

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXECUTIVE ORGANIZATION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20506

PAGEO STAFF MEMORANDUM

TO: John C. Whitaker  
THROUGH: William Kriegsman  
FROM: Murray Comarow and Andrew Rouse  
SUBJECT: Proposed Oceanographic Organization

1. Why we should do something about marine and atmospheric science organization.

a. The Stratton Commission report of January 1969 proposed the establishment of a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA). The report has provided new energy for those who feel that oceanography deserves more Federal support and should have its own agency.

b. There appears to be growing Congressional interest in NOAA

(1) largely from those interested in expanding Federal marine science and technology activities because of "the importance of the oceans". This reflects the views, for example, of people in oceanographic institutions and some industries.

(2) to a limited extent, from those more broadly concerned with Federal organization for environmental problems. The larger community of "environmentalists" in Congress are not, however, fixed on NOAA, nor on a new operating agency. They are more interested in restructuring Federal programs to insure more consideration of expanded programs to protect and improve the environment.

2



There have been perennial proposals to consolidate all Federal oceanographic programs, as well as bills to establish a "Department of Natural Resources and Environment" or the like. None of these bills appears likely to pass soon.

But one of the bills to establish NOAA may pass. These bills have active advocates and few strong opponents. Most Congressmen will have this low in their priority list, and will see little reason to fight it.

c. Some interest in a new marine organization comes from the "hardware" segment of industry, on the theory that a single marine agency would lead to increased Federal spending for civilian marine technology and related hardware, and there would then be only one agency for the hardware industry to come to for support. Other industrial sectors could not be expected to oppose NOAA. Industrial organizations, principally in aerospace industries, have invested up to \$150 million in prototype marine hardware (chiefly in submersibles) over the past ten years. This investment, however, was largely related to some exaggerated assessments of the wealth of the oceans that were widespread a few years ago. More realistic assessments in recent years have tempered investments.

In summary, industrial interests play a secondary role in supporting the proposed NOAA and would not be pressing enough to justify action.

d. Based on current Federal civilian program levels, there is little reason on the merits, to realign marine activities in the Executive Branch. There are no clear requirements for rapid expansion of Federal activities for oceanography or civilian marine technology. The higher priority areas



related to marine sciences are related to environmental problems and utilization of the coastal zone.

On October 19, 1969, the Administration announced a five-point program for FY 1971 to strengthen the Nation's "marine science" activities. Lead assignments were made but no reorganization was contemplated. The Administration's new initiatives would be carried out by NSF, Interior and Commerce (ESSA).

This report will examine various organizational alternatives. Underlying this analysis are the assumptions:

- that those who argue for separate organizational status for oceanography, or any other function, must demonstrate substantial advantages.
- that the government's proper role in respect to environmental sciences generally--including marine science--is the issue, rather than the narrower goal of elevating the status of a given function.
- that the NOAA proposal presents an opportunity to move toward a more coherent approach to environmental problems.

2. The Proposal for NOAA. Best known among the oceanographic alternatives is the Stratton Commission's proposal to establish a National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency. This Agency would merge the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Coast Guard, Environmental Sciences Services Administration, U.S. Lake Survey, Antarctic Research, Marine and Anadromous Programs of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries, the National Center for Atmospheric Research, the National Oceanographic Data Center, and the National Sea Grant Program.



Under this proposal, NOAA's functions would include: ocean exploration and research (including the development of technology to harvest food and minerals from the sea); weather and oceanic forecasting; navigational services to marine users; certain environmental studies; and the coordination of State Coastal Zone Authorities. Proponents of NOAA assert that this agency would draw together fragmented programs, fill in neglected areas, and establish a more coherent marine program. As a single marine and atmospheric agency, it would be better able to attract Congressional (budgetary) support and exercise the power necessary to direct a systematic ocean program. Table 1 shows the budgetary allocation of the constituents of the proposed agency.

These claims are valid to the extent that centralization of any activity sometimes - but by no means always - contributes to increased ability to coordinate a variety of programs. NOAA however is not the only approach to the coordination difficulty.

A fundamental objection to NOAA is that it is organized around means rather than purposes or objectives. Certain kinds of research, mining, food production, weather prediction, pollution problems, and coastal management share the common medium of the sea. But the existence of this common characteristic does not establish an oceanographic agency as the most effective way to deal with such problems. Each function has a different purpose related more closely to programs with similar purposes than to the shared medium of the sea.

The NOAA proposal excludes military programs as well as economically important civilian marine activities such as: saline water conversion, off-shore oil drilling, shipbuilding (including submarines). The reason that these activities were not included in NOAA's charter is that each is an



essential part of a mission-oriented agency such as Navy or Interior.

NOAA's appeal as a research agency encounters similar difficulties. While pure research is essential to the progress of any society, research is more likely to be supported if it is related to specific purposes, many of which would be outside of NOAA's mandate - e.g., food production or national security. The research thrust of NOAA might easily weaken linkages which exist between research in the ocean environment and the missions of agencies to which this research most directly relates. Indeed, if fundamental conflicts develop between NOAA and the mission-oriented agencies, as well they might, oceanography may have less rather than more support from Congress than it has today.

It does not make sense to establish yet another agency whose mandate overlaps those of other agencies and whose survival will depend on its ability to compete with the rest for money.

While the Stratton Commission correctly identified many ocean-related issues of increasing national importance, NOAA is not the best organization to meet those needs. The single criterion of relatedness to the sea is not a sufficient dimension around which to organize. Other criteria such as similarity of problems or interchangeability of resources need to be taken into account. Alternatives have been proposed which bring related activities together on the basis of more sophisticated criteria. These avoid the narrowness of NOAA while at the same time offering a coherent approach to related environmental sciences and services.

### 3. Organizational Alternatives

We have considered six alternatives in addition to NOAA.

1. Create a small management agency of the type being discussed by the Wakelin task force.



2. Reaffirm current lead agency designations and assign lead agencies to program areas not yet covered.
3. Create a new cabinet level Department of the Environment and Natural Resources.
4. Reorganize and strengthen the Executive Office's activity in this area.
5. Do 4, and establish a new division within NSF responsible for basic marine technology.
6. Reorganize Interior by adding ESSA and consolidating all Interior marine and oceanographic programs under one Assistant Secretary for Marine and Atmospheric Affairs.

The arguments for and against each will be covered in a subsequent memo.

4. Recommendations

We recommend that the Department of the Interior be reorganized along the following lines:

1. Retitle the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Parks and Marine Resources as the Assistant Secretary, Marine and Atmospheric Affairs.
2. In conjunction with item 1 above, consolidate Interior activities whose essential purposes relate to the development of the resources of the sea and relocate the activities which are not so related. The Park Service and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries, less its Anadromous Fish Program, should be transferred to the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management.



3. Move the Environmental Sciences and Services Administration\* of the Department of Commerce under Interior's Assistant Secretary for Marine and Atmospheric Affairs. Transfer to Interior the U.S. Lake Survey from the Corps of Engineers, the Sea Grant Program from NSF, and the National Oceanographic Data Center and the National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center, both from the Navy.

In addition to the reorganization of Interior:

4. Limit the Coast Guard's mission in this area to marine and atmospheric data collection and require that using agencies reimburse it for the cost of the data collection operation.
5. Terminate the Marine Council and add a few additional marine, atmospheric, and geophysical professionals to the Science Advisor's staff.
6. Set up a PSAC panel on Marine and Atmospheric Sciences to advise OST. Either in addition to (preferred) or as an alternative (acceptable) establish an outside advisory body to work with the Assistant Secretary for Marine and Atmospheric Affairs.
7. Restructure elements of the NSF to insure that adequate attention is given to that organization's lead responsibility for the Decade, Antarctic Research and for the development of basic knowledge about the oceans and the atmosphere.

\* Except the Radio Propagation laboratory which should remain in Commerce.



8. Establish an Interagency Coordinating Committee (Navy, Coast Guard, Interior, NSF) to insure that domestic and military research and operating programs are carried out in the most effective manner.

The recommendations have these advantages:

1. With the major exception of the Coast Guard, Interior will include almost all of the programs which would have been included in NOAA. Table 2 shows the budget allocation for the recommended organization. The Coast Guard's primary purpose is far removed from those to be pursued by any of the proposed organizational alternatives. An organization which draws together marine programs is thus formed without establishing a new and competing agency in this field.
2. Missions and roles for domestic marine activity are better defined and a mechanism is provided to integrate the domestic and the military programs in this area.
3. The marine and oceanographic interests have argued for a "home of their own". The recommended organization provides it in such a way as to both insure viability and provide a check on the inevitable demands for growth.
4. The Interior Department has long needed a tie to the universities. The Sea Grant Program particularly, will provide that link.
5. The reorganization provides an opportunity to rationalize some of the activities of the Interior Department and should be conditioned on the Secretary's agreement to undertake such departmental reorganization.



6. Key Congressional supporters of NOAA can retain jurisdiction over the consolidated activities and there is a good chance that assignments at the full committee level can remain substantially as is. (See Table 3).
7. The proposal clarifies the role of the EOP in the marine area, reducing advocacy and concentrating on coordination of program and policy development.
8. Interior, as an established and powerful agency, will probably be a more successful advocate for this area than NOAA or any of the smaller versions of an independent agency which have been proposed.

The arguments against the proposal are:

1. The plan will have a major impact on the Department of Commerce, which may be detrimental to the Department. (See Table 2).
2. Interior is one of the most diverse and fragmented operations in the government; this proposal compounds this problem.
3. Since the proposal may not enhance the prospects of major increases in funding, it fails to signal the dramatic emphasis on oceans which NOAA proponents see as necessary.
4. The proposed organization is smaller than NOAA and therefore won't be able to compete as effectively for funds.
5. Interior is a land-oriented agency which would give little attention to ocean-related activities.
6. The proposal, like NOAA itself, really fails to consolidate programs with a common purpose. Commercial Fisheries for example, should properly be placed in an agency concerned with food supply.



7. Sea Grant is a basic research program and should remain in NSF, the agency charged with the federal effort in that area. While placing Sea Grant in Interior gives that Department a university link, it does so at the cost of further fragmenting the government's basic research effort.
8. The missions and roles of agencies involved in the marine program can be redefined without making organizational changes. The same is true of better coordination of activities for military and domestic operating and research programs.

This proposal has been discussed with staff of BoB and OST who feel that it is good on its merits though there are problems that need to be solved. Required in particular are the views of the Secretary of Commerce and the affected Congressional committees. If you like this proposal it should be discussed with Messrs. Mayo, Schlesinger, and Ink. Will Kriegsman is discussing it with the Vice President's staff and we are submitting it to the Council.

Finally, we and the White House and BoB staffers who have looked at this are agreed that NOAA is an over-response, and that the proposal described above would be an improvement on the merits even if substantial pressure to act in this area did not exist.



TABLE 1  
NOAA PROPOSAL  
FY 70 BUDGET AUTHORITY AND FULL TIME  
PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT FOR  
AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

Agency or Program	FY 70 B. A.		Full-time Permanent Employment	
	\$	% of Total	Number	% of Total
ESSA (DOC)	172.2M	20.6	10,020	17.8
U.S. Lake Survey (COE)	2.3	0.3	159	
National Oceanographic Data Center	2.0	0.2	135	
National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center (Navy)	1.8	0.2	57	
Sea Grant Program (NSF)	10.0	1.4	9	
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (DOI)	53.6	6.4	1,850	3.3
Anadromous Programs - Sports Fisheries (DOI)	2.7	0.4	13	
Marine Fish (DOI)	1.0	0.1	70	
Coast Guard (DOT)	591.4	69.5	43,857	77.9
Antartic Program (NSF)	7.5	0.9	13	
National Center for Atmospheric Research (NSF)	11.4	-	1	
Total	855.9	100.0	56,184	99.7



TABLE 2  
INTERIOR BASED PROPOSAL  
FY 70 BUDGET AUTHORITY AND FULL TIME  
PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT FOR  
AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

<u>Agency and Program</u>	<u>FY 70</u>		<u>Full-time</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>BA</u>	<u>% Total</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>% Total</u>	<u>of Losing Agencies</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>\$</u>		<u>Employment</u>		<u>BA</u>	<u>Employment</u>
			<u>Number</u>			
ESSA	172.9M	70.4	10,020	82.0	14.0	39.7
U.S. Lake Survey	2.3	0.9	159	1.3	Inconsequential	
National Oceanographic Data Center	2.0	0.8	135	1.1	Inconsequential	
National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center	1.8	0.7	57	-	Inconsequential	
Sea Grant Program	10.0	4.0	9	-	2.3	1.0
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	53.6	21.7	1,850	15.0	Now in Interior	
Anadromous Fish Program	2.7	1.1	13	-	Now in Interior	
Marine Fish	1.0	0.4	70	-	Now in Interior	
Total	246.3 <sup>1/</sup>	100.0	12,313	99.4		

<sup>1/</sup> This proposal includes all of the NOAA proposal except the Coast Guard and NSF's Antarctic and Atmospheric Research Programs.



TABLE 3.

CONGRESSIONAL ASSIGNMENTS  
FOR ELEMENTS OF THE INTERIOR PROPOSAL

House Merchant Marine & Fisheries

Coast Guard  
C&GS of ESSA

Subcommittee on Coast Guard,  
Coast & Geodetic Survey, and  
Navigation

DemocratsRepublicans

Clark (Chairman)

Keith

Lennon

Grover

Byrne (Pa.)

Watkins

Sullivan

Schadeberg

Rogers (Fla.)

Ruppe

St. Onge

Button

Jones (N.C.)

Frey

Stubblefield

Feighan

Biaggi

Subcommittee on Fisheries and  
Wildlife Conservation

Dingell (Chairman)

Pelly

Lennon

Keith

Downing

Dellenback

Karth

Pollock

Rogers (Fla.)

Goodling

Hanna

McCloskey

Leggett

Frey

Annunzio

Long (La.)

Biaggi

Subcommittee on Oceanography

Lennon (Chairman)

Mosher

Rogers (Fla.)

Pelly

Ashley

Keith

Downing

Schadeberg

Karth

Dellenback

Hathaway

Pollock

Clark

Ruppe

St. Onge

Goodling

Jones (N.C.)

Bray

Hanna

Leggett

Feighan

Bureau of Commercial  
Fisheries

Bureau of Sport  
Fisheries &  
Wildlife  
(Partial)

Bureau of Sport  
Fisheries &  
Wildlife  
(Partial)

Sea Grant

Chairman and ranking minority member of Full Committee are ex officio  
members of all Subcommittees  
Garmatz (Chairman)

Mailliard



House Committee on Interstate & Foreign CommerceSubcommittee on Commerce & Finance

ESSA (Weather Bureau)

DemocratsRepublicans

Noss (Chairman)  
 Murphy (N.Y.)  
 Blanton  
 Stuckey  
 Eckhardt

Keith  
 Watkins  
 Harvey  
 Thompson (Ga.)

Chairman of Full Committee -- Staggers  
 Ranking Minority Member -- Springer

House Committee on Interior & Insular AffairsDepartment of the InteriorDemocratsRepublicans

(Geological Survey,  
 Bureau of Mines,  
 National Park Service,  
 irrigation & reclamation,  
 Indians)

Aspinall  
 Haley  
 Edmonson  
 Baring  
 Taylor  
 Johnson  
 Carey  
 Udall  
 Burton  
 Tunney  
 Foley  
 Kastenmeier  
 O'Hara  
 Ryan  
 Mink  
 Kee  
 Meeds  
 Kazen  
 Burlison  
 Cordova-Diaz

Saylor  
 Berry  
 Hosmer  
 Skubitz  
 Burton  
 Kyl  
 Steiger  
 Pollock  
 McClure  
 Clausen  
 Ruppe  
 Wold  
 Camp  
 Lujan



## House Committee on Public Works

Army Corps of Engineers  
(U.S. Lake Survey)

Chairman of Full Committee -- Fallon  
Ranking Minority Member -- Cramer

### Instrumentation Laboratory National Oceanographic Data Center

## House Armed Services Committee

### Subcommittee on Rivers & Harbors

#### Democrats

Blatnik (Chairman)  
Johnson (Cal.)  
Gray  
Wright  
Henderson  
Roberts  
Dorn  
McCarthy (N.Y.)  
Howard  
Anderson (Cal.)  
Caffery  
Obey

#### Republicans

Harsha  
Cramer  
Grover  
Clausen, D.H. (Cal.)  
McEwen  
Duncan  
Schadeberg  
Snyder  
Hammerschmit

#### Democrats

Rivers  
Philbin  
Hebert  
Price  
Fisher  
Bennett  
Byrne  
Stratton  
Pike  
Ichord  
Nedzi  
Lennon  
Randall  
Hagan  
Wilson  
Leggett  
Hicks  
Long  
White  
Nichols  
Brinkley  
Mollohan  
Daniel  
Cordova-Diaz

#### Republicans

Arends  
O'Konski  
Bray  
Wilson  
Gubser  
Pirnie  
Hall  
Clancy  
Stafford  
King  
Dickinson  
Whalen  
Foreman  
Hunt  
Whitehurst  
Corbett  
Beall

There are four subcommittees which are designated by number rather than function. Chairman and ranking minority member of full committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees.