

The original documents are located in Box 7, folder “Seaward Advancement Conference” of the Norman Ross Files, 1974-75 at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Norman E. Ross, Jr. donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

*Final Announcement
and Program*



**A SPECIAL CONFERENCE
ON THE
SEAWARD ADVANCEMENT
OF
INDUSTRIAL SOCIETIES**

December 2 and 3, 1974

**National Academy of Sciences
Washington, D.C.**

GENERAL SESSION
Lecture Room—NAS Building
Entrance: South side of 2100 block, C Street, N.W.

WORKSHOPS
Joseph Henry Building
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Entrance on 21st Street, N.W.

*Sponsored by the Sea Grant Office of NOAA
and the Marine Technology Society*

Chairman: Athelstan Spilhaus, NOAA

Technical Coordination: Joe A. Hanson
The Oceanic Foundation,
Hawaii

Conference Management: Elizabeth Wallace
Marine Technology
Society



About the conference...

Background:

Pushed by economic and environmental pressures on land and pulled by modern ocean technology, industrial societies are advancing seaward. Future-thinkers see the probability of seaward extension of urban/industrial activities, exploiting the food, mineral, energy, and waste recycling resources of the sea. Within the concept of a coastal society characterized by low density land areas, preservation of coastal zone natural environment, and offshore location of high density and industrial functions, a 4-year study by the University of Hawaii and The Oceanic Foundation has demonstrated the engineering feasibility, at acceptable cost, of advanced offshore platforms and marine transportation.

But society has given little recognition to the long-term socio-economic impact of the seaward advancement concept. Steps by industry have been classically single-purpose, to date. How fast and how far will seaward extension go? Will it be planned intelligently, or will it repeat the same errors committed ashore?

Conference goals:

The outcome of this incipient seaward advancement can be highly beneficial if it can be guided by prime principles of systems engineering directed toward environmental compatibility, social benefits, and long-term economic viability. To achieve this, the concept must gain the recognition and counsel of influential government administrators, industrial leaders and academics. This invitational conference, intended for a selected group of industrial, government and scientific participants, is planned for that purpose. In the workshops, participants will examine the problems and opportunities inherent in seaward extension with the following goals: 1) an informed and objective examination of the concept, and 2) clear guidance on the direction of future national efforts.

Interaction with the U.S. Senate's Ocean Policy Study Committee and representation by appropriate news media are planned to enlist public recognition of the socio-economic implications of this evolutionary movement as well as governmental commitment to intelligently planned development.

AGENDA

December 2, 1974

Morning: Concept presentation and review.

Lecture Room—Main building

- 8:30 Conference convenes. Welcome
Elizabeth Wallace, MTS
- 8:35 Introduction to the conference.
Athelstan Spilhaus, NOAA
- 8:45 Successful and unsuccessful urban systems.
Athelstan Spilhaus, NOAA
John P. Craven, State of Hawaii
- 9:30 Multiple use of structures at sea.
Ira Dyer, MIT
- 10:00 Coffee break.
- 10:20 Technical feasibility of extending urban/industrial functions seaward.
Moderator: John P. Craven, Hawaii Marine Affairs Coordinator
- 10:25 Seakeeping and seakindliness of very large floating structures.
Ludwig Seidl, Ocean Engineering, University of Hawaii
- 10:40 Concrete for ocean structures.
Ben C. Gerwick, Jr., Civil Engineering, University of California, Berkeley
- 10:55 Structures and construction of very large floating platforms.
Guy N. Rothwell, The Oceanic Foundation
- 11:10 Comparative economics of sea and land based urban/industrial systems.
Jack Davidson, Sea Grant, University of Hawaii
- 11:30 Planning the seaward advancement.
Athelstan Spilhaus, NOAA
- 12:30 Lunch. Refectory of the NAS Bldg.
(Tickets will be available at the registration desk.)

AGENDA

continued

December 2, 1974

Afternoon: Workshops 1:30 to 5:30 p.m.

Joseph Henry Building

1. Social implications of the concept.
Room 500B
2. Energetic and environmental implications of the concept.
Room 500A
3. Economic implications of the concept.
Room 500C
4. Legislative and administrative implications of the concept.
Room 600B
5. Technical implications of the concept.
Room 600A
6. Legal implications of the concept.
Room 600C
7. Guiding the evolution of the concept.
Room 800

Evening: Cocktail reception 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Great Hall — NAS Building
Entrance south side of 2100 block,
C Street, N.W.

AGENDA

December 3, 1974

Morning: Workshops continued 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

Joseph Henry Building — same rooms as previous day

Morning workshops will prepare summaries of conference results and policy recommendations.

Afternoon: 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. Lunch. Refectory of the NAS Bldg.

(Tickets available at the registration desk.)

1:30 to 5:00 p.m. Concluding general session.

Lecture Room — NAS Building

Athelstan Spilhaus will chair this concluding General Session in which Workshop Chairmen will summarize the results of each workshop.

Approximately 15 minutes will be devoted to hearing each committee chairman's report and 15 minutes allowed for questions from the floor, for a total of one half hour devoted to each of the seven workshops.

The complete staff of the Senate Ocean Policy Study Committee will be invited to join us for lunch and the concluding General Session.

5:00 p.m. Conference adjournment.

About the workshop...

The first morning's General Session will be devoted to an overview examination of the seaward advancement concept and a review of developments to date. Immediately after lunch, the workshop sessions will begin.

The principal work of the conference will be accomplished in the workshops. In addition to the general attendance, each workshop will have a panel with two co-chairmen. The workshops will begin with initial statements and discussion by the chairmen and panelists, following which the workshop audience will participate with the panelists in examining workshop topics.

The objective of each workshop is, from its own point of view, to define the problems and opportunities offered by the potential movement to sea of segments of industry and high-density residential complexes and to recommend national initiatives and policies. The matrix shown in this program provides a rough framework of preliminary topic suggestions.

At the conclusion of each workshop, the chairmen will prepare a concise summation of the problems, opportunities and policy recommendations defined during the discussion. These summaries will be presented to the concluding General Session and to the Senate Ocean Policy Study Committee. They will also appear in the February 1975 issue of the MTS Journal, which will be devoted to recapping this conference.

WORKSHOP PANELS

(Only those panelists whose participation was confirmed as of November 1, 1974, are listed here.)

1. SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPT.

Chairmen: to be confirmed

Kenneth Gayer — NSF

D. Michael Harvey — Senate Interior Committee

Edward E. Palmer — State University of New York

Fitzhugh Green — EPA

*Representative from U.S. Dept. of Interior, not yet named

2. ENERGETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPT.

Chairman: William Felling — The Ford Foundation

Chairman: Wheeler North — California Institute of Technology

Walter R. Lynn — Cornell University

William J.D. Escher — Escher Technology Associates

Lloyd O. Herwig — NSF/RANN

M. Barry Meyer — Senate Committee on Public Works

D.R. Muller — AEC

Howard Harrenstien — University of Miami

Paul W. Schmidt — Offshore Power Systems

3. ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPT.

Chairman: Myron Tribus — Xerox

Chairman: James A. Storer — NOAA

Jack Davidson — University of Hawaii

A.M. Rigg — Exxon Corporation

Barry J. Smernoff — Hudson Institute

Giulio Pontecorvo — Columbia University

Francis Christy — Resources for the Future, Inc.

4. LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPT.

Chairman: Dennis Clift — Executive Office, White House

Chairman: Robert Abel — NOAA

David H. Wallace — NOAA

WORKSHOP PANELS

continued

James P. Walsh — *Senate Commerce Committee*

Charles D. Matthews — *National Ocean Industries Association*

John H. Clotworthy — *NOAA*

Jack Bollard — *NAE/Marine Board*

5. TECHNOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPT

Chairman: Phillip Eisenberg — *Hydronautics, Inc.*

Chairman: Ira Dyer — *MIT*

A.A.H. Keil — *MIT*

Ben C. Gerwick, Jr. — *University of California, Berkeley*

Eugene Allmendinger — *University of New Hampshire*

E.P. Swatek, Jr. — *University of Delaware*

Bernard Le Mehaute — *Tetra Tech, Inc.*

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONCEPT.

Chairman: Robert Krueger — *Law offices: Nossaman, Waters, Scott, Krueger & Riordan*

Chairman: Myron Nordquist — *U.S. Department of State*

Judith Kildow — *MIT*

John P. Craven — *University of Hawaii*

David Keany — *Senate Foreign Relations Committee*

7. GUIDING THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT.

Chairmen: to be confirmed

Harold Goodwin: *NOAA, Retired*

Pharo P. Phelps — *Bechtel Corporation*

Walter A. Hahn — *Library of Congress*

Herman Kahn — *Hudson Institute (Tentative)*

Raymond J. Nelson — *Case Western Reserve University*

Edward H. Erath — *Center for Technical Service*

REGISTRATION FORM

ADVANCE REGISTRATION REQUIRED

Please print the following information:

Name _____

Address _____

Organization _____

Title _____

Registration fee: \$75.00*

Signature _____

* Because of General Session and Workshop space constraints, only pre-registration can be accepted.

Please indicate which workshops you plan to attend:

Travel and lodging to be individually arranged. (The Executive House at 1515 Rhode Island Ave., N.W. offers good, inexpensive, convenient lodging and an "educational rate" for those who have an I.D. Early reservations are advised.)

PLEASE MAIL THIS REGISTRATION FORM TO:

MARINE TECHNOLOGY SOCIETY

1730 M Street, N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20036

Attention: Elizabeth Wallace

The Conference Theme and Purpose

Future-thinkers see the inevitability of a seaward advancement of high-density living and industrial functions of society in the foreseeable future. The ultimate result could be highly efficient societies in which much of the land area is dedicated to low density functions and the natural environment is preserved to the maximum extent possible; or it could be a continued uncontrolled exploitation of terrestrial and oceanic resources. In any event, the phenomenon of seaward advancement is occurring now and shows every prospect of accelerating.

The outcome of this phenomenon can, we believe, be highly beneficial if it can be guided by prime principles of systems engineering directed toward environmental compatibility, social benefits, and long-term economic viability. To achieve this, the phenomenon must gain the recognition and counsel of influential government administrators, industrial leaders and academics. This invitational conference, intended for a selected group of participants, is planned for that purpose. In the workshops, the participants will examine the problems and opportunities inherent in seaward extension with the following goals: 1) an informed and objective examination of the concept, and 2) clear guidance for the direction of future national efforts.

As an important step in achieving the stated goals, conference representatives will interact with the U.S. Senate's Ocean Policy Study Committee to reinforce government commitment to intelligently planned development. Representation by appropriate media is planned to enlist public recognition of the concept and opportunities.



The Conference Format

The first morning of the conference will be devoted to a presentation of the seaward advancement concept and a review of the thinking on the subject thus far. Several speakers will discuss past mistakes and future opportunities in urban/industrial development and conclusions reached to date on technical feasibility, economics, and planning. For the remainder of the conference, participants will examine the problems and opportunities from a variety of informed viewpoints, and their recommendations will be discussed subsequently with the senior staff of the Senate Ocean Policy Study Committee.

The bulk of the work of the conference will be accomplished in the workshops, each of which will have a panel of informed participants, with two co-chairmen (in general, one from government and the other from the private or academic sector). And each workshop will be open to attendance by the general conference audience. We are enclosing a list of panel members under consideration, and panel co-chairmen -- both firm and tentative. We would appreciate your giving us any suggestions you have for prospective members of your panel. The invitations are going out as rapidly as possible, since time is short.

The objective of each workshop is to examine the subject area and to define the problems and opportunities offered by the potential movement to sea of large segments of industry and high-density residential development. These will be viewed in terms both of near-shore siting and of distant complexes. Each workshop should identify specifically a well-defined set of problems and opportunities in its subject realm that can be incorporated into recommendations for shaping the focus of a national-scale program.

For your consideration, we have outlined a suggested format for the workshops that would involve five steps.

1. A brief presentation, by one or both of the co-chairmen, of the workshop's objectives and the chairman's suggestions, observations, and guidelines for approaching the subject.
2. Brief statements from each of the panel members to delineate individual perspectives on problems and opportunities.
3. Approximately 2 hours of panel interaction -- with or without audience participation, by chairman's choice.
4. At least an hour or two of audience participation, during which the session would be open to interactions between the panel and the floor.



5. The conclusion of the workshop would be a concise summation by the chairmen of the problems, opportunities and recommendations that have been identified, followed by panel comments -- and by comments from the floor, if the chairmen choose to solicit them.

The products of all the workshops will be very quickly collated and summarized by a conference executive committee, to be appointed by the general chairman, for immediate presentation to the Senate Ocean Policy Study Committee. This presentation will take place at a luncheon meeting, from noon to 2:00 p.m., following the workshops' conclusion at 11:00 a.m. You can see that, with so little time for collation, we must depend on the results of each workshop to be stated very coherently and concisely.

It will assist the Senate Committee to comprehend and react to the program outlined if each workshop can categorize its recommendations according to type, so far as feasible. We suggest, a) short and long range activities, b) areas requiring research and development, c) program directions requiring modification to the federal structure, and d) efforts requiring regulation and/or funding, as potential categories. You may have others to suggest. We realize this could easily get complicated: any tendency in that direction can best be resolved in favor of simplicity and clarity.

Due to the limited facilities, it may not be possible to afford all attendees participation in the presentation to the Senate Committee. But a poll will be taken early in the conference and if there is sufficient demand, the chairman will reconvene the conference after the luncheon meeting ends and present the summary of the results, along with the Ocean Policy Study Committee's responses, to the general audience. Also, the February issue of the MTS Journal will be devoted to conference coverage. Representation by the news media at the conference is expected to contribute to public awareness of our goals.



The Conference Agenda

December 2, 1974

Morning:¹ Concept Presentation and Review

1. Successful and unsuccessful urban/industrial systems.
Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, NOAA
Dr. John P. Craven, State Marine Affairs Coordinator,
Hawaii, and Dir. of Marine Programs, U. of Hawaii
2. Technical feasibility of extending urban/industrial systems seaward.
Dr. Ludwig Seidl, Assoc. Professor of Ocean Engineering,
U. of Hawaii
Dr. Ben C. Gerwick, Jr., Professor of Civil Engineering,
U. of California, Berkeley
Guy N. Rothwell, Senior Engineer, Systems Sciences and
Engineering Div., The Oceanic Foundation, Hawaii
3. Comparative economics of sea and land based urban/industrial
complexes.
Irving P. Swatzburg, U. of Hawaii
4. Planning the seaward advancement of urban systems.
Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, NOAA

Afternoon: Workshops

1. Social implications of the concept.
2. Energetic and environmental implications of the concept.
3. Economic implications of the concept.
4. Legislative and administrative implications of the concept.
5. Technological implications of the concept.
6. Legal implications of the concept.
7. Guiding the evolution of the concept.

Evening: Cocktail Reception

December 3, 1974

Morning: Workshops - continued. Prepare summaries.

Afternoon: 12:00 - 2:00 p. m. Presentation of conference results to senior staff of
the U. S. Senate Ocean Policy Study Committee (by conference executive
committee).

2:00 - 5:00 p. m. General session for presentation of conference results
and Senate Committee reaction. (Tentative - depends on demand.)

¹Starting times to be announced.



Marine Technology Society

1730 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 659-3251

December 4, 1974



Executive Director
Elizabeth M. Wallace

Council
President
Robert B. Abel

President-Elect
John C. Calhoun

Immediate Past President
William E. Shoupp

Secretary-Treasurer
Joe S. Creager

Vice Presidents
Creighton A. Burk
William T. Burke
John V. Byrne
Anton L. Inderbitzen
Harris B. Stewart, Jr.
Robert M. White

Directors
John R. Botzum
Lincoln D. Cathers
John E. Flipse
William J. Hargis, Jr.
D. Michael Hughes
Richard M. Morse
Sheila A. Mulvihill
Stewart B. Nelson
Arthur S. Westneat

MEMORANDUM FOR Members of the Panel on Legislative and
Administrative Implications of the Concept of
the Special Conference on the Seaward Advance-
ment of Industrial Societies

Subject: Our Panel's Report

A copy of our Panel's report to the Conference is enclosed for your review. In considering changes, please understand that my pride of authorship is normally close to zero in the first place and that this was a team effort, in every sense of the word.

A copy of my observations respecting the other panel reports will be forwarded in a week or two. It needs considerable attention.

May I say what a pleasure it was working with such a talented group? I hope we'll have the opportunity of future collaboration.

Robert B. Abel
President
Marine Technology Society

Enclosure

cc:
Joe Hanson
Norman Ross ✓
Athelstan Spilhaus
Libby Wallace
David Wallace



12/7

A Special Conference on the
Seaward Advancement of Industrial Societies
Sponsored by the Sea Grant Office of NOAA
and the
Marine Technology Society

December 2-3, 1974

Legislative and Administrative Implications of the Concept

I. Fundamental Postulates

A. The panel's mandate is addressed only to offshore structures, rather than to all Seaward Expansion (e.g., fishing, supertanker traffic, etc.).

B. That the structure be multi-purpose (i.e., not limited to petroleum, etc.).

C. That this development will require cooperation between government and private industry.

D. That our panel's transactions must be carried on in the perspective of the likelihood of imposition of an extended territorial sea or economic zone beyond, which may come about.

E. That, in the general sense, adequate legislation already exists to approach the technical, administrative, financial, and sociological aspects of Seaward Advancement; the requirement could theoretically be approached by extrapolating the existing body of doctrine as far seaward as is appropriate. In other words, if the Conference consensus is that under the circumstance of an extended economic zone, the States' authority should be extended from 3 to e.g. 12 miles, we simply recommend a law so proclaiming. (Nonetheless, some legal impediments may exist to delay implementing this concept.)

F. That ideal or optimal legislation respecting this Seaward Advancement can be expressed as lying in a two-dimensional matrix:

1. Horizontally:

- a. It would be unwise for the country to plan and execute a full blown city-on-the-sea all at once.
- b. It would be no more in the country's best interests to allow the structure to develop haphazardly, piecemeal.
- c. The optimal rate and manner of such development would lie somewhere in-between. We hope our colleagues in the technological implications panel will have addressed themselves to this topic.

2. Vertical-Government Role:

- a. It would be presumptuous and self-defeating to try to impose full legislation; i.e., a fully developed body of doctrine on the system.
- b. It would be no more useful to permit a laissez-faire philosophy which would result in, e.g., no protection by, or exchange of responsibility with, the national or local authorities.
- c. The optimal development of legislation, therefore, lies somewhere between the two.

G. Whether one believes that the current degree of attention to the offshore structure concept is merited at this time, with particular reference to appropriate legislation, it is generally agreed that for the reasons stated Monday morning, this type of development is inevitable; the only question is when.

Nonetheless, this development, however Federally promoted, assisted, or cosponsored, should not be a technology project for technology's sake, but should be addressed to need and purpose.

II. Considerations to be faced in terms of formulating optimum legislation

A. Authority over these structures could be focused at the Federal, State, or local levels. Our panel recommends State because--the State is the best level for exercise of political purviews that would be involved in fostering this development, such as providing maximum investment opportunity; i.e., within the State's jurisdiction.

Such a conclusion opens up such options as amending existing CZM legislation so as to provide the States with the means for promoting these developments. This conclusion also opens up a different kind of possibility - that of giving some individual States powers over others, or even over the nation. For instance, unfortunate framing of the rights and privileges sections, if not performed adroitly, might allow one State the transportation and communications rights over the offshore structure organizations which should have been more responsive to other States, or industries in other States.

In considering the legislative assignment of relative powers among National, State, and/or local authorities, our panel considered the three classic arrangements:

1. Exclusive Federal
2. Concurrent (both Federal and State)
3. Exclusive State

Our panel feels that options 1 or 2 could apply, but not conceivably #3.

B. The form for the organization of the structure could be any of the following:

1. Federal enclave
2. Industrial corporation
3. Industrial or private (proprietor) group building and leasing space as an industrial park
4. Federal-Industrial partnership (like COMSAT)
5. Port authority
6. City or county-like structure

With apologies for not coming to grips with the situation; we lack both time and expertise. We suggest, however, that this form cannot be prescribed universally - that it should be permitted to vary with the locale and circumstances involved.

C. Assuming heavy industrial involvement, the legislative process should encompass the goal of imposing the minimum controls upon industry consistent with the national interest. To the contrary, recognition of the enormous costs involved should argue for exploration of possible inducement techniques. These may or may not include the following:

1. Tax breaks
2. Relaxation of antitrust provisions
3. Establishment of environmental constraints more compatible with the situation
4. Relaxation of public disclosure laws
5. A clear legal regime

which will allow the entrepreneurs, developers, builders, and investors, the easiest possible means of dealing with public officials or in the public domain. Interpretation of the legislation as to where permits are obtained or who or what functionary has what controls on the system should be as simple and obvious as possible.

As a general consideration, government should follow closely the development of such concepts, not hinder their consideration, remove any special legislative roadblocks, and assure that when the concepts are proven feasible (i.e., politically, socially, as well as economically consistent with national priorities), the proper legal regime is created so as not to delay its actual creation.

In this connection, it should be realized that industry is more concerned with disincentives as inducements and minimum government interference.

On the other hand, a totally laissez-faire posture on the part of government would be equally inimical, since there are some functions, appropriate only to government, which would be needed on and around these structures:

1. Safety and rescue (USCG)
2. Military protection
3. Patent and copyright protection
4. Law and order

Etc.

D. Whether the legislation is constructed all at once, trying to foresee every eventuality, or patched together piecemeal, or some happy medium, it must recognize that the population of these structures must be evolutionary.

1. Primary populations: persons directly connected to the physical functions of the structure:

- a. Handling cargo
- b. Disposing of waste
- c. Manning power plants
- d. Etc.

2. Secondary populations: persons supplying direct services to the primary populace:

- a. Food on the structure
- b. Transportation to and from the structure

3. Tertiary populations: persons furnishing amenities to 1 and 2 above:

- a. Recreation
- b. Self-government
- c. Information services (e.g., libraries)
- d. Education

It must be emphasized that the delineation among these categories is blurred, at best.

E. Legislation must recognize and allow for exercise of citizens' rights:

- 1. Voting
- 2. A degree of self-government
- 3. A degree of ownership of the space
 - a. For instance, depending on the locale, financial circumstances, etc., residents on these structures could be permitted to:
 - (1) Reside as wards of the controlling or investing authorities
 - (2) Rent quarters (per month)
 - (3) Long term leases
 - (4) Ownership toward fee simple

The panel believes that option 4 is not realistic, at present.

F. In determining the appropriate roles for Federal and State governments, it will be valuable for the legislators to adopt a dual regime similar to the Submerged Lands Act (which outlined State powers) and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (which outlined Federal powers). Whatever legislation is developed should complement these basic public laws.

The legislation may have to fix, adjust, or otherwise clarify State boundaries, as extended seaward. In the same sense, States' authorities and boundaries may have to be encompassed in the legislation to provide the Federal Government maximum mobility in dealing with other nations such as making and implementing treaties.

G. As alluded to earlier, the legislation should be sufficiently flexible to permit shifts in the nature of local jurisdiction; i.e., to allow for evolutionary government. This philosophy supposes that at some point in the evolution of the structure and its population, the population will reach a critical mass which will argue for a degree of self-government. This could be a city manager, mayor, etc. That point in time and contingency of plan should be provided for in the legislation.

H. The State Department claims that existing legislation is adequate to prevent a financial or administrative takeover by another nation. The panel, nonetheless, believes that such a prospect is sufficiently alarming to call it to the attention of the Conference.

I. The panel is uncertain as to the form the legislation ought to take in the matter, but defense aspects must inevitably be considered in two ways:

1. Protection of the structure and its populations; security
2. Use of the structure for military purposes

J. There may be areas in which offshore development concerns or impacts more than one State or local area. Failure to resolve complicated jurisdictional problems may create avoidable inhibitions and prevent a balanced and coherent legal and administrative system. Consequently, the Federal Government should consider providing formal incentives for the formation of interstate and regional authorities in appropriate areas.

III. Considerations to be faced in implementing legislation; i.e., administrative implications

A. The fundamental question to be decided, and that by legislation, is whether the Federal overview will be exercised:

1. As traditionally; i.e., by each existing Federal agency according to its mission and function, or
2. By a single offshore-responsive/responsible agency.

The arguments favoring #1 are obvious; the agencies already have these missions, authorities, and responsibilities. They are set up to carry them out.

The argument favoring option #2 relates to the great commonality: Everything happening on these structures will be happening at sea. Our panel, while admitting its natural bias, favors a least agency approach.

B. Given a decision for lead agency jurisdiction over the structure, the question of evolution rises again. Clearly, such an agency would not assume jurisdiction over a single function structure of minor nature; the owner of a Duck Blind would still obtain his permit from the Fish & Game Department.

At what point in the structure's expansion, however, would the lead agency take over?

Our panel offers the gratuitous opinion that this problem would not arise if a lead ocean agency existed now.

C. The agency in authority would have to ensure coordination with all other cognizant agencies. This could be accomplished by the technique adopted in fashioning the Senate's offshore ports bill, to wit that:

1. The agency in charge would have to circulate proposed actions for review among sister agencies.

2. A specified amount of time would be allowed for each agency's response.

3. After that period, without response, it could be legally assumed that none would be forthcoming.

In this way, private citizens or structure developers would face only single agency confrontation. This would be particularly felicitous respecting permit applications.

D. The panel generally favors consolidating the ocean missions and expertise of civil agencies.

IV. Summary

Our Panel feels that, reduced to simplest terms, what are needed are:

- A. Legislation to extend a legal regime beyond U.S. territorial limits to the geographical limits recognized as allowable under international treaty or custom.

- B. A legislative regime that would assure adequate protection to industrial entrepreneurs willing to proceed on their own initiative and investment.

C. Arrival at an optimum government/industry relationship to foster same.

D. Establishment of a lead agency to represent the Federal structure and to be responsive to needs and opportunities presented by the offshore structure concept.





U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Rockville, Md. 20852

December 20, 1974

File

MEMORANDUM FOR Dr. Athelstan F. Spilhaus
Conference Chairman
Seaward Advancement of Industrial Societies

Subject: Referenced Conference Held December 2 and 3, 1974

Inasmuch as time did not permit my responding to your mandate to present my panel's findings in perspective of those of the other four panels, I thought I might add them now as a sort of coda to my written report:

1. Economics

Dr. Jack Davidson presented several reasons why industry moves seaward. These related closely to our panel's discussion of incentives and disincentives. Our panel wishes to emphasize that the latter are just as important as the former. In fact, as industry views its options and opportunities in the oceans, it sometimes appears (according to the representatives to whom we have talked) that the institutional problems are as great or greater than the technical problems. Disincentive in this case, therefore, would relate to easing rules, regulations, laws, and procedures now governing, and often restricting, industrial activities at sea at the present time.

Dr. Davidson emphasized the need to weld legislation to any discussion of economic factors. This was, of course, assumed and implicit in all the statements of our panel. Economists and legislators, however, cannot each sit back and wait for the other to make the first move. The bullet must be bitten; it is less important who bites it first. In relation to Dr. Davidson's statement, the legislative panel had considered the possibility of public investments in terms of the legislation required. We concluded (as I am sure I made apparent) that the lead role must be in the private sector of the economy.

2. Social

In dealing with social implications, the legislative panel had to accept a basic premise--that legislation has, perforce, social underpinnings because, after all, it governs society. Nonetheless, social aspects are amorphous, as Dr. Cleveland indicated.



12127

While acknowledging the validity of Dr. Cleveland's allusions to aesthetic characteristics; e.g., the glory aspects of seaward advancement, we played them down as nebulous and therefore hard to build into legislation. We really believe that for purposes of fashioning legislation, economic considerations must supersede social and aesthetic considerations.

Respecting "attempts at excellence," Route 128 was a Federally-assisted private development. I believe the legislative panel would opt for allowance for this in legislation.

Our panel also believes in the developer/entrepreneur, but we would have emphasized industrial motivation rather than adventure as the fundamental incentive.

We devoted no attention to questions such as the size of the modules. We had enough problems of our own without getting into considerations of this type. However, it is evident that an important interface between the module's size and legislation would concern safety of the population.

The legislative panel also had considered the possibility of one of these modules seceding, perhaps joining the United Nations and becoming a member of the third world. We recognize certain self-government needs, but had to veer off short of recommending its precise form.

3. Legal

The closing moments of the legislative panel's deliberations were conducted jointly with those of the legal panel and the interaction was threaded throughout our report. In discussing the form of the stages, however, when Mr. Robert Krueger suggested that Federal and State action would have to be on a case-by-case basis, we trod this course delicately to avoid depressing industrial initiative. Industry, after all, has to have certain guarantees to make investments.

I was particularly intrigued by Mr. Krueger's discussion of finance. This was an extremely pragmatic sector of his presentation. We had thought somewhat about finances during our own panel's transactions and had considered that perhaps a special finance panel was needed to assist the conference, overall. Yet, even realizing the importance of money, we steered clear of Federal financial mechanisms.

4. Technology

The matter of relative abundance of materials bothered us; we recognized it to be a serious issue but without an obvious legislative handle. Accordingly, we carefully left it to the technical panel which handled it admirably.

Our panel gave serious consideration to how to implement a model city as Mr. Phillip Eisenberg described. As was evident in my presentation, we came up with several alternatives excluding only the NASA type of structure. We are agreeable to techniques similar to the Port Authority, but don't feel it to be universally optimal.

5. Environmental

The legislative panel particularly embraces a central philosophy, expressed by Dr. Wheeler North, relating to the need to examine the development of, and operations on, the platform as an evolutionary process. It seemed to us that this theme had to be a necessary underpinning to all of our findings.

I was also struck by the number of opportunities that the environmental panel had uncovered and presented, for the platform to make practical use of the environment as well as refrain from ruining it. This was, admittedly, something that the legislative panel had failed to take into account and, even in retrospect, we are not quite sure how we would have handled it. Practical use of undiscovered material is difficult to assess in procedural terms, without knowing what the materials are or the circumstances of their discovery.

The legislative panel also subscribes heartily to Dr. North's note of the need for freedom of existing legislation. This harmonizes completely with the legislative panel's mention of disincentives.

This report might as well end on a quixotic note. I am personally sympathetic to Dr. North's observation of the need for a strong joint Federal/Industrial Research and Development Program. The legislative panel, leaning toward industrial initiative, was going to suggest mechanisms to prevent, or at least minimize, Federal participation in the R&D program attendant upon seaward expansion, until someone happened to observe that this would mean the death knell to the Sea Grant program. At that point, by common consent, we ceased and desisted.

Bds

Robert B. Abel
Chairman, Panel on Legislative and
Administrative Implications of the Concept

cc:

Dr. White, Mrs. Wallace

Messrs. John Craven, John Clotworthy, Phillip Eisenberg, Charles Matthews,
Norman Ross, James Walsh

