

ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3 MEETING HELD BEFORE THE  
4 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
5 HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 MANCHESTER GRAND HYATT  
12 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA  
13 FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2005  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.  
22 COURT REPORTERS  
23 500 North Brand Boulevard, Third Floor  
24 Glendale, California 91203  
25 (818) 551-7300

24 REPORTED BY: RUBEN GARCIA, CSR NO. 11305

25 FILE NO. 9F0224C

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

VOTING PANEL MEMBERS:

SCOTT RAINEY, Chairman  
HELEN BROHL, Vice Chairperson  
ANDREW ARMSTRONG  
JONATHAN DASLER  
ELAINE DICKINSON  
WILLIAM GRAY  
SHERRI HICKMAN  
LEWIS LAPINE  
RICHARD LARRABEE  
ADAM McBRIDE  
ANDREW McGOVERN  
MINAS MYRTIDIS  
JOHN OSWALD  
TOM SKINNER  
RICHARD WEST  
LARRY WHITING

NOAA EMPLOYEES:

CAPTAIN ROGER PARSONS, FACA Federal Official  
1315 EAST WEST HIGHWAY,  
STATION 6242  
OFFICE OF COAST SURVEY  
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910  
MIKE SZABADOS  
CHARLIE CHALLSTROM  
STEVE VOGEL  
BARBARA HESS

I N D E X

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

	PAGE
MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:	4
COMMENTS ON HSRP MISSION OVERVIEW:	4
CAPTAIN ROGER PARSONS, NOAA	
CONGRESSIONAL FACTFINDING VISITS BRIEFING:	6
ADMIRAL WEST	
WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS ON HSRP RESPONSES TO U.S. OCEAN ACTION PLAN:	29
TOM SKINNER, Chair	
REVIEW AND FINALIZE WORK GROUP TASKINGS AND DELIVERABLES FROM THURSDAY:	38
SCOTT RAINEY, Chair	
TOM SKINNER, Chair	
BILL GRAY, Chair	
PUBLIC COMMENTS:	105
CLOSING REMARKS:	131
MEETING ADJOURNED:	134

1 HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES REVIEW PANEL

2 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2005

3 8:30 A.M.

4  
5  
6 MR. RAINEY: Good morning, everybody. Let me go  
7 ahead and open up our meeting here and we'll get started.

8 Welcome to Day 2. I've got a couple notes here,  
9 just administrative comments. I guess we have three forms  
10 that we should have signed here. So if you can think  
11 through, there was a travel form, a time and attendance  
12 and the compensation waiver. So if you can sign those and  
13 give them to Barbara or Steve before you leave, that would  
14 be very helpful.

15 Also, our name badges, they would like to get  
16 these back from us, so if we can leave those before we go.

17 CAPTAIN PARSONS: If I could, since the public that  
18 is here today is the same public that was here yesterday,  
19 I will not review once again the mission of the HSRP. I  
20 would like to enter a correction to some comments that I  
21 made yesterday. When we were talking about costs for NRTs  
22 yesterday, in particular a statement I made to Larry  
23 Whiting, the cost to establish each NRT is a million  
24 dollars. The operation maintenance cost on a yearly basis  
25 is \$500,000. I think I had a figure a little larger than

1 that. So it's a million to establish and half a million  
2 to operate and maintain on an annual basis each NRT.

3 MR. RAINEY: Let's go ahead and get into our business  
4 here. The first thing we had then would be a briefing on  
5 the Hill visits that we had prior to the meeting. Just a  
6 little bit of a background. I think it was in the inside  
7 front cover of the notebook you saw, the one-pager that's  
8 two-sided, which was prepared by Office of Coast Survey,  
9 and we had a chance to take a look at that, pulling from  
10 our charter, and that was done sort of an introduction and  
11 a lead behind, if you will, with the congressional staff  
12 to familiarize them with our mission. Many of the staff  
13 obviously with the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act  
14 already knew because they were involved in standing this  
15 up, but I think it's a good explanation of trying to set  
16 the base work.

17 We were able to set up and we set it up through  
18 NOAA's Legislative Affairs office. April Black there was  
19 the point person on setting that up. We had two meetings  
20 so far. One was on the house side with House Resources  
21 staff, which also included John Rayfield who is formerly  
22 with House Resources but now with Coast Guard Maritime  
23 Transportation, but he was in there with Bonne, Bruce and  
24 Janzen from the minority. So it was a good meeting on  
25 that. The people that attended there, myself, Admiral

1 West, and Larry.

2 And then the following week we had a second  
3 meeting on the senate side with, I guess, primarily it was  
4 Elaine and Admiral West were there on the senate meeting.  
5 And I think it was Margaret Spring and -- was it Chris  
6 Patton? But they had two staffers from the Senate  
7 Commerce.

8 Can I turn it over to you, Admiral, and we can  
9 talk a little bit about it and talk with him a little bit  
10 on the issues that were discussed on those meetings.

11 MR. WEST: I didn't take notes while we were sitting  
12 there, but I do have notes in my little book here. I have  
13 a tendency to write things when people think I'm listening  
14 to them, and then I go back to look at them later and  
15 don't recognize them. So I tried to put these things back  
16 together.

17 We did meet with the House Resources on the  
18 15th. As Scott said, it was Larry and myself. And April  
19 was there. We had a NOAA representative and that's  
20 important, because we didn't the second time, which is  
21 rather interesting.

22 But let me start out with I'm really  
23 disappointed it took us this long to get to the Hill. And  
24 I don't what happened in NOAA, but I think you need to  
25 chase it down. Many of you have been on FACA's before,

1 and I have been on lots of them. There is absolute need  
2 to get over to the Hill and find out what's going on.  
3 Especially a FACA that's established by legislation.  
4 There was obviously some reason for them wanting to have a  
5 FACA for Hydro Services, and it doesn't come through in  
6 the language. You have to go find out what they want to  
7 know.

8           So it took us, what, a year, a little over a  
9 year? I'm not going to dwell on it, but that was  
10 unsatisfactory in my opinion.

11           It's very important to get over there in my  
12 opinion, especially the ones that were established. As  
13 far as I know, FACA's can be established by two ways, a  
14 federal agency can do it, and then it can be done by  
15 legislation. And usually, for example, if this was an  
16 initiative of Lautenbacher, then we ought to be up talking  
17 to him more often. But this, in fact, was done by the  
18 Hill, so you need to get over there pretty quick. It's  
19 important to let them know you're up and running because,  
20 as I said, they can't tell you what they want in language.  
21 They have to tell you to your face. And that's really  
22 what you're after, because if you don't answer the mail,  
23 then we're wasting our time, to be honest with you.

24           We met with the Resources as Scott said. I just  
25 went through my notes. The only thing that popped up in

1 my mind, because I have known John for years, I asked him  
2 from a several-year perspective what your thoughts on  
3 where Hydro Services is in NOAA, because that's really  
4 what we want to know. He basically said he thought it was  
5 coming up very nicely since the mid '90s when there were  
6 some ships put in and some money put in. And please jump  
7 in, the rest of you folks that were there because I am  
8 recreating this from my notes.

9 But that was encouraging. So there was really  
10 no real negative push-back from any of them that I thought  
11 of. There was obviously the balance between the feds and  
12 contractor support came up briefly. It wasn't a big deal  
13 that I saw. It did come up again in the senate side too.  
14 So that's a theme we have to pay attention to.

15 The big thing for me, because I worked mostly  
16 these ocean issues on a daily basis, we had a long  
17 discussion in IOOS on the role of Hydro Services and how  
18 it fits into Integrated Ocean Observing. It was a good  
19 discussion, and it was pretty unanimous by the staffers on  
20 both sides that there's -- I don't know if confusion is  
21 the right word, but -- by the way, the Hill uses  
22 "confusion" very differently than we do. They use  
23 "confusion" to put you "Go away, because I have other  
24 things to do." It's a nice excuse for them. And we can't  
25 let them have that. And they're using that a lot, and I



1 hear that a lot on other things I do on the Hill too.

2           And if ocean observing is important to the  
3 nation, which I think it is -- I mean, we've had  
4 commission reports and the President even said it's  
5 important -- we have to figure out how these pieces fit  
6 together. And it was a good discussion. I took several  
7 notes and I won't spend much time on it. But what's  
8 happening is people are going to the Hill to the  
9 respective constituents, their staffers, and saying,  
10 "Here's my piece. Before you go spend a lot of money on  
11 all these grand schemes, give me my money." And then the  
12 question goes back, "Well, how do you fit into the grand  
13 scheme," and there's no answer, and they say, "Well, when  
14 you figure that out, come back." And that's a general  
15 theme that's gone out. In fact, Elaine and I had a nice  
16 chat with Margaret, who is very experienced, and in some  
17 way we might be able to solve that, and I'll talk about  
18 that in a minute.

19           The only other thing I had written down, I don't  
20 know what it means, it says, "Figure it out in senate  
21 language."

22           Do you remember anything that we talked about  
23 with the Resources folks that talked about figuring this  
24 out in senate language?

25           MS. BROHL: You mean maybe it's new legislation?

1 MR. WEST: Yeah. It's all too late for that now, by  
2 the way. This year you're done. They're all done and  
3 written. But Margaret did say in our second meeting that  
4 she thought we could have a significant impact if we had  
5 some recommendations and some thoughts by this fall, so we  
6 ought to shoot for that.

7 But that's all I got for the house. Scott or  
8 Larry.

9 MR. WHITING: Somebody in the meeting made the  
10 recommendation that NOAA appoint an Ocean Observing Czar,  
11 I guess is what you would call it.

12 MR. WEST: Yes. I think I brought that up because  
13 that's my personal opinion. As I said, I work this every  
14 day. Until somebody, until a federal agency steps up and  
15 says, "Ocean Observing is my mission. Here is my program  
16 office. Here is my line item. I am going to get on with  
17 it." And we don't have that.

18 In fact, I'm a little concerned about you  
19 folks -- I think Helen was getting into it a little bit,  
20 but if you add all this stuff up, in fact, I think at the  
21 industry day a couple weeks ago that NOAA had -- or the  
22 Ocean.US had, they listed almost a billion dollars within  
23 NOAA for Ocean Observing. If you add up all the things,  
24 bits and pieces and if it's taken data from the ocean and  
25 you consider that to be part of IOOS, then you probably

1 do. I think it was 925 million. But that's dangerous.  
2 So if you tell the Hill, "I'm already spending a billion  
3 dollars on Ocean Observing in NOAA," where? How? Go  
4 away. There's too much chaff going on right now with  
5 Ocean Observing. So I'm a little concerned about that.

6           Until somebody -- it's got to be NOAA. There's  
7 no other federal agency that has that mission. The  
8 problem is NOAA doesn't have a mandated mission. That's  
9 why the NOAA Organic Act is the number one issue on the  
10 Hill right now. In fact, it's already been introduced,  
11 got through the Science Committee. So it's on its way.  
12 The problem we're going to have is administration also  
13 introduced one that looks exactly like NOAA is today. So  
14 there's going to be a battle and who knows what is going  
15 to happen over there. But we need to get the mission to  
16 NOAA. And I think that would help us clear up who is in  
17 charge of IOOS, what are the pieces and stuff like that.  
18 Margaret had an interesting thought later, and we'll talk  
19 about that.

20           DR. LAPINE: Who is Margaret? Margaret who?

21           MR. WEST: Margaret Springer.

22           MS. BROHL: Can you explain what she does and who she  
23 is?

24           MR. WEST: I haven't gotten to that meeting yet.

25           DR. LAPINE: You have used her name about a dozen

1 times and I don't know who Margaret is.

2 MR. WEST: She's on the senate side. We met with  
3 her, Elaine and I did, the second meeting.

4 MR. GRAY: She's a staffer.

5 MR. WEST: Yes.

6 MR. RAINEY: Any questions on the house briefing? I  
7 think Admiral West covered it very well. I think those  
8 were the main points. They did seem to indicate that they  
9 were looking at some hearings on issues that we would be  
10 advising the Admiral on, so it will be interesting to see  
11 how it plays out in legislation. As I said, the ball is  
12 kind of rolling on the Organic Act.

13 MS. BROHL: Speaking of hearings, how appropriate is  
14 it for Scott to be invited by a staffer? Let's say they  
15 invited him to speak at a hearing, is that appropriate?  
16 Is that doable? Because I think it would be terrific to  
17 put him up there and discuss what the panel is doing and  
18 the issues. Could you confirm that?

19 CAPTAIN PARSONS: I don't believe there's any  
20 prohibition against the chairman of a FACA from being  
21 called to testify.

22 MR. WEST: In fact, that's why you have a chairman.  
23 In fact, while you were sitting there, I don't know if you  
24 were there early enough, I asked a couple of Resources  
25 folks had they ever heard of a FACA that didn't have a

1 chairman, and they all couldn't think of one that didn't,  
2 although I'm sitting on one that doesn't, and it's the  
3 Marine Mammal FACA. And it's a disaster. I think it was  
4 done so that you didn't have a point of contact for the  
5 panel to be drawn in front of congress to testify, because  
6 if you don't have a chairman, who do you go pick? And so  
7 you have a chairman so they can represent this panel in  
8 hearing. So I think it's very appropriate and we ought to  
9 push for it.

10 MR. RAINEY: It's good to hear that we're just short  
11 of a disaster. But the one thing on that though I know,  
12 because I have checked a little bit and I testified a  
13 couple times on NOAA issues from the pilot's perspective,  
14 but I know that if we ever did go up as a FACA, whoever  
15 went we would have to clear the testimony I think further  
16 through NOAA and all that. So it would be somewhat of a,  
17 you know -- it would be a coordinated or at least sort of  
18 an approved talk on that. But I think that may be in  
19 the offing.

20 MR. WEST: You can go through them, but they can't  
21 change them.

22 MR. RAINEY: Right. Bill?

23 MR. GRAY: Dick, you said you brought up this subject  
24 of an ocean czar or something like that. I'm trying to  
25 recall, but in the Commission on the Oceans, wasn't there

1 recommended in that sort of a formalizing of the  
2 interagency committee on the MTS or something of that  
3 type? I mean, that has existed since the MTS report came  
4 out in 1999 and it's a totally powerless body, because it  
5 has no money to spend. It's just a talk shop and so  
6 forth.

7 But I thought on the Commission on the Oceans  
8 which we did review during last summer that there was  
9 something in there that gave a little more muscle to that.  
10 It's not the Oceans, but it is the MTS. And I am just  
11 curious how that contrasts with what you might call an  
12 ocean czar.

13 MR. RAINEY: Admiral West could probably talk to you  
14 in real detail about the cop. They're raising to the  
15 executive cabinet level oversight on the Counsel on Ocean  
16 Policy. And what you're talking about, Bill, is they also  
17 had an executive order that stood up on the interagency  
18 task force on the MTS to a similar level, and then how  
19 those things are going to coordinate is probably yet to be  
20 seen. But you're right.

21 MR. GRAY: So there should be a leader for the  
22 Oceans, as you say, IOOS, and for the MTS. Not  
23 necessarily the same person.

24 MR. WEST: The Ocean Action Plan, as the President  
25 announced in December, puts the CEQ in charge of this

1 whole thing. The Ocean Commission, one of the  
2 recommendations was to get the administration involved  
3 that's got to get into the White House. So they did.  
4 They made CEQ in charge of it. So he's now the new czar  
5 at the top of what used to be known as the National Ocean  
6 Partnership Program, which was 15 of the federal agencies.  
7 That's been expanded to about 19 or 20 now. The cabinet  
8 level that's hosted by Connaughton at CEQ. The day-to-day  
9 operation hopefully, this is my personal opinion, gets  
10 passed to Lautenbacher because that's the person who has  
11 the most responsibility for this. If it stays up here --  
12 CEQ is never put in place as a program management office.  
13 It's just an advisory group, and they just don't have the  
14 expertise to but plug them in and turn them over to  
15 whoever your lead agency is. And Lautenbacher has been  
16 designated the lead agent for GEOSS by the President, he  
17 has that mission, including the Ocean Observing. And in  
18 the Ocean Commission report and in the OAP it says, "NOAA,  
19 that's your job. Go do it." But what's happened is that  
20 wasn't reflected in the '06 budget because that  
21 recommendation wasn't endorsed by his boss until the '06  
22 budget was submitted.

23 We need to have it in the '07 budget.

24 Lautenbacher has to have in his budget a line that says,  
25 "I am in charge of Ocean Observing," and hopefully Spinrad

1 gets it and we can get on with this thing. Because until  
2 you do that, we're all kind of trying to keep our programs  
3 going wherever we can.

4 MR. GRAY: In keeping with that, does that mean  
5 that's something this HSRP should put together right away?  
6 We know that ought to be done. It's got to be done by a  
7 certain point in time, and when we come to whether it's  
8 which work group or something else, but just to get that  
9 statement of the HSRP that we feel it's essential to make  
10 any of these things happen that Lautenbacher be so named.

11 MR. WEST: Actually, one of my comments after the  
12 senate meeting, I was going to mention it. That's  
13 probably something we ought to consider doing, along the  
14 lines with some of the things Margaret suggested to us are  
15 pretty good ideas too.

16 MR. RAINEY: Under Tab G, that's where we have the  
17 Ocean Action Panel, on page 32 of that is the cite I guess  
18 where it talks about just about what you're asking about,  
19 the interagency committee, that the President is directing  
20 that to come up.

21 MR. WEST: If you have the box diagram, you might  
22 want to look at that. It's about the third or fourth page  
23 of it.

24 MR. RAINEY: That's on the top sort of organization.  
25 That's on page 10. And that shows the Committee on Ocean



1 Policy breakdown and the joint subcommittees underneath  
2 that and the explanation of that.

3 MR. WEST: Let me spend a minute because this is kind  
4 of important I think to all of us. The middle box here,  
5 if you had it in color is blue, and they now call this the  
6 aqua box. This is the new cabinet level thing. By the  
7 way, the CEQ group meets for the first time on Tuesday,  
8 this coming Tuesday, on the 5th.

9 National Ocean Partnership Program that we've  
10 had since 1996, so the 15 federal agencies were Navy, NSF,  
11 NOAA and NASA have rotated as chair of this thing has now  
12 been disbanded as of 1 April. They are now the middle  
13 box. So we've added a layer of hopefully not bureaucracy  
14 of the White House on top of that. Hopefully they will  
15 hand that stick back to Lautenbacher in the middle box.  
16 The bottom left is the SNTR research, education, and all  
17 that piece of it. The new box, which nobody seems to know  
18 what it is, is on the bottom right. The Ocean Commission  
19 says we really have a problem with regulatory issues for  
20 our oceans and all that other stuff. So you need to  
21 address that too because Connaughton never did that.  
22 Well, that's that box. And nobody really knows what that  
23 is.

24 The issue with IOOS, is it in the left bottom box or  
25 left right box? And the answer is a little bit of both.

1 And therein lies a problem because we have 60,000 people  
2 trying to decide how to do this all, and I go back to say  
3 hopefully we'll get one person in charge and we'll make  
4 him sort this all out.

5 MR. OSWALD: As a point of reference, I know vaguely  
6 the CEQ. Could you give us a one line or what it is.

7 MR. WEST: Counsel on Environmental Quality. It's an  
8 advisor on environment. I don't even know the history of  
9 it, how long it's been there.

10 MR. GRAY: About 1970.

11 MR. OSWALD: Outside of the cabinet?

12 MR. WEST: Yeah, it's an advisor to the White House  
13 just like many of the other counsels that have been set up  
14 to advise the President on certain issues.

15 MR. GRAY: It was set up the same time E.P.A. was,  
16 which is '70 or '71.

17 MR. WEST: It's strictly an advisor. It's a small  
18 staff. Great people. But in no way are they in a  
19 position to manage something as huge as this.

20 On the 3/22, we went over to the Senate Commerce,  
21 Elaine and I were there. Unfortunately, it was Easter  
22 recess so we got this talk with Chris when we don't know  
23 her last name. Nice gal. And Margaret joined us, which  
24 is important because Margaret has been involved in this  
25 for many, many years. Here again, relationship between

1 the core capabilities of NOAA versus industry and how you  
2 deal with that. I do have a note here on Brook Act, and I  
3 don't know what I wrote that down for, but that was  
4 discussed too. All I have is it allows the best product  
5 and choice. Margaret brought it up so there's some  
6 support there to do it that way which is probably good  
7 news to you. She did mention in passing, and I didn't  
8 know what she was talking about, that a Map Act had been  
9 introduced and was a nice act and got cold at the last  
10 minute because of some --

11 MR. RAINEY: That was probably the integration.

12 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Yeah, I think that was S363, which  
13 was the Coastal and Ocean Integrated Mapping Bill.

14 MR. WEST: She was disappointed that there was enough  
15 influence from outside to pull that because she thought  
16 that was a pretty good act. That's all. I didn't know  
17 what she was talking about to be honest with you.

18 She did mention the huge backlog of data that  
19 you all have. And she brought that up unsolicited. So I  
20 leave that to you to take on. Then we did go on to spend  
21 a lot of time with her also along the same issue we had  
22 with resources about the number of pieces of IOOS and the  
23 competition between them and the confusion and how to sort  
24 that all out. We talked for quite a while. And I've  
25 worked with Margaret before on this. And we spent some

1 time on it.

2 One of the suggestions she had was some type of  
3 a letter to the Hill with all the pieces signing up at the  
4 bottom. And until you get a program office, I don't know  
5 how you coordinate all this stuff. All I can tell you is  
6 it's a problem. I don't think any of us are going to take  
7 advantage of the momentum the commission report is going  
8 to bring to us until we figure this piece out because  
9 everybody is all of a sudden signing up to be part of  
10 IOOS, and there lies the problem. If you sign up to be  
11 part of IOOS, then you say, "I'm the best example of how  
12 do that, so give me some money and I'll go show you how to  
13 do my piece and then you can institute that." And that's  
14 what's going on. And unfortunately, for all of us, that's  
15 not going to help.

16 Margaret and I talked a lot about the NOPP thing  
17 because she's been close to this in the transition to the  
18 new oversight by President. The Organic Act is probably  
19 the hottest one over on the Hill right now. There's about  
20 20-some bills that relate to the Ocean Commission Report  
21 flying around. Only two were passed last year of  
22 interest, Harmful Algae Bloom and Oceans and the Human  
23 Health. There's a common word in there that kind of rings  
24 to everybody, and that's called "health." Health sells.  
25 It does. So there's about 20 plus. And they change names

1 and they look different every day, but right now the  
2 Organic Act is very important in my opinion, and hopefully  
3 we'll get that one through this year at least.

4 Elaine, do you have anything else?

5 MS. DICKINSON: No.

6 MR. McBRIDE: Did you say there was a senate version  
7 of a NOAA bill in committee?

8 MR. WEST: No. The only one that I know that has  
9 been through a committee is the house.

10 MR. McBRIDE: Do you know the number?

11 MR. WEST: Yeah, I can get it for you. I do have it.  
12 I will get it for you.

13 I don't know if all of you know that NOAA really  
14 does not have a mandated or legislated mission. It was  
15 just established in 1971 as a result of the Stratton  
16 Commission and said take care of ocean issues because we  
17 need an atmospheric agency. And then they stuck them  
18 under Commerce, so Commerce has a say in everything they  
19 do. So if Lautenbacher puts a line in there for ocean  
20 education, for example, it gets caught in Commerce because  
21 they said, "That's not your mission, that's Department of  
22 Education," for example. And that's been constantly the  
23 problem with NOAA for years and years.

24 One of the initial thoughts by the Ocean  
25 Commission was to make NOAA an independent agency just

1 like NASA. Take it out and stick it up here so it didn't  
2 have to go through that process. Well, 65 percent of  
3 Commerce is NOAA. And so you're not going to lose a  
4 cabinet position by pulling out, so they were told in no  
5 uncertain terms that that would not be accepted. So they  
6 went back to telling exactly what NOAA must do, its  
7 mission, et cetera, et cetera. There's another initiative  
8 to actually move it -- it wasn't introduced this year --  
9 out of Commerce over to the Department of Interior. And I  
10 don't know where -- that's floating around some place. I  
11 don't think that one is going to sell. But NOAA needs to  
12 be legitimized with an Organic Act.

13           The only other thing I'd like to say is I have  
14 sat on lots of FACA's. And -- just because I have. One  
15 thing we have to be very, very careful of that we in our  
16 role are independent of what we do back home when we leave  
17 here and what we do here, you all have a great spread of  
18 knowledge and different capabilities and that's why you're  
19 all here and that's how the process was done. And that's  
20 good and we need to hear all that, but at the end of the  
21 day, the FACA recommendation is the one we all rally  
22 around. And I don't mean that because there's been any  
23 problem, but just from previous experience. And the Hill  
24 looks at that too a little bit.

25           MS. BROHL: Just for your information, on March 2nd

1 many of you know that NOAA held a strategic planning  
2 meeting and there was a Commerce and Transportation  
3 breakout from that. And you can view the comments from  
4 that breakout on their Office of Strategic Planning  
5 website, I think it's "osp.noaa.gov," and go to the  
6 Commerce and Transportation section and see every single  
7 recommendation. Charlie was kind enough to be the  
8 moderator and manager of that breakout.

9 One of the things that came out of it -- two  
10 very important points came out that made the top list  
11 based upon two questions that were posed to the group.  
12 One of those was that the group very strongly believed  
13 that the role of marine transportation and the marine  
14 transportation system should be viewed as greater value in  
15 NOAA. It's the perception from the group was that it  
16 didn't place very high in the scope of NOAA things and  
17 operations and that the marine aspects, the maritime  
18 services and those things should be considered all through  
19 all the mandates and all the offices in NOAA.

20 For example, if there's going to be new  
21 delineations on sanctuaries, that perhaps maritime should  
22 be viewed as a stakeholder in the front end, not after a  
23 federal regulation has been published for comment; and it  
24 was said that maritime wanted to be engaged on the front  
25 end not on the back end.

1                   And the second important issue, I think  
2 interesting one, and it follows what Bill Gray had said,  
3 and that was recommended that there might be a marine  
4 transportation ombudsman, somebody, or a liaison, that an  
5 ombudsman might be at the administrator level or there  
6 should be a liaison at the department -- the office level.

7                   And I thought those were two interesting  
8 aspects, that maritime felt that they weren't always  
9 heard. Not necessarily under NOS navigation service  
10 programs, but that maritime seemed to be kind of the last  
11 thought. Obviously that's not always the case, but I  
12 thought you should be interested and those bullets are  
13 available on line. And you can still respond individually  
14 to the strategic planning process through that website and  
15 I recommend you do it. You do have to address the two  
16 questions that they posed. I'm sorry, I don't know them  
17 off the top of my head -- but when you see, it's worth  
18 anything to take a look at the bullets that other people  
19 put up there and then put your own two cents in if you're  
20 inclined.

21                  MR. GRAY: I am Bill Gray. That's interesting how on  
22 the problem, as I see it, getting a maritime ombudsman, or  
23 whoever it may be, is that the maritime activities in the  
24 government are split in so many places. NOAA for sure.  
25 Coast Guard, now it's in Homeland Security. MARAD, I have



1 to be careful what I say here, but I have never been  
2 terribly impressed with what they have done, and they're  
3 in the Department of Transportation. And it's just split  
4 all over the lot.

5 If I could wave a wand on some of these things,  
6 I would put them all under one and have it, have a person,  
7 individual or organization that represented all of those  
8 things, and the recreational side of it too, but I don't  
9 know how one does that.

10 MS. BROHL: This is clearly speaking just within the  
11 NOAA context, not a federal ombudsman, but one within NOAA  
12 who would help bring the stakeholder interests and  
13 concerns of the maritime transportation industry to the  
14 many different facets of NOAA. But it was just a NOAA  
15 concept.

16 MR. GRAY: But people with whom I spent my time in  
17 this industry, it's got Coast Guard also. It has the  
18 Corps of Engineers. It's got MARAD. And you just can't  
19 point your finger at any one of them. And then the Army  
20 Engineers. And they're tough people to even get ahold of.

21 MR. WEST: Bill, if you look on page 6 and 7 of the  
22 Ocean Action Plan, they've added several more people, and  
23 some of them are kind of strange. But it's got everybody  
24 and the federal government has a piece of the ocean.  
25 Originally there were 15 and now they're up to well over

1 20. But that's the whole purpose to try to bring them to  
2 that aqua box, the middle box there. And you're invited  
3 to participate. And the decision is going to be made  
4 there. And if you don't join, then the hell with you.  
5 We're going to move on. And that's why it's important  
6 that our Federal Ocean Agency is in charge of that, and  
7 that's NOAA. And there's some things, reservations, with  
8 NOAA, but then we have to get past that.

9 MR. GRAY: But from what I heard you say, Dick, and  
10 Helen also, that if Admiral Lautenbacher could somehow be  
11 put in the position of really speaking for a large part of  
12 that group, and whoever is head of CEQ, if it's an  
13 individual that has some muscle or that the President  
14 happens to like, it's a position that really can do  
15 something, being in the White House. But I think it's  
16 totally dependent on which person you put in there. But  
17 that pair of people, CEQ plus the head of NOAA, if they  
18 were reminded to do so for IOOS and the other things that  
19 we want, the MTS things we want.

20 So as I said before, I think that for the HSRP  
21 to -- and you said there are times when you can get into  
22 the next cycle or something like that, for us somehow to  
23 advance the cause of getting an individual like the  
24 Admiral, Admiral Lautenbacher, and so forth to be  
25 officially anointed to have something like that role, that

1 would be something I think we should support.

2 MR. RAINEY: I was encouraged in the Ocean Action  
3 Plan on page 15 on the NOAA side, they're talking about  
4 one of the action items is to coordinate ocean and coastal  
5 mapping activities and activities should include  
6 development of an annual inventory of federally funded and  
7 non-federal governmental ocean and coastal mapping and  
8 charting programs, et cetera. And they talk about, after  
9 they inventory that, to coordinate and leverage resources  
10 and efforts across federal sector with industry academic  
11 NGOs, et cetera. So they're actually listing the  
12 coordination.

13 Similarly to go back to the interagency  
14 committee on the MTS, a similar charge to, on page 32,  
15 talking about implementing the administration's freight  
16 action agenda, and one of the bullets is to improve  
17 coordination of planning and financing and public private  
18 infrastructure, and talking about just several things in  
19 here about the purpose of the ICTMS will be to improve --  
20 that's a typo. ICMTS it should be -- will be to improve  
21 the federal MTS coordination and policies, develop  
22 outcome-based goals and coordinate federal annual budget  
23 requests and regulatory activities that impact the MTS.

24 So to the extent that NOAA and the hydro  
25 services play a role in that, we may be able to sort of

1 frame recommendations to Admiral Lautenbacher, kind of  
2 looking towards those kind of oversight bodies. But  
3 anyway, any further --

4 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We can certainly make it available  
5 to the panel that the Ocean and Coastal Mapping  
6 Integration bill that I mentioned before, S364 is a direct  
7 response to this particular recommendation and the Ocean  
8 Act Plan. So we'll get a copy of that to you and post  
9 that on the website as well.

10 MS. BROHL: But that was last year's bill. 364 is  
11 from last year; right?

12 CAPTAIN PARSONS: I think that's where its genesis  
13 was, yeah.

14 MS. BROHL: It's been reintroduced this year?

15 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Yes.

16 MR. WEST: The only other thing I would add is I  
17 think we ought to get back over there within the next  
18 three or four months, at least before the summer recess,  
19 and then go back again this fall. And I would encourage  
20 to do it when some of the other members can go.

21 MS. BROHL: Is it appropriate to ask that NOAA  
22 provide a little briefing of some of the programs, an  
23 overview, or do you think it's better to go separately, to  
24 help clarify -- sometimes when the department heads here  
25 talk about their programs with the PowerPoint, it gets a

1 little bit better. But I don't know if you think that  
2 that is too tight.

3 MR. WEST: My personal opinion, I just spent a year  
4 and a half on a NOAA research review team, which is a FACA  
5 looking at NOAA. We went over at least every 90 days.  
6 And it was us. And we didn't have anything from NOAA. It  
7 was us going back and forth because they, in fact, set up  
8 that FACA too to look at specific things. So it was kind  
9 of dialogue between the FACA and the staffers and not  
10 NOAA. So I think you kind of introduce some other  
11 problems if you do that.

12 MR. RAINEY: Thanks very much. Why don't we go ahead  
13 then and take a look then on the letter, proposed letter  
14 that HSRP responds to the Ocean Action Plan. That's the  
15 two-pager that I circulated yesterday.

16 This is largely credit to Tom Skinner. We had a  
17 meeting of the work group chairs, vice chair and myself  
18 and Captain Parsons down in Silver Springs, trying to get  
19 it coordinated, an initial talk about how we're going to  
20 set up the working groups and all of that, I guess,  
21 somewhere around a month ago. And Tom had volunteered to  
22 take a draft letter from the panel.

23 We'd been discussing that it would be important  
24 for us to weigh in as the FACA on the Ocean Action Plan,  
25 that hydro services are relevant and important, and to

1 contact Admiral Lautenbacher with some of our just initial  
2 views on the Ocean Action Plan with the anticipation that  
3 we'll be continuing work on that in work groups as we go  
4 forward. So Tom had graciously offered to write the first  
5 draft. And that was circulated over the Internet, and  
6 then several folks had provided some comments to that.

7 The document that I passed out yesterday was my  
8 attempt to incorporate the various comments that came in  
9 to Tom's original draft, and so the hope here is to  
10 have -- the people have had a chance to see this. We've  
11 tried to take on board the comments, but I would like to  
12 open up the floor with discussion on it.

13 And again, the idea here is it's kind of an  
14 initial correspondence to say that this is an important  
15 thing. We recognize that. And that we feel that the FACA  
16 has something to say about this on into the future that  
17 hydro services are relevant and just sort of an opening  
18 dialogue on that. So I guess with that, I would like to  
19 go ahead and open up the floor.

20 The intent here is that we could go through this  
21 and come up with a consensus document that we could  
22 forward in fairly short order to Admiral Lautenbacher. So  
23 hopefully we can talk about it here and then approve this  
24 and send it forward. Let me go ahead and open up the  
25 floor for discussion.

1 MR. GRAY: I think this is really an excellent job  
2 that Tom has done. Very good. And the only thought that  
3 occurs to me on it is what we were speaking about two or  
4 three minutes ago, might be another letter that we would  
5 send to Admiral Lautenbacher talking about some specific  
6 parts of the action plan where we feel this should be  
7 done, this should be done, and so forth in the ways that  
8 Dick and Helen have both spoken about. And it probably  
9 would be not timely and maybe a little bit messy to try  
10 and add any of that to the letter that we have in front of  
11 us. I am very happy with the way it is. I think it  
12 expresses very well the views that I certainly can  
13 support. I think whoever did the first one, Tom, I guess  
14 you did, and so forth like that, and the re-editing it. I  
15 think it's very good.

16 MR. RAINEY: Thank you, Bill.

17 MR. WHITING: I would like to just make one  
18 recommendation here. In the almost to last paragraph  
19 where NOAA need to -- the U.S. Ocean Plan needs to pay  
20 attention to things that were merely inferred or actually  
21 omitted.

22 Why don't we say commitment to the full  
23 implementation of the NWLONs, whatever that acronym stands  
24 for, and the Physical Oceanographic Real-Time System. Why  
25 don't we just say that we support them both, not just

1 PORTS systems, but a full implementation of that.

2 MR. ARMSTRONG: Add NWLON?

3 MR. WHITING: Just add NWLON to that sentence  
4 somewhere and a full implementation of that.

5 MS. BROHL: A commitment to it.

6 MR. WHITING: A commitment to it, right.

7 DR. LAPINE: Before you go too far with that -- this  
8 is Lou Lapine. John and I were talking about that same  
9 sentence, and although we're committed to PORTS, it's not  
10 the only real-time system. And I asked Charlie about  
11 whether we should include the continuously operating GPS  
12 reference system, which integrates so well with PORTS and  
13 NWLON, so that Lautenbacher knows that we're interested in  
14 all real-time operating systems.

15 MR. SKINNER: We can change that around so it states  
16 the larger field first and then maybe parenthesis say, for  
17 example -- and then in parenthesis give specific examples,  
18 including but not having to go through the whole list,  
19 that these are the types of things that we mean. I think  
20 we can --

21 MR. RAINEY: It sounds like there's a general  
22 consensus on that. Could you write that down and then  
23 we'll have a complete memo we can both accept.

24 MR. SKINNER: I also have some other minor comments  
25 that people have either given me so I don't know if we



1 really want to go through those because a lot of them are  
2 really sort of minor edits. My co-author over here and I  
3 have added "public health" a couple times, trying to  
4 follow up on the Admiral's suggestion. So there are some  
5 minor things. And I don't think it really changes the  
6 tone of the letter. It sort of cleans it up a little bit,  
7 but I don't think we really need to go through those.  
8 Just as long as people are comfortable with that.

9 MR. RAINEY: I guess that's fine for now, and we want  
10 to try to keep it so we know exactly what we're doing, but  
11 at the end of the day I think we should go through exactly  
12 and we know that we've all agreed on even, I guess,  
13 the fine tuning.

14 MR. SKINNER: We will have a revised thing by  
15 lunchtime.

16 MR. RAINEY: That's a great idea.

17 MR. OSWALD: Just a couple quick comments. Is this  
18 letter to be hand delivered by our committee? I would  
19 recommend that.

20 MR. RAINEY: I am not quite sure what you mean. It  
21 would be signed --

22 MR. OSWALD: Are you going to send it in the mail or  
23 are you going to physically meet with Admiral  
24 Lautenbacher?

25 CAPTAIN PARSONS: If I could comment, to get on the

1 Admiral's schedule may not be as timely as you might want.

2 MR. OSWALD: I've done it before. So it's pretty  
3 simple from my perspective. I mean as a citizen. But  
4 anyway, I would recommend that if it's possible. Just a  
5 couple quick comments and maybe I can meet with Tom  
6 offline, but the use of the word "near shore" I would like  
7 to have the word considered like geospatial that shows up  
8 in the Ocean Action Plan and lots of other documents.  
9 Geospatial information.

10 MR. GRAY: What language is that?

11 MR. OSWALD: That's the language of the 21st century,  
12 I think.

13 MR. GRAY: Can't we just speak plain English around  
14 here.

15 MR. OSWALD: We're not the surveying department  
16 anymore of the United States. We're the geomatics  
17 department. We create words on the fly. And it might be  
18 appropriate just to consider, because it's a comment from  
19 Bill Gray, is at the bottom of the first thing, is  
20 always put the -- and I don't know if that's an accurate  
21 figure. Bill's used it, the hundred million dollar  
22 cleanup on the Athos.

23 MR. GRAY: I think the hundred million dollar figure,  
24 it's been in the government has signed up behind that I  
25 know because -- whatever the fund is that was created by

1 OPA, and they have agreed they're handling the claims now  
2 and so forth. But it's in excess of a hundred million.  
3 That's for sure.

4 MR. OSWALD: And I just have a couple other minor  
5 words. Maybe I will meet with Tom and come up with a  
6 consensus.

7 MR. SKINNER: Well, a couple things. I'll have  
8 office hours at the break if anyone wants to visit with  
9 me. And I think before we start getting into the details,  
10 let me explain a little bit of the rationale behind this  
11 letter, which was, this is our place saver for going back  
12 and following up on this. So intentionally we left out a  
13 lot of the details. And I think it's a mistake to start  
14 putting more details in here because then we've already  
15 mentioned it and it's harder to go back and complete  
16 detail at a subsequent letter. So "these are the things  
17 we're interested in and we'll get back to you" type  
18 letter.

19 The other thing I want to make sure people are  
20 aware of is that this pretty much commits us to this  
21 strategy of -- I don't know how to put it -- but if we're  
22 interested in getting some of these real-time programs  
23 funded, we're tagging on pretty clearly here to the IOOS  
24 program and initiative. And that's been -- we've had  
25 quite a bit of discussion on that. So I just want to make

1 sure that people are comfortable with that and that that  
2 will sort of provide the framework for how we move in the  
3 future.

4 DR. LAPINE: In John's defense, because there was a  
5 lot of chuckling going on, but for better or worse,  
6 geospatial is the terminology nowadays for geographic  
7 information, surveying information, and it is compatible  
8 with the commission report. And that's the kind of word  
9 you're going to have to get used to, Bill. I don't like  
10 it either.

11 MR. GRAY: What does it mean? Does it mean "near  
12 shore"?

13 DR. LAPINE: What does "near shore" mean is a better  
14 question.

15 MR. GRAY: Near the shore.

16 DR. LAPINE: Does "near shore" mean in the water?  
17 Above the water? I think that's a very ambiguous term,  
18 near shore.

19 MR. SKINNER: Could you two not see me after the  
20 meeting.

21 DR. LAPINE: And one other thing, since the one thing  
22 I can really hang my hat on in this committee is a merging  
23 technology. So I will talk to Tom offline about a little  
24 thing about emerging technology in here.

25 Since I was the last one to have the microphone,

1 I fully endorse a hand-delivered letter so that you look  
2 at the Admiral -- I think if Scott calls the Admiral's  
3 office, he can get five minutes, ten minutes.

4 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We'll get him on schedule.

5 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: This letter from -- that was  
6 addressed to us, to the panel, from I guess NECSA, can we  
7 get some explanation on this, I guess?

8 MR. RAINEY: That was handed out at the beginning of  
9 the meeting yesterday by Mr. Eric James from CMAP on  
10 behalf of the board of directors from NECSA.

11 He had mentioned yesterday that he might talk  
12 about it at public comment at the end, but he's not in the  
13 room at the time. But if not, we'll certainly make note  
14 of it and we can perhaps discuss it.

15 CAPTAIN PARSONS: When Scott decides it appropriate  
16 to discuss the letter during this meeting, I have got some  
17 comments on the assertions that NECSA makes in their  
18 letter, that I think ought to enter into the record.

19 MR. RAINEY: Taking a look at the schedule, we're  
20 coming up on 9:30 so we're actually running well ahead,  
21 which is fantastic. It sounds like we have a few minor  
22 edits that could be incorporated fairly easily into the  
23 body of the letter. We'll cast one more round.

24 Were there further comments or perhaps we can  
25 break into sort of a drafting group to come up with, see

1 if we can incorporate those edits and then reconvene. And  
2 we may be able to type that in here momentarily. It  
3 sounds like they're fairly minor changes. And then we can  
4 have a consensus document that we can have a motion on and  
5 approve. And I would like to kind of stay on task on this  
6 letter to get this done and then maybe we can pick up the  
7 letter as Captain McGovern mentioned. Does that sound  
8 agreeable to everybody?

9 So if you had some specific edits that you  
10 wanted to make, why don't we meet over at Tom's office  
11 then and we can do that. Shall we say -- let's just go  
12 ahead and take maybe a 15-minute break on that.

13 (Recess)

14 MR. RAINEY: Tom, would it be most efficient maybe to  
15 hand you the floor and then you can walk people through?  
16 You have kind of the big picture on the edits here.

17 MR. SKINNER: Going through the changes on the  
18 letter, I think in the first paragraph the only -- I  
19 should have done this with a strike-out version, but I  
20 didn't. I think the only change is that in the last  
21 sentence in the first paragraph we ended after "NOAA's  
22 hydrographic services." The original one added something  
23 that said, "And hope that you will look to the panel as an  
24 important expert source regarding this program." We're  
25 just trying to keep it a little bit shorter, so that was

1 taken out.

2 The second paragraph, and anyone can jump in if  
3 they want something changed or have some questions.  
4 Second paragraph, the "near shore observations" was  
5 changed to "geospatial observations," Mr. Gray's concerns  
6 aside. And I deleted several long, lengthy paragraphs on  
7 the definition of near shore. No, I'm just kidding.

8 Down towards the end of the paragraph, that's  
9 been changed so it says -- it originally read "focused  
10 coordinated funding." Elaine had suggested "stable  
11 coordinated funding," and I was trying to think of what we  
12 were actually needing. I'm not sure if "adequate" is the  
13 right word. So any comments on that, let me know.

14 "Funding for these activities will have the  
15 greatest positive impact on navigational safety, economic  
16 development," and this is another change, "and the  
17 protection of public health in the environment."

18 MR. ARMSTRONG: It says "environmental."

19 MR. SKINNER: Who types these things. It should be  
20 "in the environment." Thank you.

21 In the third paragraph, about three-quarters of  
22 the way down, the sentence that starts, "The coordinated  
23 resources of federal agencies, including but not limited  
24 to NOAA, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers," "included but  
25 not limited" was added.

1           On the second page, the first bullet of that  
2 phrase was changed, I believe, from "the need to update"  
3 to "the need to complete priority, hydrographic survey  
4 areas."

5           The second bullet is one that we had talked  
6 about, a commitment to implement and maintain real-time  
7 observation systems, e.g., PORTS, NWLON and CORS.

8           The third bullet, there was a phrase added after  
9 the parenthetical remarks there, "e.g. wave heights, storm  
10 surges all related to a single vertical datum compatible  
11 with emerging GPS technology," and those of you who know  
12 me know that I did not come up with that.

13           MR. DASLER: Do we want to make reference to Vdatum?

14           MS. BROHL: Is that part of the second bullet? It's  
15 another real-time continuous observation perhaps? No?

16           DR. LAPINE: So you can take various data sets from  
17 various sources and surveyors use a different vertical  
18 datum, not real time, more real time. But we want all  
19 these data sets to come to the same zero.

20           MR. SKINNER: And I think that was it.

21           MR. WHITING: Tom, I would like to put the word fully  
22 in the second bullet, "commitment to fully implement and  
23 maintain the real-time observation systems." I think  
24 there's a significant difference between just "implement"  
25 and "fully implement" because there's a need for those



1 things over the years.

2 MR. SKINNER: Group hug on that one?

3 MR. WHITING: "A commitment to fully implement and  
4 maintain the real-time observation systems."

5 MR. WEST: What does that mean? How many real-time  
6 observation systems are we supposed to have? What's the  
7 requirement?

8 MR. WHITING: I believe there's 150 of them  
9 advertised around that --

10 MR. SZABADOS: Our goal is 150 seaports.

11 MR. WEST: That's written down as a "requirement"?

12 MR. SZABADOS: That's a "requirement" more it's the  
13 goal of the program.

14 MR. WEST: Well, there's a little bit of difference  
15 between a goal and a requirement. You fund to a  
16 requirement and plan to a goal. I agree with you. I just  
17 want to know what "fully implement" means.

18 MS. BROHL: "Fully fund"?

19 MR. WEST: I think it's okay. I'm just curious  
20 sitting on this panel what you mean by that. How many  
21 PORTS systems? How many water-level type gauges?

22 MR. SZABADOS: That goal was based on a requirement  
23 to try to put real-time observation in seaports so we  
24 could cover -- and I forget the exact number, I think  
25 95 percent of the tonnage coming in and out of the ports

1 of the United States.

2 MR. WEST: My only point is that -- we're going to  
3 sign up to this. It's legitimate for somebody to ask our  
4 fearless leader here, what is involved with fully  
5 implementing a real-time PORTS system. What is it? How  
6 much does it cost? How many years? Is it all there?

7 MR. SZABADOS: We do have a plan for five years.

8 MR. WEST: As long as it's there, that's fine.

9 MS. BROHL: Also, if I can add again to Tom's comment  
10 that we're just trying to save a place at the table here,  
11 and that, because we could discuss what it means to  
12 implement one to address public safety, commerce and  
13 environmental protection. We're just trying to get on  
14 record here, and that's something we might address and  
15 some of our tasks will discuss in the future.

16 MR. SZABADOS: Reflect a little bit, we do have a  
17 plan within the PPBES process for NOAA for 100 percent  
18 solution for PORTS which is reflected in that process.

19 MR. WEST: How many is that?

20 MR. SZABADOS: That is the 150 seaports in the United  
21 States.

22 MR. WEST: Where are we now?

23 MR. SZABADOS: Right now we're about 35.

24 MR. WEST: Didn't we decommission one not too long  
25 ago or did we get that back?

1 MR. SZABADOS: That was Delaware, and the funding  
2 finally came through so we brought it back on line.

3 MR. WEST: How did it finally come through?

4 MR. SZABADOS: It was funded by the state of  
5 Pennsylvania.

6 MR. WEST: So it was not NOAA?

7 MR. SZABADOS: Not NOAA.

8 MR. WEST: So we can't claim credit for that one. Is  
9 that a near-term fix?

10 MR. SZABADOS: Right now it looks like a long-term  
11 fix.

12 MR. WEST: Is that setting a precedent?

13 MR. SZABADOS: It's port by port. Right now about  
14 50 percent of our ports are what I will call on the ropes,  
15 under funded, like San Francisco. Actually we've taken  
16 some stations down in San Francisco recently.

17 MR. WEST: That's why, because the State won't fund  
18 it and you won't?

19 MR. SZABADOS: Well, we can't. We're not in the  
20 position to fund it. We don't have the funding to do it.  
21 And the state funding is not there.

22 MR. WEST: But if I remember, where is that -- I  
23 think I remember in one of the last meetings he was  
24 concerned they got no funds for New York.

25 MR. SZABADOS: My understanding in discussions with

1 New York there's concerns there, yes.

2 MR. WEST: So how can you convince these other how  
3 ports you've got to go that I'm going to put this in, but  
4 then you got it.

5 MR. SZABADOS: Under the plan is federal funding.

6 MR. WEST: The new installations are going to be  
7 installed and funded, and operating money is going to be  
8 provided by NOAA.

9 MR. SZABADOS: In the hundred percent solution within  
10 the PPBES process is federal funding.

11 MR. WEST: Are you going to go back, the ones you  
12 have in place now, are get them fixed up and do that to  
13 them before you go on to new ones?

14 MR. SZABADOS: Our first step is to fund the existing  
15 partners.

16 MR. CHALLSTROM: I just want to be clear on this  
17 process. The program baseline assessments that capture  
18 the stated requirement do advocate for fully federal  
19 funding. There is not yet a NOAA commitment to be able to  
20 do that. That is, it's not yet reflected in acceptable  
21 funding proposals for the future yet to do a fully  
22 federally funded.

23 Right now the only approach that has been  
24 endorsed with funding is for joint funding. That is  
25 shared -- the costs shared with the local organization.

1 So that is very much an issue that is a policy issue in  
2 front of NOAA, and I, as goalie, have to continuously  
3 juggle how much can we push forward. And for now the  
4 approach that has been funded is really based on the cost  
5 sharing. So I just want to make sure that this panel is  
6 aware of the distinction there from a policy point of view  
7 thus far. I would expect this panel would have some views  
8 about what would be the recommendations for long-term  
9 funding on that.

10 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Two things. Number 1, I have a  
11 small edit on that second bullet, page 2, bottom line,  
12 application, just because we're trying to push the new  
13 buzz word, "public health and safety, commerce and  
14 environmental protection."

15 And on the PORTS issue, I do believe the  
16 authorization is in place to federally fund PORTS. The  
17 appropriation isn't there, but the authorization is in  
18 place. So the missing -- I'm just saying the missing  
19 link. Charlie just mentioned the fact, you know, it's for  
20 joint funding, but that's not -- the authorization is for  
21 full federal funding. NOAA has not chosen to push forward  
22 or Commerce, what the argument is which one is holding it  
23 back, but that that hasn't gotten forwarded in the  
24 appropriation cycle to fund it yet. But it's been  
25 authorized.

1 MR. GRAY: That's what I had wanted to say. It still  
2 isn't the way the industry would like to have it at all.  
3 You said 35. I think there are only ten ports that  
4 have PORTS.

5 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: They've expanded.

6 MR. GRAY: There's more?

7 MR. RAINEY: For example, say the Tampa PORTS system,  
8 you're talking about the Port of Tampa, Port Manatee,  
9 et cetera. So I think Mike is counting the port authority  
10 or the ports served by each system.

11 MR. GRAY: The last time I looked at it there's only  
12 ten.

13 MR. RAINEY: There is about 12 or 13 PORTS systems.

14 MR. SZABADOS: We would call it 12 capital ports, but  
15 they represent 35 seaports. Chesapeake Bay has Baltimore,  
16 Norfolk, Newport News. We count each one of those  
17 seaports as one of those seaports.

18 MR. WEST: I need to understand where NOAA is going  
19 with PORTS. I think it's important here. Right now it's  
20 authorized to fully fund and operate a system, is that  
21 correct, wherever you put them in?

22 MR. SZABADOS: Correct.

23 MR. WEST: So the authorizer said, "When you put them  
24 in, I expect you to install and equip and maintain."

25 MR. SZABADOS: Correct.

1 MR. WEST: NOAA has decided not to do that for  
2 funding reasons. And before you install the next one,  
3 you're going to have an agreement with the State or the  
4 City or Agency or something, where you will share, and  
5 that's an MOU you have ahead of time?

6 MR. SZABADOS: Correct.

7 MR. WEST: What happens if they back out or they run  
8 into financial issues and it's a critical part of the  
9 national backbone of Ocean Observing. Here's where all  
10 these little pieces are very, very important. It's the  
11 weak link here. And we're trying to make the case of  
12 PORTS is a very big part of it, and it may turn out to be  
13 the weak link the way we design it. That's what I'm  
14 concerned about.

15 I think this group ought to take a look at that.  
16 That may be a fundamental flaw that NOAA is using for the  
17 future of PORTS to have it a co-shared thing. It ought to  
18 be funded fully and operated that way if it's going to be  
19 critical part of Ocean Observing.

20 MS. BROHL: Admiral, I think that that's been part of  
21 the discussion all along, that we recognize there's a big  
22 difference between the fact that it's authorized and the  
23 fact that one, NOAA doesn't get the money; and two, in the  
24 past even when they had the money it was their policy to  
25 make it a partnership program.

1           And it's always been my assumption that as we  
2 discuss or perhaps get into the tasks for the working  
3 groups that how it would be implemented and addressing  
4 that weak link concern that you can't just say, "Hey,  
5 NOAA, you should do this." You have to talk about the  
6 funding mechanisms or pushing, because remember in the  
7 beginning of these meetings we talked a great deal about  
8 or asking the Admiral even, "Are you guys recommending  
9 PORTS?" And actually, Dr. Spinrad said, "We recommend it.  
10 Commerce turns us down."

11           We do understand that. It's my assumption we  
12 make that connection between the inability to pay and the  
13 authorized ability to pay.

14           MR. WEST: So you're saying that in fact NOAA does  
15 submit fully funded in their budget, but Commerce cuts it  
16 out?

17           MS. BROHL: I heard that from Dr. Spinrad.

18           MR. WEST: I heard it was a NOAA decision not to do  
19 it that way and to proceed in the co-pay. There's a big  
20 difference there, by the way.

21           MR. SZABADOS: In FY '06 there's a request for some  
22 federal funding for the existing ports, which was not  
23 passed -- passed by NOAA, but not passed by Department of  
24 Commerce. NOAA approved one of its requests, federal  
25 funding of the existing ports.



1 MR. WEST: We need to work on this because one of the  
2 inputs to the staffers was, "Don't spend any more money on  
3 this big ocean observing system until you've fixed PORTS."  
4 So we have to understand how we're going to fix PORTS  
5 first because that's an input and that was one of the  
6 things we discussed. Some of you were there. And I am  
7 not sure that I feel comfortable that NOAA has fixed it.  
8 I mean, we may have to go get you some more money. I  
9 don't know what the answer is. I don't know if we have a  
10 plan.

11 MR. RAINEY: That's a real important discussion. I  
12 think we could continue that when we start talking about  
13 the work groups and I know Admiral Larrabee is interested  
14 in that as well. He's going to join us by conference call  
15 at 10:30. I think we're very close to having a consensus  
16 document here on the letter. If we could go back to that  
17 and then, Tom, had you made the run-through as far as the  
18 edits on that?

19 MR. WEST: Can I interrupt? One last thought. NOAA  
20 is putting together their '07 budget right now, folks. If  
21 you want influence, we better get there.

22 MR. DASLER: With that in mind, just backing up one  
23 bullet item, I just struggle a little bit with where we're  
24 talking about the priority hydrographic survey areas as  
25 soon as possible. And "as soon as possible" seems a

1 little weak, and if that could be beefed up a little by  
2 "fully funding existing contracts and maintaining NOAA's  
3 core capabilities" or somehow beefing that up as opposed  
4 to just "as soon as possible."

5 MR. RAINEY: What if we simply struck "as soon as  
6 possible" and flagging that as a priority that we need to  
7 complete that with adequate vessels and staffing.

8 MR. GRAY: Aside from "geospatial" I decided not to  
9 say anything on the rest of this. To complete the  
10 priority -- I guess it means high-priority hydrographic  
11 survey. I agree with that. But there is another point,  
12 and that is, and I made it yesterday, that I see the  
13 surveying activity as one that has got to continue on into  
14 the future at some level probably greater than the level  
15 at which it's progressing actually right now,  
16 substantially greater than what we're doing right now.  
17 Because when we finish up some of the absolute  
18 set-in-concrete areas, we won't have to go back there  
19 unless we have an earthquake or something else like that.  
20 But there sure are an awful lot of areas where things are  
21 changing sufficiently all the time that we're going to  
22 have to continue to do that. So the completing of it  
23 bothers me.

24 Really what we're trying to do is we're trying  
25 to right now complete the already identified high

1 priority, navigationally critical areas, but then we have  
2 to have an adequately sufficiently funded continuing  
3 capability based on the core work by NOAA and adequate  
4 contracting for the rest. Now I don't know how all that  
5 goes into one phrase. So I've decided not to say. But  
6 the "complete part" sort of bothers me. "Oh, boy, we may  
7 get that done and then we don't have to do it anymore."  
8 So back to the office, Tom.

9           Those are points, incidentally, which I hope  
10 when we define or at least discuss what we're going to do  
11 as working groups, that should come out of the  
12 recommendations that our working group makes to the panel  
13 as a whole and so they can come in a follow-up stage.

14           MR. SKINNER: Do we want to add on that first bullet,  
15 after "with adequate vessels and staffing," something to  
16 the effect of "and continue survey," "continue," I don't  
17 know, something there that actually states that it's not  
18 finished?

19           MS. DICKINSON: "Maintain"?

20           MR. SKINNER: You maintain survey work?

21           MS. BROHL: Plan for long term.

22           MR. GRAY: "Maintain this capability for the future."  
23 Something like that.

24           MR. SKINNER: "Maintain this capability for the  
25 future"? Are people comfortable with that?

1 MR. CHALLSTROM: "Sustain."

2 MR. SKINNER: "Sustain"?

3 MR. DASLER: Because there is definite areas that are  
4 repeat survey areas because of the change.

5 MR. SKINNER: So the first bullet reads currently,  
6 "The need to complete priority hydrographic survey areas  
7 as soon as possible, with adequate vessels and staffing,  
8 and sustain this capability for the future," semi-colon.

9 Mr. Chair, I was going to suggest you call a  
10 role call very, very, very quickly.

11 MR. RAINEY: Were there any other suggested  
12 amendments to the letter? Can you summarize through what  
13 we have and make sure that we're all in agreement on that  
14 and then I'd like to entertain a motion for approval.

15 MR. SKINNER: I think we have four changes. The  
16 first one is changing "environmental" to "environment,"  
17 typo. On page 2, the second bullet, adding -- the first  
18 bullet, I'm sorry, adding "and sustain this capability for  
19 the future." Second bullet, adding "fully" between "to"  
20 and "implemented" -- between "to" and "implement." "A  
21 commitment to fully implement." And there's another one  
22 on the second bullet, second to last line, "Application  
23 for public health and safety, commerce, and environmental  
24 protection," semi colon.

25 And Captain McGovern insists that "Poo-bah" has

1 an "H" on the end of it, on "Poo," but actually it's been  
2 changed to "Chair Hydrographics Services Review Panel."

3 MR. RAINEY: Can I have a motion to approve his  
4 amendment?

5 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Second.

6 MR. DASLER: I second.

7 MR. RAINEY: Any further discussion? All in favor?

8 MS. BROHL: Aye.

9 MR. ARMSTRONG: Aye.

10 MR. DASLER: Aye.

11 MS. DICKINSON: Aye.

12 MR. GRAY: Aye.

13 MS. HICKMAN: Aye.

14 DR. LAPINE: Aye.

15 MR. LARRABEE: Aye.

16 MR. McBRIDE: Aye.

17 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Aye.

18 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Aye.

19 MR. OSWALD: Aye.

20 MR. SKINNER: Aye.

21 MR. WEST: Aye.

22 MR. WHITING: Aye.

23 MR. RAINEY: Opposed?

24 (Silence)

25 MR. RAINEY: Okay, motion carries. Thank you.

1                   What are the mechanics involved with dialing  
2 Admiral Larrabee?

3           MS. BROHL: You just have to dial that number in  
4 there. It's right next to the speakerphone. Do you want  
5 me to do it?

6           MR. RAINEY: There was an earlier version passed  
7 around, which you should have in front of you, Version 2  
8 of these proposed work group taskings.

9           MR. LARRABEE: Hello.

10          MR. WEST: That's all your friends in San Diego.

11          MR. LARRABEE: It sounds like you're having a good  
12 time.

13          CAPTAIN PARSONS: Admiral, this is Roger Parsons. We  
14 faxed to you a five-page document this morning. Do you  
15 have that?

16          MR. LARRABEE: I do.

17          CAPTAIN PARSONS: What you have in front of you is  
18 the product of yesterday's discussion, briefings and a  
19 half-hour summary session that the chair, the vice chair  
20 and the two work group chairs provided yesterday.  
21 Admittedly some of this is my interpretation. What I  
22 suggest, there are five proposed work group taskings here.  
23 I suggest we not go at this as a wordsmithing exercise,  
24 but if you take a look at each one and either approve  
25 conceptually what is being asked for in each of the work

1 group taskings, and then it would be up to the individual  
2 work groups to further refine. But I don't think it  
3 serves any purpose to hammer out specificities of this  
4 unless there's something that really sticks in people's  
5 craws.

6           So what I propose to do is just briefly go  
7 through each one of these. There are five proposed  
8 taskings. There are suggested work group assignments by  
9 number, and a summary, if you will, of expected  
10 deliverables with a proposed time line. The first one  
11 we're calling "Hydrographic Survey Cost Analysis." We  
12 propose that NOAA provide the panel or the work group in  
13 this case with our proposed cost analysis model and  
14 methodology that we want to move forward with and ask that  
15 you review that and provide us feedback on whether we are  
16 considering all aspects of the costs associated with  
17 in-house and contract surveys, and anything -- you may  
18 bless the model or have suggested changes to it and that's  
19 what we're looking for.

20           Number 3 is a little confusing. There was a  
21 discussion yesterday, and I think the term I used was  
22 "normalized." There has been some suggestion that the  
23 2001 study was not comparing apples and oranges. It was  
24 comparing the bottom line, what it cost the government and  
25 what it costs for outsourcing.

1           The term "normalization" I guess means do we  
2 strip out certain aspects of contractor costs and  
3 government costs to put it on a, quote, "level playing  
4 field." For instance, part of the cost of contractor work  
5 is a profit margin, that's expected. On the government  
6 side there's still some question as to whether the cost of  
7 the vessel was utilized in the last study because the  
8 government had paid for that already. So is there a  
9 benefit to normalizing the two comparisons?

10           Number 4, we will propose several ship/launch  
11 operation models that we want to compare, I think we  
12 discussed yesterday Alaska, deep water, Alaska, shallow  
13 water, Gulf of Mexico. Also we want to look at the cost  
14 of airborne LIDAR operations, and although we haven't  
15 implemented them yet, the cost of implementing AUVs in our  
16 operations.

17           Are there other survey models that we're missing  
18 that the panel would like us to include in that analysis?  
19 Additionally, we'll include a discussion of the time  
20 charter model we're proposing. Several of them you may  
21 want to weigh in on any recommendations of the model being  
22 proposed. And we also had a discussion afterwards, the  
23 cost per square nautical mile is a metric that the Office  
24 of Coast Survey has used for a number of years. It is not  
25 the best metric. We understand that. We have wrestled



1 with other performance metrics. And would like to hear  
2 from the panel on perhaps your views and recommendations  
3 on a metric that is more applicable, if you have a  
4 suggestion along those lines.

5 Comments and discussions on the general  
6 framework of this work group task.

7 CAPTAIN MCGOVERN: Just the time line on all of them,  
8 actually. I think it's just a lot easier, since none of  
9 these recommendations can go anywhere without the approval  
10 of the full panel, which will obviously need a meeting, is  
11 just to make the due date either the next meeting, two  
12 meetings, three meetings, instead of putting that six  
13 months in there, I mean, it doesn't matter whether it's  
14 done in six months, if you can't do anything with it, if  
15 we don't meet for a year for some reason. I think it's  
16 just easier to say to have a due date as per "need this by  
17 the next meeting." The time line is two meetings from the  
18 time of acceptance, whatever. But the fact that it's  
19 just -- it has to coincide with the meeting. Because  
20 otherwise it just doesn't make sense.

21 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Certainly can change that to next  
22 meeting.

23 MR. GRAY: Roger and Scott, what is it you're really  
24 trying to do right now? And I ask that from the point of  
25 view as the chairman of Work Group 2. You don't want to

1 wordsmith it, that's fine by me. As I told you, I would  
2 have described this in probably about two sentences, the  
3 whole thing, which is to really get a valid costing  
4 analysis model comparing the in-house and the contracted  
5 out approaches or something of that type. But I guess  
6 these six different things more or less aim that way.

7 But right now are you wanting input on how is  
8 the work group going to go about this? In other words,  
9 who specifically in our Work Group 2 are going to work on  
10 which parts of these things?

11 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Not at all.

12 MR. GRAY: What do you want to achieve while we have  
13 Rick on the phone?

14 CAPTAIN PARSONS: What we want to achieve is, these  
15 are the proposals for taskings to the work group. Will  
16 the panel accept this as a tasking to Work Group 2? If it  
17 is, this is your marching orders.

18 MR. GRAY: That we can interpret in the way we choose  
19 to do it as we do the work. And I don't know what the  
20 methodology of doing that. I don't know when we discuss  
21 that, so I don't know how we go about it.

22 CAPTAIN PARSONS: It is up to the individual work  
23 group to decide how they're going to provide  
24 recommendations to the panel. I certainly will not  
25 dictate that. This provides the framework for this

1 particular task to the work group.

2 MR. GRAY: I guess then what I would say -- and I'm  
3 not even sure who is on Work Group 2, and we have three or  
4 four to work on here. I guess I would say to the members  
5 of Work Group 2 that by the end of next week, please tell  
6 me which one of these taskings you would like to work on,  
7 and I'm trying to find volunteers to lead on each of the  
8 several things that we want to do.

9 MR. RAINEY: I think as far as the composition, we  
10 mentioned it again a little bit yesterday, but don't feel  
11 locked in to how we recorded it coming out of the Norfolk  
12 meeting as far as which work group. I think as we go  
13 through the -- and I guess it's a chicken-and-an-egg thing  
14 a little bit. But as we go through the tasking and you  
15 look at -- these are sort of initial directions to try and  
16 frame work going forward.

17 And as we go through this, there may be some --  
18 you may want to work on all of them. You may not want to  
19 work on some of them. And I think that we can have some  
20 individual selection on that and coordinate that with the  
21 work group chairs, myself, and it will be an iterative  
22 process. We have the means available, we talked about  
23 yesterday, as far as working through over the Internet,  
24 conference calls, and if necessary, physical meetings  
25 perhaps.

1                   But again, I guess just to reinforce what  
2 Captain Parsons was just saying, this is our first go at  
3 this with the work groups constituted. And so this is to  
4 try to provide some direction and we'll try to refine this  
5 as each successive meeting. But to have us be able to  
6 leave the meetings with the idea of what we're going to be  
7 working on to bring to the next meeting.

8                   Captain Parsons?

9                   CAPTAIN PARSONS: Maybe I can sum it this way. We  
10 mentioned yesterday in that flow diagram, there are three  
11 sources of issues that can come to the panel, through  
12 NOAA, through the members and through the public. Let me  
13 state it this way. On behalf of the new administrator,  
14 we're asking that the Hydrographic Services Review Panel  
15 tackle this particular issue. This is coming directly  
16 from NOAA.

17                  MR. LARRABEE: Can I ask a question you probably  
18 touched on yesterday. But just in looking at that  
19 presentation that was given yesterday, looking at sort of  
20 the tasking that's laid out here, I am curious as to  
21 NOAA's time line to do this modeling to come up with the  
22 answer to the question, which is the best methodology for  
23 determining the lowest-cost method of collecting this  
24 data. And does the time frame here, does six months give  
25 you what you're looking for or are we going to be behind

1 the people at NOAA that need this information?

2 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We fully expect to generate a  
3 statement of work by the end of the fiscal year and put  
4 this out on the street early next year for an independent  
5 analysis. So the timing is okay.

6 MR. LARRABEE: Okay. So we're just helping you put  
7 together a statement of work.

8 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That's correct.

9 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: You know, I am listening here and  
10 maybe I am not understanding something very well. But  
11 despite the previous conversation, I see here we are  
12 talking in each one of these bullets for cost analysis,  
13 and looking at the names from Work Group 2. And again,  
14 maybe I misunderstood it, but I don't know who is the  
15 financial guru that -- as I said, maybe I am confusing  
16 this a little bit, but in my humble opinion here, to be  
17 able to give some kind of smart advice on cost and this  
18 and that, you have to have some --

19 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We're not asking the work group to  
20 conduct a cost analysis. We are providing you with our  
21 approach. We want you to take a look at it and say "good  
22 approach." "Bad approach. Make the following changes."  
23 Not the cost analysis itself.

24 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: I understand. But again, I think  
25 the two are very associated and probably that's only me.

1 I don't know if everybody has a different opinion here,  
2 but how can you look at the approach without understanding  
3 the model and what is behind the scenes?

4 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We have experts on the panel in  
5 various aspects of surveying. I would presume that they  
6 would participate in the review of this.

7 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: I would invite anybody from Work  
8 Group 2, at least if you have to say something, you have  
9 to say it now.

10 MR. RAINEY: I guess when I look at this, I sense  
11 that this is a tall order in some regards, but my take on  
12 this is that any advice we're going to be putting forward,  
13 I mean, it's our piece of advice, and the advice that  
14 we're capable of giving. And my take on this assignment  
15 would be that we're not starting from scratch. We're  
16 going to be provided, as Captain Parsons said, their  
17 model, and I would think we could look at this through the  
18 lens that it's relative to us. We have contractors that  
19 can discuss that; but for the operators, I think we could  
20 possibly look at that and say what are we concerned about,  
21 what are our requirements? Does this analysis cover our  
22 operational requirements at the end?

23 I think that there will be certainly relevant  
24 comments that we can make, but I agree with the notion  
25 that we're not going to have a complete thought on this.

1 But I think we can have relevant and important input to  
2 this that would then go back to NOAA and they would factor  
3 that in with their analysis and other things. We are not  
4 going to be the final say. But I think we do have a role  
5 we could play in helping them on this, but we're going to,  
6 again, be one piece of the overall input to the process.

7 MR. WHITING: I have no qualms with accepting this as  
8 a task for my portion of Work Group 2. So I would be  
9 happy to have some input in this. In fact I would, even  
10 if I was only on Work Group 1, I would jump over to this  
11 one just for this. I can analyze the cost of a survey to  
12 NOAA's specs. Now whether or not I can analyze NOAA's  
13 costs, I don't know that.

14 So I think I am more than qualified to analyze  
15 this from a contractor's point of view. I would ask for  
16 some additional information from NOAA, how they arrived at  
17 their cost. So I could foresee this thing taking a few  
18 months to do. Now, I don't have any problem with six  
19 months. I don't have any problem with the next meeting.  
20 But we should have something from the panel by the next  
21 meeting, or before.

22 MR. DASLER: I second that. I think anybody of the  
23 members that are contractors on the panel, we've all had  
24 to do this before and we know what it takes to go into it.  
25 And even from NOAA's operations and not like we're

1 really -- from what I understand it, we're not going to  
2 get into the nitty-gritty of their costs. It's just  
3 looking at the metrics.

4 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That's correct. The methodology  
5 that is being used.

6 MR. GRAY: Larry, thank you and Jon also. And I  
7 think you guys can certainly contribute to that. I would  
8 say that on the other part of it, how NOAA makes their  
9 costs are things that from what I heard yesterday, I am  
10 not a financial guy, but I can certainly make some  
11 comments about it. You have some damned old ships, and  
12 they're not going to last forever, and you have to renew  
13 them one of these days. And if we're really going to put  
14 a valid costing on this thing, we have to think about the  
15 future and this is a continuing activity. Putting it in  
16 that vein -- and I don't anticipate as putting specific  
17 numbers necessarily on these things.

18 Rick, for your benefit, out of the presentations  
19 we saw yesterday, this thousands of dollars per square  
20 mile surveyed comes out anywhere between 12 and 53 or  
21 something like that, which is pretty wild.

22 MR. LARRABEE: Yes, I saw the presentation, Bill.

23 MR. GRAY: And some of the reasons for that are very  
24 clear. Like anybody can see that if have you a wide beam  
25 and you are in ten feet of water, you're not going to



1 survey more than about a width of ten feet or something  
2 like that; whereas if you're in two miles, you might be  
3 able to get a little bit bigger coverage.

4           But it's a terrible metric. That's obvious.  
5 And Larry pointed out quite well that we had sort of a  
6 more of the way, I think, a business man would look at it,  
7 overview on the thing where it shows that the amount of  
8 money spent for contracting this, as in the last eight  
9 years, totaled I think it was about 120 million dollars or  
10 something like that, and the amount of square mileage  
11 surveyed was 6,000 or something like that, and it came out  
12 to be 20 or \$21 per square mile or so forth.

13           And that's a little bit more meaningful than  
14 just saying if you take the total mix of things that  
15 they're responsible for, you're going to get some  
16 difficult and expensive areas and some easy and cheaper  
17 areas and so forth.

18           So I think if we can put things in those terms,  
19 and I'm sure that with the help of the NOAA people that  
20 will be on Work Group 2 that we should be able to somehow  
21 get something to put in front of the group before meeting  
22 six months from now. And that's about what I can say on  
23 this.

24           I see the whole thing really as being to find a  
25 valid costing analysis methodology to make this evaluation

1 of should it be done in-house or should it be contracted  
2 out to the outside.

3 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That's a valid and fair commentary.

4 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Just a point of order, I guess.  
5 These work groups, are they -- they're not confined to  
6 solely the members of this panel. Am I correct? That  
7 members of the public can participate if they would like.

8 CAPTAIN PARSONS: No. These work groups are confined  
9 to the members of the panel. In order to bring in, quote,  
10 "outside experts," we need to stand up -- I don't want to  
11 get into too much detail, but you need to stand up  
12 subcommittees, which is different than work groups and is  
13 a whole other level.

14 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: I don't know. I run another FACA  
15 and I have work groups all the time that are open to the  
16 public, and we passed the test that we are able to open  
17 those work groups to public participation. Obviously, no  
18 decisions can be made at those work groups, but they are  
19 able to participate in the work groups. I mean, they  
20 could help a lot with this and other things, as Minas was  
21 talking about, financial people, maybe you want to throw  
22 it to his finance guy in the company and say, "What do you  
23 think of this?" He'll say if it's junk or "Yeah, that's a  
24 good way to do it." I think it would help. It also helps  
25 get this work done a lot quicker.

1 MR. RAINEY: It's true it's allowed under certain  
2 circumstances. In our particular instance under Tab G in  
3 our notebooks, the decision memorandum that came down that  
4 authorized it specifically has the situation that if work  
5 groups at any time call for outside members to address  
6 specific issues that may require more focused or sustained  
7 efforts by the full FACA, the designated federal official  
8 will notify the Department of Commerce, Ethics Office and  
9 general counsel for further guidance and advice.

10 So we're approved under that condition and if we  
11 find in our work that we need outside folks, then we'll  
12 have to justify that and go through Roger and get approval  
13 to move ahead. But you're absolutely right. It can be  
14 done under FACA. It is done in certain cases. But under  
15 our approval --

16 CAPTAIN MCGOVERN: So this isn't a FACA thing. This  
17 is a Commerce thing.

18 MR. RAINEY: The Department of Commerce legal shop is  
19 NOAA's legal advisor counsel on our FACA. So when we have  
20 those procedural things, it gets kicked to there and we  
21 get our rules back from them. So as we are stood up --  
22 and I tried to highlight that in my comments yesterday,  
23 but clearly right now we're authorized to operate in these  
24 work groups with HSRP members, at least initially.

25 Now, if at such time we want to try to bring in

1 outside folks, we can certainly justify our reasons and  
2 run that up the chain. But that's where we're going  
3 forward right now.

4 MR. GRAY: Scott, just to clarify, aren't we allowed  
5 in these work groups to use NOAA staff?

6 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That's correct. We will support  
7 the work groups --

8 MR. GRAY: That's what I mean. Like if we want  
9 Charlie or Mike or you Roger, or Andy or others that sit  
10 with us here, or whoever it was, Mike that was talking  
11 about some of this yesterday, as long as those people are  
12 available.

13 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Absolutely.

14 MR. GRAY: If we get to a point where we say, "Gee,  
15 we really ought to get somebody from the outside," then  
16 we'll work it that way. So it's not really just the  
17 members of the panel. It's the members plus the staff  
18 that goes with the advisory committee.

19 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We will supply all the staff and  
20 support required for you to do your work.

21 MR. WEST: I would like to back up what Andy said.  
22 We have got to be able to use some outside support here.  
23 And every FACA I have been on it's not been a problem. So  
24 I would like to have you go back and ask Commerce why  
25 we're restricted. Every other one -- in fact, Marine

1 Mammal has so many, you can't count them all. So I don't  
2 understand the ruling there.

3 To go back to the issue we talked about  
4 yesterday, these numbers have been out there for quite a  
5 while now on these slides, and it's creating a problem  
6 because they're not fair. I don't have a side on either  
7 one of these, but I can look at those and I don't  
8 think they're fair. And I think Larry said that 158,  
9 after one tough survey and the other one may have been on  
10 the NOAA side, and do you amortize ships. That's what we  
11 want to look at so it's fair. And when everybody is done,  
12 we all sign up and say, "This is fair." And I don't think  
13 that's the case now.

14 CAPTAIN PARSONS: And that's the kind of advice we're  
15 seeking.

16 MR. RAINEY: Is there any further discussion?

17 MR. GRAY: That's the first one.

18 MR. RAINEY: I would like to take these in order. So  
19 I would like to entertain a motion to accept the proposed  
20 assignment that we have just been discussing.

21 MR. WHITING: I move.

22 MR. RAINEY: Second?

23 DR. LAPINE: Second.

24 MR. RAINEY: All in favor?

25 MS. BROHL: Aye.

1 MR. ARMSTRONG: Aye.

2 MR. DASLER: Aye.

3 MS. DICKINSON: Aye.

4 MR. GRAY: Aye.

5 MS. HICKMAN: Aye.

6 DR. LAPINE: Aye.

7 MR. LARRABEE: Aye.

8 MR. McBRIDE: Aye.

9 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Aye.

10 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Aye.

11 MR. OSWALD: Aye.

12 MR. SKINNER: Aye.

13 MR. WEST: Aye.

14 MR. WHITING: Aye.

15 MR. RAINEY: Opposed?

16 (Silence)

17 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Second item is entitled "NOS  
18 Mapping and Charting Contracting Policy and Expansion  
19 Strategy." We're asking the panel to review the 1999 NOS  
20 contracting policy for surveying and mapping services. We  
21 want to know if you endorse this policy, if you have  
22 recommended changes that will strengthen the linkage  
23 between the private sector and the government for  
24 contracting opportunities.

25 And again, as I indicated, we are going to

1 publish the existing policy in the federal register here  
2 in the next month, keep it open for, at the suggestion of  
3 Elaine, 60 days, and we'll provide you with the summary of  
4 the public comments that come from that. If there are  
5 recommendations to the existing policy that you would  
6 recommend for change, we'd certainly like to hear that.

7           Additionally, we would like your advice on how  
8 NOAA can work better with the private sector on approving  
9 its contracting strategies and expanding opportunities  
10 with the private sector. Any thoughts you had along those  
11 lines would certainly be welcome.

12           Lastly, the Hydrographic Services Improvement  
13 Act talks about NOAA maintaining an operational expertise  
14 in hydrographic data acquisition and services. We define  
15 that as a core capability. We would like your advice on  
16 what you see as NOAA's core capability and hydrographic  
17 services and any actions that you think will be required  
18 to maintain that core capability.

19           Comments?

20           MR. RAINEY: I was just asking Captain Parsons. I  
21 believe yesterday in his remarks he had commented that he  
22 could provide the work group, and then the panel with  
23 NOAA's assessment of their core capabilities so we  
24 wouldn't be, again, coming up with that from scratch. We  
25 would be looking at a document that served their policy on

1 that, and Captain Parsons just confirmed that.

2 Comments on Task 2?

3 MR. GRAY: This is Bill, again, also assigned to Work  
4 Group 2. I see it as two things, the policy document and  
5 defining the core capability. I would have the question  
6 when you go out to the federal register asking for the  
7 public's comments on this, are you going to just make it  
8 that contracting policy document that we asked to review,  
9 or are you going to say that you would like the views on  
10 core capability that they feel, that the public feels NOAA  
11 should maintain?

12 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That was not my intention. I would  
13 certainly take that under advisement, but right now our  
14 goal is to publish the existing policy and ask for public  
15 comment.

16 MR. GRAY: I guess that's something that kind of  
17 trying to look around the corner it might be that as the  
18 work group works on this, they would, again, as Dick said,  
19 wish to get some outsider views on what kind of core  
20 capability they would like NOAA to possess. But let's try  
21 it this way as within the work group and staff, NOAA  
22 staff, see where we get, see whether we need to ask for  
23 outside help.

24 MR. WHITING: Core capability has changed because of  
25 legislation, so I don't think we can absolutely define it,



1 can we?

2 CAPTAIN PARSONS: I'm not sure what you mean by it's  
3 changed with legislation.

4 MR. WHITING: In '98 or '97 you had one vessel on  
5 line and one sitting at the dock and the senate and the  
6 house decided we needed to have a second vessel surveying  
7 in Alaska as part of your core capability. So is it  
8 really up to us or is it just -- what is the core  
9 capability that you're asking for? Is it something that  
10 the senate can change or --

11 CAPTAIN PARSONS: What we're asking your advice on  
12 what constitutes a NOAA core capability and hydrographic  
13 services. This is an advisory committee. No, you can't  
14 change any particular facet of that.

15 MR. WEST: You tell us what you think your core  
16 capability is and we'll evaluate it. I don't know how we  
17 can do that.

18 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That's what we said already. That  
19 we would provide you with NOAA's assessment of its core  
20 hydrographic services.

21 MR. WEST: I'm sorry. I missed that.

22 MR. GRAY: I agree with that, Dick. But I also agree  
23 that in talking about core capability, that's not a matter  
24 of counting ships or launches or something like that.  
25 It's really the whole business to me of having the

1 expertise and know-how to be able to evaluate whether or  
2 not the services provided are provided at the best -- or  
3 at the appropriate level that technology will let you do.  
4 And I don't know what number of people and ships and so  
5 forth are required to be able to do that. But that's the  
6 way I see it, more or less describing the know-how which  
7 you will continue to update and have available for the  
8 public.

9 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Again, a valid observation.

10 MR. WHITING: I move we accept this.

11 MR. RAINEY: Second?

12 MR. DASLER: Second.

13 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Maybe just a comment. Maybe we  
14 could add -- we talked about some documents that were  
15 going to be supplied with Task 1, some more documents are  
16 going to be supplied with this tasking. Maybe we could  
17 document those as part of the task statement, the  
18 documents that will be sent out, like this assessment and  
19 the contract. And then on the first one we're going to --

20 MR. RAINEY: I think that's an excellent suggestion.  
21 If it would be acceptable to the panel, probably we could  
22 follow up once we go through these and accept them and  
23 then we can sort of enumerate references and get our ducks  
24 in a row and sort of catch that up maybe rather than the  
25 process here, if that would be acceptable.

1           CAPTAIN McGOVERN: That way it's not lost in the  
2 conversation as to what would be included.

3           MR. RAINEY: We're keeping notes here. So we have a  
4 motion and a second on the table. All in favor of  
5 accepting Task Number 2?

6           MS. BROHL: Aye.

7           MR. ARMSTRONG: Aye.

8           MR. DASLER: Aye.

9           MS. DICKINSON: Aye.

10          MR. GRAY: Aye.

11          MS. HICKMAN: Aye.

12          DR. LAPINE: Aye.

13          MR. McBRIDE: Aye.

14          CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Aye.

15          CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Aye.

16          MR. OSWALD: Aye.

17          MR. SKINNER: Aye.

18          MR. WEST: Aye.

19          MR. WHITING: Aye.

20          MR. RAINEY: All opposed?

21          MR. LARRABEE: Aye.

22          MR. RAINEY: Motion carries.

23          CAPTAIN PARSONS: The third task comes under the  
24 heading of "NOAA Hydrographic Service Requirements." This  
25 was discussed yesterday as looking for advice on

1 developing a process by which NOAA can identify current  
2 and future navigation service requirements. Evaluates  
3 ability to provide adequate products and services to meet  
4 those requirements. And then a methodology for  
5 prioritizing its navigation services.

6 Also asking that the group provide advice on  
7 whether the current suite of navigation services and  
8 products are adequate to meet the existing requirements.  
9 And any advice on products and services that may be  
10 required to meet future requirements.

11 And the third item is directly related to the  
12 previous discussion on core capabilities, are those  
13 adequate to meet the Future Navigation Services  
14 requirements. Again, a lot of this is perhaps three  
15 different ways of saying the same thing. I know Bill has  
16 got a comment on that that could perhaps simplify this.

17 MR. GRAY: Again, I'm responding to Scott's request  
18 yesterday, why are we here? What are we trying to do and  
19 so forth, and I scribbled something out that sounds like  
20 this, and I think it could be fit within what you have  
21 here, Roger. But the Hydrographic Services Review Panel  
22 should advise NOAA on how to develop an ongoing system of  
23 obtaining the marine community's input on which  
24 navigational safety information they need most from both  
25 NOAA and other federal government providers, for example,

1 Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers, et cetera.

2 And I hope that -- and I am basing this on that  
3 memo that I sent around five or six weeks ago in which I  
4 said that to me one of the more important things this  
5 panel can do is to make a list of the services or products  
6 that the Corps is capable of producing, and then turn to  
7 the user community and look at their evaluation of what  
8 are their greatest needs in services to ensure  
9 navigational safety for commerce coming in and out of the  
10 U.S. waters.

11 And that, of course, could also be something  
12 that calls on us to at some time to ask for outside input.  
13 But this is an ongoing process, so there isn't a time  
14 schedule to be met on it. And we do have members of the  
15 user community, particularly pilots, port people and so  
16 forth, within the group here to make a start that way.  
17 But I can envision that in the longer term that getting  
18 some disciplined way of the Corps knowing what the users  
19 really want really is important.

20 And in that regard, as Mike asked me earlier  
21 today, I am not going to a Harbor Safety Committee meeting  
22 or something like that. I think that one of the good ways  
23 of getting this done on an ongoing basis is that with the  
24 Harbor Safety Committee structure that has emerged in the  
25 United States in the last ten years or so in a variety of

1 forms, that the ones I have been to there's almost always  
2 a good NOAA representative there, whether it's Steve  
3 Barnham from in the field or David and Abbot from home or  
4 Mike or Charlie coming out of the staff in Washington,  
5 that going to those Harbor Safety Committee meetings and  
6 not only telling people what it is that NOAA, NOS, is up  
7 to now, but listening to the users that are the members of  
8 the Harbor Safety Committees to hear what they really feel  
9 is most needed in their particular area. That is a good  
10 way of getting input from the users of the information  
11 you've produced.

12 So that's the way I see this one.

13 CAPTAIN PARSONS: If we could ask you to read that  
14 paragraph again.

15 MR. GRAY: This says, "Hydrographic Services Review  
16 Panel should advise NOAA on how to develop an ongoing  
17 system of obtaining marine community input on which  
18 navigational safety information they need most from both  
19 NOAA and other federal government providers, service  
20 providers." For example, Coast Guard, Army Engineers, and  
21 maybe there are others.

22 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We'll give Barbara a copy of that.

23 Tom?

24 MR. SKINNER: A couple comments. One, I think that's  
25 a point well taken about finding out what users want. I

1 think it's also important to be able to go the other way  
2 and have people who are working with the technology also  
3 be able to say, "Hey, what about this? If we could do  
4 this, would that be helpful?" So I think it's important  
5 to have the two ways there.

6 My general comment on this is I think this is a  
7 real good issue for both of the task forces, and I know we  
8 talked about it yesterday, and I think this fits right in  
9 with the newly acquired emerging technologies component of  
10 Work Group 1.

11 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Just a quick -- it seems like most  
12 of this task deals with navigation services as opposed to  
13 more refined than the hydrographic services, and I am just  
14 wondering if the issue at the top should be NOAA  
15 Navigation Services requirement as opposed to because --

16 CAPTAIN PARSONS: I think at times I perhaps used the  
17 term interchangeably.

18 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: But there are other users of the  
19 hydrographic services that this isn't dealing with and  
20 that's why I'm just trying to keep it -- either that or  
21 expand it to not only navigation services, but obviously  
22 other uses, coastal management, et cetera.

23 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We can make that change.

24 MR. GRAY: Actually that would fit in one of the five  
25 goals, and where Goal Number 4, commerce and

1 transportation or something like that, is what you're  
2 talking about, and the recreational community as well.

3 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Let me ask Mike or Charlie to  
4 comment on this. Does this statement that Bill suggested  
5 fit some of the discussions you've had on this?

6 MR. SZABADOS: We could work within that frame.

7 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We'll make that change and update  
8 that document here.

9 MR. ARMSTRONG: It just wasn't clear to me, Roger,  
10 whether you were going to change this to include all the  
11 other things or to exclude all the other things that  
12 hydrographic services support.

13 CAPTAIN PARSONS: State that again.

14 MR. ARMSTRONG: You said you were going to make an  
15 adjustment to this based on Tom's comment that there are  
16 other users for NOAA's hydrographic services beyond  
17 navigation. So it wasn't clear to me whether you were  
18 going to refine this to refer only to navigation or  
19 whether you were going to expand this to refer to other  
20 products and services.

21 CAPTAIN PARSONS: To include all communities that are  
22 impacted by this.

23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you.

24 DR. LAPINE: I move that we accept this.

25 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Second.



1 MR. RAINEY: I want to clarify one thing. Our  
2 understanding is that the suggestion is to reword -- I  
3 want to make sure on this point now that we're all talking  
4 about the same thing. The suggestion is to substitute  
5 Bill Gray's language for the typewritten text. Is that  
6 the consensus of the group?

7 MR. GRAY: I don't care whether it's substituted with  
8 that or this is just added to it.

9 MR. RAINEY: What I would like to do is perhaps add  
10 that to it, rather than substitute it.

11 MR. GRAY: That's fine.

12 MR. RAINEY: If that's acceptable to the work group.  
13 So in other words, is there a way to paraphrase that?  
14 Again, these are just initial ideas to give us a context  
15 to move forward on.

16 MR. GRAY: I also have to say, Scott, I signed this  
17 "Happy April Fool's Day" for you because I think it's  
18 appropriate.

19 MR. RAINEY: I got it. Thank you, sir.

20 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: My question was, is this statement  
21 dealing solely with navigation services or is it dealing  
22 with all the hydrographic services, because it says  
23 hydrographic services as the issue, but when you get into  
24 the different tasking, it deals mostly just with  
25 navigation services. So my thing was should we either

1 make this issue a navigation service issue or we expand  
2 the taskings to make it hydrographic services. I don't  
3 have a problem either way. If we have this strictly as  
4 navigation, we can always have another one down the line  
5 that deals with other hydrographic services. But it just  
6 kind of -- this kind of bounces back and forth here.

7 CAPTAIN PARSONS: I would suggest dealing with it in  
8 the broader context of hydrographic service. That's a  
9 more encompassing term than navigation service. And I  
10 think that's what I heard a moment ago.

11 MS. BROHL: If I were to work on that, that would  
12 make me very nervous to think that I have to go out and  
13 think about all the hydrographic observations as compared  
14 to just navigation services. But I would think that the  
15 working group, when they begin the discussions and  
16 deliberations would more clearly define what they think  
17 could come out of this. Don't you think, Andy, rather  
18 than -- maybe I'm not understanding, but to me  
19 hydrographic --

20 CAPTAIN MCGOVERN: The advantage to the task  
21 statements are that the whole panel, which is the  
22 Hydrographic Services panel, not the Navigation Services  
23 panel, which includes Navigation Services, that's why I  
24 don't have a problem going either way with this, but the  
25 reason why we have these specific task statements is so

1 the work group can't really go off on a tangent. They  
2 have specific deliverables that the whole panel has agreed  
3 on, not one or two members of a working group, and they  
4 have to deliver on those issues that the panel has agreed  
5 on. So that's just why I'm asking these questions,  
6 because it should be fairly specific so that the work  
7 groups deliver what the panel needs and/or wants.

8 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Could I suggest that every  
9 reference to "navigation services" be changed to  
10 "hydrographic services" to make it more clear?

11 MR. DASLER: I have a little different read on it, I  
12 guess, because I think the misunderstanding is  
13 hydrographic services that are done to develop what  
14 supports navigation. And in just looking through this --  
15 and I think it's a little bit confusing, but it's relating  
16 to what hydrographic services are used, but most of the  
17 line items are for, it's mostly the navigation community  
18 and the navigation services.

19 In other words, NOAA would use their  
20 hydrographic services to develop different navigation,  
21 either through charts or those other activities. But most  
22 of these are related to navigation. In other words,  
23 hydrographic services towards navigation.

24 CAPTAIN PARSONS: And again, I would suggest since  
25 this panel is made of a diverse group of experts in all of

1 NOAA's hydrographic services capabilities that we envelop  
2 hydrographic as opposed to navigation specific.

3 MR. GRAY: I wouldn't want to take out all references  
4 to navigation services. In the little statement I made,  
5 navigational safety information, and I kind of like it the  
6 way it's got it in each of these three paragraphs, or  
7 paragraphs 1 and 2, "current suite of navigation services  
8 products, future navigation services requirements,  
9 navigation services to meet current and future  
10 requirements." I think this is, to me, what I am  
11 interested in seeing done.

12 MR. RAINEY: Could I suggest that we leave the title  
13 as hydrographic services. I don't see it as diluting in  
14 any effort that we have on the navigation services, but I  
15 think that it is important that we do -- again, we may  
16 have a different mix and as the members change out, we may  
17 get a different mix yet or emphasis maybe on the panel  
18 just by chance. But I think it's been made clear even in  
19 this meeting, starting with Admiral DeBow's remarks  
20 yesterday, our public comments, we've seen it in the NOAA  
21 strategic plan, in interest on the Hill, with the  
22 Integrated Coast and Ocean Mapping Integration Act.  
23 There's a tremendous effort, and I think it's in concert  
24 with what we're trying to do here to promote hydrographic  
25 services within NOAA to recognize that where we can we

1 need to get a broad applicability across these different  
2 regimes for these services.

3 I think it helps our navigation interests, for  
4 those of us around the table with navigation, that we  
5 recognize opportunities that these services also are very  
6 important to other stakeholder groups. And my suggestion  
7 would be that, again, these are not -- they are written  
8 out with some specificity so that we're all in agreement  
9 in the general direction we're going, but I wouldn't see  
10 this as limiting, "we only have three things here, and  
11 we're only going to talk about this or that."

12 I would say we start out in a general direction.  
13 I would urge that the panel keep it broad with the  
14 hydrographic, not in any way intending to dilute the  
15 navigation, but to recognize. And we may point out in the  
16 work group as were constituted that we have particular  
17 expertise in navigation services, but the fact that we  
18 recognize there are other important things in  
19 hydrographic, and just to mention that, I think serves us  
20 better, again, without diluting any particular emphasis or  
21 needs on the navigation. We just may simply recognize as  
22 we go through that we know more about one piece than the  
23 other. But that would be my suggestion.

24 MR. GRAY: So do we take the term out of Items 1, 2  
25 and 3 of navigation services and make it hydrographic

1 services? Is that what you're suggesting?

2 MR. RAINEY: I don't know that it really matters this  
3 critically. We might be making more of it than necessary  
4 at this stage in the game. I would prefer -- just again,  
5 my personal comment to probably leave the issue title as  
6 the "Hydrographic Service Requirements." We can proceed  
7 1, 2 and 3 is written as navigation services, but I  
8 certainly would appreciate if we could also -- let's try  
9 to step into the full breadth of our area of  
10 responsibility and at least let's acknowledge that.

11 MR. GRAY: In this thing under Mr. Spinrad's March 18  
12 thing, Work Group 2, finishes up and developing support of  
13 the work group to consider other federal agency and  
14 private industry navigation services capability and  
15 emerging technologies. And so if we leave this the way  
16 Roger wrote it and add this little addendum that I had,  
17 then I think we have what we want.

18 MR. RAINEY: Any further discussion?

19 MS. BROHL: I move.

20 MR. RAINEY: Motion to accept?

21 MR. OSWALD: Second.

22 MR. RAINEY: All in favor accepting the task?

23 MS. BROHL: Aye.

24 MR. ARMSTRONG: Aye.

25 MR. DASLER: Aye.

1 MS. DICKINSON: Aye.  
2 MR. GRAY: Aye.  
3 MS. HICKMAN: Aye.  
4 DR. LAPINE: Aye.  
5 MR. LARRABEE: Aye.  
6 MR. McBRIDE: Aye.  
7 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Aye.  
8 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Aye.  
9 MR. OSWALD: Aye.  
10 MR. SKINNER: Aye.  
11 MR. WEST: Aye.  
12 MR. WHITING: Aye.  
13 MR. RAINEY: All opposed?

14 (Silence)

15 MR. RAINEY: Thank you. The task carries.

16 CAPTAIN PARSONS: The fourth is entitled "NOAA  
17 Navigation Services Role in the Integrated Ocean Observing  
18 System." Again, the tasking here is to "provide advice on  
19 the role that NOAA's navigation services has in the  
20 Integrated Ocean Observing System and the contributions it  
21 should make." This is based partly on the fact-finding  
22 visits to the Hill and the clear indication, at least  
23 during those two meetings, that there was not an  
24 understanding of the role of NOAA's -- probably should  
25 say -- of NOAA's Navigation Services to IOOS.

1           Second item is, "Provide advice on the maritime  
2 transportation, recreational boating and coastal zone  
3 management communities on their requirements and the  
4 ability of NOAA's navigations services to adequately  
5 address these requirement." And again, I was  
6 interchanging "hydrographic" and "navigation" and I  
7 probably shouldn't do that obviously.

8           Similar type of discussion as before, navigation  
9 versus hydrographic. I think it should be all  
10 encompassing.

11           MR. DASLER: On this one it looked like just  
12 replacing all of the "navigation" with "hydrographic  
13 services."

14           MR. SKINNER: I was going through this and trying to  
15 think what we would do under each of these, and played  
16 around with it a little bit and really, I think, I'm  
17 concerned about two; one because it's only three of the  
18 different potential user groups, and that that may be  
19 problematic as we go down the road. So I had some  
20 alternative language that I just wanted to run by the  
21 group and see what they thought.

22           I wanted to leave it fairly open because this is  
23 a pretty big topic. But what I have is "provide  
24 recommendations on the role that NOAA's navigation  
25 services should have in the Integrated Ocean Observing



1 System." Number 1. And no Number 2.

2 Within that first one I would assume that we  
3 will be looking at some of the different user groups that  
4 use these services. But I didn't want to leave out the  
5 scientific community, the waste water treatment plant  
6 operators, homeland security, some of the other groups  
7 that may use this service even though we can certainly add  
8 those in.

9 MS. BROHL: This is Helen. That was kind of my  
10 question, and I support eliminating Number 2, that is an  
11 aspect of the way to approach Number 1 as compared to its  
12 own separate bullet. And it may be that -- definitely we  
13 don't want to limit the stakeholders. That is too narrow  
14 at this time. I support that.

15 MR. WEST: I don't think this one can wait until our  
16 next meeting. There are a lot of things going on right  
17 now. There is a motion AUVs bill on the Hill, a couple  
18 different versions. NOAA is putting together their '07  
19 budget. We have to get this in here and get some  
20 commitment to some of this stuff. And this is all going  
21 to happen in the next 60 days, maybe 90 days. I think we  
22 need to jump on top of this and we have to make some  
23 assumptions to get there from here.

24 I think we all have to agree that the stuff  
25 we're talking about is important to Ocean Observing. Just

1 make that statement and say it's important, but I think we  
2 need back from NOAA their commitment to them in what  
3 they're going to put in the PPBES cycle. Are they going  
4 to fund it? Because we can't comment until we know what  
5 NOAA's commitment is to it. Maybe it is you don't have  
6 enough money. And that is something we do, we go get you  
7 some more money. I don't know. But this all has to be  
8 done, in my opinion, in the next 60 to 90 days or at least  
9 a good part of it, or you're going to miss the window of  
10 NOAA's budget and possibly something on the Hill. I'm not  
11 so confident that it will get this year, but something  
12 will be done.

13 MS. BROHL: I think the point is well taken. To some  
14 extent as soon as we begin deliberations by conference  
15 call or however it's done, I think there will be an effort  
16 to try to outline and come up with a straw manner for  
17 discussion. The downside of rushing, of course, is that  
18 it limits the document to some extent, and maybe that's  
19 going to be sufficient. Maybe you don't need pages and  
20 pages and a volume, but you just need to be to the point.  
21 But it does need some homework with it, and obviously a  
22 lot more diligence if you're going to shorten the time  
23 line.

24 So my question is, and we may not know until we  
25 get into it, what kind of a time line we think we can get

1 something done. So my question to Roger is, can we vote  
2 on something by conference call if in fact we need to get  
3 something done before the next meeting, can we vote by  
4 conference call and have it go forward?

5 CAPTAIN PARSONS: My understanding is we can hold a  
6 public meeting via conference call and offer  
7 recommendations. You bet.

8 CAPTAIN MCGOVERN: It's got to be published just like  
9 this meeting was, but you can do it.

10 MR. WEST: I agree with Helen. We have got about 60  
11 days to make it. The PORTS, whoever likes PORTS has  
12 already been to the Hill. You've told them, "Before you  
13 spend another dime on Ocean Observing, you ought to at  
14 least fund PORTS." I know that. They told us that. So  
15 we've already got a marker over there, and we have to do  
16 something. It's holding everything up. So we need to --  
17 or we'll let the, quote, unquote, "confusion" rain over  
18 there and they'll do nothing. So we have to have, in  
19 their term, a far-term commitment.

20 And I will be glad to leave this one because  
21 this is something I do every day, but I am not  
22 comfortable -- I know where NOAA's going with this. I  
23 don't know where they're going with PORTS. So if we're  
24 going to make it an integral part, which I personally  
25 think it is, you have to have a commitment from the

1 federal agency that's going to fund it, and I'm not sure  
2 we have that yet. And where you get that commitment, of  
3 course, is in the '07 budget. And I don't know -- you're  
4 probably putting it together now. You better make a  
5 commitment to it or tell us you're not pretty quick.

6 MS. BROHL: Are we thinking of eliminating Bullet 2?

7 MR. RAINEY: So to recap on that, Helen was talking  
8 about, the Bullet 2, just real quick on that, Dr. Spinrad  
9 had made the comment in the presentation to the IOOS  
10 industry day about the next fiscal year they wanted to get  
11 two sectors data requirements done for IOOS, take a look  
12 at the marine transportation and the coastal zone  
13 management communities. I think that's the genesis of  
14 that bullet. I don't see any problem personally in  
15 rolling it into the broader flag of Number 1 and moving  
16 quickly on that, and all of Admiral West's comments on  
17 that are absolutely true. This is a very kind of imminent  
18 thing if we're going to weigh in.

19 I guess I would like to ask maybe Roger or Mike  
20 or Charlie, what would you perceive to be the best way  
21 to -- it seems like we do need some kind of interaction  
22 almost at the outset from NOAA to try to understand, to  
23 get that information. I completely understand the  
24 discussions we had before about there is a position in to  
25 advocate it within the PPBES, but it hasn't really gone

1 through the chain. So is there a way, I guess my question  
2 is, to get the straight information on where that stands  
3 from NOAA here so we can weigh in.

4 MR. WEST: You're absolutely right. We all raise our  
5 right hands and say we're special federal employees, and  
6 we have access to your budget process. And what we're  
7 telling you is we want to know and work with you with it  
8 right now if we're going to be able to take advantage of  
9 this cycle. That's the close session you have. And  
10 you're allowed to do that, and we should do that. And you  
11 may want to think about having a special session in D.C.  
12 here in the next 30 whatever to talk specifically about  
13 NOAA's commitment to the pieces that they have that are a  
14 part of Ocean Observing and where we're going to go with  
15 that.

16 MR. SZABADOS: You're correct and that should be a  
17 closed session.

18 MR. RAINEY: We've made that formal request then and  
19 I guess we'll hear back on that. With that is there any  
20 further discussion or --

21 CAPTAIN MCGOVERN: Do we need that in the form of a  
22 motion?

23 MR. RAINEY: All right. I just -- let's go ahead  
24 and -- you want to go ahead and make a motion?

25 MR. WEST: Rick, you've got a lot of experience. Do

1 you agree with that approach?

2 MR. LARRABEE: Yes.

3 MR. RAINEY: Dr. Lapine.

4 DR. LAPINE: I'm a little uncomfortable with setting  
5 up committees that have a geographic location. That  
6 excludes a lot of us from participating. If it's that  
7 important, then we ought to be brought in and have a  
8 meeting, not just say, "Well, four of us live in the  
9 southeast, so we're going to have a big decision on  
10 something that impacts the whole panel."

11 MR. WEST: I didn't mean to exclude you. I said we  
12 need to have them pretty quick and it needs to be in D.C.  
13 Hopefully everybody can come.

14 DR. LAPINE: That's up to Roger bringing us all to  
15 Washington, D.C.

16 CAPTAIN PARSONS: And I think I need to sit down with  
17 Charlie to get a better appreciation of how the process is  
18 working on PPBES. And we'll do that at lunch before I can  
19 get back to you.

20 MS. BROHL: I don't know if with video conferencing  
21 if it's still a closed meeting with -- not video  
22 conferencing, but the ability to be on a conference call  
23 and still see online live discussion, a PowerPoint, and  
24 talk through it together is doable, if it's secure enough,  
25 and I am thinking of expediency as much as just getting

1 people together.

2 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Certainly a video conference or  
3 teleconference is not out of the question, but let Charlie  
4 and I talk about this at lunchtime.

5 MR. RAINEY: There seemed to be a sense that the  
6 committee wanted to have a formal motion on that, so let's  
7 open the floor for that. There be a motion that the  
8 committee requests to have a special closed meeting on the  
9 status of PORTS within the IOOS context and PPBES.

10 MR. WEST: I would expand it to the '07 budget.

11 MR. RAINEY: Can you articulate that, Admiral.

12 MR. WEST: I will make a motion that NOAA brief the  
13 FACA panel under the development of the '07 budget by  
14 NOAA, particular emphasis on hydroservices, soon rather  
15 than later, which means within the next 60 days, or 30,  
16 next week.

17 MR. RAINEY: Do I have a second?

18 MR. WHITING: I second that.

19 MR. RAINEY: Second on the motion. All in favor?

20 MS. BROHL: Aye.

21 MR. ARMSTRONG: Aye.

22 MR. DASLER: Aye.

23 MS. DICKINSON: Aye.

24 MR. GRAY: Aye.

25 MS. HICKMAN: Aye.

1 MR. LARRABEE: Aye.

2 DR. LAPINE: Aye.

3 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Aye.

4 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Aye.

5 MR. McBRIDE: Aye.

6 MR. OSWALD: Aye.

7 MR. SKINNER: Aye.

8 MR. WEST: Aye.

9 MR. WHITING: Aye.

10 MR. RAINEY: Opposed?

11 (Silence)

12 MR. RAINEY: Which means we'll forward the request.

13 The second issue then I'd like to take up the  
14 tasking is amended which is the Bullet 1 is written  
15 instead of it saying "services has in," it's "should  
16 have." Is that correct? Let me do this. Turn it over to  
17 Tom. Could you read your amended tasking.

18 MR. SKINNER: This is how this would read, "Number 1,  
19 provide recommendations on the role that NOAA's navigation  
20 services should have in the Integrated Ocean Observing  
21 System (IOOS)."

22 MR. DASLER: The only thing I would change is rather  
23 than saying "navigation," is "hydrographic services."

24 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Which we already talked about.

25 MR. SKINNER: Should I read it once more?



1 MR. RAINEY: Please.

2 MR. SKINNER: "Provide recommendations on the role  
3 that NOAA's hydrographic services should have in the  
4 Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS)."

5 MR. RAINEY: Is there a motion to accept?

6 MS. BROHL: I move to accept.

7 MR. RAINEY: Second?

8 MR. DASLER: Second.

9 MR. RAINEY: All in favor?

10 MS. BROHL: Aye.

11 MR. ARMSTRONG: Aye.

12 MR. DASLER: Aye.

13 MS. DICKINSON: Aye.

14 MR. GRAY: Aye.

15 MS. HICKMAN: Aye.

16 DR. LAPINE: Aye.

17 MR. LARRABEE: Aye.

18 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Aye.

19 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Aye.

20 MR. McBRIDE: Aye.

21 MR. OSWALD: Aye.

22 MR. WHITING: Aye.

23 MR. WEST: Aye.

24 MR. SKINNER: Aye.

25 MR. RAINEY: All opposed?

1 (Silence)

2 MR. RAINEY: Motion carries.

3 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Last item, this is short and sweet.  
4 Reauthorization Language for the Hydrographic Services  
5 Improvement Act. The tasking is for the panel to review  
6 the HSIA and amendments of 2002. Recommend revisions to  
7 the HSIA that will serve to strengthen NOAA's hydrographic  
8 services.

9 MS. BROHL: As you recall, yesterday I had put it on  
10 the table not to provide more tasks, but because this --  
11 if we do want to have an impact or we want to have the  
12 ability to make some advice to NOAA, it has to be, again,  
13 sooner than later because we're already well into the  
14 first year of the 109th congress. And it kind of -- in  
15 some respects it coincides with the kinds of results we  
16 have from the previous task. I realize that. However, we  
17 can look at the provisions directly relating to the panel  
18 and its existence. Certainly can do that in the short  
19 term. So that would be the first order of business. And  
20 then look at the other aspects of the existing law that  
21 relates to strengthening NOAA's hydrographic services.  
22 And as I said, that I would be looking to take a first  
23 stab at it in any form that's appropriate.

24 MR. RAINEY: Okay. Any comments? Can I have a  
25 motion to accept the tasking?

1 MR. SKINNER: I move.  
2 MR. RAINEY: Tom, so moved.  
3 MR. WHITING: Second.  
4 MR. RAINEY: All in favor?  
5 MR. GRAY: Aye.  
6 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Aye.  
7 MR. OSWALD: Aye.  
8 DR. LAPINE: Aye.  
9 MR. WHITING: Aye.  
10 MR. ARMSTRONG: Aye.  
11 MS. BROHL: Aye.  
12 MS. DICKINSON: Aye.  
13 MR. WEST: Aye.  
14 MR. SKINNER: Aye.  
15 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Aye.  
16 MS. HICKMAN: Aye.  
17 MR. DASLER: Aye.  
18 MR. McBRIDE: Aye.  
19 MR. LARRABEE: Aye.  
20 MR. RAINEY: Opposed?

21 (Silence )

22 MR. RAINEY: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

23 Well, we've got some work to do. Thanks very  
24 much. I really appreciate that. I think this meeting has  
25 been really good, moving through some things. And I

1 wanted to say, I really appreciate Tom and Bill  
2 volunteering to help out to lead these efforts and want to  
3 work with the working groups. I think that, again, if  
4 it's not clear, take a look at these issues and then get  
5 with -- contact Tom or Bill and find out, you know, where  
6 you can help out on that. And I think this will be an  
7 iterative process and we can kind of tune it up as we go,  
8 but I don't want people to feel like they were stuck with  
9 how we recorded who was on which work group out of  
10 Norfolk.

11 Tom or Bill, we'll break early for lunch, but as  
12 you're contemplating this, is there a way you would like  
13 to kind of have people initiate this work with you?

14 MR. SKINNER: I think we have -- Work Group Number 1  
15 has one of the -- what are they called? Taskings, and  
16 then share two of the others. And I think on Tasking  
17 Number 3, which is one of the shared ones, that's the  
18 innovative technology one, I think Lou was going to take  
19 the lead on that work group, so if have you some comments  
20 on that, let Lou know. Is that acceptable? I don't know  
21 if there are other people who are interested, but Lou has  
22 spoken to me about it.

23 DR. LAPINE: While I was listening to all that was  
24 going on, I kind of put a list together of people I was  
25 going to initially send my thoughts to, which includes Jon

1 Dasler, John Oswald and Andy Armstrong. I mean that's not  
2 exclusive, but I thought I would start out with those  
3 people. And anybody else who would like to know what  
4 we're thinking about, fine with me.

5 MR. SKINNER: The fourth task is the IOOS, the role  
6 of hydrographic services in IOOS, and I would suggest  
7 anyone interested in working on that -- I assume that's  
8 most of our work group, and maybe the whole panel, but if  
9 you do have a special interest, let me know about that.  
10 And then I think Helen was going take the lead on the  
11 Hydrographic Services Improvement Act. That's an  
12 assumption. We haven't --

13 MS. BROHL: I think I said that I would take the lead  
14 on that and it overlaps both.

15 I am presuming that most of the time since it's  
16 been made clear to us that just because you said you would  
17 like to be on one working group or another, that it's  
18 probably more issue driven how you participate rather than  
19 what group you sit on; and at least in the beginning, that  
20 the chairs would be e-mailing everybody to begin the  
21 discussions, and clearly those people who are interested  
22 will be responding.

23 Is that correct as compared to when the Working  
24 Group 1 or 2 starts out they will be, to begin the  
25 discussions. I said I will be on one, but I am assuming

1 that I would hear and be able to read some of the  
2 activities in Number 2, even if I'm not qualified  
3 necessarily to respond to some of the issues.

4 MR. RAINEY: I think that that would be a good idea,  
5 especially initially. And that will be something that I  
6 can't quite envision how it's going to work. I know  
7 already when we put some things out, like, for example,  
8 the letter we just approved, what we have done here is  
9 we've increased our administrative challenges to track  
10 e-mail correspondence across a lot of people. So we will  
11 have to try to look at how we can get that under control  
12 and record that information so that we have a current  
13 document as we get into that kind of things.

14 But I would say initially that would be a good  
15 idea, because we will need to have sort of to be able to  
16 track these efforts. But I think that we will learn as we  
17 go, and improve on that. We don't want to overwhelm  
18 people's e-mails.

19 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: A possibility is that I don't know  
20 if the website could support it, our website, but is there  
21 a way for us to have chat rooms or whatever specific to  
22 each one of these tasks, and if you want to access it, you  
23 can access it. And if you don't, you don't have to, but  
24 everything will be kind of laid out.

25 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We can certainly check into that.

1 And also Barbara can make available, and I know she has,  
2 to, I believe, the work group chairs, the instructions for  
3 setting up a teleconference using the NOAA teleconference  
4 system.

5 Perhaps, Barbara, we could make that available  
6 to everybody, but primarily the leads on some of these  
7 tasks.

8 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: On the Statement 3, the  
9 hydrographic services requirements, Helen mentioned before  
10 that the strategic planning session which NOAA holds every  
11 year, I believe, maybe even twice -- well, at least they  
12 have, at least recently, held it every year, there's a lot  
13 of information from that that would be, I think, useful  
14 for this work group. So if they can access that and get  
15 all those inputs from those public meetings, I think that  
16 would be a good start as to what is needed or what people  
17 think is needed.

18 CAPTAIN PARSONS: We'll post those on the website as  
19 well.

20 MR. GRAY: How would I like Work Group 2 to proceed?  
21 I think for the first two tasks, the cost analysis and the  
22 contracting, that we had volunteered Larry and John from  
23 the contracting side, said they could contribute to  
24 these -- both of, I think, these tasks.

25 On Number 3, the service requirements and so

1       forth like that, I'm not sure just who wants to  
2       participate in this, but I would think that we have -- and  
3       I don't know who really volunteered to be on Work Group 2,  
4       but we have users, the pilots, Andy and Sherri, we have  
5       ports, Adam is a port guy. Rick is a port guy.

6                   Are you there, Rick?

7           MR. LARRABEE: Yes.

8           MR. GRAY: Minas, an operator. We have Charlie and  
9       Mike from the staff can be very helpful in this. And I  
10      guess I would say that it would be good procedurally maybe  
11      if within the next week or a week from Monday or so, if  
12      each of the people who wishes to participate in Work Group  
13      2 and work on Tasks 1, 2 or 3 or whichever they want, let  
14      that be known to me, to Barbara I guess, and to Scott and  
15      Roger so that we just have kind of a score of who is going  
16      to do what.

17                   And out of that I would volunteer to sometime  
18      during April say something, I put that memo out five or  
19      six weeks ago or something like that, in the way of enough  
20      material to have the people who have volunteered to work  
21      on each of those three tasks start to put some meat on the  
22      bones and maybe by that methodology we can get to having a  
23      phone conference meeting or something like that sometime  
24      in May or whatever before we get into the summer period  
25      and see where we go from there. If that's fair enough by



1 people, that would satisfy me.

2 MR. RAINEY: I would like to break for lunch now. I  
3 think we've gone through that. We have some time in the  
4 afternoon again to look at future issues, much of which we  
5 just covered, obviously, with some of the tasking, but we  
6 have some time scheduled to look ahead.

7 Admiral Larrabee, is there anything that you saw  
8 in the materials or that we would be able to follow up  
9 with you before we sign off? Obviously, we'll get you  
10 some remarks here shortly on yesterday's proceedings, but  
11 appreciate you being able to join us today.

12 MR. LARRABEE: I appreciate the opportunity too and I  
13 want to thank Barbara again for setting this up.

14 No, I don't think so, Scott. I've had a chance  
15 to read through everything that Barbara sent out, and it  
16 appears that we have gotten a lot done over the last  
17 couple of days, so I think that's good.

18 MR. RAINEY: Thank you, sir. Let's adjourn for lunch  
19 then.

20 (Lunch recess)

21 MR. RAINEY: We're going to divert slightly from the  
22 agenda. We've covered a tremendous amount of the  
23 information under the next meeting with what we just set  
24 up with the tasks. So we're going to go ahead and go to  
25 public comments and then we've got some information to do

1 after the public session and administrative session. So  
2 once we get Admiral Larrabee here, we'll go ahead and open  
3 it up. I know we have at least one public comment here  
4 and then we'll have our administration session.

5 Welcome, Admiral Larrabee. I just had made the  
6 comment we're going to divert slightly from the agenda.  
7 We have one public comment we would like to hear. We're  
8 going to open it up for that, and then we have some  
9 administrative business that we'll go into administration  
10 session immediately following and finish out.

11 Much of what we were going to talk about on  
12 preparing for the next meeting agenda, of course, we  
13 covered just before lunch on our tasks for the work group.  
14 So we've gained a lot of ground on the agenda. So at this  
15 time I would like to open up and maybe ask Mr. James if he  
16 could comment on the written comment that he offered from  
17 Board of NECSA.

18 MR. JAMES: Eric James from CMAP, also representing  
19 NECSA, which is a trade group representing electronic  
20 charting and manufacturers and data distributors.

21 Basically what we feel in the marine electronics  
22 industry, we are looking to give a little bit more input  
23 into the whole process of the ENC coverage mainly because  
24 our companies are going to be on the front line many times  
25 of whatever policy is instituted.

1           We have two basic subjects we would like the  
2 panel to take a look at. And unfortunately, we did not  
3 attend the last meeting where I believe the ISO 19379  
4 standard was discussed as a background. The standard was  
5 created both by private industry and by the United States  
6 Coast Guard, the Office of Coast Survey, the British  
7 Admiralty and others. The standard took five years to be  
8 created. Five years and a lot of private money and public  
9 money as well, both taxpayer money as well. We feel it  
10 would be a real shame to have this tool to be left by the  
11 wayside.

12           The ISO standard, what it will bring is an  
13 assurance of chart quality and updating. Whether or not  
14 this standard is -- how the standard is used is, of  
15 course, up to the national offices. The Italian H.O. has  
16 already standardized that they will use it for chart  
17 carriage requirements for certain classes of vessels. Of  
18 course, here in the United States it is completely NOAA's  
19 decision. What we would suggest is revisiting, looking at  
20 this ISO standard for not just chart carriage requirements  
21 but also for supplementary chart data.

22           Right now NOAA is saying you can -- a company  
23 can distribute the ENC data and then also supply a  
24 supplementary chart data alongside of that. One of our  
25 fears is that a mariner will be sailing with very good

1 NOAA ENC data and the supplementary charts being used  
2 could be substandard, thus reducing the overall package,  
3 the overall system. We don't want to degrade that. By  
4 referencing the ISO standard for the additional charts  
5 carriage, we would provide some assurances that the system  
6 is the best possible.

7           The second subject is NOAA's proposed  
8 distribution policy. As we understand it, there will be  
9 three types of -- three ways of distributing the official  
10 ENC data. Companies, private companies, may take the data  
11 and then sell that, send it on to the ships in the S-57  
12 format.

13           Companies may take the NOAA data and if they  
14 meet the requirements, they may convert that to a sink  
15 conversion and distribute it in their own format, which is  
16 what CMAP will be doing. And then the third way is for  
17 the ship to directly download the ENC data directly from  
18 the NOAA website. The worry we have is that data  
19 encryption is not included in any of those methods.

20           What that allows is data encryption is not just  
21 for copyright protection, but also for data protection.  
22 Once you let unencrypted data out of your control, as  
23 we've unfortunately found in the past, is you lose all  
24 control of the data.

25           I would say the worst case scenario is for

1 somebody to download the NOAA ENC data maliciously, change  
2 that data with readily available -- the S-57 format is a  
3 very open format. There's probably half a dozen vendors  
4 at the exhibit yesterday selling software that will allow  
5 you to import and change that S-57 data and then pass that  
6 along to unsuspecting mariners. There would really be no  
7 way for the mariner on the ship to tell if that data had  
8 been changed.

9 Right now with the proposed system, NOAA is able  
10 to certify their data up until the point where it's  
11 downloaded from the website. Once it's downloaded from  
12 the website, really all control is lost and you can't  
13 really certify the reliability of that data.

14 My own thoughts, probably the best way to change  
15 this would be to mandate data encryption for any ENCs used  
16 to meet chart carriage requirements. But all private  
17 companies already have this. And it would be up to NOAA  
18 if they wanted to maintain the system like that.

19 In listening yesterday, the other thing is that  
20 with data encryption, you are basically creating a system  
21 where you can track usage statistics, who is exactly using  
22 the data, how it's being updated, when it's being updated.  
23 And yesterday I saw -- what were they calling this -- the  
24 socioeconomic studies being proposed. Right there you're  
25 able to track exactly how the industry, how the market,

1 how everyone is using that data from start to finish.

2 I wish to thank the panel and thank you for your  
3 time.

4 CAPTAIN PARSONS: I thank you for your comments. I  
5 they're very valuable. If I could address some of the  
6 points you bring out in your letter. ISO 19379, NOAA did  
7 participate in its development and it is an outstanding  
8 data quality standard. There's no doubt about it. The  
9 thing to keep in mind, you indicate that NOAA is not  
10 making use of the electronic database standard. That's  
11 correct. But keep in mind that the recently published  
12 quality assurance and certification program for  
13 hydrographic products allows companies and allows  
14 organizations to propose to NOAA that they adopt an ISO or  
15 a standard, in this case ISO 19379. Certainly I presume  
16 that if NECSA applies to NOAA for certification of that  
17 standard, we would certainly take that under advisement  
18 and without proposing what the organization would do, I  
19 would think, because we were involved with it and we do  
20 have high confidence in it, that it would likely receive  
21 certification.

22 Now certification does not imply that products  
23 built to that standard will meet federal chart carriage  
24 requirements, and I think that perhaps is where NECSA and  
25 NOAA differ quite a bit. There is a large market that

1 NECSA organizations, and I think there are about 13 or a  
2 dozen or so private sector chart manufacturers within the  
3 organization; is that correct?

4 MR. JAMES: Both chart manufacturers and system  
5 manufacturers, yes.

6 CAPTAIN PARSONS: There is a large market that that  
7 particular industry serves, and we envision that by  
8 certifying a particular standard for charts, ENC's, other  
9 publications, other data, that will provide assurances to  
10 the public that the product is built to high standards,  
11 but that does not mean that the standards in the resulting  
12 product, in this case the ENC's, will meet chart carriage  
13 requirements.

14 So certainly that's where we differ on  
15 philosophy, and we've spoken for a number of years with  
16 the director of NECSA, Mort Rogoff (phonetic). In fact,  
17 Mort was the very first individual I met the day I came on  
18 board. He was up at my door and we went to lunch that  
19 day. So before I new what NECSA was, I was eating lunch  
20 with Mort.

21 So again, there's a difference between  
22 certifying a standard for meeting a certain purpose and  
23 certifying the product. And we are -- the quality  
24 assurance and certification program is not envisioned nor  
25 was it set up to certify a product. It was meant to

1 certify, in this case, standards by which products are  
2 built and there's a subtle difference.

3           You also indicate NOAA's intention is to allow  
4 private data to supplement officially and seize, and by  
5 referencing ISO 19379, end users will be able to receive  
6 assurances of the value of the data. That's correct. We  
7 will allow private data to supplement ENC's. You mentioned  
8 three ENC distribution processes. One is the direct  
9 certification for taking our S-57 format and selling it to  
10 the public to the users. The second was to convert to  
11 SENC, as you indicated CMAP would do. And third is the  
12 end user can download directly from our website.

13           But for those manufacturers that want to add  
14 value to the product, they may do so so long as there is a  
15 way for the user to distinguish between what is the  
16 official NOAA data and what is the value added data. And  
17 we envisioned that to be things such as photographs and  
18 tables and other supplemental information useful to the  
19 mariner. But again -- and if the requirements are met,  
20 the product can be certified to meet carriage requirements  
21 so there's not an issue there.

22           Thirdly, you indicate that by excluding  
23 companies from using ISO 19379 -- again, we haven't  
24 excluded anybody. We have yet to receive a request from  
25 NECSA or any other organization to certify this particular



1 standard. And once we get a request to certify, we will  
2 sit down, review and go through the process with the  
3 organizations, with industry, and in this case there's a  
4 standard already developed. We envision a number of  
5 organizations or manufacturers to come in and ask for  
6 assistance in developing standards for particular  
7 purposes, and we will certainly do that in accordance with  
8 the program.

9 But this does not exclude companies from using  
10 the standard. You build your products to these standards  
11 right now. And once the application is made, we'll sit  
12 down and go through the process.

13 Your points on data encryption I think are  
14 certainly worth exploring further. I am not a data  
15 encryption expert. The concerns you bring up certainly  
16 make the hairs on the back of my neck stand up, but my  
17 folks tell me that they are looking into this. And so  
18 there's not a final policy on encryption. Certainly we  
19 will encourage manufacturers to encrypt the data, but  
20 there may be some problems with us encrypting our data on  
21 the website and then allowing people to add value to it.  
22 That presents some problems. So certainly I think we can  
23 work with industry and work with NECSA in this case on the  
24 encryption issue.

25 MR. JAMES: I think maybe one of the issues, and it's

1 a very laudable goal, is to be able to get this data as  
2 widely dispersed as possible to as many users as possible.  
3 I think right now, however, we're not making any  
4 distinction between a GIS user in an office-based setting  
5 and an oil tanker transitting. And I think we feel there  
6 needs to be a distinction made in the product line  
7 possibly. But we would definitely like to explore this  
8 further.

9 MS. BROHL: I have two questions. The first is to  
10 Eric. What is NECSA's position on the free downloading?  
11 The fact that they've up to this point hit three million  
12 downloads of ENC's that anybody can access. Is it your  
13 position that that should not be available, that you're  
14 concerned about its manipulation somehow because of that  
15 and that it should only be available to qualified people  
16 with an agreement with NOAA?

17 MR. JAMES: It's really our position that that type  
18 of data should not be available to meet any type of  
19 carriage requirements. I think the debate -- on the  
20 carriage requirements we would definitely say no because  
21 it can actually be very dangerous. The debate then goes  
22 to should recreational boaters be using that type of data  
23 when it can be maliciously altered as well; and that, to  
24 be honest, I haven't thought through that. So there is a  
25 problem.

1 MS. BROHL: My second question is really for Minas  
2 because you're directly engaged in vessel operations and  
3 have need for this kind of information. I would be  
4 interested to hear what NCL uses now, and I guess a  
5 perspective from your position. You're one of the most  
6 important end users.

7 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: I have my microphone ready here.  
8 I've been holding it right from the beginning. First of  
9 all, I have to say that -- let me back track a little bit  
10 so I can answer your question. We are using CMAP. We are  
11 using what Eric's company is producing. And if you want  
12 me to, I can explain to you why, but I think we can take  
13 this off the table.

14 What is important for me is the encryption, and  
15 this is something that I would like to remind everybody  
16 that I had mentioned, and I had a very strong position on  
17 the last meeting in Norfolk because I think it is very  
18 important. You know everything is geared towards the  
19 navigation-based electronic charting, and if this data is  
20 unprotected, you know, I cannot even start telling you  
21 what could happen when we have ships navigating the seas  
22 with data that we don't know where they come from.

23 So I have to support this position 100 percent.  
24 So that was one of my comments.

25 MS. BROHL: Thank you.

1           CAPTAIN PARSONS: Entertain me for a minute. Give me  
2 a scenario where malicious manipulation of the data could  
3 be possible. And certainly NOAA does not intend to  
4 certify any distributors that are not reputable and whose  
5 processes we can't verify.

6           MR. JAMES: Probably in the easiest case situation  
7 would be a disgruntled employee, is one case. Anybody on  
8 board a ship could have a piece of hydroservice software,  
9 coashal oceagraphic (phonetic) software. Take the data in  
10 on a laptop, delete a few rocks, obstructions, move the  
11 traffic fairway over to pass right over there, really  
12 anything, the chart would be wide open, then save that  
13 chart again using the same S-57 file format and load that  
14 directly into the ECDIS. And the navigator, the end user,  
15 would have zero way of verifying or being warned that that  
16 had happened. What would appear, as a safe traffic lane  
17 could take you directly over anything.

18           So disgruntled employee. I am not sure of the  
19 statistics of how probable it is, but a competitor could  
20 download the NOAA ENC, make changes and then pass it along  
21 to the rest of the fishing fleet, for example.

22           I think what's going to happen is these file  
23 sizes are fairly large for the S-57 file sizes, so even  
24 though I think in regulations it's been recommended that  
25 the regulations each individual should be downloading

1 themselves, I think what you would see in the market is  
2 one person would download it and then give it to the boat  
3 next door, his buddy next door, just because the bandwidth  
4 to download it is going to be fairly precious at times.

5 The other thing is say a Coast Guard official  
6 coming on board the vessel really has no way of telling --  
7 he's going to have to go on to the vessel, and I suppose  
8 certify that the charts are up to date and this is what  
9 they have for the coverage area. But beyond that it's  
10 completely invisible. I don't even know how you would be  
11 able to begin to tell if the charts are pure or clean. I  
12 don't think there is any way to know.

13 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Let me say again, these points are  
14 very valid and I will commit my organization to exploring  
15 particularly those encryption issues with NECSA and any  
16 other manufacturer that chooses to engage in those  
17 discussions. Let me say that our intention before we  
18 certify a manufacturer -- distributor, I should say, of  
19 ENC's is to verify their product, do a comparison with the  
20 official database to ensure at least when you release it  
21 to your customers or any other ENC distributor, that the  
22 data has not been altered. Certainly without encryption  
23 we can guarantee that.

24 You're absolutely right. Once it goes to the  
25 users, is there a possibility that an individual,

1 maliciously or otherwise, could alter the data? I submit  
2 to you based on the scenario you've laid out that it is  
3 possible. So I will certainly take back to my office and  
4 have them look at that in a little more depth and engage  
5 your organization to see if, in fact, we can provide  
6 safeguards against that.

7 MR. JAMES: The last thing I would like to point out  
8 is that we feel we're really on the verge of transforming  
9 the marine electronics industry and providing the mariners  
10 just an unbelievable tool to really increase the safety of  
11 navigation in U.S. waters. We're very excited and we're  
12 really looking forward to working with NOAA and providing  
13 the mariner absolutely the best possible system, and  
14 that's really our overall goal.

15 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Certainly. We have similar goals.

16 Other comments?

17 CAPTAIN MCGOVERN: I agree with the fact that I think  
18 something has to be, call it a read-only file or whatever,  
19 but unless you're a certified distributor or whatever you  
20 want to call it, that whatever you download off the  
21 Internet should be sealed somehow or encrypted, whatever  
22 you want to call it, so that it can only be used in the  
23 format -- it can't be changed. I don't think you can just  
24 say, "Take it off the Internet," because then there's  
25 going to be issues, as you said before.

1                   But I think unless you're a certified  
2 distributor or manufacturer and that you have given the  
3 clearance for them to alter this data -- maybe not alter  
4 it, but change it over, migrate it, whatever, that it  
5 should be a read-only file, which I don't think is that  
6 hard. You download them all the time. They're files you  
7 just can't do anything with. You can still use it, but  
8 you can't change it. And I think that's probably the  
9 easiest way to get around this, that it should be somehow  
10 encrypted or locked that it just doesn't -- again, I'm not  
11 an expert on that either, but it does make perfect sense  
12 that you don't want this to be going out. Because that is  
13 going to be the normal distribution.

14                   I guess even Minas, each one of your ships  
15 probably doesn't download it directly, you probably  
16 distribute it; right?

17                   CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: I would like to make another  
18 comment for the benefit of the panel here. I had  
19 mentioned before that we're using CMAP electronic charts  
20 and we have been doing that for, I think, the last five  
21 years as a matter of fact. Very pleased, very aware with  
22 the product.

23                   However, I want to bring to the attention of  
24 everybody why we're using those and why we're not using  
25 something else. The problem is coverage. There's not

1 enough coverage from the official ENC's in the areas that  
2 we navigate. Therefore, we have to use a product which  
3 unfortunately doesn't meet the carriage requirements in an  
4 advisory capacity, and at the same time we have to carry a  
5 full folio of paper charts.

6 But it is there. We projected in our display.  
7 It assists in navigation a great deal because they're  
8 smart charts. Great capabilities. But really, in  
9 essence, what we do, we have to do position fixing still  
10 on the paper chart back in the chart room.

11 MR. WEST: Do you think you'll ever change that?  
12 Will you go paperless some day?

13 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: I hope so. Depends on the  
14 hydrographic offices. Everybody is screaming and yelling  
15 about electronic servicing and we have yet to see the  
16 results in the industry. We would like to have them but  
17 they're not there.

18 MS. BROHL: Eric, given your interest in trying to  
19 provide the best possible chart for mariners use to meet  
20 carriage requirements, are you or NECSA engaged with U.S.  
21 Coast Guard in any form in their efforts, in any level,  
22 whether it's Coast Guard staff on the Hill or whether it's  
23 U.S. Coast Guard headquarters, and are you engaged with  
24 them at all in these discussions because they will  
25 obviously make the carriage requirements?



1 MR. JAMES: We're involved -- right now the Coast  
2 Guard and NOAA is sitting in and the IEC is designing an  
3 ECS.

4 MS. BROHL: What does that mean?

5 MR. JAMES: There are a lot of acronyms in the  
6 business. Right now the only thing that can really meet  
7 carriage requirements and is regulated is called an ECDIS;  
8 very expensive, sometimes very complex. Right now the  
9 Coast Guard is working towards making an ECS, which is  
10 called an electronic charting system, which basically up  
11 until now an ECS is everything except an ECDIS. So  
12 there's ECDIS and then everything else is ECS. They're  
13 trying to formalize what exactly should constitute an ECS  
14 for non solas glass vessels to use.

15 So we are involved in some of these panels.  
16 We're involved in the RTCM organization. But one of the  
17 things we're really trying to change, and this is why I  
18 have sat through the two days of the meeting, is we're  
19 really trying, as a marine electronics industry, to get  
20 more involved because many times we unfortunately sat back  
21 and regulations and specifications go through and then we  
22 have to deal with sometimes some pretty horrible  
23 consequences, as the state of the ECDIS and the ENCs  
24 around the world can sometimes attest, is that -- and then  
25 we're on the front lines. I am the one answering the

1 phone on the weekend when something doesn't work right.

2 So we're trying to be a little bit more  
3 proactive, and I think the other day there's mention of,  
4 we're actually trying to look for ways to better  
5 communicate, both with NOAA and the Coast Guard. It's a  
6 challenge. We're very small companies for the most part,  
7 although the big ECDIS manufacturers are large companies.  
8 CMAP is a very small company. And we have a hard time  
9 keeping up with the regulatory side of things. And we  
10 don't do a lot of contracting, so we don't read the  
11 publications probably as often as we should, which is why  
12 we weren't at the last meeting where this was discussed.

13 So we're really trying to look possibly to the  
14 RTCM organization, possibly through some other means to  
15 increase our feedback and our participation because it  
16 really is a partnership, especially going forward.

17 MS. BROHL: Captain, is it possible at the next  
18 meeting we could have just a report if you're going to go  
19 back and take a look, just give us an update at the next  
20 meeting, follow-up to the discussion?

21 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Sure can.

22 MR. RAINEY: Any further comments or discussions?  
23 Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

24 Was there any other public comment that would  
25 like to be made?

1           Again, all of our public comment that we had  
2 some that were submitted, one that I failed to mention  
3 yesterday was we had a comment from the National  
4 Association of Maritime Organizations, from NAMO, and that  
5 will be distributed, or has been distributed, and made a  
6 part of the record.

7           Let's move then to the next agenda item here,  
8 next meeting agenda items. As I mentioned, I think that  
9 clearly we covered a lot of that ground, and we'll have  
10 reports from the work groups. Not all of these, as we've  
11 indicated. We don't have to go back over all of what we  
12 just covered before lunch, but some of these we'll  
13 hopefully have prepared for the next meeting. Others will  
14 be sort of status reports on how we're going.

15           We had some goods discussions at lunch, and  
16 clearly I would like to follow up with Roger and Barbara  
17 and see what we can do on our website to sort of  
18 facilitate some of these discussions, and I would like  
19 to -- and I guess begging the obvious, but sometimes you  
20 come into the office and you have 150 e-mails to weed  
21 through, and if we start sending e-mails all over -- so  
22 we'll see what we can do, technology. So I would just  
23 like to ask everybody to be patient as we start out.

24           We had some good discussions before lunch about  
25 how to do these initial rounds of engagement here on the

1 e-mail. We'll try to get it up on the website, but we'll  
2 move forward. I think as far as the timing goes,  
3 obviously before the next meeting. We've had our formal  
4 request to see what we can do on the report on the budget,  
5 with particular interest in the PORTS and the IOOS issue.  
6 So we'll get feedback on that shortly.

7 I would like to open it up for comments on if  
8 there's other ideas for new businesses. We don't have to  
9 have it all wrapped up, but if there are ideas for issue  
10 briefings that you perceive in conjunction with these  
11 tasks or if you want to talk again, Captain McGovern  
12 mentioned earlier a little bit about identifying some  
13 references, and I think we picked up many of them as we  
14 went through our earlier discussions. But maybe open the  
15 floor up for a few minutes about comments for looking  
16 ahead, and the what we'll do is incorporate that in fairly  
17 short order here and be able to kind of capture that and  
18 get it back out to folks with kind of a consolidated  
19 approach on what the references and all of that and start  
20 catching up to the progress on these work groups.

21 Open up the floor for discussions.

22 MS. BROHL: Thank you. My name is Helen. Roger, do  
23 I understand correctly that the charter of the panel is  
24 only to October 1st, 2005? Did I read that correctly?

25 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That's correct. It's going through

1 the renewal process now.

2 MS. BROHL: So that might be on the agenda? If we  
3 have to vote on it or do something in preparation for  
4 October? We do not. It's just continuing. Okay.

5 Is there any validity to reviewing the chart or  
6 now that we're two years into it or a year and a half into  
7 it to see whether it appears to be right on track?

8 CAPTAIN PARSONS: You certainly may renew the  
9 charter, but it's going to go through and the  
10 recommendation is that it be renewed, so I'm not quite  
11 sure what you're looking to add to that.

12 MS. BROHL: I have a question about process then. I  
13 am sorry I can't remember at this point the process of the  
14 charter and I can't recall. I know that NOAA originally  
15 drafted the charter, and I can't recall if it was  
16 something we voted on originally. It wasn't. It was just  
17 something presented to us. Okay. Then it might be a moot  
18 point. Just recognizing that it expired October 1st,  
19 2005, I wondered if it was something we should put through  
20 to look at and see if it's meaningful. But if we don't  
21 have a say in the charter in any case and you're reviewing  
22 it automatically, then perhaps it's moot.

23 CAPTAIN PARSONS: The charter was drafted by NOAA and  
24 signed by the deputy and the secretary for administration  
25 or whoever he was and endorsed.

1           CAPTAIN McGOVERN: We can always look -- we are an  
2 advisory committee. All these advisory committees, the  
3 charter, Sunset -- I think it's every two years, or is it  
4 every three years? Every two years you have to renew the  
5 charter. There's nothing that would prevent us from  
6 making a recommendation if we feel that the charter should  
7 be amended. But it's -- the final say is going to be up  
8 to NOAA. We don't vote on the charter. If we see that  
9 there's something we want to change in it, we can make  
10 that recommendation and that's what it is. We're an  
11 advisory committee. That's it.

12           MR. GRAY: I guess you're in sort of whatever we  
13 might want to bring up at the next meeting?

14           MR. RAINEY: Again, we have some time and I think  
15 we're a long way there with the work group task, but we do  
16 have some time that if you had some comments or you wanted  
17 to discuss some of the issues, certainly.

18           MR. GRAY: I have a question because I know that,  
19 what, a third of the panel has to step down at the end of  
20 the year.

21           CAPTAIN PARSONS: A third of the panel's appointments  
22 expire. All of the panel members whose appointments  
23 expire have applied for nomination again.

24           MR. GRAY: But I guess the question I have is does  
25 NOAA sort of broadcast "we're interested in prospective

1 members for the panel"? They did back when this was first  
2 being created. And secondly, if they don't, I think maybe  
3 they should just to see who might be useful to this panel.  
4 And secondly, does a person have to be an American to be a  
5 member of this committee?

6 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Answer to your first question, on a  
7 yearly basis solicitations for nominations are posted in  
8 the federal register. That was done this year or at the  
9 end of last year. And we have received roughly 20 or 21  
10 nominations for those five seats. The answer to your  
11 second question is you don't have to be a U.S. citizen to  
12 be appointed to this panel.

13 MR. GRAY: I guess there was a time, and thank God  
14 it's over, when I had to look at the federal register. I  
15 don't have to look at it now, so I don't. And I suspect a  
16 lot of people share my pleasure, or their pleasure of not  
17 having to look at the federal register. I guess I'm  
18 saying if you want to get what this group does out and  
19 known and get others that could be helpful interested,  
20 maybe broadcasting that it exists and that periodically  
21 nominations for new members would be helpful and might be  
22 a worthwhile endeavor.

23 CAPTAIN PARSONS: That was done. Everybody on this  
24 panel received a copy of the federal register announcement  
25 at the end of the year.

1 MR. GRAY: I'm think I'm talking about like putting  
2 it in a Lloyd's List or Marine Law or something like that  
3 just to see what happens.

4 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: Press release.

5 MR. GRAY: And it's interesting in Minas's comment  
6 that I was hearing on the charts, is for all the good  
7 things you do, you don't cover the world. And it is  
8 interesting in a little bit of conversations on the side  
9 of this meeting while I have been here today, that we have  
10 people from various other parts of the world that also  
11 know how to do some of these things. And I think a little  
12 bit of outside influence, non-American influence, might be  
13 no bad thing.

14 CAPTAIN PARSONS: If you recall that the initial  
15 panel that was established did include a Canadian citizen  
16 subsequently was determined that there was a sufficient  
17 conflict of interest and we had to disinvite him.

18 MR. GRAY: I think it's just for consideration,  
19 people can think about it, whether they think it's  
20 worthwhile making the work of the panel known a little bit  
21 more broadly in what I think our newspapers, magazines,  
22 whatever it may be, that people in the marine industry are  
23 interested in might be no bad thing, and see what happens,  
24 whether it sparks any interest and any help. And then  
25 when and if we do call on -- if we ask to have outsiders



1 come and talk to us in the work or the work groups, we  
2 might get some interesting people to talk to us that might  
3 have some ideas that go beyond what ourselves come up  
4 with. So I think it's for consideration. And we could  
5 take that up at a future meeting of whether or not this is  
6 worth doing. Thank you.

7 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Are the 20 nominations on top of  
8 the five that reapplied, or are the five included in the  
9 20?

10 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Five are included.

11 MR. WEST: Who is the selection authority? Do you  
12 recommend and then you pick?

13 CAPTAIN PARSONS: A panel will recommend to Rick  
14 Spinrad. Rick Spinrad will endorse or otherwise make  
15 recommendations, and the ultimate nominator is the Vice  
16 Admiral.

17 MR. WEST: Now that you said that everybody that is  
18 going to expire this year wants to come back, I make a  
19 strong push to bring them back. All you folks sitting  
20 around here know we didn't get to this point very quickly.  
21 I think we have a little bit of a learning curve. And I  
22 think we're getting up on step now, and I hate to see a  
23 third of the folks leave. And if that's an input, you've  
24 got mine.

25 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Duly noted.

1 MR. GRAY: I wasn't trying to encourage that, Dick,  
2 so much as I was trying to --

3 MR. WEST: You were trying to get rid of me, I know.

4 MS. DICKINSON: Do you publish the meeting  
5 announcements in the federal register?

6 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Certainly do. And we forward a  
7 copy of that federal register announcement to all the  
8 members as well.

9 MS. BROHL: A number of us who are in maritime --  
10 there seems to be a whole circular of information that  
11 seems to be around and around and I get notices. I get  
12 them through -- NOAA gets it. I get it through a maritime  
13 lawyer in D.C. has a huge distribution list. I get it  
14 from guys out of Philadelphia who monitor federal register  
15 notices. I in turn then send it to other people. Now,  
16 that's not formal and I think the idea of publishing it in  
17 certain periodicals that have a broader readership is  
18 appropriate, but we've gotten pretty good in certain  
19 circles to get information out there and pass it around  
20 quite a bit. So it certainly wasn't done in a vacuum.

21 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: I think probably what Bill was  
22 getting to was that probably a press release would be --  
23 we can't force people to publish it, but if a press  
24 release went out, and I know -- I'm assuming NOAA has a  
25 public affairs office.

1 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: It was running --

2 CAPTAIN PARSONS: Barbara, did a press release go out  
3 this time?

4 MS. HESS: On the meetings?

5 CAPTAIN PARSONS: On the nominations.

6 MS. HESS: Initially.

7 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: And even the meeting notices. I  
8 know legally it has to be in the federal register. And  
9 again, we can't force anyone to publish it, but all NOAA  
10 can do is put out the press release, but if they do that,  
11 at least hopefully somebody will pick it up.

12 CAPTAIN MYRTIDIS: Unless they're on a cruise ship.

13 MR. RAINEY: What I would like to do then is whether  
14 we need a motion or not, I don't know. I guess we can  
15 throw it out for a motion to adjourn the public meeting.  
16 We do have some administrative matters we need to attend  
17 to subsequent to that.

18 But one of the things, I guess jumping ahead,  
19 maybe we can mention here now is, it may go to the  
20 administrative as well, but looking toward the next  
21 meeting, the idea of the time frame is looking toward an  
22 August meeting, and I've talked with Captain Parsons here  
23 today, and the latest is there's considerable interest in  
24 possibly an Alaska venue, but also some interest in  
25 possibly Washington. So the sites are not specific yet,

1 but what we want to do is have people kind of give us  
2 their availability windows in August. It sounds like  
3 that's, for NOAA and some of the things that we're working  
4 on, the time frame. And again, notwithstanding the  
5 notice of the budget that we want to try to do before  
6 then. But for the regular meeting that's been what's kind  
7 of in the works.

8 MS. BROHL: Washington, D.C., in August?

9 MR. RAINEY: Or Alaska.

10 If there's no other business, I would like to go  
11 ahead and take a motion to adjourn the public session --  
12 Roger.

13 CAPTAIN PARSONS: One comment. Perhaps over the  
14 course of the next two weeks if you can forward your  
15 availability to Barbara for the month of August, indicate  
16 what days you might be available, and we'll take a look  
17 and see what common two- to three-day window exists.

18 MR. ARMSTRONG: New Hampshire would be happy to host  
19 a meeting.

20 MR. RAINEY: Do I have a motion to adjourn the public  
21 session?

22 CAPTAIN McGOVERN: So moved.

23 MS. BROHL: Second.

24 MR. RAINEY: Thanks very much for the patience and  
25 the interest from the public. Excellent comments. Very

1 much appreciated.

2 Thanks again, everybody. What we have is a  
3 chance -- we have a little bit of information here. My  
4 presumption at this point after four meetings is that  
5 everybody is getting information on the Internet. Is  
6 anybody having any particular -- other than I know a lot  
7 of people are out of their office when they're doing work  
8 and sometimes they're not available, but as we move  
9 forward on these working groups, the Internet will  
10 probably be a tool of very much use. Is there anybody  
11 that has a difficulty with that? Has that been a problem  
12 other than the volume of e-mails, which we will try to  
13 resolve through the website application? Is that working  
14 out? Okay.

15 The administrative information, Charlie  
16 Challstrom was working on some things to respond to some  
17 of the panel members' questions about the budget, which is  
18 not publicly available information. And so we thought  
19 while we're here rather than wait with it, he could give  
20 us a quick rundown on where things kind of stand on that.  
21 So this is just sort of a special administration session  
22 for that.

23 (Whereupon an off-the-record presentation  
24 was given by Mr. Challstrom.)

25 MR. RAINEY: I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

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

MS. HICKMAN: So moved.

MR. WHITING: Second.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.)

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

I, Ruben Garcia, CSR No. 11305, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do hereby:

That the foregoing Transcript of Proceedings was taken before me on Friday, April 1, 2005, at the time and place therein set forth; and was taken down by me in shorthand, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting under my direction and supervision.

And I hereby certify that the foregoing Transcript of Proceedings is a full, true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, nor financially interested in the action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 10th day of May.

Ruben Garcia

RUBEN GARCIA, CSR NO. 11305