

NOC

Comment #1 (C) 6-8, 173-174 Need to define “coastal forecasting” and explain why it needs to “achieve the effectiveness and timeliness of weather forecasting.”

Response: Agree. Need to clarify. Plan will be modified. The Plan’s intent is not to create a new “coastal forecasting” program but, rather, to support NOAA’s existing marine weather forecasting and NOAA missions that require currents for trajectory predictions such as spill response, search & rescue, HABs.

Comment #4 (C) p. 9 multiple; Statements here clearly imply “real-time,” 24x7(“around the clock”), “gap free,” “operational” requirements for HFR.

Response: Agree. Need to clarify. Plan will be modified. Some, but not all, of NOAA’s missions support activities that require real-time surface current data. Primary example: spill response. USCG also uses NOAA data/models for search & rescue and is now operationally using HFR data as well. HABs forecasting also benefits from gap-free near-real-time data so the forecast can respond to changing conditions.

Comment #6 (C) 373, 657 Data archiving trivialized.

Response: Data archive is addressed by its own section. Cost estimates would supplement existing NODC funding. Extensive discussions with NODC conclude that the cost estimates in the Plan are reasonably accurate. If further analysis by NODC indicates the need to revise these estimates, future versions of the Plan will reflect those revisions.

Comment #12 (C) 841 Non-tidal (residual) currents should be considered

Response: Residual currents are an application product. They are implied in the Applications section and Level 4 Products, section 7.2. Draft will be modified.

Comment #13 (C) 1058 Level 3 and 4 data should also be archived. Suggest archiving data processing software, user manual, and QC documents as well.

Response: Agree. Level 3,4 regional products will be archived as they transition to operational mode from demonstration products.

Comment #1 (S) p. 1-2 Discussion of importance is too coastal and too surface oriented.

Response: The intent of the Plan is to address surface current measurements within 200 km of shore. The primary positive impact of HFR-derived surface currents is to those regions. For many sub-disciplines of oceanography and meteorology, 200 km is not considered coastal. The link to currents beyond the coastal area is made in the “Modeling” section. HFR-derived measurements are surface, in nature. To the extent

that models can better resolve 3-D currents because of the improved surface currents provided by HFR, 3-D currents are addressed indirectly by the Plan.

Comment #5 (S) 248 Is covering “economically and ecologically important” areas equal to filling all spatial gaps?

Response: No. Regional gap analyses have taken into account BOTH geography and economically and ecologically important areas.

Comment #7 (S) Section 6 This is not a management plan. This is a “technical coordination” plan.

Response: Partially agree. Section will be modified to clarify roles. Re the “authority” of IOOS on operators: presently, IOOS uses “cooperative agreements”, not grants, to fund regions. These agreements do allow for IOOS to direct how funds are spent. In the long-term, other mechanisms will be explored for funding O&M, as well.

Comment #8 (S) 583 Suggest that non-tidal (residual) currents should be produced as part of a national product.

Response: Agree but, to date, no program or agency has requested a residual current product. Will clarify.

Comment #9 (S) 628 Add Chu et al (2003).

Response: Agree. Will add.

Comment #11 (S) Section 9.1 Need to include performance metrics

Response: Performance metrics are now included.