Keeping of UNOCS Fleet use.

The General recommendation is that greater use be made of accessible computer data bases.

The subject of computer assistance in UNOCS cruise scheduling and record keeping was

Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.

Richard West distributed copies (Appendix X) of a paper on "Operations and maintenance
expressed in K-cellunits" (Electronic mail memorandum to Ocean of 1 April (Appendix X).
Research vessels with ONR interest in implementation in FY 1988. These were
Research vessels with ONR interest in dissipation with the new schedule requirements for Navy-owned
Research vessels and to increase ship operation funds by $55 per year beginning in FY 1988

The Office of Naval Research's decisions to update or replace their large academic
Research vessels was set for 13-14 August at the Naval Postgraduate School in
Monterey, California.

Miscellaneous

Taking into consideration any written comments and recommendations at the meeting.

R. Discussion: Nowlin addressed prior to the August committee meeting to revise the proposal
committee operation for a two-year period. Written comments had been received only from
Nowlin and Trechsel had circulated to the PIC a first draft proposal for ongoing

Operating Proposal for the Committee
The subject of requirements for a large polar research vessel was discussed. Nowlin had presented the proposal of the NSF Division of Polar Programs (DPP) to provide the assistance of the IFP to the NSF Division of Polar Programs (DPP) in the development of the U.S. Oceanographic Community's requirements for an oceanographic research vessel that would serve as a major asset to the scientific community. The Ifp Committee's comments included the need for a vessel with a seawater tank, a good quality icebreaker, and a large complement of scientists and engineers. The committee also recommended the inclusion of a laboratory and consultant space for the scientist to conduct research aboard the new vessel. The committee also expressed concern about the cost of the vessel and the need for funding.aja

The committee also discussed the need for a large polar research vessel that would serve as a major asset to the scientific community. The Ifp Committee's comments included the need for a vessel with a seawater tank, a good quality icebreaker, and a large complement of scientists and engineers. The committee also recommended the inclusion of a laboratory and consultant space for the scientist to conduct research aboard the new vessel. The committee also expressed concern about the cost of the vessel and the need for funding.aja

The conference was well attended and the discussions were lively and informative. The committee members were enthusiastic about the potential of the new vessel and expressed their commitment to ensuring its success. The committee agreed to meet again in the future to continue the discussions and make further recommendations.
null
requirements are compromised and it would create an unacceptable environment for the personnel. An examination should be made as to which of the other system missions, such as the speed, endurance, and payload requirements, for each listed mission, are either (1) the speed requirement, (2) the endurance requirement, only, (3) the speed and payload requirements, (4) the endurance and payload requirements, (5) the speed, endurance and payload requirements, and finally (6) no requirements. For each endurance requirement, it is necessary to determine an endurance profile and a speed profile for each endurance requirement. (Some endurance requirements do not require a speed profile.)

The FIC has been asked to determine which designs are acceptable for the mission requirements shown in column 1 of those given in column 2. Therefore, the FIC suggested a parametric study in which all mission designs are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weld</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Lift</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Endurance</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000 T</td>
<td>2000 T</td>
<td>8000 T</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not clear which (combination) of these requirements force the resulting undesirable

The community are listed in column 1 of the following table:

SWATH ships for distant users from common components. SWATH/T-AOOG T-AOOGH mission study, which involves the concept of constructing several

PIC WILL BE SCHEDULED for the initial review of the study. This was the result of the

It was agreed that neither of the PIC members should poison the progress of the study by expressing any views and the PIC members were

Advanced Designs

RORO plans will be sent to the PIC members and an assessment made of the use in recent

years of CONRAD, MOORE, and WASHINGTON FOR MCS work.
recognitionation to accommodate MCS on General Purpose vessels. As background,

its would include a feasibility study of temporary vessel

geology- and geophysically-capable vessels. Generally, we speak of geophysical and geophysically-capable vessels. This is included as Appendix III. The distinction between these vessel types is quite important. When we speak of geophysics (in situ) as opposed to geophysical (underwater). This is included as Appendix III. Longshore discussed vessel requirements in support of marine geology and geophysics. The presented and compared in table form the vessel requirements for marine geology and geophysics. Also, the programs of NSF and ONR.

James Henry presented an overview of funding, vessel requirements as reflected in scientific study during the meeting. The National Program may be used in preparing this report. The remainder of the report is the National Program for the Next Five Years, a draft report before the next PC meeting deadline.

Corollary's adopted to prepare a draft report before the next PC meeting deadline.

Robert W. Kellogg, C.J. Koelle, D. R. Haines, C. G. Cross, and John

K. McElfresh were appointed to the committee to review prepared for the meeting. After discussion, the agenda

R. W. Kellogg, C. J. Koelle, D. R. Haines, C. G. Cross, and John

K. McElfresh were appointed to the committee to review the agenda.

The U.S. Fleet Improvement Committee met on 11-12 May 1987 in Washington, D.C. The committee is composed of members from various agencies.

Meeting Date: 11-12 May 1987

Washington, D.C.