UNIVERSITY - NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

UNOLS COUNCIL MEETING

SUMMARY REPORT

OCTOBER 16, 1991

Board Room
American Institute of Architects
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC

UNOLS COUNCIL MEETING REPORT

Board Room
American Institute of Architects
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC
16 October 1991

The UNOLS Council met at 0830, 16 October 1991 in the Board Room at the American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. The meeting was called by Garry Brass, Chair. Agenda items were followed except as altered herewith. Attached as Appendix I is a copy of the agenda.

ATTENDEES

UNOLS Council:
Garry Brass, Chair
Tom Johnson, Vice Chair
Larry Atkinson
Peter Betzer
Paul J. Fox
D.S. Gorsline
Dave Karl
Fennan D. Jennings
Marcus Langseth
Ken Palfrey

Participants/Observers:
Chris Andreasen, NOAA
Jack Bash, UNOLS
Bruce Cornwall, RVOC, Chesapeake Bay Inst.
Dolly Dieter, NSF
Patrick Dennis, JOI/USN
Annette DeSilva, UNOLS
John Freitag, URI
Grant Gross, NSF
Don Heinrichs, NSF/OCFS
David Johnson, NOAA
Keith Kaulum, ONR 1121 RF
Tom Kinder, ONR
Dennis Nixon, UNOLS-URI
John Ogden, Florida Inst. Oceanography
Mike Reeve, NSF
Lisa Rom, NSF
Phil Taylor, NSF
Don Wright, VIMS/College of William & Mary

APPENDICES

I. UNOLS Council Meeting Agenda, 16 Oct '91
II. Coastal Oceanography Questionnaire
III. Cruise Assessment Forms
IV. NSF Funding Slide
V. UNOLS Review Questionnaire
VI. Revised Annex I to UNOLS Charter
VII. UNOLS Council Ballot

The minutes of the July 1991 Council meeting were accepted as written.

COASTAL OCEANOGRAPHY

A mini-colloquium on Coastal Oceanography was held by a panel of experts. These were:

Name	Representing
L. Atkinson	MARCO
D. Johnson	NOAA
T. Kinder	ONR
M. Reeves	NSF
D. Wright	FIC

Don Wright opened the discussion by noting the long-term increases in interest and activity in coastal marine science causing the UNOLS Fleet Improvement Committee (FIC) to accept the task of evaluating the future research vessel and facility requirements for coastal ocean research programs by the U.S. academic community. A subcommittee of the FIC was formed to address this issue. Their tasking is: To assess the needs of the coastal oceanography community, define scientific mission requirements, draft a report summarizing the outcome of the survey and offer recommendations for addressing the identified needs. To get the study underway a questionnaire (Appendix II) was developed and distributed to the community via electronic mail. Responses to this questionnaire have begun to come in.

Tom Kinder followed stating that ONR sees a long term trend from open oceanography to coastal oceanography. With this shift will come more use of moorings, satellites and computer simulations. The studies are expected to be multi-disciplined and conducted in shallow water. Because coastal processes happen more rapidly than those in the open ocean, new sampling procedures will be required.

Dave Johnson of NOAA explained the activity of the Coastal Ocean Science Working Group (COSWG) a sub group of the Committee on Earth and Environmental Science (CEES). This group is just beginning its work in looking at coastal issues. It is chaired by John Knauss and includes representatives of all federal agencies involved in coastal studies. Their research goals are:

I. Coastal ocean water quality- Predict at what loading rates pollutants affect human and ecosystem health.
II. Coastal habitat conservation- Predict effects of physical habitat change on coastal ecosystem dynamics.
III. Conservation and use of living coastal resources - Predict effects of natural and human forces on living coastal resource variation.
IV. Conservation/use of non-living coastal resources - Predict impacts of resource utilization to optimize use.
V. Protection of life and property - Predict coastal hazards to minimize threats.

The COSWG has not considered those facilities necessary to conduct the research studies planned. Dave Johnson indicated that he would see that Garry Brass receive an invitation to a COSWG meeting to permit the UNOLS concerns for facilities to be heard.

Mike Reeves provided an NSF perspective on coastal oceanography. He indicated that in 1985 NSF decided to separate coastal oceanography from global change studies. He stated that Ken Brink was putting together a science plan for NSF. He suggested a trend toward more interdisciplinary science and the need to define where coastal oceanography ends and wetlands begins. Ship needs for the coastal areas need to be defined.

Larry Atkinson completed the initial phase of the colloquium by discussing the new consortium, Middle Atlantic Research Consortium (MARCO). Members include BBSR, William and Mary, Duke, ODU, UNC, Rutgers, Stony Brook, U. of Delaware and U. of Maryland. Their purpose is to coordinate the use of resources for oceanographic research in the mid Atlantic area. MARCO has submitted a proposal to NSF requesting funds for Mission Requirements and Concept Design for a Coastal Research Vessel.

Discussion: Considerable discussion followed. There is concern that agencies funding science need to coordinate their facility needs to enhance efficiency and to develop the critical mass necessary to build or develop facilities that are equal to the task. It is clear that numerous federal agencies are involved in the coastal oceans. The UNOLS fleet is not presently configured to respond to their perceived needs. Much more coordination is needed.

The Council and panel agreed that regional needs will dictate the design requirements of any new coastal research vessel. As a minimum, it was believed that four separate regions should be considered when preparing mission requirement statements for coastal research vessels. These are: Eastern seaboard, Florida and Gulf, West Coast and Great Lakes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

RESEARCH VESSEL OPERATORS COMMITTEE:

Bruce Cornwall, RVOC member, reported on the RVOC Annual Meeting held in September in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

RVOC Old Business:

RVOC Newsletter: The Committee agreed that the Vice Chairman should continue to publish at least two issues a year.

Federal Register Monitor: It was agreed that the clipping service provided by Ireland Consulting to monitor the Federal Register is adequate and should be continued.

Small Boat Operations: It was decided that each institute will develop their own qualification standards for small boat operations.

RVOC New Business: Under new business the following items were addressed: 1991 Salary Survey, RVOC's Safety Committee, Dennis Nixon's role Risk Manager/Legal Advisor for UNOLS, and pier safety and condition inspections. The "Research Vessel Cruise Assessment" form has been modified and new assessment form has been developed titled, "Captain's Post Cruise Report". Both forms are included in Appendix III.

RVOC Invited Speakers: Three speakers were invited to give presentations at the Fall RVOC meeting. Joe Hersey, USCG presented an overview of the Global Maritime Distress System (GMDSS). Sam Applegarth, ABS Technical Services, provided a report on the history and development of the NSF ship inspection program as it exists today. A presentation was made by Rich Finley, University of Miami, on science information systems, data gathering, and Serial ASCII Integrated Loop (SAIL).

Safety Seminar and Workshop: A safety seminar and workshop was held to review, discuss and make decisions concerning the UNOLS Research Safety Standards (RVSS), hazardous materials, waste and pollution control, and other issues.

Hazardous Materials Subcommittee Progress Report: An ad hoc committee was formed in April 1991 to address safety issues, inventory control, labeling, response guideline, transportation, disposal, handling, and training, among other hazardous material issues. The committee members include Bruce Cornwall (Chair), CBI; Linda Goad, U. of Michigan and Bill Hahn, URI.

Recommendations of this committee include:

- Identify specific problem areas and issues for future discussion.
- Expand ad hoc committee or convene a workshop to develop guidelines to address hazardous material issues.
- Change the name of Chapter 9, in the UNOLS RVSS to "Explosives and Hazardous Scientific Materials.
- Create a chapter in the UNOLS RVSS to deal with the prevention of pollution from ships and shipboard hazardous materials.
- Urge UNOLS Operators to include a section in their cruise planning manuals on hazardous materials.

RVOC recommended that the ad hoc committee prepare a statement to address shipboard hazardous waste and pollution which would include a compendium of information already available on the subject, including, the NOAA Hazardous Waste Manual, NOAA Corps Instruction 6280B, *"Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Policy, Guidance, and Training"* and the RVOC Safety Training Manual Chapter 13, "*Hazardous Materials.*" The RVOC membership reviewed the committee's proposed changes to Chapter 9 of the RVSS. A recommendation was made to add a paragraph stating that hazardous scientific materials should be shipped to Department of Transportation regulations. It was also recommended to make *"Explosives"* a stand alone chapter.

Safety Training Manual: The manual has been delivered and is an excellent training and reference document. Congratulations goes out to all those who contributed to its development.

Drug Testing: Effective 1 October 1991 all operators are required to have random drug testing program in place.

Plastic Trash: No plastic trash should be disposed at sea by UNOLS vessels.

Research Vessel Safety Standards: The three year review cycle of the RVSS by the RVOC Safety Committee started in January. Extensive revisions will be made to Chapter 8, Lifesaving Equipment; and Chapter 12, Communications. The proposed changes will be presented to the UNOLS Council for approval in their winter meeting, with final approval by the UNOLS Council in the Summer, 1992. The revised standards would be published October, 1992. Bill Hahn was selected to chair the RVOC Safety Committee.

RVOC Vice Chair: Mike Prince was selected by the RVOC membership to be Vice Chairman.

RVOC 1992 Meeting: Will be held in Lewis, De.

ALVIN REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Feenan Jennings provided a report of the ALVIN program status, ARC activities and plans for 1992.

The forecast for 1992 is very gloomy. All proposals recommended by the ARC in June, 1991 were declined in the NSF review. ALVIN/AII has a short schedule of less than 200 days and will return to WHOI in the early part of August. Of the scheduled days, 129 days are funded. NSF has funded 123 days and 6 days are funded privately. Thirty-four days are pending funding; six of these are Navy and 28 are NOAA. There are 27 days of transit in this schedule.

A discussion followed commenting on the possible causes of the decline in ALVIN use. The decline might be caused by a number of reasons. ALVIN requests are difficult to get funded because when compared to other funding requests they are expensive. This year the proposals were just as good as other years, but it basically came down to money. It was suggested that perhaps ALVIN should go to more exotic locations to attract more proposals. The light 1992 schedule was partially due to ALVIN's commitment to operate in the Mid-Atlantic Ridge; however, the work in this area never materialized.

ALVIN/AII will spend three and half months in the East Pacific including 70 unscheduled days in the port of Manzanillo, Mexico. Fifty days will follow in the Gulf of Mexico. Thirty-five days are scheduled in the Atlantic before ALVIN returns to WHOI for overhaul. ATLANTIS II will continue for the remainder of the year conducting non-ALVIN work.

ALVIN Planning Meeting: An ALVIN planning workshop will be held on Sunday, 8 December, preceding the fall AGU conference in San Francisco. The meeting is open and will be used to gain information on directions of ALVIN during the 1993-1996 period.

SEACLIFF and TURTLE: NOAA/NURP in conjunction with UNOLS will solicit proposals for SEACLIFF and TURTLE for 60 days of non-Navy funded research. NURP announced the request for proposals in early October on the electronic mail bulletin board, OCEAN. ARC will serve in an advisory capacity in this scheduling process. NOAA will provide a $5K per day consumable cost for assets.

ALVIN Archives: The ARC visited the archives at WHOI in June. The color films are deteriorating. WHOI would like to make new masters before losing data. They would also like to digitize the dive data to have the capability to be more responsive to requests for information.

Memorandum of Agreement (MOA): Don Heinrichs, NSF, pointed out that the MOA expires at the end of the calendar year. The MOA is a tripartite agreement with ONR, NSF, and NOAA. In light of ALVIN funding situation, the MOA will be carefully evaluated. ARC and UNOLS will be working with the funding agencies to review the MOA.

Submersible Science Subcommittee: The ARC will form a subcommittee to address undersea technology. As part of their tasking they will examine whether the tools of ALVIN are suitable for today's science. A two day workshop will be held to examine ALVIN's capabilities.

FLEET IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE:

Marcus Langseth, Fleet Improvement Committee (FIC) Chair reported on the fall meeting held at the Alton Jones Campus of the University of Rhode Island.

Review of Laboratory Facilities and Accommodations on UNOLS Ships - Two studies will be conducted by the FIC, one will address laboratory conditions and the other will address accommodations. The studies will be directed by Marcus Langseth and Teresa Chereskin respectively. The study on laboratories will focus on fundamentals; such as, number of labs, types, size, utilities (power, water, lighting), communications (intra-ship, ship-to-shore), flexibility (access, modularity) and shared use equipment (computers and sounders). The study on accommodations will address berthing and heads, mess accommodations, amenities (lounges, exercise room) and special features (network communications). Bob Dinsmore will be consulted. The ships from the UNOLS fleet will compared to vessels of other research fleets. Some suggested vessels include:

	INTERMEDIATE	LARGE
UNOLS	OCEANUS	THOMAS G. THOMPSON
NOAA	MILLER FREEMAN	BALDRIDGE
NON U.S.	SUROIT	METEOR II DARWIN HAKUKO MARU

SOONS Report: A report was drafted by Robert Pinkel, Fred Spiess, Dick Pittenger, and Marcus Langseth titled *"Scientific Opportunities offered by Nuclear Submarines"*. Garry Brass sent letters to Dr. Allan Bromley from the Office of Science and Technology Policy and to the Honorable H. Lawrence Garrett, III from the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Navy. The letters express UNOLS Support for efforts to encourage scientific research aboard a nuclear submarine. A response was received from the Assistant Secretary to the Navy, Canns, stating that the submersible NR-1 was designated for this use.

AGOR 24/25 Recommendations: Marcus Langseth sent a letter to ONR recommending modifications based on feedback received from AGOR 23. Patrick Dennis (JOI/USN) commented that some minor changes will be accommodated; however, major changes probably will not be possible.

OCEANUS Class Refit: Mid-life refits are scheduled for the three OCEANUS Class vessels, ENDEAVOR, OCEANUS, and WECOMA. The estimated cost per refit is $2 million. ENDEAVOR is scheduled to start her refit in October of 1992. All ships are scheduled to be completed prior to 1994 when the new admeasurement rules go into effect.

FIC Membership: Bob Dinsmore's term expired this month. Marcus Langseth will forward names of candidates to Garry Brass for appointment. It was suggested that candidates from the University of Hawaii should be considered since they have not been previously represented on the FIC.

Arctic Research Vessel: Thirty letters were received in response to the Arctic Vessel conceptual design study. In view of these responses, follow-on actions for the FIC's Small Ice-Capable Ship Subcommittee include: (1) Review and revise mission requirements for an arctic research vessel, (2) Plan a fact-finding trip aboard the Russian vessel SOROKIN to gain first hand information concerning the Thyssen/Waas hull, and (3) Prepare a preliminary design proposal for the arctic research vessel. Unless unforeseen problems are discovered the THYSSEN/WAAS hull design, which is considered an ice-cutter, will be the preferred hull form. A video of the THYSSEN/WAAS hull in operation was shown.

Coastal Ocean Facilities: A subcommittee has been formed to address the facility needs of coastal oceanography. The subcommittee includes D. Wright, Chair; P. Betzer, C. Nittrouer, T. Malone, R. Dinsmore, C. Simonstad, J. Bash (ex-officio) and M. Langseth (ex-officio). To determine the needs of coastal oceanography, the following actions have and will be taken:

(1) A questionnaire has been posted on the telemail bulletin boards OCEAN and COASTAL.NEWS requesting input from the coastal ocean community regarding their facility needs (Appendix II).
(2) Town meetings will be scheduled for 11 November in San Francisco and on 10 December at the fall San Francisco AGU meeting to provide an open forum for discussion of coastal facility needs.
(3) A meeting will be held with Coastal Ocean Processes (CoOP) to seek their input.
(4) Scientific Mission Requirements (SMR) would be developed for four regions and presented as a strawman at the December AGU town meeting. The four regions are the Eastern seaboard (Georgia to New England), the Gulf Region including the Florida coast, the West Coast including Alaska and the Great Lakes.

SHIP SCHEDULING COMMITTEE:

Regional Scheduling Meetings: Ken Palfrey reported on the ship scheduling meetings. Two regional meetings, East and West, were held in the Spring. The East Coast meeting was held on 12 June in Atlanta, Ga. and the West Coast meeting was held on 17 June in San Francisco, Ca. The concept of regional meetings was effective. It was evident at these meetings that there is a pent up demand for large ship time.

Ship Time Requests: Ken reported that many ship time request forms are not sent directly to the UNOLS Office and a few fail to get logged into the system. Each operator/scheduler should insure requests for his/her institution get appropriate distribution, including the UNOLS Office.

Fall Scheduling Meeting: **The** Fall scheduling meeting was held on 4 September in Washington, D.C. The scheduling review committee met the following day. The meetings went smoothly. Letters of guidance have been sent to operating institutions and 75 percent of these institutions have adjusted their schedules accordingly. The present schedule reflects 5600 operating days scheduled with a funding estimate of $53 million. NSF has funded approximately 4000 days with $39 million.

Some points of interest which were brought up at the meeting include:
- KNORR has been accepted by WHOI and has a full 1992 schedule.
- MELVILLE will enter into service in the spring and WASHINGTON will be retired.
- VICKERS will be in full operation with a NOAA crew.
- RIDGELY WARFIELD will be tied up as a result of a light schedule.
- ATLANTIS II and ALPHA HELIX have light schedules. ALPHA HELIX has been recommended to extend her operating region.

AGENCY REPORTS

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION: Don Heinrichs provided the NSF agency report. Larry Clark has received a "Council on Environmental Quality Fellowship" and will be gone from the Foundation for about ten months. His work will be covered by Don, assisted by Lisa Rom who has returned to the OCE branch of NSF. Don reported that Congress has not approved a final budget for 1992 however all indications were that OCE would receive an increase of 9.9% or a total of $181.06 million. This was less than the 14.4% increase requested. This budget should permit approximately $31 million available for ship operations which is considerably less that the $39+ million requested by the community at the Ship Scheduling Committee meeting in September. A summary of Congressional action is included as Appendix IV. Dolly Dieter followed Don with an update on the task of bringing the ship operating dollars requested in line with the dollars available. The requested funds had been reduced to $37 million, however, this still left a $6 million shortfall. She stated that she would be negotiating with the ship operators to bring these two numbers closer together.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH: The ONR report was given by Keith Kaulum. ONR anticipates approximately $6 million for ship operations for 1992. This is down from $6.87 million in 1991. Most of the 1992 support is expected to go on intermediate ships in the Atlantic. They anticipate supporting US research aboard the British ship Darwin for about $500,000.

Ship Construction and Renovation - Keith reported that the AGOR 23, Thomas Thompson was now in operation. All reports were very positive as to its design and operating characteristics. The ship has however taken a MOCNESS and an OBS into the Z drive screws. A tight schedule is planned for the year which includes a six week post shipyard overhaul in mid- summer. Keith further reported that Knorr was enroute to WHOI and that operational reports coming from the ship were favorable. Knorr is scheduled to spend two months alongside the Woods Hole dock for equipment outfitting. Melville is scheduled for delivery to Scripps in December or at latest February 1992. Supplemental funding for the cost overrun of these two ships is working its way through Congress.

AGOR 24 and 25 have been awarded to Scripps and WHOI respectively. The selection of the AGOR 24/25 builder yard is due in the next month or two. Both Scripps and WHOI will be involved in the technical review process for the yard selection. A Joint Program Office is being set up to coordinate the management interests between ONR and the Oceanographer for the construction of these two ships.

Other ONR Issues - ONR believes that the "Federal Fleet" should receive first priority when funding science. They support consortia in the oceanographic community for management of equipment and facilities. Keith also expressed ONR's concern about the ALVIN agreement considering the apparent waning support for this vehicle.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE: Tom Cocke provided the report for State. He reported that the computerization of the clearance procedure has promoted efficiency in his office and has allowed him to give more attention to the post cruise obligations. He indicated that there seemed to be fewer problems with clearance but that this may be the result of scientists avoiding trouble spots. Clearance requests seem to be coming in more promptly with 50% being late in 1991 as compared with 75% late submissions in 1990. Post cruise obligations appear now to be the major problem.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION: The NOAA report was given by Chris Andreasen who reported that Congress had appropriated $33.2 million for fleet modernization. NOAA has yet to decide how to expend these funds. Budget cuts in maintenance funds and health care/retirement have been experienced. A new congressional requirement of an IG inspection every six months is likely to add a significant administrative burden to the NOAA organization. NOAA has been working with the Navy to possibly take possession of several TAGOS vessels. These negotiations are still in progress.

Chris reported that NOAA and USC had signed a Memorandum of Agreement on the operation of VICKERS. ABS certification and a USCG stability letter were in hand. VICKERS sailed on 7 October with four NOAA officers in a crew of 14. To date NOAA has 50 funded days however this is expected to increase to 110. NOAA may be required to send MT. MITCHELL to the Persian Gulf opening up opportunities for possible UNOLS ship time in the Gulf of Mexico.

UNOLS ISSUES

RISK MANAGEMENT: Dennis Nixon provided a summary of his activities since being on the UNOLS staff. He assisted in the NOAA/USC agreement and provided ONR with contacts for providing salvage insurance. He has been contacted by several UNOLS institutions for risk management advice. Four UNOLS institutions have agreed to pull their resources in order to purchase group insurance. These negotiations are just beginning. Dennis encourages other institutions to join with this initial four with the expectation of yet greater savings.

REVIEW OF UNOLS: A UNOLS Review Panel has been set up to take a critical look at UNOLS and its activities. Members of this panel are: T. Johnson (Chair), B. Lewis, R. Pittenger and R. Wall. A questionnaire has been prepared to gather information (Appendix V). The panel plans to meet at the San Francisco AGU meeting in December to evaluate the questionnaire responses and proceed with a report.

ALVIN PROGRAM REVIEW: Jeff Fox reported briefly that Woods Hole had commissioned an ALVIN Program Review that was chaired by F. Spiess. A draft report for this review has been provided to WHOI.

SUBMERSIBLE SCIENCE COMMITTEE: The forming of a Submersible Science Committee as a fifth committee of UNOLS received considerable discussion. Such a committee was the recommendation of the Submersible Science Study and received favorable discussion at the January and July UNOLS Council meetings. This meeting, however, provided dissenting views. Concern was expressed that the mission of this committee overlapped that of the Alvin Review Committee. It was finally the consensus of the Council that a new committee should not be formed but that the ARC should take on this responsibility and that the makeup of this committee should be fortified to take on the new tasking.

REVIEW OF NSF SHIP INSPECTION PROGRAM: Jack Bash reported that a panel has been established and tasking provided to review the NSF Ship Inspection Program. The panel consists of J. Williams (Chair), D. DeMaster, R. Hutchinson, D. Nixon and T. Shipley. This panel expects to commence their work by the end of the year and complete the study in six months.

SAFETY PANEL SUBCOMMITTEE: A Safety Panel Subcommittee was proposed at the July Council meeting in Seattle. The Subcommittee was to provide guidance to the Council on safety matters and to review safety comments on NSF/INSURV inspection reports as well as safety comments on Ship Assessment Forms. After some discussion it was decided that since the charter did not allow for permanent subcommittees that this function should be handled by an ad hoc committee as events dictate.

MODES OF FLEET ACQUISITION AND OPERATION: At the July Council meeting in Seattle the Council proposed forming a study group to evaluate the various modes by which UNOLS and other agencies/commercial entities handle their acquisition of ships and conduct their operations. The purpose was to look at the pros and cons of each method. Difficulty was experienced in staffing this study group causing the action to be tabled.

CHANGE FOR ANNEX FOR SHIP SCHEDULING COMMITTEE: The charter annex for the Ship Scheduling Committee was updated by its chairman, Ken Palfrey and presented to the Council for approval. Approval was granted permitting the revised annex to be presented to the Membership at the Annual meeting for final acceptance. The revised annex is attached as Appendix VI.

NEW CRUISE ASSESSMENT FORMS: At the July Council meeting in Seattle Jim Williams and the RVOC were tasked to revise the Cruise Assessment Form by adding a safety statement. Additionally, they were asked to develop another form that is to be completed by the ship's master on the conduct of the cruise. These forms were presented to the Council and approved for use. It was suggested that these forms be given to the PI and the Captain at the completion of the cruise and that an envelope be provided for distribution to the marine office. The marine office would then forward the forms on to the UNOLS Office. This should encourage a greater return of the assessments. Copies of the new assessment forms are attached as Appendix III.

WEATHERBIRD II NSF INSPECTION STATUS: The Council was given the results of the follow up action on WEATHERBIRD's NSF inspection. The Council was satisfied that their safety concerns were addressed and approved WEATHERBIRD II as a UNOLS Vessel.

LANEY CHOUEST LEASE RENEWAL: The Council was informed that the Navy has, at least to date, agreed to continue funding for Laney Chouest as a tender for Sea Cliff and Turtle.

EDWIN LINK AND MAURICE EWING: The NSF Inspections for EDWIN LINK and MAURICE EWING have been completed, thus fulfilling the requirements for these two vessels to become designated UNOLS vessels. Letters are to be sent to Harbor Branch and LDGO acknowledging this fact.

COMMITTEE APPOINTEES:

ARC: The ALVIN Review Committee recommended the renewal of two members terms, Dave Cacchione and Jeff Fox. The Chair endorsed these recommended appointees.

FIC: Mark Langseth, chairman of the Fleet Improvement Committee, will submit a recommended slate to the UNOLS Chair for selection to the FIC.

RVOC: Mike Prince has been selected vice chairman of RVOC.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT: David Karl was appointed to the UNOLS Executive Committee replacing Council member, Larry Atkinson, whose term has expired.

UNOLS COUNCIL ELECTIONS: The resignations of council members George Grice and Worth Nowlin were accepted. The slate of nominees for the UNOLS Council was presented to the Council for their information. Elections will be held at the Annual Meeting. A copy of the ballot is included as Appendix VII.

CALENDAR FOR UNOLS MEETINGS: The Council considered dates and places for the 1992 UNOLS Council and Committee meetings. These were:

Meeting	Time	Place
UNOLS Council	7-8 Feb	College Sta.TAMU
UNOLS Council	26-27 Jun	Alton Jones URI
UNOLS Council	Sep-Oct	Washington DC
UNOLS Annual	Sep-Oct	Washington DC
Ship Scheduling	Late Jun	Washington DC
Ship Scheduling	Sep-Oct	Washington DC
Fleet Improvement	20 Apr	Washington DC
Fleet Improvement	Fall	TBA
RVOC	20-22 Oct	Lewes,Del.
ALVIN Review	8 Dec '91	San Francisco
ALVIN Review	Jun	Woods Hole
ALVIN Review	Dec	San Francisco

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 PM .

UNOLS COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA
8:30 a.m. - OCTOBER 16, 1991
BOARD ROOM
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS
1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

Call the Meeting: Garry Brass, UNOLS Chair, will call the meeting.

Accept Minutes of July, 1991 Council meeting.

COASTAL OCEANOGRAPHY

Coastal Oceanography: David Johnson (NOAA), Tom Kinder (ONR), Stewart Nelson (OP-096/FOFCC), Larry Atkinson (MARCO), and Don Wright (FIC) will lead a discussion on coastal oceanography. The direction of coastal oceanography and its impact on the mix of research vessels to meet future needs will be addressed.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Research Vessel Operators Committee: Jim Williams, Chair, will report on the 1991 RVOC meeting held on 10-12 September. He will advise the Council on the progress of the Hazardous Material subcommittee, the status of the Safety Training Manual, and current drug testing requirements.

ALVIN Review Committee: Feenan Jennings, Chair, will provide a status of the ALVIN programs scheduled for 1992. An update of the SEA CLIFF and TURTLE scheduling arrangement will be provided. He will report on the upcoming December ARC meeting.

Fleet Improvement Committee: Mark Langseth, Chair, will report on the October FIC meeting at Alton Jones, Rhode Island. He will provide an update on the polar research vessel design study. The status of the SOONS report will be provided.

Ship Scheduling Committee: Ken Palfrey, Chair, will review the progress of the scheduling procedure for 1992 with the results of the September scheduling meeting and review.

AGENCY REPORTS

Agency Reports: Reports from representatives of NSF (D. Heinrichs), ONR (K. Kaulum) and NOAA (C. Andreasen) on funding outlook and special projects. A report on foreign clearances will be provided by the State Department (T. Cocke).

UNOLS ISSUES

NOAA/USC VICKERS Arrangement: Chris Andreasen (NOAA) will provide a status of the NOAA/USC arrangement for operation of R/V VICKERS.

Risk Management: Dennis Nixon will discuss current issues in risk management.

ALVIN Program Review: Discussion of the ALVIN program review.

Review of UNOLS: George Grice has provided a tasking for a UNOLS review (see enclosure 1). A committee has been appointed by Garry Brass for this review.

Submersible Science Committee: A Submersible Science Committee will be formed by Garry Brass. The UNOLS membership will be asked to approve the establishment of a standing committee during the October Annual Meeting. The charge of this committee is enclosed (see attachment 1) Candidates for this committee are included in the attachment. See Dick Pittenger's comments regarding this committee (attachment 2).

Review of NSF Ship Inspection Program: Dick West has requested that UNOLS review the NSF Ship Inspection program to evaluate whether or not it fulfills the criteria for which it was established. A panel has been appointed by Garry Brass to perform the review as charged (enclosure 3).

Safety Panel Subcommittee: A permanent subcommittee is being formed by Garry Brass to oversee safety aspects of the UNOLS fleet and ships chartered by UNOLS Institutions. The proposed charge for this subcommittee is enclosed along with the proposed nominees (enclosure 4).

Modes of Fleet Acquisition and Operation: A committee will be formed by Garry Brass to assess Modes of Fleet Acquisition and Operation as charged (enclosure 5).

Change to Annex for Ship Scheduling Committee: Ken Palfrey and Jack Bash will discuss the change to the Ship Scheduling Committee Annex (enclosure 6). UNOLS membership approval of the Annex Change is required.

New Cruise Assessment Form: Jim Williams will discuss the changes made to the cruise assessment form (enclosure 7). Council approval of the new form is required.

WEATHERBIRD II ABSTECH Status: Bermuda Biological Station has provided the current standing of WEATHERBIRD II in regard to the April 1990 ABSTECH recommendations (enclosure 8).

UNOLS Vessel Status: Discussion on provisional status of EDWIN LINK and MAURICE EWING (attachment 3).

Ship Construction and Renovation: Discussion on the status of the new ship construction (THOMPSON and PALMER , see attachment 4) and ship renovations (KNORR and MELVILLE).

AGOR 24-25 Solicitation: Announcement of the AGOR 24-25 operating institution (enclosure 9).

LANEY CHOUEST Lease Renewal: Discussion on the status of the Navy's lease renewal for LANEY CHOUEST (enclosure 10)

UNOLS Council Elections: The terms of three council members will expire and two resignations have been received. The terms which expire are L. Atkinson (non-operating institution), P. Fox (at large), D. Gorsline (operation institution). Resignations were received from W. Nowlin (1 year remaining, at-large) and G. Grice (2 years remaining, operating institution). The nominating committee of G. Brass, P. Betzer, and D. Karl have provided a slate of candidates for the elections at the Annual Meeting (enclosure 11).

Executive Committee Appointment: Garry Brass will appoint a UNOLS Council member to the Executive committee to replace Larry Atkinson whose Council term is expiring.

UNOLS Appointments to Committees: The Chair will present appointments for Council endorsement.

FIC: Marcus Langseth will provide a slate of new members, if any.
ARC: Feenan Jennings will name new members, if any.
RVOC: Jim Williams will provide the name of a new vice chair of RVOC.

Calendar for UNOLS Meetings: In setting the calendar, it is reminded that the last target date for NSF proposals requiring ship time is 1 May 1992. Additionally, all requests for ALVIN time are due by mid May 1992.

MEETINGS TO BE SET:	TIME:	PLACE:
UNOLS Council	Jan-Feb 1992	Someplace Warm.
" "	July ? 1992 (2 weeks after Ship Sched)	Open
" "	Sep-Oct 1992 (with Annual)	Washington, DC
UNOLS Annual	Sep-Oct 1992	Washington, DC
Ship Scheduling	Late June ?, 1992	Washington, DC
" "	September ?, 1992	Washington, DC
Fleet Improvement Committee	Will set their own 3 meetings	
RVOC	Set Dates in September/October	
ALVIN Review Committee	December 8,1991	San Francisco, CA
" " "	June ?, 1992	Woods Hole, MA

Adjournment

Posted: Wed, Oct 2, 1991 8:13 AM PDT Msg: IGJB-4937-8145
From: D.WRIGHT.VIMS
To: ocean, coastal.news, nearshore
CC: g.brass, unols.fic, cosc.list, d.heinrichs, m.reeve, t.spence, b.haq, t.kinder
Subj: UNOLS Coastal Vessels

RESEARCH PLATFORM NEEDS FOR COASTAL OCEANOGRAPHY

Foreseeing long-term increases in interest and activity in coastal marine science, the UNOLS Fleet Improvement Committee (FIC) has accepted the task of evaluating the future research vessel and facility requirements for coastal ocean research programs by the U.S. academic community. To begin the evaluation and planning process, the FIC has established a subcommittee. Your input is required to enable this subcommittee to carry out its charge in a way that adequately represents the needs of the community.

The National Science Foundation has recently initiated multidisciplinary research programs in coastal oceanography such as: Land-Margin Ecosystem Research (LMER), Global Ocean Ecosystems Dynamics (GLOBEC), and Coastal Ocean Processes (CoOP). In addition to the NSF programs, recent NOAA initiatives include a major Coastal Ocean Program (COP) while the Ecological Research Division of the Department of Energy is supporting interdisciplinary studies of the Dynamics of Continental Margins. Additional coastal research activities are in progress or planned by ONR, EPA, USGS, MMS, NASA, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Given the projected level of coastal oceanographic research, it seems clear that a new generation of research vessels and other research platforms (e.g. moorings, aircraft, drilling rigs, etc.) capable of working effectively in the coastal realm and of accommodating the needs of relatively large interdisciplinary scientific teams will be required. We also recognize that, with a few exceptions, the existing vessels that are available for coastal studies are inadequate. The notion that ships are primarily the tools of "blue-water" oceanographers and that coastal oceanographers are best served by small, shallow draft boats is, for the most part, obsolete. The coastal community needs modern and sophisticated vessels with adequate accommodation and lab space for large teams.

Over the coming year, our subcommittee must assess the needs of the coastal oceanography community, define scientific mission requirements, and draft a report summarizing the outcome of our survey and offering recommendations for addressing the identified needs. Because coastal ocean problems and environments vary geographically, we envision that whereas some mission requirements may be universal, others are likely to be regionally specific. We thus expect our report to embody regional considerations; however, we would hope that our report would assist in the design of a vessel or vessels, capable of operating in the widest possible range of

coastal environments, including regions outside of U.S. waters. It is important to note here that at least one regional consortium, the Middle Atlantic Research Consortium for Oceanography (MARCO) has been formed and is well along in assessing the vessel requirements of oceanographers operating in the coastal waters of the Middle Atlantic region. Our subcommittee has a direct liaison with MARCO and expects to benefit from the experience attained by MARCO.

At this stage, we are offering two mechanisms for obtaining your thoughts and suggestions: (1) direct reply via e-mail or mail to this request; and (2) a "town meeting" at the forthcoming AGU Fall Meeting in San Francisco in December, probably in conjunction with the planned Coastal Ocean Processes (CoOp) town meeting. You will be notified in the near future (on these bulletin boards) of the time and place of the joint meeting once it has been scheduled. In addition, we hope to be able to hold a number of workshops as part of the FIC study.

All of your thoughts and suggestions on this subject will be welcomed. For starters, however, you might consider some of the following questions in formulating your responses.

(1) What is the nature of and source of support for your ongoing and anticipated coastal ocean research?

(2) How large are the teams involved and to what extent are they interdisciplinary?

(3) What platforms (ships, boats, COE Field Research Facility, moorings, aircraft) are you currently using?

(4) Do you have access to existing platforms and are they adequate for your research needs?

(5) What are the most significant deficiencies of the platforms available to you?

(6) What, in rough order of priority, would you consider to be the most important attributes of a coastal research vessel capable of meeting the research needs of the 21st century ?

We also invite your input as to more explicit mission requirements of a new generation coastal research vessel. To provide you with a "straw" example illustrating the kind of information required, the UNOLS "Scientific Mission Requirements for Small General-Purpose Oceanographic Research Ships" drafted July, 1988 is available on request. Please note that this set of mission requirements is provided solely for the purpose of indicating the criteria that must be considered; they are not the proposed set of requirements for the future vessel. Edit, change as you see fit.

The subcommittee membership is as follows: D. Wright (Subcommittee Chair), P. Betzer, R. Dinsmore, T. Malone, C. Nittrouer, C. Simenstad, M. Langseth (UNOLS FIC Chair), J. Bash (UNOLS Executive Secretary).

Please communicate your responses to Don Wright.

OMNET: D.WRIGHT.VIMS
FAX: 804/642-7250
PHONE: 804/642-7267
MAIL: Virginia Institute of Marine Science
College of William and Mary
Gloucester Point, Virginia 23062

Alternatively, you may give your contributions directly to any of the other members of the subcommittee.

UNIVERSITY-NATIONAL OCEANOGRAHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

An association of institutions
For the coordination and support
of university oceanographic facilities

UNOLS Office
P.O. Box 392
Saundertown, R.I. 02874

RESEARCH VESSEL CRUISE ASSESSMENT
By Chief Scientist

1. PI/Chief Scientist: _____
2. Ship: _____
3. PI/Chief Scientist Institution: _____
4. General Type of Work: _____
5. Cruise, Expedition, Leg No., and/or Project Name: _____
   Procedures Employed: _____
6. Area of Operations: _____
7. Dates of Cruise: _____
8. Days Total: _____
9. Days Transit: _____
10. Days Stations: _____
11. Days Underway Surveying: _____
12. Was Cruise Successful in Terms of Your Scientific Project? (Please circle best choice):

    Fully Partially Marginally—Successful Unsuccessful

13. What ship did you request if not this one? _____
14. Were you given adequate advance information by the operating institution concerning equipment and technician services provided? ❑ Yes ❑ No
15. Work lost because of weather: Days: _____ Stations: _____
16. Work lost because of ship, ship's scientific equipment or ship's personnel: Days: _____ Stations: _____
17. Work lost because of user provided scientific equipment: Days: _____ Stations: _____
18. Factors adversely affecting cruise success (include percentage estimate if possible):

    Main engine _____ Electric power _____ Officers & Crew _____ Other____

    Ship's Technicians _____ Pre-cruise liaison _____ Scientific equipment _____
19. Please circle equipment used:

    Crane or A-frame Winches ADCP Computers Other electronics Other (specify)

    _____
20. List safety related problems recommended for follow-up:

    _____

    _____
21. Comments, details of problems, suggestions, and praise, if appropriate, for both successful and unsuccessful cruises. (Use other side and additional pages as necessary).

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

Please forward this form to the UNOLS office via the operating institution's Marine Office—in the envelope provided. These evaluations will be used to assist operating institutions and funding agencies in their efforts to improve the quality of research vessel operations.

UNIVERSITY-NATIONAL OCEANOGRAHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

An association of institutions
For the coordination and support
of university oceanographic facilities

UNOLS Office
P.O. Box 392
Saundertown, R.I. 02874

CAPTAIN'S POST CRUISE REPORT

1. Cruise, Expedition, Leg No., and/or Project Name: _____

2. Dates of Cruise: _____ Length: _____ days _____ miles

3. Captain's Name: _____
   Sr Tech's Name: _____

4. PI/SIC: _____

5. Ship: _____
   Operating Institution: _____

6. Areas of Operation: _____

7. General Type of Work: _____

8. In Captain's and Senior Technician's judgement, were published operational objectives of shipboard phase of project achieved? ❑ Yes ❑ No

   If not, what were the factors involved?

   Ship's propulsion _____
   Electric power _____
   Crew _____
   Techs _____
   Scientific party and equipment _____
   Ship's scientific equipment _____
   Other _____

9. Work days lost due to weather: _____
   Work days lost due to ship's crew: _____
   Work days lost due to Scientific equipment: _____

10. Organization of scientific party (planning, use of time, making needs known in advance, sufficient people, etc.)

    Excellent *Good* *Average* *Below Average* *Very Poor*

11. Did Chief Scientist have reasonable expectations for the ship? ❑ Yes ❑ No

12. Did Chief Scientist have reasonable expectations for the cruise? ❑ Yes ❑ No

13. Communications/liaison between scientific party and techs/crew:

    Excellent *Good* *Average* *Below Average* *Very poor*

14. Date that safety briefing was conducted for scientific party and crew: ____/____/____/

15. List safety related problems recommended for follow-up:

    _____
    _____

16. Comments by both Captain and Senior Technician are encouraged. (Details of problems, suggestions; and praise where applicable).

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

Please forward this form to the UNOLS office via the operating institution's Marine Office. These evaluations will be used to assist operating institutions and funding agencies in their efforts to improve the quality of research vessel operations.

Summary of Congressional Action
on the FY 1992 NSF Budget Request
$M

NSF

Program	FY 1991	Request	% Inc	House	Senate	Conf	% Inc
Research	1,694.2	1,963.5	15.9%	1,960.5	1,926.0	1,879.0	10.9%
Education	322.4	390.0	21.0%	435.0	465.0	465.0	44.2%
Inst/Facil	20.0	50.0	150.0%	20.0	46.0	33.0	65.0%
Antarctica *	175.0	193.0	10.3%	193.0	88.0	88.0	-49.7%
Salaries/Exp	101.0	122.0	20.8%	109.0	117.0	109.0	7.9%
Inspec Gen	3.0	3.5	16.7%	3.3	3.5	3.5	16.7%
Total NSF	2,316.1	2,722.0	17.5%	2,720.8	2,645.5	2,577.5	11.3%

* An additional $105M is pending in the DOD appropriation bill

OCE

					----- Estimated ** -----		
Program	FY 1991	Request	% Inc	Inc	Inc	Conf	% Inc
Research	82.08	97.67	19.0%	15.59	10.70	92.78	13.0%
Facilities	47.74	54.45	14.1%	6.71	4.60	52.34	9.6%
Drilling	34.98	36.38	4.0%	1.4	0.96	35.94	2.7%
Total OCE	164.80	188.50	14.4%	23.7	16.26	181.06	9.9%

** Applies 10.9%/15.9% ratio to requested increase

R. West
10/91

The UNIVERSITY-NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM (UNOLS) was formed in 1971 recognizing the need for improved coordinated use of Federally supported oceanographic facilities. The founding objectives were "To create a mechanism for coordinated utilization of and planning for oceanographic facilities through an association of academic institutions in a national system whereby institutions can work together with funding agencies to assist in the effective use, assessment and planning for oceanographic facilities. To improve the level and stability of Federal support for academic oceanography,thereby continuing and enhancing the excellence of this nation's oceanographic program." UNOLS has evolved over these twenty years from 18 plank owners to the present 56 member institutions.

In 1988 UNOLS adopted a new charter making minor changes to the objectives yet fundamental changes to the internal structure of the organization. This change shifted the focus of the organization from primarily supporting the operating functions of the oceanographic community to a broader support for the user group. It also realigned the UNOLS Council to give this body greater responsibility by being the primary operating arm of the organization. This increased the efficiency and speed by which the organization could respond to tasking and problem solving.

UNOLS is made up of its membership, a UNOLS Council and four standing committees. These committees are: Scheduling Committee, Alvin Review Committee, Research Vessel Operators Committee and the Fleet Improvement Committee. The present objectives of UNOLS are to "coordinate and review the utilization of facilities for academic oceanographic research, access to those facilities and the current match of facilities to the need of academic oceanographic programs. UNOLS makes appropriate recommendations of priorities for replacing, modifying or improving the numbers and mix of facilities for the community of users. To foster federal and other support for academic oceanography, thereby continuing and enhancing the excellence of this nation's oceanographic program. Emphasis is placed on ships and other seagoing facilities."

Recommendations and decisions by UNOLS or sub-organizations thereof are not binding on any member or interested participant thereof. No legal, fiscal or contractual authority is intended, granted or implied under the terms of the UNOLS Charter. Membership does not ensure Federal funding.

Two questionnaires follow. One is for UNOLS ship users which is self-explanatory. The other questionnaire is for UNOLS participants. This includes those persons who have participated in UNOLS activities such as council members, committee work or as ship operators or agency representatives. If appropriate, both questionnaires should be completed.

UNOLS REVIEW

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SHIP USERS

1. Approximately how many oceanographic cruises have you participated in during the past 5 years? _____

   How many of these were aboard UNOLS vessels? _____
   U.S. non-UNOLS? _____ Foreign vessels? _____

2. What is your oceanographic discipline? Circle one. (Biology, Chemistry, Geology and Geophysics, Physics, Other).

3. Have you found the UNOLS vessels to provide an adequate common level of:

   a) instrumentation _____
   b) safety guidelines and practice _____
   c) operational procedures at sea _____

   Please elaborate briefly on any negative responses.

   _____
   _____

4. Have you found the procedures for ship scheduling and cruise planning with ship operations staff to be reasonably user friendly? _____ If not, do you have suggestions for improvement? _____
   _____

5. Have you found UNOLS ships to have improved in capabilities and/or services over the years that you have been using them?

   _____
   _____

6. If you have gone to sea in recent years aboard both UNOLS and non-UNOLS ship, how have they compared in:

   a) capability _____
   b) habitability _____
   c) safety _____
   d) expense _____
   e) technical support _____

7. Have you ever participated in any UNOLS-sponsored activities (committee work, study groups, etc)? _____ If yes, how would you characterize the experience?

_____

_____

If no, would you like to participate in the future? _____

8. Is your institution a member of UNOLS? _____ If yes, do you know who your designated institutional representative to UNOLS is and have you ever discussed UNOLS matters with him or her? _____

UNOLS REVIEW

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNOLS PARTICIPANTS

1. Do you believe that the basic rationale for the establishment of UNOLS is still valid? _____ If not, why not? _____

2. How well do you believe the UNOLS organization and activities have adapted to changing circumstances in US oceanography over its 20-year lifetime? _____

3. Are the current organization and activities of UNOLS appropriate for dealing with the major oceanographic facilities issues of the 1990's? _____ If not how might they be modified to be more effective? _____

4. UNOLS is given significant responsibilities for the coordination, planning and use of the nation's academic, seagoing facilities. It is also consciously set up to have limited authority in influencing funding decisions or facilities operations. It is a mixture of operator and non-operator institutions and is funded by federal agencies.

   Do you believe this distribution of responsibility and authority is reasonable and well-balanced or should it be modified in some way? More specifically:

   a) Should UNOLS have a greater or lesser responsibility towards general fleet wide maintenance related to safety, normally accepted capabilities, and the user survey forms which bear in part on the operating condition of shipboard systems? _____

   b) Do you believe that UNOLS should have more authority or less over the operator institutions? If so, how might that be achieved? _____

   c) In your view, how has the 1988 change to the UNOLS charter and organization affected member's participation? _____ Is the new "balance of power" between operator and non- operator institutions appropriate and working well? _____ If not, how would you recommend changing it? _____

   d) Should UNOLS have more or less independence from the Federal funding agencies? _____ And, if so, how might this be achieved? _____

5. From your knowledge of UNOLS and its activities over the past 20 years, what do you feel have been its major accomplishments and its major weaknesses or failings? _____

_____

_____

6. Is UNOLS effective in influencing funding agencies and operators in matters concerning ships? _____

ANNEX I
TO THE CHARTER

Ship Scheduling Committee

1. **An important facet of the UNOLS' activities is the provision of a mechanism to coordinate the use of available facilities.** The coordination of ship schedules is the most obvious area where immediate benefit might be gained. An underlying principle of UNOLS is that control of facility operations and scheduling remain the responsibility of the operating institution, with the understanding that UNOLS and UNOLS operating institutions will make serious efforts to assure that ships and facilities are fully available to all federally-funded users. To assure that ships and facilities are broadly available and that their use is effectively scheduled and coordinated, it is critically important that records of ship-time requests, ships and facilities available, the funding status of proposed ship use and tentative schedules be broadly disseminated in a timely fashion. It will be a responsibility of the UNOLS Council to assess and report on the effectiveness of facility utilization.

2. **A Ship Scheduling Committee** is maintained in UNOLS. The UNOLS Chair shall appoint a Ship Scheduling Committee Chair and Vice Chair from among UNOLS operator institutions, and usually in accordance with nominations from within the Committee. Normally the Chair and Vice Chair will be from opposite coasts (Atlantic/Gulf and Pacific). Terms of office will be for two years. The purpose of the Committee is to serve as a mechanism for the development and coordination of ship schedules in order to assure the most effective, efficient and economic utilization of ships and associated facilities. The Ship Scheduling Committee has its own terms of reference. Membership consists of representatives from each UNOLS operator institution. Representatives of NSF, ONR, NOAA and other sponsoring agencies shall be included regularly as observers.

   The Ship Scheduling Committee may establish subcommittees to meet and function on a regional basis, reporting then to the main committee.

3. **The Ship Scheduling Committee, supported by the UNOLS Office shall pursue an annual process of schedule development.** The process is executed so as to assure effective ship and facility support to federally-funded investigators, efficient and economic operating schedules for individual ships and the UNOLS fleet and

to provide timely information for fleet management to funding agencies, UNOLS ship operators and the research vessel user community. Procedures for schedule development include:

- collection of ship-time requests both at the operating institutions and at the UNOLS Office.

- exchange of ship-time requests and summaries among all UNOLS institutions and the UNOLS Office,

- development of tentative ship schedules by operating institutions and dissemination among all institutions and the UNOLS Office,

- meetings to consolidate knowledge of science project funding status, to compile institution estimates of operating costs, to coordinate schedules and to make recommendations concerning fleet management.

4. **Ship-time requests** are ordinarily solicited and collected by individual operating institutions. In addition, prospective investigators are required to submit an NSF-UNOLS Ship Time Request Form as a part of their Research Proposals to NSF or to notify ONR, NOAA or other sponsoring agencies of their ship time requirements. Whenever practical, requests are filled using the ship requested by the investigator. Institutions encourage submission of ship-time requests as early as practical, hopefully in January or February, prior to the operating year, although experience is that some requests will not be received until spring. Ship- time requests shall also be submitted to the UNOLS Office; these requests will be sent to all operating institutions. The UNOLS Office maintains a central file of ship-time requests for each year. The file should be accessible, to allow operators, program managers and ship users ease and flexibility of use. Successful implementation of a central ship-time request file requires that all operating institutions submit all of their ship-time requests promptly, that electronic communications be used and that a computer database system be employed. The central file of ship-time requests will be the principal mechanism for the exchange of ship-time requests.

5. **Tentative schedules** are generated by each UNOLS institution for their ships. Tentative schedules are generated as soon as operators have a basis in credible ship-time requests (routinely in the spring). Tentative schedules are exchanged with support from the UNOLS Office among operative institutions, program managers and the user community. The exchange of tentative schedules is to provide information and to

prompt negotiations to eliminate double bookings, assure accommodation of all funded science, enhance effectiveness of facility support and to improve the efficiency and economy of the overall fleet schedule. These negotiations are a critical part of the UNOLS scheduling process.

6. **Meetings of the Ship Scheduling Committee** are held as necessary, at least annually. The number and dates for meetings may be influenced by institutions' efficiency in developing and exchanging ship-time requests and tentative schedules. Practically, the timing for meetings is dictated by the flow of ship-time requests and of their science funding decisions and by the submission date for Ship Operations Proposals. A late spring regional meeting should be scheduled after most ship-time requests have been compiled and some funding decisions have been announced. The meeting should be early enough to refine tentative schedules thereby forming a basis for Ship Operations Proposals and for other aspects of fleet management. An early fall meeting is necessary to finalize ship operating schedules and to accommodate fleet operating costs to the total funding available and to the needs of sponsored science projects. Additional scheduling meetings as necessary are encouraged among regional groups and consortia of operators. These regional meetings are to prompt exchange of information on ship-time requests and tentative schedules and to promote negotiation among operators and users.

7. **The Ship Scheduling Committee** will, as a part of each meeting report, with the input of the Federal sponsoring agencies, make comprehensive recommendations regarding effective utilization of the UNOLS fleet based on criteria for ship scheduling, the ship needs of sponsored science programs and other aspects of ship management. Recommendations should include the need for additions to or deletions from the UNOLS fleet, temporary periods out of service for individual ships, or modification to schedules for individual ships or groups of ships. Recommendations should be reached through an open process, and transmitted to the UNOLS Council.

Originally adopted:	Sep 22, 1971, Palisades, NY
Amended and readopted:	May 16, 1974, Washington, DC
Amended and readopted:	May 13, 1977, Washington, DC
Readopted:	Oct 21, 1981, Washington, DC
Readopted:	May 25, 1984, Washington, DC
Amended and readopted:	Oct 23, 1987, Washington, DC
Readopted:	Oct 28, 1988, Washington, DC
Readopted:	Sep 15, 1989, Washington, DC
Amended:	Oct 17, 1991, Washington, DC

BALLOT

UNOLS COUNCIL ELECTIONS

October 17, 1991

The UNOLS Nominating Committee has assembled the following slate of candidates for the UNOLS Council positions to be filled at the 1991 Annual Meeting. This election will be held in accordance with the UNOLS Charter as adopted September, 1989. One representative from each UNOLS institution is eligible to vote. Please vote for only one candidate to fill each position. Vitae is included on backside.

UNOLS COUNCIL SLATE

AT-LARGE (term expires 10/92) - individual affiliated with any UNOLS Member Institution:

☐ Donn Gorsline
Univ. of Southern California

☐ Jeff Fox
Univ. of Rhode Island

OPERATING REPRESENTATIVE (term expires 10/93) - from among designated representatives of Member Operator institutions:

☐ Robert Knox
Scripps

☐ Richard Pittenger
Woods Hole Oceanographic Inst.

OPERATING REPRESENTATIVE (3-year term) - from among designated representatives of Member Operator institutions:

☐ Dennis Hayes
Lamont-Doherty Geol. Observatory

☐ Carolyn Thoroughgood
Univ. of Delaware

AT-LARGE (3-year term) - individual affiliated with any UNOLS Member Institution:

☐ Gregory Cutter
Old Dominion University

☐ Richard Jahnke
Skidaway Inst. of Oceanography

NON-OPERATING REPRESENTATIVE (3-year term) - from among designated representatives of Member Non-Operator institutions:

☐ Charles Nittrouer
State Univ. of NY at Stony Brook

☐ Robert Wall
University of Maine

VITAE

Donn Gorsline	W. & D. Zinsmeyer Professor of Marine Geology Department of Geological Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles Marine Geology
Paul J. Fox	Research Professor, Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, RI Marine Geology and Geophysics, Crustal and Plate Dynamics
Robert Knox	Director, Physical Oceanography Research Division & Research Oceanographer Scripps Institute of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego Physical Oceanography; Global and equatorial ocean circulation and acoustic remote sensing
Richard Pittenger	Associate Director for Marine Operations Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA Underwater Acoustics, Global change
Dennis Hayes	Associate Director Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY Marine Geology, Bathymetry, Topography, High latitude Geology
Carolyn Thoroughgood	Dean, College of Marine Studies University of Delaware, Newark, DE Marine and Biochemistry; academic and research program administration
Gregory Cutter	Associate Professor of Oceanography Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA Chemical Oceanography
Richard Jahnke	Professor of Oceanography Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, Savannah, GA Seafloor Processes, Geochemistry
Charles Nittrouer	Professor and Associate Director for Research Marine Sciences Research Center, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY Geological oceanography, continental margin, sedimentology
Robert Wall	Director of the Center for Marine Studies and Sea Grant Director University of Maine, Orono, ME Geophysics