

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE OCTOBER 1981
SEMIANNUAL MEETING

CONTENTS

Summary Report of the UNOLS Business Meeting	1
--	---

APPENDICES

I. Semiannual Meeting Agenda	6
II. Registered Attendees	7
III. Opening Address to UNOLS Semiannual Business Meeting	8
IV. Executive Committee Epistles	11
V. NASULGC	15
VI. Telemail Message from D. Spencer to TAC Members	16
VII. Ship Operations 1982	17
VIII. Seabeam Preliminary Request Form	19

NOVEMBER 1981

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

SUMMARY REPORT OF SEMIANNUAL MEETING UNOLS BUSINESS MEETING, October 21, 1981 COSMOS CLUB AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C.

GENERAL: The meeting was brought to order at 0920 by D. Spencer, UNOLS chairman. The numbered paragraphs below follow those of the agenda which is included as Appendix I.

A list of registered attendees is found in Appendix II.

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTION: D. Spencer welcomed those present with an opening address. Special mention was made of Mr. James Gibbons, U. Miami Marine Operations Manager, having been awarded a meritorious Public Service Award by NSF for his part in overseeing the construction of CAPE FLORIDA and CAPE HATTERAS. He made a special plea to the membership for strategies on dealing with projected deficit in fleet operation. His full remarks are recorded here in Appendix III.

2. ADVISORY COUNCIL: B. Robison summarized Council activities. He indicated the Council had dissolved the Technology Assessment Committee (see 5 below) and that members of the Council had adopted the concept of standing roles. They are summarized in the table below.

1. Fleet efficiency & effectiveness (J. Curray)
2. R/V User Manuals (D. Frankenberg)
3. Replacement & addition of ship's equipment
 - Winches/Wire (T. Rossby)
 - Computers (D. Spencer)
 - Communications (J. Van Leer)
4. Replacement, additions, retirement of fleet
 - Ship design (C. Miller)
 - Management (R. Corell)
5. Specialized facilities (T. Rossby)
6. Cooperative bulk purchases (D. Gorsline)
7. Regional ship scheduling groups (W. Sackett, East - B. Robison, West)

D. Spencer asked for further comment on the roles above and his Excom reports of September 21 which were posted on Telemail and also sent members by U.S. Mail. See Appendix IV.

SUMMARY REPORT OF SEMIANNUAL MEETING, October 21, 1981

3. SHOULD UNOLS INCORPORATE: This issue has been well discussed for several months. Upon review of the written comments, the Council recommends that UNOLS not incorporate at this time. UNOLS doesn't operate facilities or directly support programs.

In order to reduce costs Council members recommend reducing their meetings from four to three per year and a return to a single national meeting, to be held in the fall. This would fit better into the ship scheduling cycle. The East and West regional ship scheduling groups should continue to meet twice a year, or more often, as necessary.

MOTIONS: W. Gaither made a motion that semiannual meetings be kept at least for the next year; the motion passed.

Another motion was made not to incorporate but that the Advisory Council should examine the subject annually; the motion passed.

D. Frankenberg described the activities of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). This organization tracks federal budget items of interest to members throughout the budget process. The UNOLS organization has a need for timely information and D. Frankenberg expressed willingness to explore NASULGC's role further if the members wishes him to.

D. Gorsline so moved; the motion passed.

Members may be asked to vote on joining, after documentation is assembled. A sample NASULGC report is included as Appendix V.

4. RE-ADOPT UNOLS CHARTER: Discussion of the possibility that UNOLS role will change led to the likelihood of changes to the charter. This led to a request for position papers from W. Gaither and G. Shor (present) and M. Langseth and G. Keller who will be notified by H. Kennedy and C. Miller respectively.

So that there would be no question a charter existed to revise the charter was unanimously re-adopted by voice vote.

5. TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (TAC): During the past summer TAC called the Advisory Council's attention to several difficulties inherent in the pursuit of their goals. In August the Council resolved to ask the membership to endorse their recommendation that TAC be dissolved. B. Robison reviewed the reasons leading to this decision and the membership endorsed the recommendation. Appendix VI is the statement put on Telemail in September to TAC Members.

6. REPORT OF SHIP SCHEDULING GROUP CHAIRMEN: The East and West Regional Ship Scheduling Groups had met the previous day to review 1982 schedules, determine if any funded program was omitted and assess the cost of what is

SUMMARY REPORT OF SEMIANNUAL MEETING, October 21, 1981

proposed. R. Dinsmore presented the three tables included here as Appendix VII which summarize the scheduling groups' findings. His explanation follows:

The June 30th proposed costs and probable funding is shown on Table 1. It shows a shortfall then of about two million. This is reasonably normal inasmuch as ship costs are usually inflated and some schedules are more fantasy than real.

Table 2 is the current outlook when schedules are realistic and usually correspond to the projected funding which usually doesn't change. Now, however, NSF ship funding has been severely cut and a real shortfall is upon us. The NSF cut is brought about by the total elimination of Polar Programs ship funds and a 12% cut in OFS funding. An even more austere outlook is 1983 which is forecast to be another 12% cut over 1982 (with a possible but maximum 6% add on for inflation).

Table 3 shows the individual ship profiles. Scenario No. 1 corresponds to Table 2 and shows some pretty severe cutbacks already in place: ISELIN fully layed up; ATLANTIS II, MELVILLE, and CONRAD layed up half the year. Scenario No. 2 is one of several strategies to meet the new cuts. It reflects the fact that if Polar Program ship time is eliminated, the assignment of ATLANTIS II to the Southern Ocean is obviated. Therefore, this scenario keeps the AII layed up all year and some of its programs transferred to other ships (KNORR, CONRAD, and OCEANUS). Although this action is only one of several possible, it is the most likely.

The impact of all this on Woods Hole implies that the AII may be out of service most, if not all of 1982. Some possibility exists that if Polar Programs is reinstated AII might get underway late in the year. The opportunity is presented that the SEABEAM might (and should) be installed during 1982.

The 1983 outlook is even worse. The Federal agencies are talking about permanent retirements. How this might be decided has already been the subject of long and vigorous debate. No conclusions yet. One side says that if the funding (both science and ships) is not there, we must face up to reality. The other side says the big ships are a valuable resource which must be preserved in some manner for better days ahead. It can be anticipated that this argument will heat up in the months ahead.

G. Shor, chairman of THOMAS WASHINGTON Seabeam scheduling committee, distributed forms for use by investigators for indicating 1983 interest. One such form is attached here as Appendix VIII.

7. OUTLOOK FOR FY82/83 SHIP SUPPORT:

NSF: R. La Count reported last June the Ocean Sciences Division had \$79.7M and now it was \$70.7M. Of great concern are the consequences of the 12% cut not being "across the board", i.e., all affected agencies sharing equally.

ONR: K. Kaulum said ONR had not yet received authorization to spend fully their planned funds. He presented the following:

	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
Core Programs	\$35M	Flat Funded
Special Focus Mostly facilities, e.g. Seabeam	6M	Stretched Out
	<u>41M</u>	

USGS: T. Aldrich indicated their usage might run to 150 days in 1982, but probably none in 1983 or 1984.

At this time with diminishing funds being forecast, discussion turned to the Ocean Sciences Board report, out only in draft to a few persons. Those familiar with it saw no solutions offered to the funding problems.

D. Spencer summarized by predicting emergence of new operator consortia and that if a free market place atmosphere prevailed a reduction in the fleet would inevitably follow. He asked those present to discuss and share reactions to the funding "crunch" with others at their institutions. It is time to indicate what sort of a fleet we should preserve.

8. STATUS OF VARIOUS REPORTS: T. Stetson reported on the following reports:

1. Serial ASCII Instrumentation Loop (SAIL)
R. Mesecar, OSU, ed.
2. Oceanographic Research Cranes
R. Williams, U. of Wash., ed.
3. Winches & Wire
A. Driscoll, URI, ed.
4. Submersible Science Study (S³)
W. Ryan, L-DGO, ed.
5. Ocean Sciences Board fleet assessment
Draft in limited circulation.
6. Report to NSF on Engineering Study of UNOLS Ships as Submersible Support Ship
John W. Gilbert Associates, N.A.

1. and 2. above have had sufficient review and are released as TAC (technical reports).

3. is about a month from a final draft. It will need review before being released.

4. should be released by W. Ryan by mid-November.

SUMMARY REPORT OF SEMIANNUAL MEETING, October 21, 1981

6. is an engineering study funded by UNOLS to assess the capability of the AGOR class vessels in the fleet to act as support to the submersible ALVIN. It will become part of 4. above. J. Gilbert presented his findings to the meeting. Problems center around vessel stability; the smaller AGORs would be much wetter with the articulated A-frame and ALVIN aboard.

9. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY REPLACEMENT: D. Spencer, chairman of the Search Committee, has called a meeting of that group on December 3, 1981 to evaluate the 5 proposals expected from institutions wishing to host the UNOLS Office. The membership will be asked for its approval.

10. OTHER:

a. RVOC: D. Frankenberg had attended the recent RVOC Meeting at Beaufort, N.C. He reported the RVOC was willing to take on some of the tasks the Technology Assessment Committee faced, especially in regard to ship's equipment. Uniform accounting and contractual procedures, examination of regulations and safety standards were discussed. They will also be examining how to best advertize the fleet to increase utilization.

b. REMOTE CRUISE EARLY WARNING: It was suggested by D. Spencer and others a file cataloging scientist's interest in foreign waters be kept by the UNOLS Office. W. Erb suggested Dept. of State would be interested in "early warning" aspects of this undertaking. G. Shor suggested the Office might also maintain a list of foreign research vessels as well as means to access them.

Both these projects have been implemented to some degree over the past few years.

Adjourned 1605
October 21, 1981

Thomas Stetson
Executive Secretary
UNOLS

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

SEMIANNUAL MEETING
Washington, D.C. 21 October 1981
REGISTERED ATTENDEES

T.C. Aldrich, USGS	J.G. McMillan, NSF/OCE
F.R. Alexander, NSF/OFS	*D.W. Menzel, Skidaway
*G.C. Anderson, U.WA	*C.B. Miller, OSU
J.F. Bash, URI	D.B. Milligan, ex-USN
H.L. Clark, NSF/OCE	D.A. Moller, W.H.O.I.
*R.W. Corell, UNH	A.F. Montgomery, NSF/AAEO
B.K. Cornwall, CBI	W. Owen, U.DE
J.R. Curray, SIO	*P.L. Parker, U.TX
E.R. Dieter, U.AK	*B.H. Robison, UCSB
R.P. Dinsmore, W.H.O.I.	J.J. Rooney, USCG
W.A. Erb, State Dept.	*T.C. Royer, U.AK
T.F. Forhan, NSF/OCE	W.M. Sackett, U. So. Fla.
*D. Frankenberg, UNC	R.W. Schneider, U.DE
*W.S. Gaither, U.DE	S.M. Schrobo, USN
*J.C. Gibbons, U. Miami	*R.K. Sheehan, CBI
J.W. Gilbert, J.W. Gilbert Assoc.	*G.G. Shor, Jr, SIO
D.S. Gorsline, USC	*D.W. Spencer, W.H.O.I.
G.D. Grice, W.H.O.I.	T.R. Stetson, UNOLS
*J.J. Griffin, URI	L.R. Stevens, State Dept.
M.G. Gross, NSF/OCE	D.M. Tollaksen, NORDA
*W.G. Harkness, U.HI	*T.K. Treadwell, TAMU
M.K. Jahrde, ex-NSF	*J.F. Ustach, Duke
K.W. Kaulum, ONR/NSTL	J.C. Van Leer, U. Miami
*H.V. Kennedy, L-DGO	*E.B. Veek, USC
R.R. La Count, NSF/OCE	J.B. Watkins, U.WA
R.L. Longfield, U.HI	

*Representative of UNOLS member institution

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

SEMIANNUAL MEETING

0900, Wednesday, October 21, 1981
Cosmos Club Auditorium
2121 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

1. Introduction & Welcome
-Dr. Derek W. Spencer, Chairman, UNOLS
2. UNOLS Advisory Council - A Report to the Membership
-Dr. Bruce H. Robison, Chairman
3. Should UNOLS Incorporate? -Discussion
4. Re-Adopt UNOLS Charter
5. Role of the Technology Assessment Committee
6. Report of Ship Scheduling Group Chairmen
7. Outlook for FY82/FY83 Ship Support -Forecasts by Federal Funding Agencies
8. Status of Various Reports:
 - Winches & Wires
 - Marine Cranes
 - Submersible Science Study
 - Ocean Sciences Board Fleet Assessment
9. Progress on UNOLS Executive Secretary Replacement
10. Other

OPENING ADDRESS TO UNOLS SEMIANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

October 21, 1981
Derek W. Spencer

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Good morning and welcome to the UNOLS Semiannual Business Meeting. I am pleased that we have a good attendance this day for it is apparent that we are on the brink of decisions that will affect the future of our work for several years to come.

It is with some trepidation that one ventures into Washington, DC these days for the budget knives are being wielded so effectively that one wonders if it will be necessary to walk home. Truly, the magic of excaliber pales before the wizard Stockman. This remarkable political process that we are witnessing leaves me in awe of its brilliant execution, somewhat puzzled at its motivation, but with little doubt that oceanographic science in this country will be profoundly affected both in its scope and its capabilities.

It is, of course, too early to define the extent and precise points of impact of the likely budget cuts. We will hear later in this meeting, some preliminary estimates from various agency representatives with regard to facilities support. They will not be encouraging, but they will also point out that it may be several months before the fiscal situation is clear and even then, the likelihood of future cuts is much more than a remote possibility. The uncertainty of the current situation is perhaps its most disquieting characteristic and poses dilemmas for all of us. It is not particularly good management to overestimate the severity of a crisis and institute controls that may have the effect of decreasing an effort to less than some critical mass. But it is worse to ignore the realities of the times and adopt the complacent muddle-through philosophy that led Britain from the heights of its Victorian influence to the near economic disaster of recent years.

The oceanographic community, and in this I include investigators, institutions and agencies, has had a complacent, muddle-through philosophy for a number of years.

We think our science is good and we have had the arrogance to assume that, with little effort on our part, this should be recognized and suitably rewarded with flowing streams of support. This is not a reality of the times.

In the sixties and early seventies, individuals and institutions alike joyously and freely accepted the largess of agencies who themselves were flushed with the successes of their investments. The last fifteen years have been a most exciting time. New technology, new data, new ideas, discovery heaped on discovery so that in many disciplines we have truly revolutionized the way we think about the ocean.

In the process of these achievements, two trends were occurring, the first of which is well recognized and the second is less obvious but warned of by a few sagacious individuals.

Firstly, most oceanographic institutions, certainly all of those responsible for the collection of data at sea, became heavily dependent upon agency funds.

Secondly, the methods of funding evolved so that the principal negotiations became those between individual principal investigators and program managers. This has developed to the point that many institution administrations are caught in an investigator-agency squeeze that leaves little room for institution management initiatives that may aid either investigator or agency. I think it would be an exaggeration to claim that the impotence shown by institutions to deal with some of our current problems is due solely to this squeeze, but I wonder if it is not a significant factor. I wonder too, whether we should not rethink the role of the institutions. Should they be a mechanism

to hire, house, fire and retire individuals and do little else other than pass funds from agency to PI, and reports and proposals from PI to agency. Or is there a role for institutions in program planning and operation? Perhaps they may be the only mechanism to stimulate successful interdisciplinary research. Perhaps a stronger institutional role could help remove some of the horrendous tax of proposal and panel reviewing that permeates our business, - - - and I wonder whether or not the principal role of UNOLS should be to work to strengthen institutions who are its members and associate members.

Whether or not my musings are correct, I believe that one bright side to our current problems is that we will be forced to examine closely, not only the superficialities of the status of funding of ships, but also the very fabric of the way we do business. This must, in the long run, strengthen our science.

But what of the short haul?

It is clear that we should not stop planning for future innovations in technology and facilities and Bruce Robison will later review for you some of the Advisory Council initiatives in this area.

However, we have, or are very likely to have, a most immediate pressing problem. Which of our facilities and technology should we seek to retain in the near future if over the next two years we are forced with budget cuts amounting to 30 or more percent?

For a totally unbiased individual this is a difficult question to answer for it entails judgements on the quality and frontiers of the science a few years hence in a community whose manpower will be impacted by the same cuts and whose ranks may be additionally depleted by transfer to the security of industry. For most of us with discipline and institution biases, it is an easier question to answer, but we should not be surprised if our colleagues disagree most vehemently with our position. Nevertheless, an answer to some degree must be found.

9/22/81 SENT TO - UNOLS MEMBERS
ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

0 read!

1

2 Posted: Mon Sep 21, 1981 8:11 PM EDT Msg: EGCR-1318-8294

3 From: D.SPENCER

4 TO: UNOLS

5 Subj: Executive Comm. Reports

6 Executive committee report number 1 (EXCOM-1) follows :

7

8 In response to requests for better communications within
9 UNOLS your executive committee has initiated a series of
10 executive committee reports (EXCOM). These will be
11 designed to provide current information on the activities
12 of the various UNOLS committees and to present issues for
13 your discussion and comment .

14

15 Your executive committee for 1981-82 is :

16

17 *****

18

19 Dr. Derek W. Spencer (Chairman UNOLS)

20 Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

21 Woods Hole , Mass . 02543

22 Tel : Business 617-548-1400 x2244

23 Home 617-563-5315

24 Telemail D.Spencer/ocean

25

26 Dr Dirk Frankenberg (Vice chairman UNOLS)

27 University of North Carolina

28 Chapel Hill , N.C. 27514

29 Tel : Business 919-962-1252

30 Home 919-732-4989

31 Telemail D.Frankenberg/ocean

32

33 Dr Bruce H. Robison (Chairman UNOLS Advisory Council)

34 Marine Science Institute

35 University of California

36 Santa Barbara , Calif. 93116

37 Tel : Business 805-961-3568 < messages 805-961-3764 >

38 Home 805-967-7489

39 Telemail B.Robison/ocean

40

41 Mr. Thomas Stetson (Executive Secretary UNOLS)

42 Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

43 Woods Hole , Mass . 02543

44 Tel : Business 617-548-1400 x2532

45 Home 617-548-2768

46 Telemail T.Stetson/ocean

47

48 *****

49

50 Posted: Mon Sep 21, 1981 8:15 PM EDT Msg: NGCR-1318-8303

51 From: D.SPENCER

52 TO: UNOLS

53 Subj: EXCOM-2

54

55 This is a report of the activities at the UNOLS Advisory
56 Council meeting of August 27-28 . It is not the official
57 minutes which will be approved at the next council meeting .
58 Any errors in this report are the sole responsibility of your
59 executive committee and not of the Council as a whole .

60

61 The minutes of the A.C. meeting of May 27 were approved and
62 have been distributed . The council elected Bruce Robison

63 (UCSB) as its chairman and Tom Rossby (URI) as its vice chairman
64 for 1981-82 .

65 A proposal for incorporation of UNOLS was discussed at length
66 and a decision not to recommend such action was taken . A
67 further EXCOM report on this item will follow .

68 The UNOLS A.C. has a statutory responsibility to report
69 to member institutions and sponsoring agencies on the status
70 of oceanographic facilities . In order to meet this responsibility
71 individual A.C. members have undertaken standing assignments
72 for the oversight of UNOLS activities . These assignments are

73 a) Scientific efficiency of the operation of federally funded
74 facilities J.R. Curry SIO

75 b) Review of UNOLS vessel user manuals ...D. Frankenberg UNC/CH

76 c) Oceanographic equipment , status and replacement

77 Completion of TAC reports T. Rossby URI

78 Shipboard computers D.W.Spencer WHOI

79 Ship communications and navigation .. J.C. Van Leer UM

80 d) Academic fleet replacement

81 Future oceanographic platforms ... C.Miller OSU

82 Management strategies R.W.Corell UNH

83 e) New and specialized oceanographic facilities .. H.T.Rossby URI

84 f) Cooperative bulk equipment and supplies purchases ... D.S.Gorsline USC

85 h) Regional ship scheduling review

86 East coast W.M. Sackett USF

87 West coast B.H. Robison UCSB

88

89 Discussion of the recently tested UNOLS research cruise
90 assessment forms resulted in a decision to incorporate these
91 into assignment a) , above , as a basic information gathering
92 tool .

93 Discussion of the UNOLS Technology Assessment Committee and
94 its functions resulted in a decision to include the oversight
95 responsibilities in assignment c) above . This topic is
96 discussed in more detail in a later report .

97 Evaluation of the UNOLS meeting schedules resulted in a
98 decision to recommend a single annual business meeting in
99 October of each year but to continue with the East and West
100 coast regional scheduling meetings in the late spring .

101 Advisory Council meetings will be cut from 4 to 3 per year.

102 An A.C. position paper on radioactivity on UNOLS vessels
103 was discussed and approved . This position paper has been
104 mailed to all members .

105 Status reports were recieved on

106 a. UNOLS Telemail network

107 b. Submersible Science Study Report

108 c. Progress of the Executive Secretary replacement

109

110 The next meeting of the A.C. was scheduled for Oct 20 in
111 Washington D.C.

112

113 Posted: Mon Sep 21, 1981 8:18 PM EDT

Msg: 06CR-1318-8304

114 From: D.SPENCER

115 TO: UNOLS

116 Subj: EXCOM-3

117

118 The advisory council of UNOLS , at a meeting on Aug.
119 27-28 , voted unanimously to recommend the dissolution of
120 the Technology Assessment Committee (TAC) as a standing
121 committee of UNOLS . This action , which followed
122 extensive discussion , in no way reflects upon the qualities
123 or dedication of the existing and past members of TAC .
124 Rather , it reflects the realization by the advisory council
125 that the charge to the TAC committee was difficult , if not
126 impossible , to accomplish with the resources available ,
127 that the advisory council itself needs to take the full
128 responsibility for the establishment of priorities and the

129 commissioning of reports and that , with the rapidly increasing
130 travel costs , the role of all standing committees needs to
131 be examined and justified in detail .

132 Further , the recommended action does not indicate that
133 the issues under consideration by TAC are unimportant for
134 the UNOLS community . On the contrary , it is vital that
135 we continue to press for increasing the availability of
136 modern technology and facilities and we must search for the
137 most propitious and effective means to achieve this end .

138 Depending upon the extent to which a technical or facilities
139 problem has been defined it is necessary to consider a variety
140 of mechanisms including workshops , ad hoc committees or study
141 groups and contracting for specific data or reports . Input
142 to both the definition and the solution of problems is required
143 from a broad spectrum of engineers and scientists , from
144 operating institutions and from sponsoring agencies .

145 Several advisory council members have agreed to undertake
146 lead roles in the definition of the most appropriate mechanisms
147 for the various facilities assessment tasks that face us now
148 and in the future.. The specific responsibilities of the council
149 members was outlined in Executive Committee Report 1981-2 and
150 reports of their deliberations and recommendations will be
151 forwarded for your information and comment .

152 We hope that the talents of the existing TAC committee and others
153 can be brought to the assessment of many of our future needs.

154 The status of TAC will be a subject for discussion and vote
155 at the business meeting on October 21 1981 .

156

157

158

159 Posted: Mon Sep 21, 1981 8:21 PM EDT

Msg: RGCR-1318-8307

160 From: D.SPENCER

161 TO: UNOLS

162 Subj: EXCOM-4

163 The advisory council of UNOLS at a meeting on August
164 27-28 voted unanimously to recommend that UNOLS not consider
165 the step of incorporation at this time .

166 Presently , unlike many incorporated academic consortia ,
167 UNOLS does not operate , or support directly , any facilities
168 or programs . The principal need for incorporation arises
169 from the requirement to protect member institutions from
170 liability but , in its current role and limited by the terms
171 of the existing charter , there is no liability that may accrue
172 to member or associate member institutions .

173 The UNOLS charter states in section 2(a) :

174 " The purpose of the organization is to provide for community-
175 wide coordination and review of the utilization of academic
176 oceanographic facilities , opportunity for access to those
177 facilities , assessment of the current match of facilities
178 to the needs of academic oceanographic programs and recommendations
179 of priorities for replacing , modifying or improving the numbers
180 and mix of facilities for the community of users . "

181 Further , in section 12 :

182 " (a) Recommendations and decisions by UNOLS or any sub-
183 organization thereof are not binding on any member or interested
184 participant thereof .

185 (b) No legal , fiscal or contractual authority is intended,
186 granted or implied under the terms of this charter . "

187

188 A question that needs to be addressed before , or at least
189 alongside , the issue of incorporation is whether or not UNOLS
190 should operate facilities or directly support programs .
191 It is the perception of the advisory council that such reorganization
192 is not the wish of the membership but rather that UNOLS be more
193 responsive , under the existing charter , to the needs of its
194 members and associate members .

195 At this time , the members who have reported to us , either
196 verbally or in writing , are predominantly against incorporation
197 for UNOLS . The principal reasons for this attitude are
198 that incorporation is not necessary to conduct our business
199 which is principally the coordination of activities between
200 member and associate member institutions ;
201 that incorporation , particularly if UNOLS established a
202 permanent headquarters , would be costly ;
203 that incorporation as a not-for-profit organization would not allow us to lo
bby ;
204 The issue of whether or not to proceed with incorporation
205 will be up for discussion and vote at the business meeting
206 on October 21 , 1981.
207
208 Command?



WASHINGTON MEMO

(MARINE AFFAIRS)

Number 44, October 16, 1981

TO: Marine Affairs Committee
Members of the Sea Grant Association
Directors of Cooperative Extension Service (Coastal & Great Lakes States)
Cooperators/Oceans Community

FROM: Russell C. McGregor, Director of Governmental Relations
Kathryn R. Tollerton, Marine Affairs Consultant

OCS REVENUE SHARING PROPOSED TO FUND SEA GRANT PROGRAM

Legislation which provides funding for the Sea Grant Program and several other activities administered by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) from Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) revenues was introduced by House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee Chairman Walter Jones (D-NC) on Sept 25th. The revenue sharing proposal, entitled "National Ocean and Coastal Resource Management Block Grants," is Title IV of H.R. 4597. Other titles of the bill amend the OCS Land Act (Title I), the oil spill liability title of the 1978 OCS amendments (Title II), and the federal consistency provision of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), (Title III).

On October 29, the Subcommittee on Oceanography will hold a hearing on Titles III and IV. NASULGC will testify on the effect of this proposal on the Sea Grant program. Administration, state, industry and environmental witnesses have been invited. Subcommittee Chairman Norman D'Amours (D-NH) has scheduled a markup session for November 19th. Although there has been little Congressional comment on the revenue sharing proposal to date, Committee staff members indicate that it will receive a friendly hearing in the Oceanography Subcommittee and that the Subcommittee seems likely to report the title favorably in November. Mark-up on Title I is also scheduled for November, but subcommittee action on Title II is not yet scheduled. Full committee action on H.R. 4597 will not be taken until 1982. The bill has also been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, chaired by Representative James Santini (D-NV), has not yet scheduled consideration of the bill.

REVENUE SHARING PROVISIONS

H.R. 4597 proposes the establishment in the U.S. Treasury of an Ocean and Coastal Resource Management Fund. Beginning in Fiscal Year 1982, 5% of all OCS revenues, up to a maximum of \$300 million per year, would be paid into this fund. Starting in FY 84, this revenue would be disbursed, subject to annual Congressional appropriations, through National Ocean and Coastal Resource Management Block Grants to the coastal and Great Lakes states, and to U.S. territories (hereinafter referred to as "coastal states"). Block grants would be allocated to the coastal states under a formula established by Commerce Department regulations. The formula would be based on 5 equally weighted criteria: OCS oil and gas activity, coastal related coal activity, coastal related energy facilities, shoreline mileage and coastal population in states having approved section 306 coastal management programs under the 1972 Coastal Zone Management Act. Funds would be allocated to each coastal state in proportion to its share of the 5 formula criteria. (Staff members indicate that if a state could meet only 4 of the 5 criteria, the state would receive four fifths of the funds it would receive if it met all 5 criteria.) At least 30% of the block grant funds would be used for coastal state activities authorized by the 1972 Coastal Zone Management Act and the section 308 coastal energy impact program (CEIP) authorized under that law. At least 10% would be used for coastal state activities authorized under the National Sea Grant College Program Act. A minimum of 10% would be spent on coastal state activities authorized under the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act, and 10% minimum would be spent on coastal state activities

0 To all TAC members :

1

2 The advisory council of UNOLS , at a meeting on Aug.
3 27-28 , voted unanimously to recommend the dissolution of
4 the Technology Assessment Committee (TAC) as a standing
5 committee of UNOLS . This action , which followed
6 extensive discussion , in no way reflects upon the qualities
7 or dedication of the existing and past members of TAC .
8 Rather , it reflects the realization by the advisory council
9 that the charge to the TAC committee was difficult , if not
10 impossible , to accomplish with the resources available ,
11 that the advisory council itself needs to take the full
12 responsibility for the establishment of priorities and the
13 commissioning of reports and that , with the rapidly increasing
14 travel costs , the role of all standing committees needs to
15 be examined and justified in detail .

16 Further , the recommended action does not indicate that
17 the issues under consideration by TAC are unimportant for
18 the UNOLS community . On the contrary , it is vital that
19 we continue to press for increasing the availability of
20 modern technology and facilities and we must search for the
21 most propitious and effective means to achieve this end .

22 Depending upon the extent to which a technical or facilities
23 problem has been defined it is necessary to consider a variety
24 of mechanisms including workshops , ad hoc committees or study
25 groups and contracting for specific data or reports . Input
26 to both the definition and the solution of problems is required
27 from a broad spectrum of engineers and scientists , from
28 operating institutions and from sponsoring agencies .

29 Several advisory council members have agreed to undertake
30 lead roles in the definition of the most appropriate mechanisms
31 for the various facilities assessment tasks that face us now
32 and in the future . Your continued input into these discussions
33 will be sought and appreciated .

34 The reports that are currently underway , ie. the
35 crane ,SAIL and winch & wire reports , will be completed and
36 issued as TAC reports .

37 At the UNOLS meeting on October 21 I intend to ask
38 the UNOLS membership to approve the council recommendation .
39 However , I wish to emphasize that the dissolution of TAC as
40 a standing committee is not related to its members . Your
41 expertise and advice is valued and will be sought in the future
42 on a variety of tasks . I wish to thank , personally , all
43 of you for your efforts up to this time .

44 Sincerely ,

45 Derek W. Spencer
46 (Chairman UNOLS)
47

21 September 1981

10/20/81

SHIP OPERATIONS - 1982

#M

TABLE 1.

SHIP PROPOSALS 6/30/81 TO MEET PROPOSED SCIENCE

	NSF	ONR	OTH	TOTAL COST
EAST COAST	13,396	1211	2690	17,297
WEST COAST	12,105	1658	1767	15,533
TOT. FLEET	25,501	2,869	4,457	32,830

Projected Funding 6/30/81:

	23,300	3,400	5,000	31,700
SHORTFALL	<u>2,201</u>	<531>	<543>	<u>1,130</u>

TABLE 2.

SHIP REQUIREMENTS TO MEET AUTH. SCIENCE NEEDS - 10/20/81

	NSF	ONR	OTH	TOTAL COST
EAST COAST	12,139	1217	2323	15,679
WEST COAST	9,533	2340	2510	14,383
TOT FLEET	21,672	3,557	4,833	30,062

Projected Funding 10/20/81:

	20,150	3,400	4,833	28,383
SHORTFALL	<u>1,522</u>	<u>157</u>	-0-	<u>1,679</u>

For Planning Purposes, Projected NSF Funding For Ships in 1983 is between \$17.7M and \$18.8M.

TABLE 3

SCENARIO #1 - COST PROFILE
TO MEET SCIENCE REQ'S.

SCENARIO #2 - STRATEGY
TO MEET FUNDING CONSTRAINTS

	OP.	NSF	OTH.	TOT	OP	NSF	OTH	TOT
	DAYS	\$K	\$K	\$K	DAYS	\$K	\$K	\$K
EASTERN								
ATLANTIS II	214	2461	-	2461	LAYUP	300	-	300
KNORR	229	2049	447	2496	282	2530	447	2961
CONRAD	240	2088	-	2088	240	2088	-	2088
OCEANUS	240	974	563	1536	254	1029	563	1592
ENDEAVOR	259	1306	430	1736	259	1306	430	1736
ISELIN	LAYUP	200	-	200	LAYUP	200	-	200
GYRE	250	800	867	1667	250	800	867	1667
C. HATTERAS	267	723	342	1067	250	644	342	986
C. FLORIDA	181	840	65	905	200	898	65	963
C. HENLOPEN	200	35	665	700	200	35	665	700
WARFIELD	140	455	-	455	140	455	-	455
CALANUS	137	125	89	214	137	125	89	214
BLUE FIN	210	83	72	155	210	83	72	155
TOT		12139	3540	15679		10493	3540	14033
WESTERN								
MELVILLE	208	1724*	220	1944*	208	1724	220	1944
T. WASHINGTON	265	1159	1630	2789	265	1159	1630	2789
THOMPSON	266	1695	559	2254	266	1695	559	2254
WECOMA	261	1402	268	1670	261	1402	268	1670
NEW HORIZON	244	934	681	1615	244	934	681	1615
KANA KEOKI	216	212*	824	1036*	216	212	824	1036
ALPHA HELIX	200	1066	235	1301	200	1066	235	1301
VELERO IV	194	497	150	647	194	497	150	647
E.B. SCRIPPS	122	406	13	419	122	406	13	419
CAYUSE	180	297	227	524	180	297	227	524
ONAR	181	94	32	126	181	94	32	126
HOH	138	47	11	58	138	47	11	58
TOT		9533	4850	14383		9533	4850	14383
FLEET TOTAL								
		21672	8390	30062		20026	8390	28416
Projected Support								
		20150	8390	28540		20150	8390	28540
Shortfall								
		1522	-	1522		<124>	-	<124>

* Does not include 1981 Carryover Funds

