

UNIVERSITY - NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

An association of Institutions
for the coordination and support
of university oceanographic facilities

UNOLS Office
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting, February 28-29, 1980
Marine Science Institute
University of California Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California

GENERAL. Dr. Robison welcomed the group to the Marine Science Institute, indicating there would be a chance to meet informally with some of MSI's Staff that evening.

The following were present:

G. Anderson, Ch.	
R. Fisher	****
G. Keller	D. Frankenberg
J. Martin	M. Johrde
B. Robison	L. Clark
J. Schubel	W. Erb
T. Treadwell	T. Stetson
J. Zeigler	

The minutes of the 15-16 November 1979 meeting were accepted with several minor changes to the wording.

1. Monitoring Foreign Post-Cruise Obligations. Mr. Erb reviewed his recent "Notice to Research Vessel Operators" numbers 40, 40 Addendum, and 57. These notices set a minimum standard for cruise reports, including calling for a schedule of compliance by the PI for specific items of the post cruise obligation.

One advantage of his scheme would be that the PI would know at the outset what the post cruise obligations were to be.

He mentioned Navy and NOAA had agreed to monitor post cruise obligations for their respective vessels.

There was discussion on how to effect enforcement. UNOLS could persuade PIs or their superiors or funding agency that it was in the general interest of the community that obligations be met. Stetson suggested the proposal budget contain an item representing the cost of meeting post cruise obligations. Dr. Frankenberg said he doubted that the NSF budget format could be modified easily, but that he would instruct program managers it was an allowable expense. Perhaps the NSF form 831, Requirements for Research Vessel Use, could be more easily altered to contain an item alerting those concerned that obligations were anticipated.

Stetson was asked to set down how he envisioned a UNOLS monitoring scheme might function. That evening Erb, Stetson, and others met to discuss how DOS and UNOLS might implement such a scheme.

The next day, Stetson reported on a mechanism for same as follows: DOS would send the list of post cruise obligations and reports to the UNOLS Office. The Office would also receive copies of letters of data transmittal and a tickler file would prompt UNOLS inquiry into why an obligation had not been met if such a letter had not been received. DOS wants to reserve the right to penalize the research vessel by not processing further foreign clearances, but as Stetson pointed out, it is not the vessel that defaults. Why jeopardize other PI's work in other areas? However, it would be an area from which pressure could be brought to bear on a delinquent PI.

After further discussion, Stetson agreed to send the Executive Committee a statement as to how post cruise monitoring might work and that this would be laid before the Annual Meeting for endorsement after assessment.

2. National Facility ALVIN. The final year of the three year award calls for a program review and evaluation by UNOLS, funding agencies, and operator. It was noted the Science Board will consider a new three year grant proposal this fall. Such an evaluation would be useful to the Board.

There was general discussion as to who could lead the UNOLS portion of the evaluation. Dr. R. Corell, chairman of the ALVIN Review Committee was to be approached in this respect. It was noted the annual ALVIN proposal review by that Committee is to take place shortly and that the elements of the evaluation will be examined.

2a. Submersible Science Study. Dr. Keller gave a short review of the progress of this study. The question of how the Study would handle deep and shallow needs had come up and the Science Assessment panel and Task Force had thought to appoint a third sub-group to look at shallow submersible needs. Candidates for this group had been put forth by the study office for review by the Council. No action was taken except to pass the following motion:

That the Submersible Science Study look at science needs without depth limitation, subject to funders' agreement.

There was concern that appointing a third panel to the Study at this date would lead to a delay in the final report.

Dr. Robison mentioned a recent workshop that had been held at UCSB on the use of shallow submersibles, in particular a one-man tethered design for up to 700 M depths. Apparently some investigators are going to work up a proposal to charter such a device.

Dr. Keller agreed to carry the sense of this Council meeting back to the Submersible Science Study panels.

3. 1980 Funding Review, 1981 Funding Forecast: Dr. Frankenberg put the following figures on the board:

<u>Budget Division</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Oceanography	\$24.1 M	\$25.9 M
IDOE/CORES	21.1 M	24.8 M
OFS	24.6 M	29.3 M

It is to be emphasized these figures are good for the present only and that they are subject to revision. Also subject to revision is the \$2.4 M shortfall for 1980 Dr. Frankenberg forecast, given continued fast developments in the fuel and funding scenes.

Also discussed under this item was the upcoming review of the Office for Oceanographic Facilities & Support at NSF by a subcommittee of the Ocean Science Board.

Dr. Frankenberg also mentioned the short and long range studies, initially being conducted by NSF, ONR, and UNOLS, which are getting started and will include the following:

MANAGEMENT: SHORT RANGE, 0-3 YEARS

To include: Status quo
Efficiency of rotating lay-ups
Criteria/definitions of excess capability
Experimentation with dedicated ship
Define reference frame for long term study

MANAGEMENT: 5 & 10 YEARS PROJECTION

Constraints: Starting point = existing fleet
1980 budget, -5%, 0%, & +5% per year

Points to be considered:

Science evolution - facility needs
Mix of facilities
Operational modes
Scheduling mechanisms

4. Planned JOI Inc. Study of Long Range R/V Requirements. After a brief discussion of past attempts by various bodies to deal with this issue, the Council agreed with Capt. Treadwell's recommendation to stay in touch with JOI Inc. and to stand ready to offer any assistance they might require. Dr. Frankenberg emphasized NSF needs community input so decisions aren't made in a vacuum.

5. Review of Draft Letter To Navy Concerning AGOR Manning. The decision to send such a letter grew out of developments at last Fall's RVOC meeting. Briefly, some at RVOC felt relief from certain manning stipulations might be sought from Navy since the Navy-owned R/Vs are public vessels and thus technically exempt. Others felt that it would be unlikely that Navy would alter the charter party agreements now governing the vessel's operation.

Capt. Treadwell distributed copies of the draft text and it was suggested that it be sent to both the Oceanographer of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Research. It was noted Navy was considering transfer of the responsibility of USN-owned UNOLS vessels to ONR.

6. Marine Technician Workshop. The Council discussed the possibility of such a workshop but did not move to hold one at this time. An earlier workshop on the subject was held at URI in January 1975. Instead, Dr. Anderson agreed to write C. Tollios, chairman of the Technology Assessment Committee, to request they consider the definition, management, and duties of such technicians at their next meeting and report to the Council on their findings.

7a. UNOLS Annual Meeting Date. It was decided to move the date for this meeting, scheduled since last August, to a week later, i.e. May 22-23, because of conflict with NSF Board meeting.

7b. Guest Speaker Candidates. Several names were put forth by members of the Council and they will be contacted to see if they can accept the engagement.

7c. Navy's Relationship to Navy-owned AGORs. Several persons present expressed optimism at the Navy's increasing interest in vessels of the UNOLS fleet that are Navy owned. It is hoped that some of the financial burden for items mandated by new regulations might be assumed by Navy.

7d. Miscellaneous. At a session attended only by the Council the problem of Council member's absences was discussed. The UNOLS Charter does not treat the problem and the group did not want to amend it at this time. The Council Chairman will take such action as he deems fit.

Thomas Stetson
Executive Secretary
UNOLS

Upcoming Meetings, 1980

Technology Assessment Committee, 15-16 April, Denver, CO
ALVIN Review Committee, 23-24 April, Woods Hole, MA
UNOLS Annual Meeting, 22-23 May, Washington, D.C.
Advisory Council at U.W., Seattle, August date unknown