

UNIVERSITY-NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

EASTERN REGION SCHEDULING GROUP

Report of Meeting

15 December 1980

The first regular meeting of the UNOLS Eastern Region Scheduling group was held in Room 642, National Science Foundation building, Washington, D. C., from 0800-1700, 15 December 1980. Chairman was R. P. Dinsmore. Attendees were:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| R. P. Dinsmore, WHOI | J. Gibbons, RSMAS |
| D. A. Moller, WHOI | G. C. Anderson, UNOLS, A/C |
| E. M. Herron, LDGO | T. R. Stetson, UNOLS Office |
| J. J. Griffin, URI | M. K. Johrde, NSF/OFS |
| J. F. Bash, URI | J. G. McMillan, NSF/OFS |
| W. Owen, U. of Del. | T. F. Forhan, NSF/OFS |
| E. B. Nelson, Duke U. | M. G. Gross, NSF/OCE |
| J. Bagrunco, GAO/Observer | |
| D. Stumpf, GAO/Observer | |

Agenda for the meeting was followed as submitted. Copy is attached.

Draft Terms of Reference dated 10 December 1980 and submitted by the Chairman were reviewed and discussed. Several changes were proposed and Amended Terms of Reference dated 15 December 1980 were approved. These are attached. These will be submitted to the West Coast Group for similar action before becoming final.

The 1981 ship funding situation was reviewed and is summarized on the attached table. For East Coast ships:

(12 Ships)

| | <u>Total Costs</u> | <u>NSF Portion</u> |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Original Proposals (6/30/80) | \$17.18M | \$12.59M |
| Current Estimates (12/15/80) | \$15.49M | \$10.66M |

It was noted that the projected fleet shortfall has been reduced by about \$1.6M in terms of total costs for these 12 ships; and about \$1.9M in terms of NSF demands. These are very encouraging results and show that by the actions taken potential shortfalls are reduced to a manageable figure. These actions include:

1. Operation of ATLANTIS II and KNORR
250 days vice 290.
2. Placing EASTWARD and VEMA out of
service earlier than planned.
3. Combining several projects onto one
cruise and deferring several others
into 1982.
4. Extending maintenance period on
CONRAD.

1981 ship schedules were reviewed. UNOLS Office submitted a list of Atlantic ship requests which have not yet been accommodated. Actions on these were as follows:

1. BANE, UNC - 12 days ONR - will be done on ISELIN
2. YENTSCH, Bigelow Lab
- 28 days NASA - CONRAD will attempt;
otherwise, no possibility exists
3. COPELAND, MBL
- 14 days NSF - OCEANUS will do (10 days)
4. DeMASTER, NCU
- 6+ days NSF - Defer to 1982 (Antarctic)
5. FROELICH, FSU
- 25 days NSF - Defer to 1982
6. HECKER, LDGO
- 20 days MBL - Assigned to CAPE HENLOPEN
7. LARSON, URI
- 30 days NSF - CONRAD will do
8. PAFFENHOFFER, Skidaway
- 21 days NSF/DOE - CZRV #1 will do
9. WALLACE, Skidaway
- 14 days NSF - Defer to 1982
10. WEISBERG, NCU
- 10 days NSF - Assigned to GYRE (if possible)
11. COLWELL, U. of Maryland
- 5 days NSF - OCEANUS will attempt

With the above action, all known Atlantic requests have been considered and acted upon.

1982 ship use requests were reviewed with the following considerations:

1. NSF now plans to support Antarctic shiptime every other year. This means that the next deployment of a UNOLS ship will be the 1982-1983 session.
2. Woods Hole holds current requests for 412 days of large ship and 368 days of intermediate shiptime. This is well below average for full ship years. Most requests are for North Atlantic with no extended voyages in sight. One cruise to Greenland Sea in February will have to be examined carefully.
3. URI sees a "normal" pattern of requests in the North Atlantic.
4. University of Miami holds requests for about 300 ship days -- somewhat below average -- mostly in Bahamas, Gulf of Mexico, and local area.
5. Lamont sees year beginning off Chile with possible efforts in Northern and West Pacific or in Equatorial Atlantic.
6. GYRE will continue its summer deployment for USGS.

The next step in 1982 ship scheduling will be the circulation of request information via the UNOLS Office and the preparation and circulation of initial ship schedules. These are to be reviewed at the May UNOLS meeting. Other coordinating meetings before then will include:

1. Large ship operators will meet to examine areas of mutual interest and to plan for the 1982-83 Antarctic deployment.
2. University of Miami, Duke, and New England Consortium will meet to plan for most effective use of coastal research vessels. Where appropriate, this will include Univ. of Delaware (CAPE HENLOPEN).
3. Woods Hole and URI will meet for cruise planning between OCEANUS and ENDEAVOR.

1982 Ship Funding: (Very preliminary outlook)

- NSF is budgeting \$22.4M which is a \$1.4 increase (7%) over 1981.
- ONR is projecting \$2.5-3.0M which is a decrease of \$0.5M over 1981.
- "OTHER" support is not yet reportable, but in the absence of a major TTO project it can be speculated at about \$5.5M.

TOTAL projected support can be estimated at about \$31M. This can be compared with 1981 support of about \$30.5M to note that the spectre of a major shortfall is again present.

Interaction with the new Federal Oceanographic Fleet Coordinating Council (FOFCC) was discussed, but too little information was known concerning the proposed activities of that group for any proposed action. It is understood that that body proposes to act as a clearing house for requirements of the Federal users.

At the request of the Chairman of UNOLS, a form (copy attached) to supplement the ship use form in order to better define supporting requirements was discussed. Questions arose regarding the applicability and use of this form. It was tabled with the request that each member provide written comments for submission to and for circulation by the UNOLS Office.

The meeting concluded with the reminder by the Chairman that it is now the obligation of each member to keep the UNOLS Office advised of all ship requests which they hold and all draft ship schedules which they develop. The next meeting of the group to review these will be during the May UNOLS meeting.


R. P. Dinsmore
Chairman

RPD:crm
Attachments

- 1) Meeting Agenda
- 2) Draft Terms of Reference
- 3) Supplemental Format --
Equipment and Technician Requirements

UNIVERSITY-NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

EASTERN REGION SCHEDULING GROUP

MEETING AGENDA

15 December 1980

Room 642

National Science Foundation

Washington, D.C.

0900 hours

1. Introduction and Background

- . Review of events and recommendations leading up to the formation of the Group.
- . Adoption of Agenda.

2. Terms of Reference

- . Purposes and procedures of the Group. Please refer to the Report of the UNOLS Working Group on Joint Ship Scheduling, 25 August 1980, and to the Summary Report of the UNOLS Semiannual Meeting, Sept.9-10 1980.
- . Adoption of Terms of Reference for the Group. See attached Draft dated 10 Dec.1980.

3. Identification of Members

- . Although it is not reasonable to expect any member to be able to commit his Institution without checking back, appointed members should be able to participate with meaningful authority.

4. 1981 Funding Situation

- . Review of current funding and impacts on 1981 operations
- . Problem areas and recommendations

5. 1981 Schedules

- . Examination and discussion of current 1981 ship schedules.
- . Overview of unaccommodated projects and problem areas.
- . Recommendations

6. 1982 Ship Use Requests

- . Review and exchange of current requests available.
- . Antarctic situation
- . Status of current cruise and schedule planning
- . Longer term planning - 1983 and beyond.

7. 1982 Funding Outlook

- . Preliminary cost and funding projections
- . Impacts on ship operations and schedules
- . Recommendations at this time?

8. Interactions with other Groups

- . Western Region
- . Federally operated ships
- . Others?

9. Timetable and Procedures for Further Action

- . Exchange of Ship Request Data
- . Development of Ship schedules
- . Funding Impacts
- . Recommendations
- . Meeting Schedule

10. Request Format for Equipment and Technician Support

- . At the last Advisory Council Meeting there was proposed a format to be added to the Ship Request Form to better define supporting requirements. A copy of this form is attached. The Chairman of UNOLS has requested that this form be examined and reactions noted.

11. Other Business

12. Summary of Actions and Recommendations

UNIVERSITY-NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM
EASTERN REGION SCHEDULING GROUP

Terms of Reference

1. The Group shall be designated the Eastern Region Ship Schedule Coordinating Group of UNOLS. (Short title: Eastern Region Scheduling Group).
2. The purpose of the Group is to serve as a mechanism within UNOLS for the development and coordination of Ship Schedules in order to assure the most effective, efficient and economic utilization of ships and associated resources.
3. Membership of the Group shall comprise authorized representatives from each UNOLS Institution in the Eastern (Atlantic) Region plus a member appointed from the UNOLS Advisory Council drawn from the Eastern Region Associate Membership. Representatives of NSF and ONR shall be included regularly as observers.
4. Chairman of the Group shall be elected annually by and from the members. Duties of the Chairman include the convening and reporting of meetings, and adherence to the purposes of the Group.
5. Meetings of the Group shall normally be held four times yearly including Spring and Fall Semi-Annual UNOLS Meetings, and at other times as may be necessary. In addition to meetings of the full Group, meetings of smaller groups representing sub-Regions and operating consortia are encouraged. Although meetings are intended to be working sessions between members, nothing precludes a potential investigator or user from attending a meeting for the purpose of discussing ship use requirements or problems.
6. Procedures of the Group for the accomplishment of its purposes shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) Close and continuing liaison between members of the Group shall be maintained.
 - b) Requests for ship use shall be submitted to the intended operating lab and to the UNOLS Office. Regional Group members shall circulate copies of ship use requests via the UNOLS Office as they are received.
It is intended that all members be aware of all requests within the region.
 - c) Initial ship operating schedules usually will be prepared by individual labs considering the UNOLS Fleet as a whole. Preliminary schedules and subsequent iterations will be circulated to all members of the Group. At this stage as well as later care shall be exercised to place the proposed use on the most appropriate ship and to avoid duplications.

- d) Meetings early in the scheduling cycle are for the purpose of developing the best possible ship schedules using the following criteria:
- . Knowledge of funded scientific programs
 - . Appropriateness of ships assigned
 - . Combining compatible projects
 - . Minimizing unproductive transits
- e) Later meetings will produce final schedules for the ensuing year assuming that both science and ships' operations funding are reasonably well known. At this stage all ship schedules will be reviewed using the above criteria and stressing both appropriateness and efficiency.
- f) Throughout the scheduling cycle, anticipated costs of ship operations *vis-a-vis* projected agency funding shall be reviewed to determine potential funding shortfalls. In such cases recommendations shall be made regarding practicable alternatives. These include:
- . Reduction of operating days
 - . Further combination of projects
 - . Deferment of projects
 - . Ship layups
- g) Based on the criteria for effective scheduling, and on the needs and resources of science and facilities funding, the Group has the authority and responsibility to recommend specific ships for temporary periods out of service. Such periods shall be included within the schedule and shall be transmitted to UNOLS and to the funding agencies, following appropriate discussions with the operating lab regarding the potentials of alternate use.
- h) From time to time summaries of available ship time will be circulated by the Group via the UNOLS Office.
- i) The evolution of major expeditions and distant voyages should be the result of scientific meetings and discussions, but the planning and scheduling for such cruises should be a long-range effort through the Group. This will ensure the widest participation possible as well as develop sound funding arrangements well in advance. Information should be communicated broadly to all potential participants.
- j) In the event that a ship is proposed to operate as a "dedicated" facility, the Group may assist in developing participation in the

facility. Conversely, the Group must ensure that investigators displaced by the dedicated operation are accorded opportunities on other vessels.

7. Recommendations of the Group in the matters given above shall be transmitted concurrently to UNOLS Members, the Advisory Council and to Federal Sponsoring Agencies.
8. Operation of the Group is on a temporary and trial basis and shall expire at any time at the direction of UNOLS.

15 December 1980

[PROPOSED FORM 12-8-80]

EQUIPMENT AND TECHNICIAN SUPPORT REQUIRED FOR PROPOSED CRUISE

| Equipment to be used: | Equipment provided by: | | Technician Support (type and amount) to be provided by: | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| | Scientist | Operator | Scientist | Operator |
| Winch, 1/2" | | | | |
| Winch, 1/4" | | | | |
| Winch, other | | | | |
| Crane | | | | |
| Navigation | | | | |
| SAIL | | | | |
| PDR | | | | |
| Water bottles | | | | |
| Thermometers | | | | |
| Radios | | | | |
| Computer | | | | |
| Other (specify) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Elaborate on special needs, such as type of water bottles, radios for scientific use, navigation equipment, etc., and technician support required:

POTENTIAL PROBLEM AREAS CONNECTED WITH EQUIPMENT/TECHNICIAN QUESTIONNAIRE

Definitions: What does a marine/electronics/computer technician do?
Is there -- or can we develop -- a standard set of duties, so that scientists know what to expect?

What are the capabilities of the operating institutions? Can they in fact provide the required services? If not, where can the scientist go to get the help he needs?

Timing -- if the scientist needs extensive pre- or post-cruise help, can this be arranged?

What are the boundary conditions? The lower limit of number of technicians required for any cruise is probably set by the operator's "ship keeping" needs. The upper limit may be set by the sponsor's willingness to fund.