MATT WELLSLAGER: Mm-hmm.

12 ED WELCH: I even suggested to him it
13 might be -- strengthen his case to be
14 reappointed if he were the vice chair. That
15 didn't seem to be too compelling to him last
16 night.

17 SHERRI HICKMAN: West's dropping the ball.

18 ADMIRAL WEST: I nominate Matt.

19 TOM SKINNER: Second, if it already wasn't
20 seconded.

21 ED WELCH: Okay.

22 We have a nomination for me to be
23 chairman, and we have a nomination for Matt to
24 be vice chairman.

1 And, Matt, I'm going to ask you, you
2 aren't going to make a General Sherman
3 statement right here?

4 I shouldn't be asking somebody from South
5 Carolina to make a General Sherman statement.
6 That was pretty bad.

7 MATT WELLSLAGER: Burn and run, heh?

8 (Laughter.)

9 ED WELCH: Okay.

10 Is there further discussion?

11 JONATHAN DASLER: I just have a technical
12 question, because you just filled a -- you took
13 over on Lou's spot, right? Was that -- only
14 because I know they've had a thing about four
15 years, but then you can renew if you only
16 served a partial.

17 And just so there isn't a monkey wrench
18 thrown into it, it's kind of a technical
19 question. I want to make sure that that's an
20 option for Matt moving forward.

21 ADMIRAL WEST: The loophole of this whole
22 thing is you can keep somebody here forever if
23 you don't designate somebody to relieve --
24 personally relieve Matt. That's how it works.

1 The problem we had with Sea Grant, to be
2 honest with you, after a while it becomes
3 stale. There needs to be turnover. There
4 needs to be new people, diversion of expertise
5 and stuff.

6 But there's some expertise that you might
7 want to keep because something's going on that
8 they should be on the team for a while.

9 So you have the right to keep people
10 forever, quite frankly. Nobody is ever going
11 to say anything until it becomes a problem.

12 ED WELCH: Is there any other discussion?

13 I guess at this point it would be
14 appropriate to call for a vote.

15 Should we vote on the slate as a whole as
16 opposed to individually?

17 SHERRI HICKMAN: On the whole.

18 ED WELCH: Well, then all in favor say
19 "aye."

20 All opposed.

21 Look like the motions carried, so great.

22 Well, congratulations Mr. Vice Chairman.

23 MATT WELLSLAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24 ED WELCH: And thanks to the Chairman --

1 to the panel, and I'll continue to try and do
2 my best for you.

3 Okay. Let's move on to a discussion of
4 where we are on the update, current-year update
5 of 2007 most-wanted.

6 Let me tell you where we wanted to be. We
7 were -- well, let me summarize it.

8 If you all recall, we discussed this
9 extensively at our Duluth fall meeting, did
10 some work on it then.

11 We divided ourselves into working groups,
12 focusing on individual chapters and provided
13 feedback on language.

14 That was presented to the full panel in
15 Duluth. There was a sense at Duluth that we
16 were very close to where we wanted to be. And
17 that I think we left Duluth thinking that we
18 were -- with the exception of some technical
19 rewrites and some fact updates and some --
20 locating some new examples and photos and that
21 type of thing, we were -- we were just about
22 there, and we would be ready to have a finished
23 draft circulated by email before this meeting,
24 and this could be almost the official rollout

1 of it.

2 We got -- we didn't quite make it.
3 We're -- we've done a lot of that follow work,
4 but the calls of some staff changes in NOAA and
5 where there were -- and Rebecca Aronson was
6 reassigned to some new positions and also a
7 couple of the intervening things, including the
8 oil spill, we just didn't quite get to the
9 point where a document would be a final
10 document with all the material that everyone
11 had suggested could be circulated to us in
12 advance of this meeting, and it's still not
13 quite ready.

14 So several of us -- but it's close. It's
15 much, much closer than it was in Duluth.

16 Some of us have talked informally about
17 what we want to do, and I -- my personal belief
18 is -- well, some folks said haven't we already
19 said it's okay, except we're doing technical
20 changes and photographs and isn't all that
21 editorial? And can't we assume that we have
22 blessed the report?

23 And if the panel feels that way after
24 discussing the matter today, we can go down

1 that road; but I personally feel like I would
2 want to have in hand electronically the final
3 draft with the pictures, with the graphs,
4 without the little boxes that say check this
5 fact, that kind of thing.

6 And we haven't quite gotten all that stuff
7 together, so I still think we need to have that
8 occur. And then once we have that, that we
9 convene one more time and actually have a vote
10 to bless that completed document.

11 So we could do that by setting a time in
12 early summer by which the NOAA staff, possibly
13 even before Memorial Day, later on this month,
14 whereby the NOAA staff can get us that
15 completed document, give us a couple of weeks
16 or so to review it as carefully as we might
17 want to on an individual basis, and then
18 have -- formally call -- a conference call to
19 have any last discussion and to have a vote to
20 approve.

21 And then at that point, then, by the time
22 we have our fall meeting, we can have a
23 completed printed document in hand, and we can
24 make a big deal about it.

1 So that's my preference on the way to go,
2 but I wanted to hear what other people feel.

3 Tom?

4 TOM SKINNER: It's a great way to move
5 forward on it.

6 ED WELCH: Okay.

7 Is there -- is there anything -- any other
8 feeling or --

9 Yes, Tom Jacobsen.

10 TOM JACOBSEN: Yes, I agree. I think it's
11 a great way. And also for the Portland
12 meeting, we were talking about inviting some
13 other politicians and --

14 ED WELCH: Right. Right.

15 TOM JACOBSEN: -- that would be good.

16 ED WELCH: Well, what I would propose,
17 then, is that we leave here, and working with
18 the NOAA staff, Kathy, and all our NOAA
19 colleagues here, we ought to pick a date by
20 which NOAA can distribute this draft to us by
21 email, and I would suggest either right before
22 the Memorial Day holiday or right after the
23 Memorial Day holiday.

24 And what we need to hear from NOAA staff

1 is when should that date be.

2 Juliana?

3 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Yes.

4 I think we should make the commitment, and
5 if June 1st, for those NOAA types that are
6 here, if we can agree to that, to validate the
7 information that's in there, check the figures,
8 make our final information available to it and
9 have that wrapped up and have a June 1st date,,
10 which is the day after, send that out
11 electronically, does anybody see a problem with
12 meeting that deadline?

13 At the same time, we could establish a
14 range of a few dates of when we could hold the
15 next meeting, get the staff to look at that
16 calendar as well.

17 ED WELCH: Right.

18 We will also -- if we do this, go this
19 route, we will need to have the NOAA folks
20 right away put into motion -- whether they need
21 to put into motion, to have notice of a
22 particular date for a conference call and
23 publish to the Federal Register, because it
24 will be an official meeting of our panel, and

1 therefore it has to be noticed, and therefore
2 there's a certain period of time by which the
3 Federal Register has to have it, and therefore
4 it has to work its way through NOAA before it
5 can be transferred to the Federal Register.

6 So I would say either right before or
7 right after July 4th holiday, and I would say
8 preferably before the July 4th holiday.
9 Sometime in that time frame.

10 Now, if we -- if that -- Kathy, is that
11 sufficient time if we got an early date picked
12 right before the July 4th holiday that we can
13 do all the appropriate things per Federal
14 Register notice?

15 KATHY WATSON: Yes, I think June 30th
16 would actually be the best date, if you're
17 going to go for a June 1st date of having the
18 final report and then a teleconference.

19 June 30th, that gives the panel at least
20 two to three weeks to review it.

21 ED WELCH: What day of the week is
22 June 30th?

23 KATHY WATSON: It's on a Wednesday.

24 MATT WELLSLAGER: It's a Wednesday.

1 ED WELCH: Does that sound like a doable
2 date for members?

3 TOM JACOBSEN: Yes.

4 ED WELCH: Admiral?

5 ADMIRAL WEST: One thing you want to keep
6 in mind, we'd like to influence the annual
7 program guidance from Jane to NOAA, and I think
8 that comes out -- is that July or August or
9 September?

10 So this would work, because we want to
11 influence what she wants. In June, OSTP puts
12 out the Federal Investment Science and
13 Research, and then within about 60 days, the
14 agencies put out -- the administrators put out
15 their annual guidance memorandum.

16 So we want to have ours out so that's
17 available for NOAA to use, so I think that's
18 around -- I --

19 Maybe we can check. I think if you do it
20 on 30 June, we're okay. I think that's good.

21 ED WELCH: Well, then I would propose that
22 we -- unless there's an objection, we pick 30
23 June as our date for the conference call.
24 Kathy, if you could do that?

1 I notice, Juliana, in your presentation
2 you had something called hard earmarks and soft
3 earmarks.

4 This would be a hard -- these dates we're
5 talking about here are going to be hard
6 deadlines. We don't -- you know, we don't want
7 slippage of the distribution date out to the
8 members, and we're expecting the members to
9 do -- to read through what they get before the
10 evening of June the 29th.

11 And then we would expect everybody to
12 participate, if at all possible, in the
13 June 30th call.

14 JONATHAN DASLER: Is that a production
15 issue at all? Don't you contract out some of
16 that or do you do it all in house?

17 KATHY WATSON: No, everything is done in
18 house.

19 JONATHAN DASLER: This publication was
20 done in house? The compiling and the producing
21 and all that?

22 KATHY WATSON: Yes.

23 ED WELCH: Matt, did you have a question?

24 MATT WELLSLAGER: That was going to be my

1 question. Jon kind of read my mind.

2 I thought this kind of went out to a
3 publisher before --

4 ED WELCH: Okay.

5 Well, are people comfortable with this
6 procedure of this schedule? Tom?

7 TOM SKINNER: Yes, I think it sounds
8 great.

9 I just had two things to possibly
10 consider. One is the federal notice, if we're
11 doing a summary letter to the administrator,
12 that -- as we have often done after meetings,
13 that the Federal Register notice also include
14 that if we're going to do a draft.

15 ED WELCH: Have we -- refresh my memory.
16 Have we had to have official committee
17 meetings and votes of that letter or did we do
18 it by sort of an email process?

19 TOM SKINNER: We tried several different
20 things. One, we tried to develop the draft
21 policies at the meetings, vote on them subject
22 to fine-tuning, which was a disaster
23 logistically.

24 I think subsequent to that, we circulated

1 a draft; and my recollection is that to be on
2 the safe side, we then had a phone call
3 meeting, conference call meeting to approve the
4 letter.

5 ED WELCH: Okay.

6 I think that's a good suggestion. Why
7 don't we incorporate that into the agenda for
8 the -- for the June 30th call.

9 TOM SKINNER: The second comment was you
10 might want to think about also including the
11 letters that have gone to the administrator as
12 an appendix in the report, one, so that we're
13 forced to make sure that we're consistent with
14 the letters that we've sent; but two, it's a
15 good two years of summary of what the panel has
16 done, and I just offer that as a suggestion for
17 people to think about.

18 ED WELCH: Appendices.

19 So our letter says -- since the
20 publication of prior report, I think there's
21 probably been about four of them?

22 TOM SKINNER: Right.

23 ED WELCH: Does the panel feel like that's
24 a good suggestion? Okay.

1 Admiral?

2 ADMIRAL WEST: One other thing, right
3 after we approve the original report, we bring
4 it to the SAB, so I suggest Juliana get ahold
5 of the SAB and get on their schedule. Do it as
6 quick as them, maybe somebody can brief them on
7 that. Ed or somebody can brief.

8 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Right.

9 So we'll take that action to get it on --
10 you said SAB?

11 ADMIRAL WEST: Yes.

12 JULIANA BLACKWELL: And do you know any
13 details about the -- do I just find out from --

14 ADMIRAL WEST: I've got the document.
15 Virginia and Ashley worked with me last time.
16 It went really well. It was well-received.

17 So this will be an update to it.

18 ED WELCH: Okay, great.

19 Anymore on the status of the update to the
20 2007 most-wanted?

21 Andy?

22 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: I just see a
23 possible addition here, just because of what's
24 gone on, why don't we bring them up, any

1 changes to this draft.

2 ED WELCH: I think at this point, what I
3 would recommend is if somebody sees something
4 right now that they would like to propose as a
5 change in the draft, that maybe you commit that
6 to paper or to wording and send me an email and
7 we'll send it around.

8 I don't think we're really kind of
9 prepared at the moment here to start working on
10 the substance.

11 And we'll figure out a way to make sure
12 that that is considered and had a fair chance
13 for incorporation into the final draft.

14 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: It's really just
15 we have a thing in here about the Coast Guard's
16 introduction of electronic charting system,
17 carriage requirements.

18 Well, the IMO since this has instituted
19 ECDIS carriage requirements. So I was just
20 going to add that in addition to the ECS also
21 ECDIS.

22 ED WELCH: Why don't we delegate you to
23 write a sentence or two. We'll consider that
24 to be a technical update. We'll get it to the

1 NOAA staff and put that in. Okay?

2 Elaine?

3 ELAINE DICKINSON: I was going to ask a
4 similar question.

5 If when we're reviewing this before
6 June 30th, if there are just small changes or
7 edits or just small corrections, do you want --
8 does NOAA staff want them piecemeal or is that
9 something that everybody has to talk about on
10 June 30th, go through the whole thing?

11 ED WELCH: Why don't -- if you see little
12 things like that, you send them to Kathy and
13 me, and what we'll do is -- if we consider them
14 to be technical or clerical or just minuscule
15 fact type changes, we'll compile them all into
16 one document.

17 We'll have a technical amendments package
18 that can be noticed to everybody, and somebody
19 can make a motion during the call, approve all
20 these technical amendments.

21 If on the other hand we feel like it's
22 getting into the realm of a substantive change,
23 we'll keep that separate. And we might even
24 let people know about it, private call, so you

1 can think about it.

2 Andy?

3 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: Just to -- Elaine
4 mentioned June 30th, but would you want any of
5 these technical changes before June 1st, right?

6 ED WELCH: Yes, the technical -- yes.

7 So you would be working off what you have
8 now, right?

9 KATHY WATSON: Yes.

10 TOM SKINNER: So you wouldn't have to do a
11 technical amendment. People would just submit
12 them in, and what would be sent around would be
13 the thing --

14 ED WELCH: Yes.

15 Anything we get by June the 1st or late
16 May, let's -- late May that we all -- that we
17 consider to be a technical type of a change
18 we'll incorporate in what's sent out to
19 everybody, and we won't have to mess with it
20 anymore.

21 And if the NOAA staff feels like is this a
22 technical change or does this get into the
23 realm of substance, I would suggest that you
24 all delegate them to have a discussion with me,

1 or perhaps me and Matt, and we'll -- we'll make
2 a decision as to substantive or technical.

3 And depending on how it's decided,
4 we'll -- we won't make any substantive changes
5 on just the one or two people making that
6 decision. Is that --

7 So obviously, if people want to do a
8 little bit of work between now and say May the
9 20th and can get us their reaction then, that
10 would be good. That saves us just that much
11 more work.

12 Okay.

13 VIRGINIA DENTLER: And I don't know if you
14 all remember who your groups were, but go ahead
15 and send it through your groups, I guess.

16 Or do you not want to do that? You want
17 to --

18 ED WELCH: Well, I don't know about
19 anybody else but I don't remember who my groups
20 were.

21 VIRGINIA DENTLER: Okay. No, I mean --
22 okay.

23 ED WELCH: I think this -- yes, I think
24 we're at the point, Virginia -- that's good

1 raising that suggestion, but I think the groups
2 have come and gone at this point.

3 VIRGINIA DENTLER: That's good. That's
4 fine.

5 ED WELCH: Okay. Thank you.

6 I think we've got a plan and we're close
7 to being able to pull this thing off.

8 Okay. We've got another couple of
9 administrative things, but let's take a
10 three-minute break, because I understand that
11 NOAA wants to take a picture of the panel
12 members.

13 They don't have a -- you know how you go
14 into a federal government building or office
15 and the President's picture is up there on the
16 wall? I am not sure if they're planning to put
17 us next to the President or not, but I guess if
18 they want to...

19 So if you want to put on your coat or
20 brush your hair, let's do it. And who is the
21 photographer? Tiffany?

22 Yes, brush your hair. And be real
23 assertive with us, Tiffany, and tell us where
24 you want us to be.

1 TIFFANY HOUSE: I was thinking right in
2 front of the table here.

3 (Recess.)

4 ED WELCH: Okay.

5 We have two or three other things left to
6 do. First, yesterday we started assembling a
7 list.

8 Somebody lost their shoes. Are those your
9 shoes, Virginia?

10 VIRGINIA DENTLER: Yes, because I wasn't
11 going to stand on the chair with my shoes on.
12 I'd fall.

13 SHERRI HICKMAN: Ed, those look like
14 yours.

15 VIRGINIA DENTLER: They're real
16 comfortable.

17 ED WELCH: I don't display my toes in
18 public.

19 ADMIRAL WEST: Did somebody pick her up?

20 VIRGINIA DENTLER: I kicked them off and
21 on stood on the chair there.

22 ED WELCH: Yesterday towards the end of
23 the day, we started assembling an informal list
24 of things that might be in the -- the

1 recommendation letter or report letter to the
2 administrator.

3 And Kathy, I guess --

4 KATHY WATSON: I had Virginia type them
5 up.

6 ED WELCH: Oh, okay.

7 So Virginia is going to put what we had
8 yesterday up, but we can look at those, and
9 we --

10 And then the question is, do we have
11 things that have arisen from today's agenda
12 that might be candidates for that letter and
13 recommendations?

14 So I'll entertain any discussions or
15 comments.

16 LARRY WHITING: Did we include that --
17 Larry Whiting here.

18 Did we include that from yesterday's
19 motion from yesterday that was made?

20 ED WELCH: Be more specific, Larry.

21 LARRY WHITING: I don't remember what
22 Virginia typed up.

23 VIRGINIA DENTLER: It's all right here.

24 Oh, no, the one that you said yesterday, that's

1 already gone off to Captain Lowell. That's

2 already typed up and --

3 You want me to open that one, too?

4 LARRY WHITING: No, no, no. I don't care
5 about that. That's already passed.

6 ED WELCH: That was the -- that was the
7 resolution which we commended NOAA on its
8 testimony today and the hearing on Congressman
9 Young's bill.

10 I think the hearing started at 1:00 -- I
11 mean at 10:00. If somebody does a Google News,
12 it might be the first item up.

13 Any other --

14 Larry?

15 LARRY WHITING: One comment on that.

16 I passed around the copies of Senate bill
17 that mentions the H -- the wording is identical
18 except -- well, you can read it.

19 ED WELCH: Larry is pointing out that
20 there was companion legislation in the Senate
21 that is very close to the House bill, but not
22 absolutely identical, so just to take note of
23 that.

24 I guess we don't know of any scheduled

1 activity and -- as far as a hearing or activity
2 in the Senate at this point.

3 But I'll be glad to do some checking or
4 work with NOAA legislative people to find out
5 what the prospects are first in the House
6 with -- you know, any subsequent activity after
7 the hearing, the House bill, a whether there
8 might be some activity in the Senate bill as
9 well.

10 Tom?

11 TOM SKINNER: Well, I -- I think I -- I
12 talked a little bit about the meeting of the
13 Boston PORTS system, but on -- in retrospect, I
14 think that's getting into some really specific
15 activities that maybe we don't want to do,
16 particularly where I think CO-OPS is interested
17 in going up there.

18 I think maybe instead of having it as a
19 recommendation, perhaps just maybe, Rich, you
20 could report at the next meeting what's going
21 on with that or something more informal. That
22 seems kind of a small picture type thing.

23 ED WELCH: Tom, I think it's worth -- I
24 mean, we might not want to say help arrange a

1 meeting, but I don't think it's a bad idea to
2 note that there's -- to note to the
3 administrator that there's an interest in the
4 Boston maritime community in pursuing the
5 establishment of a PORTS system and we --

6 We've been fairly specific in the past --
7 we talked about an adjustment to the cruise
8 ship anchorage in south Florida. That was
9 pretty specific.

10 I think those Boston people would
11 appreciate a mention in the letter.

12 MATT WELLSLAGER: Follows with a letter of
13 recommendation.

14 ADAM McBRIDE: My only thought on that is
15 that -- I can't remember his name, the young
16 fellow who was speaking to us on this matter
17 yesterday.

18 TOM SKINNER: Bob Hamilton.

19 TOM JACOBSEN: Woods Hole.

20 ADAM McBRIDE: Yes.

21 They have a specific commercial interest
22 in the Boston project, as they do in most of
23 the PORTS installations. They do the O&M work
24 on the contract.

1 So I have -- I'm a little concerned about
2 making a recommendation in support of a
3 commercial interest working with Boston. Why
4 not somebody who is working with Jacksonville
5 who wants to get one or someone who is
6 working --

7 Pick another port who's trying to get one.
8 The point being, we would -- we continue to
9 encourage the establishment of PORTS systems at
10 ports of national significance around the
11 country, whether promoted by interested parties
12 or by the maritime community directly.

13 ED WELCH: Well, we could -- I understand
14 the point, and we could certainly, if we wanted
15 to, adjust the recommendation to say we
16 continue to urge NOAA to be responsive to --
17 about the possibility of additional PORTS
18 systems.

19 And we can say we know that there's some
20 degree of interest in Allston Jacksonville and
21 Humboldt Bay. I mean, we don't have to say we
22 endorse any particular system, and we certainly
23 don't endorse a particular commercial interest,
24 but we -- we're aware that there is some

1 interest in those geographic locations.

2 Would this -- is that getting too far --
3 too close to your feeling about commercial
4 interest?

5 ADAM McBRIDE: Well, I guess we -- we've
6 all been on the record supporting and
7 encouraging the establishment of PORTS systems,
8 and I don't think there's any question that
9 NOAA itself is receptive to additional
10 installations.

11 I'm not exactly sure what we're trying to
12 recommend here.

13 ED WELCH: Well, why don't we do this. I
14 mean, first off, on this list here, this is
15 not -- this is just a list of suggestions. Why
16 don't you let us conclude this on the list and
17 we'll flag it.

18 And then when we meet on our conference
19 call, if -- maybe we will have developed some
20 generic type language and -- but we'll know
21 that that's something that we aren't
22 necessarily committed to including in the
23 letter. But I would like to at least take a
24 shot at it and have it discussed.

1 Then if it's the belief of the panel that
2 we don't want to go down there, it's easy
3 enough to -- you know, we can put it in, we can
4 take it out.

5 Will that be satisfactory?

6 ADAM McBRIDE: Yes.

7 ED WELCH: Okay.

8 Tom?

9 TOM SKINNER: One final comment on that.
10 The issue that I had raised was -- and I didn't
11 hear what Bob Hamilton had heard, which was
12 interest by the pilots in a PORTS system, what
13 I had been talking to CO-OPS about was
14 explaining how a PORTS -- what types of
15 information a CO-OPS systems can provide to try
16 and generate interest in Boston.

17 So it's not -- in terms of what I heard,
18 it was not specific interest from the port
19 users in a PORTS system unless someone happened
20 to want to pay for it.

21 ED WELCH: Okay.

22 SHERRI HICKMAN: And I just -- I have a
23 question.

24 I understand your concerns, but we've

1 always pushed for the PORTS and expanding it to
2 those who wanted it.

3 How did you -- because we never
4 specifically said Lake Charles, but you guys
5 didn't have that for quite a long time. Same
6 Sabine.

7 How did -- how did that end up occurring?

8 ADAM McBRIDE: In the case of Lake
9 Charles, the Port Lake Charles agreed to take
10 on the O&M cost, and that was always required.

11 I understand the hurricanes prompted
12 Congress to put money into the supplemental
13 bills to install them in a number of Gulf
14 ports.

15 So once it was installed, the port agreed
16 to take on the operating and maintenance costs,
17 and that's was always required.

18 SHERRI HICKMAN: Okay.

19 ED WELCH: Any other suggestions of
20 possible items on the list?

21 Elaine?

22 ELAINE DICKINSON: Yes.

23 If you could entertain a new item, I was
24 thinking that maybe the panel should express

1 its concern about the erosion of the chart
2 distribution service under FAA management, and
3 that perhaps the OCS could revisit the system
4 they now have in place and get back to us and
5 we could discuss it at the next meeting,

6 Also, the loss of -- there's no public
7 access anymore to the NGA charts, which I
8 think, you know, is something that ought to be
9 addressed.

10 ED WELCH: Are we comfortable adding that
11 as a bullet for inclusion in some form or
12 fashion in the letter?

13 TOM JACOBSEN: Yes.

14 ED WELCH: Okay. We'll do that, Elaine.
15 Thanks.

16 I'd like to suggest -- oh, I'm sorry, go
17 ahead, Andy.

18 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: On that second
19 bullet, Marine Transportation System, maybe a
20 thought that the -- you know, the safe
21 transport of goods affects basically all the
22 other NOAA line offices almost, you know, like
23 fisheries and --

24 ED WELCH: You're -- Virginia, you're one

1 category down.

2 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: Scroll down so
3 you're missing the top one.

4 VIRGINIA DENTLER: Thank you.

5 Affects all of commerce?

6 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: No. Affects --
7 you know -- well, it affects all the other --
8 many of the other NOAA interests, like
9 fisheries, et cetera. the environment, all that
10 stuff.

11 I'm sorry, ecosystems. How's that?

12 ED WELCH: Good.

13 I have one suggestion, and that would be a
14 new item. I'd like for us in response to
15 Grover Fugate's statement to have some
16 expression that Rhode Island is showing us that
17 good hydrographic data can be extremely useful
18 in creating marine spatial planning activity
19 and supporting marine spatial planning
20 activities, and our recommendation is that as
21 NOAA and the federal government proceed with
22 marine spatial planning, that they place a lot
23 of reliance on hydrographic activities to
24 support their policy choices.

1 Jon?

2 JONATHAN DASLER: Yes.

3 I guess I was thinking something along
4 that line, but I think it actually relates to
5 the specifications and the accuracies that are
6 done to collect some of that data.

7 So I think what we really need to focus on
8 is some way of kickstarting IOCM, how can there
9 be more key -- how can we put forward a
10 recommendation that --

11 You know, there's -- a lot of states now
12 are coming up with their own mapping plans,
13 doing it to their own specification, which
14 doesn't meet NOAA charting. And it's a
15 tremendous waste of even taxpayers money coming
16 from other sources.

17 It could be helping fund the charting
18 backlog, getting data on the charts, doing
19 updates. It doesn't take all that much more.
20 And somehow NOAA needs to -- before all these
21 states go out and collect all that data, to
22 kickstart this IOCM effort and give it a little
23 more teeth so there can be that effort to get
24 that data on the chart.

1 ED WELCH: I understand.

2 Actually, I think probably we ought to
3 separate those two items into two separate --
4 but we don't have to do that here today,
5 Virginia.

6 But basically, what I was going to say is
7 it seemed like me from my understanding of
8 federal activities on marine spatial planning that
9 Rhode Island is far ahead of the federal
10 government in using hydrographic information to
11 inform its choices.

12 So the federal government ought to look to
13 that as an example or a lead. And then your
14 position is, okay, if all these different
15 people are going to be out collecting
16 hydrographic data for -- to support their
17 spatial planning efforts, let's intensify our
18 efforts to make sure everybody's doing it in a
19 coordinated way and a consistent way. Okay?

20 There are other considerations?

21 Andy?

22 ANDY ARMSTRONG: I'd like to offer for the
23 panel's consideration the thought that in
24 addition to Captain Peacock's story which

1 highlighted a need for good hydrographic
2 surveys outside of the typical navigationally
3 significant areas, Jon Dasler also read an
4 article which highlighted another need for good
5 hydrographic surveys outside of the typical
6 navigationally significant areas.

7 And that at this point, there's no sort of
8 programs to do surveys and -- in those areas
9 that are not considered navigationally
10 significant.

11 ED WELCH: Okay.

12 Let's --

13 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: And the point is
14 that those areas are significant, because they
15 have a significant impact on, in this case, the
16 safety of life of people in fishing vessels and
17 on the ability of us to react to an oil spill.

18 ED WELCH: Okay. I understand the point
19 and along that.

20 JONATHAN DASLER: And along that same
21 line, and I don't know if we've captured it up
22 there, but the concept of NOAA seeking
23 reimbursement. So not only for a response but
24 potential mitigation.

1 So some of the mitigation could be funding
2 that collects that data that's needed to do
3 accurate spills.

4 I think it was Massachusetts also had the
5 pretty good model of taxing the users of sorts
6 that are putting that in. But I think trying
7 to -- NOAA should investigate that. And if we
8 can kind of highlight that in a letter to the
9 administrator, it would be good.

10 ED WELCH: Okay.

11 I know one thing, we -- when we get to the
12 point of reducing this to a letter, we need to
13 remember this is a letter and not a report, and
14 so we're going to need -- we --

15 We want to put in enough, but we don't
16 want to put in too much. And I don't know if
17 we're approaching that limit or not, but we
18 just need to be aware of that.

19 Adam?

20 ADAM McBRIDE: And I just want to -- I'm
21 going a little bit backwards here, but the
22 second bullet point, Andrew McGovern raised
23 that as an issue to emphasize, I want to lend
24 my voice on that in support, because I was very

1 concerned in the early presentations yesterday
2 that there was a drift away from commercial
3 maritime transportation systems, ocean charting
4 and we were moving in --

5 You know, the resilient coastal
6 communities thing as a home for maritime
7 transportation considerations was really far
8 removed from where I think this panel -- at
9 least where I wanted it to be and where we
10 started it

11 So I need to reemphasize to the leadership
12 do not let that submerge as a topic or
13 consideration. It needs to come back to the
14 forefront.

15 ED WELCH: I think several of us feel that
16 way, and whether or not some of our presenters
17 were indicating that the agency might be moving
18 in that direction, that doesn't necessarily
19 have to mean we -- we are dragged in that
20 direction.

21 Elaine or Larry, did I see you all looking
22 for recognition?

23 LARRY WHITING: Yes. I was wondering if
24 the NRTs are not supposed to be going into

1 places like Cobscook.

2 ED WELCH: Isn't that what they're for?

3 ANDY ARMSTRONG: Well, they certainly can
4 be, but it --

5 My understanding is there's no plan to go
6 systematically survey that area at this point,

7 CAPTAIN GERD GLANG: Well, I think what
8 Captain Lowell was waiting on was that
9 lettering from Senator Snowe, which I think is
10 like on his doorstep, and then the next step
11 would be to assess how big is the job and what
12 resource do you send up there.

13 So it could well be an NRT. It could be a
14 contractor. I don't know.

15 ED WELCH: My feeling is that our role
16 ought to be just to highlight that situation
17 and not be particularly prescriptive about if
18 it's attended to, how it's attended to.

19 ANDY ARMSTRONG: I agree.

20 ED WELCH: Okay.

21 Any other thoughts or is this what we want
22 to accomplish today?

23 What I would hope, then, is -- well, let's
24 do this. If anybody in the next week or so

1 upon reflection about this can think of
2 anything else that they think ought to be a
3 candidate for inclusion in the letter, why
4 don't you zip Kathy and me an email, and then
5 I --

6 Juliana?

7 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Would you want to put
8 in here the update to the report or is that --

9 ED WELCH: No, I think this -- you mean
10 update to the most-wanted list? Is that what
11 you mean?

12 JULIANA BLACKWELL: Yes.

13 Do you want to send a message that you are
14 working on this and it will be coming soon or
15 just leave it out of it?

16 ED WELCH: I think it -- I think we can
17 probably convey that in other ways, yes, if --
18 unless the panel wants to. Okay.

19 Well, let's -- Tom?

20 TOM JACOBSEN: Just a quick question.

21 Are we going to get copies of the
22 presentations from yesterday and today?

23 KATHY WATSON: Yes.

24 Some of them are already on the HSRP

1 website, and then the rest of them will be
2 uploaded to the website.

3 TOM JACOBSEN: Because I think some of us
4 want to review a couple of those, and we might
5 drum up some questions.

6 ED WELCH: Right.

7 But if you do have some more thoughts
8 about something that ought to be in this letter
9 or something that ought not to be in this
10 letter, send me an email, and Kathy.

11 And then I guess the normal procedure for
12 development of this letter is that the chairman
13 and the staff work together to develop a draft,
14 and then it's sent out in advance of the next
15 call and then it because an agenda item,
16 correct?

17 KATHY WATSON: Correct.

18 ED WELCH: Okay. We'll do it that way if
19 that's satisfactory. Okay.

20 I think we're at the point now of talking
21 about our next meeting. Oh, no, we're not.
22 Kathy is going to tell us where we are.

23 KATHY WATSON: Sorry.

24 Before we get to our next meeting, Gerd

1 made a couple of points here. As we were
2 talking about the most-wanted, the NOAA's ADM,
3 it's not expected until August. That's --

4 Gerd, is that Version 3.0?

5 CAPTAIN GERD GLANG: That's the annual
6 guidance memorandum that Admiral West was
7 talking about. So that's the guidance NOAA
8 puts out on the budgeting cycle for the
9 planning.

10 KATHY WATSON: That's right. I'm sorry.

11 ADMIRAL WEST: Is that August.

12 CAPTAIN GERD GLANG: We're not expecting
13 it before then, sir.

14 ADMIRAL WEST: Well, the key is, if we
15 don't want to influence that, NOAA puts it
16 together, ought to have this 30 days or so in
17 advance, it's there, which I think --

18 CAPTAIN GERD GLANG: They threw out the
19 PPS, as you know, going to a new process, so
20 August --

21 ADMIRAL WEST: Dysfunctional for another
22 five years.

23 KATHY WATSON: And in addition, the --
24 once we get the final for this report, the

1 update, it goes to the government printing
2 office for printing, and that takes about four
3 weeks.

4 ED WELCH: Okay.

5 Well, I -- I honestly don't think we have
6 much flexibility of having our panel called
7 much before June 30th.

8 I think we -- I think June 30th, we're
9 just going to have, you know -- that's what
10 we're going to have to do. I don't think it's
11 really feasible to do it much earlier than
12 that.

13 Andy?

14 ANDY ARMSTRONG: I agree, but I don't
15 think that would necessarily stop the Chairman
16 and a small committee from briefing the
17 contents.

18 ADMIRAL WEST: Absolutely.

19 ED WELCH: That certainly we can do. We
20 probably will discuss it with the staff and
21 Dave Kennedy and whoever else is appropriate.
22 Okay. Thanks.

23 Kathy, now are we at next meeting?

24 KATHY WATSON: Yes.

1 ED WELCH: Okay. We left Duluth. There
2 was a feeling that we -- we needed to go to the
3 Pacific northwest soon, and we needed a -- we
4 had the desire to go to Hawaii.

5 There was some strong recommendation from
6 the NOAA staff that you didn't want to plan a
7 meeting in Hawaii the last two or three weeks
8 of a fiscal year because there was a fear that
9 a lot of the NOAA -- given the time -- the time
10 that would be required, people weren't going to
11 be available to leave the offices.

12 So we sort of made a feeling then that we
13 would go with a rotation of the Pacific
14 northwest. And specifically, we were talking
15 about Portland this fall and September, and
16 then Hawaii would be in the spring of 2011.

17 So that still seems to me to be an
18 appropriate next two meetings. And we were
19 looking at the week of September the 13th in
20 Portland.

21 KATHY WATSON: Mm-hmm.

22 ED WELCH: So first is that rotation --
23 are those two meetings -- is that still what we
24 want to do? Yes? Okay?

1 Is week of September the 13th still
2 Portland?

3 TOM JACOBSEN: That's good.

4 ED WELCH: Yes.

5 Do you want to start on a Monday? No, we
6 don't. Okay. If we're having a two-day
7 meeting, are people more interested in a
8 Tuesday-Wednesday meeting or a
9 Wednesday-Thursday meeting?

10 Andy?

11 ANDY ARMSTRONG: Tuesday and Wednesday
12 would be my preference.

13 ED WELCH: Are there other people that
14 feel strongly either way.

15 SHERRI HICKMAN: Tuesday, Wednesday.

16 ED WELCH: Kathy and NOAA staff, is a
17 Tuesday-Wednesday meeting doable, assuming we
18 can locate a proper hotel?

19 KATHY WATSON: Confirmed.

20 ED WELCH: Okay.

21 SHERRI HICKMAN: Roger.

22 ED WELCH: All right. Tuesday,
23 September 14th Wednesday, September 15th.
24 Those are what we're honing in on.

1 Now is the time if anybody objects to say
2 so.

3 Okay. Kathy, let's see what we can do on
4 that.

5 KATHY WATSON: Okay.

6 ED WELCH: There we are.

7 VIRGINIA DENTLER: Do you want that? Do
8 you like that one? We're a little bit off
9 center, aren't we?

10 Gary, everybody is sort of clustering.
11 You're -- you look awfully pleased with
12 yourself.

13 (Laughter.)

14 ED WELCH: Okay.

15 In terms of what themes or what we want to
16 accomplish out in Portland, one thing I would
17 like to do is work with the NOAA staff to see
18 if there is any possible way of convincing
19 Dr. Lubchenco that she ought to go back to
20 Oregon, which is her stomping grounds, and be
21 there for part of the HSRP.

22 And to induce that, we can say, A, we'll
23 be able to give you an official presentation of
24 the updated most-wanted list; and B, perhaps we

1 may be able to have some kind of event about
2 the Columbia River PORTS program.

3 Does that sound doable? At least, you
4 know -- it's doable from our end. We don't
5 know anything at all about what kind of a
6 schedule she would have or interest she would
7 have.

8 Juliana?

9 JULIANA BLACKWELL: The NOAA staff will
10 start working on the paperwork right away, as
11 well as talking to Dave Kennedy, et cetera, to
12 do all we can to get Dr. Lubchenco.

13 ED WELCH: Okay.

14 Now, let's assume we've accomplished that.
15 That still doesn't necessarily totally occupy
16 the entire meeting, or we might not be able to
17 accomplish that, in which case we're going to
18 have to have some other things we want to
19 attend to.

20 Admiral West has suggested the situation
21 with the potential problem of technology
22 outreaching people's ability to actually use it
23 efficiently and safely, so that could be
24 something we wanted to have a couple of

1 speakers on.

2 You wanted to --

3 ADMIRAL WEST: The last two days, every
4 speaker was talking about -- even Captain
5 [inaudible] talking about the Navy challenges.
6 We've heard it for two days. I've heard it
7 since I've been on this panel, and so I think
8 it's our responsibility as an advisory group to
9 take a look at this and is there proper
10 training coming along with the capability.

11 And if there isn't, is that the sponsor's
12 responsibility? Is that the federal
13 government? Is that NOAA?

14 Back when I was a kid, before you could
15 get a gun and go hunting, you had to go to
16 class, and you had to get a little piece of
17 paper to say you're qualified, you knew which
18 end of the gun to shoot out of.

19 So I really do think that's something we
20 ought to look at, because I'm not sure who else
21 is looking at it.

22 And I highly recommend if we can get this
23 person from the NTSB to come. It was really
24 fascinating. So maybe we can start working on

1 that, too.

2 ED WELCH: Okay.

3 And I know a good number of folks over at
4 NTSB, so I'll work with you on that.

5 Matt?

6 MATT WELLSLAGER: The Pacific Marine
7 Center is moving from Seattle down to Oregon.

8 Would it be interesting to find out where
9 the status of that move is? Because I think
10 they're having docks built, and they should be
11 ready by 2011.

12 ED WELCH: Well, I think we ought to look
13 into that, but it's also my understanding that
14 there are lawsuits filed or being filed, and I
15 understand Senator Murray from Washington
16 state, who is a key Appropriations Committee
17 person, might have something to say about
18 whether the money is flowing or not.

19 She apparently is not particularly
20 thrilled with that decision, so I'm not sure
21 it's a done deal, but -- but it might be worth
22 finding out.

23 Andy?

24 CAPTAIN ANDY McGOVERN: A couple of

1 things.

2 I agree with the Admiral. It's not only
3 just the training, it's -- and actually, the
4 NTSB had a conference on this, but, you know,
5 it's the man-machine interface, it's do you
6 actually lower the workload or do you just
7 change it.

8 I didn't really like the Captain's talk
9 today about the man on watch will also be
10 monitoring the engine room. I think that's not
11 a good idea.

12 So there's a lot of that information
13 overload. So I think that's really -- you can
14 get all this stuff. It's like NOAA's
15 capability to do all these --

16 When they do their surveys, they actually
17 now have almost too much data as opposed -- you
18 know, it used to be not enough. Now it's
19 almost too much, where people are getting the
20 same way.

21 You know, used to not have enough
22 situational awareness, and now you've got an
23 overload. And where is that balance with
24 everything that's coming along and all the

1 products that can come out? Are they
2 necessarily good? Are they worth it? Are
3 they -- that's one thing.

4 The other thing, all the presentations
5 we've heard over the last few days were great,
6 but they didn't leave us a whole lot of time to
7 discuss and actually offer advice, which is
8 what I think --

9 We've got -- technically, we ended our
10 meeting, according to the agenda ten minutes
11 ago, and we didn't really start talking until
12 about 3:30.

13 So my thought is either we have a
14 three-day meeting or we concentrate more on our
15 meetings on less subject matter and have more
16 time to discuss.

17 ED WELCH: I understand.

18 And let me respond to both of points,
19 because Tom Jacobsen had talked to me about
20 this as well.

21 I think it is a fair point that we
22 schedule in some time that is basically
23 discussion time that -- where we can -- we can
24 go in whatever direction we want to based on

1 what we've heard, which is what I think you're
2 saying.

3 And so we ought to have some time that is
4 not designated for a particular subject,
5 because we may not know exactly what that
6 subject is until we hear what is said.

7 Similarly, Tom suggested -- and I agree --
8 you know, there had been some desire expressed
9 that we have some time here in this meeting for
10 a closed session to talk about the direction as
11 far as future appointments to this panel and
12 whether -- whether the administrator or the --
13 or the agency is expecting something different
14 in the way of this panel, and we weren't able
15 to do it because by the time we started
16 thinking about it, it was too late to put in
17 some kind of revised notice to the Federal
18 Register.

19 But I'm going to propose that from here on
20 out, we put in the Federal Register as part of
21 our regular announcement that a portion of our
22 agenda is going to be closed so that we can
23 have -- so that if we need to have a discussion
24 on something like that, we've had the notice --

1 the public has had the notice.

2 If we don't need it, we don't need to
3 close the meeting. You know, we can continue
4 in open session. But that way, we protect our
5 ability -- ensure our ability that we can have
6 a more confidential type of discussion.

7 So if we can build in that option and
8 preserve a little bit of time, you know, not a
9 little bit, a sufficient amount of time and --
10 for open session discussion of whatever
11 discussion, we'll do that.

12 Is that satisfactory?

13 TOM JACOBSEN: That's good.

14 ED WELCH: Okay.

15 Jon?

16 JONATHAN DASLER: Yes, I guess for
17 starters I want to offer my assistance in
18 helping put together, being right there in
19 Portland, so I could help with the local
20 stakeholders.

21 And then there's also, I guess, a number
22 of opportunities -- this was mention of USGS
23 and what they're doing. Walter Wakefield has
24 been working a lot the university, Oregon

1 State. And Dr. Chris Goldfinger, who has been
2 working on the Oregon seafloor mapping effort.

3 There's the whole Columbia River Treaty
4 that the Portland District Corps of Engineers
5 has been working on. They've been working on
6 the new GI [phonetic] models and the new VDatum
7 efforts and the whole combined bathymetric
8 model, going all the way down the Columbia from
9 Canada to the Pacific

10 So there's a number of things I think we
11 could help out with.

12 ED WELCH: That sounds good.

13 You heard the offer, Kathy?

14 KATHY WATSON: Yes.

15 Jon, I've got one request. You've got to
16 give me your cellphone number.

17 JONATHAN DASLER: No problem.

18 KATHY WATSON: Because he never answers
19 his emails until four weeks later.

20 ED WELCH: You know, I think with respect
21 to this Portland meeting, our problem is going
22 to be, you know having to deal with too many
23 subjects and sort of narrow them down and which
24 ones do we postpone to another meeting as

1 opposed to scrambling to find something to fill
2 the time.

3 Tom?

4 TOM JACOBSEN: Not to add another one on
5 the list, but they're struggling up there with
6 the draft issues, like we all are, and they're
7 installing -- SCRIPPS Institute is helping them
8 install another wave buoy. They're going to do
9 wave modeling so they can -- so they can load
10 the ships to the maximum amount. And crossing
11 the bar is pretty challenging.

12 So that's going to be interesting as well.
13 So we can just add this to the list and maybe
14 cross some of them out.

15 JONATHAN DASLER: Right, Columbia Bar
16 Pilots.

17 TOM JACOBSEN: Exactly, the bar pilots are
18 very involved in this.

19 JONATHAN DASLER: They're crazy.

20 ADAM McBRIDE: Well, I'd like to hear --
21 that's a really interesting transit.

22 TOM JACOBSEN: That would be a great
23 presentation to listen to when those pilots
24 talk about the borings and the recent

1 challenges.

2 JONATHAN DASLER: We can get [inaudible]
3 from the Port of Portland on the Loadmax system
4 and what's going on, some kind of kickoff -- if
5 CO-OPS could be working on something.

6 Mention that...

7 ED WELCH: We've done good talking into
8 the mike most of the time. Let's not forget
9 now.

10 TOM JACOBSEN: So it sounds like we're up
11 to three- or four-day meeting?

12 ED WELCH: I think we're still on a
13 two-day meeting.

14 SHERRI HICKMAN: I think they're saving
15 that three- or four-day meeting for Hawaii.

16 ED WELCH: Okay.

17 I'm going to -- unless somebody feels
18 strongly, I think we have pretty well gotten a
19 good direction for the Portland meeting, and
20 that's the last specific thing I have to raise.

21 I guess the question is, does anybody else
22 have anything else they want to bring to our
23 attention?

24 Okay. Well, I think we've had a

1 successful meeting. I really want to thank all
2 the NOAA staff, starting with Kathy and
3 Virginia and Tiffany and all the -- all the
4 other NOAA people that worked on the logistics
5 of this meeting and the agenda.

6 It all came together, Kathy. I think
7 there were times she had her doubts, but it
8 worked out fine.

9 We had excellent attendance from the
10 members. Thanks to everybody for making it.
11 Look forward to having everybody together in
12 Portland.

13 And Jill, I've been talking slow. Thank
14 you very much for your help. And with --
15 thanks to the public for sticking it out with
16 us.

17 And with that, unless anybody has anything
18 else we'd adjourn the meeting. Thanks.

19 (Proceedings adjourned at 4:46 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24