

UNOLS COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday- Wednesday, March 29-30, 2005, 8:30 am
National Science Foundation
Stafford II Building, 595

A copy of these minutes can be downloaded as a pdf by clicking: <<200503cncmi.pdf>>.

Meeting Summary

Executive Summary

The UNOLS Council met at the National Science Foundation (NSF) in Arlington, VA on March 29-30, 2005. Major items of attention included Fleet operation budget shortfalls and Fleet renewal activities.

Bob Winokur, Federal Oceanographic Facilities Committee (FOFC) Chair, provided a status report on the FOFC Long-Range Fleet Plan update. The planned release date for the report is 30 September 2005. Dave Hebert, Fleet Improvement Committee (FIC) Chair, discussed plans to update the 1995 UNOLS Fleet Improvement Plan (FIP). The update will identify facility needs based on future science initiatives and research directions. An outline for the document was reviewed.

Federal agency plans for Fleet renewal implementation were reviewed. RADM Cohen, Chief of Naval Research, addressed the Council meeting participants via phone conference to discuss Ocean Class Acquisition. He thanked UNOLS for their efforts in recommending a hull form and the thoroughness of the process. He emphasized that the initial costs and life cycle costs are critically important for this ship Class. A construction cost of approximately \$60M can be expected. He reiterated the requirement for eight vans in a covered area and capability for UAV and helicopter hover support.

NSF and NAVSEA reported on plans for Regional Class ship acquisition. They plan to issue a solicitation for design/build teams in summer 2005. Once the RFP is issued, there would likely be a 60-day response period. Operator selection is also slated for this year. A mechanism for UNOLS representation during the process was presented. UNOLS can have two individuals on the source selection team and 6-8 representatives on a technical advisory committee. Peter Wiebe appointed a small UNOLS subcommittee to solicit volunteers and identify representatives for both the Source Select team and the UNOLS Technical Advisory group. Mike Prince has compiled community comments on the Regional Class Performance Specifications. He will provide these to NSF.

There was a lengthy discussion on agency budget projections and shortfalls, and the impact on Fleet operations. NSF has asked for advice on reducing NSF's overall Fleet operating costs. Peter Wiebe appointed a small ad hoc group to work with the Ship Scheduling Committee to address this issue. To the extent that the funds available do not meet the operational needs, they will develop a plan for ship lay-ups that will fit the budget realities and minimize impact on funded scientific programs. This plan would take into consideration longer term issues such as the impact of retirements versus lay-ups or the various forms of lay-ups ("ready to go" versus mothballed) and funding prospects in the out years.

The Council reviewed an application from Bermuda Biological Station for Research (BBSR) requesting designation of the *R/V Seward Johnson II* as a UNOLS vessel to replace the *R/V Weatherbird II*. The Council voted to approve the designation of *Seward Johnson II* as a UNOLS vessel to be operated by BBSR pending the acquisition of *Seward Johnson II* by BBSR, the successful completion of the NSF inspection of *Seward Johnson II*, and the retirement of *Weatherbird II*.

Draft terms of reference for a new UNOLS standing committee to oversee science and ship operations

for a National Oceanographic Seismic Facility were reviewed. The recommended name of the committee is the *Marcus Langseth Science Oversight Committee (MLSOC)*.

Notification and reporting of mooring locations, safety zones, and release code conflicts were discussed. UNOLS Office will investigate ways to collect information regarding installation and locations of moorings.

A white paper drafted by Terry Whitledge on ADA Guidelines and how they can be accommodated in ship designs was reviewed. It was recommended that a committee be formed and include Terry Whitledge, Dennis Nixon, a member of the Safety Committee, a Ship's Captain, and seagoing scientist with a disability. The ad hoc committee should review and provide input to the paper drafted by Terry Whitledge. Additionally the group should recommend how procedural guidelines could be established for accommodating seagoing scientists with disabilities.

The MLML UNOLS Office will complete their second 3-year term on April 30, 2006. MLML has stated their desire to host the office for one more three-year period. A small committee was appointed to review the performance of the current office. In the process of doing this review, they should seek input from all the UNOLS representatives and ask if any other institutions would be interested in competing to host the office.

Actions Items:

Minutes of the October 2005 Council Meeting – incorporate changes from Tim Cowles and Wilf Gardner	DeSilva (Complete)
Establish the 2005 Council Slate – The Nominating Committee will prepare a slate to fill Council positions (Terms ending – Wiesenburg (2 nd term) and Ortner (1 st term)).	Bruce Corliss, Chair; Eileen Hofmann, and Denis Wiesenburg
Regional Class Acquisition Process:	
Community representation in Regional Class Acquisition Process – The Ad hoc Committee shall draft a message for community distribution calling for volunteers to participate on Regional Class Government Teams (2 people as advisors on the source Select Team and 6-8 individuals as a UNOLS Advisory Group). Provide the UNOLS Chair with nominations by mid May. UNOLS Chair to shall provide NSF with the list of representatives by mid May 2005.	Dave Hebert, Wilf Gardner, Tim Askew, and Bill Martin (Complete) Peter Wiebe (complete)
Performance Specification – Mike Prince will compile community responses and provide to NSF. UNOLS will review the next draft of the Performance Specs when made available.	Mike Prince (complete) Awaiting next draft from Govt.
Designation of <i>Seward Johnson II</i> as a UNOLS Vessel – Peter Wiebe will send a letter to BBSR indicating that the Council voted to approve the designation of <i>Seward Johnson II</i> as a UNOLS vessel to be operated by BBSR pending the acquisition of the vessel by BBSR, the successful completion of the NSF ship inspection, and the retirement of the <i>Weatherbird II</i> .	Peter Wiebe (complete)

<p>National Oceanographic Seismic Facility –Revise the Terms of Reference for the MLSOC based on comments received. Provide the revised terms and nomination suggestions to Council during the summer meeting.</p>	<p>Marcia McNutt and subcommittee</p>
<p>Notification and reporting of mooring locations, safety zones, and release code conflicts – UNOLS Office will investigate ways to collect information regarding installation and locations of moorings.</p>	<p>UNOLS Office</p>
<p>Frequency Spectrum Management – Form a small committee from those who have expressed interest to liaison with Government managers.</p>	<p>Mike Prince</p>
<p>ADA Guidelines – Form an ad hoc committee to address ADA guidelines for new ship construction/conversion. The ad hoc committee should review and provide input to the paper drafted by Terry Whitledge. Additionally the group should recommend how procedural guidelines could be established for accommodating seagoing scientists with disabilities. The ad hoc committee should include Terry Whitledge (FIC), Dennis Nixon (Risk Manager), one person from the Safety Committee, Seagoing scientists with disability (Amy Bower and/or Dave Glover), Eric Buck (Ship Master, SIO), and Dolly Dieter as ex-officio. The Committee would be asked for a status report at the July Council meeting.</p>	<p>Peter Wiebe</p>
<p>Guideline for PIs submitting proposals involving seismic fieldwork – Provide a link from UNOLS web page to the NSF guidelines.</p>	<p>UNOLS Office (Complete)</p>
<p>UNOLS Response to Larry Clark letter:</p>	
<p>An Ad-hoc committee has been formed to address the concerns identified in Larry Clark’s letter and make recommendations. They will work to develop a plan for ship lay-ups that will fit the budget realities and minimize impact on funded scientific programs. With input from the Ship Scheduling Committee, the UNOLS Office, and agency representatives, they will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Determine a best estimate of the UNOLS Fleet utilization based on funded science by class, by region/season, by special requirements. 2) Estimate the ship operation funding from all sources. Evaluate the probability of NOAA funds and additional Navy funds. 3) To the extent that the funds available do not meet the operational needs, develop a plan for ship lay-ups that will fit the budget realities and minimize impact on funded scientific programs. This plan should take into consideration longer-term issues such as the impact of retirements versus lay-ups or the various forms of lay-ups (“ready to go” versus mothballed) 	<p>Marcia McNutt (Chair), Eileen Hofmann, and Denis Wiesenburg Input from Ship Scheduling Committee, Ship operators, UNOLS Office, and agency representatives.</p>

and funding prospects in the out years (Observatories). Marine Superintendents and Directors should be asked to recommend a lay-up process. The cost of lay up scenarios should be provided.	
The Ship Scheduling Chairs shall send a message to all UNOLS Schedulers asking that they provide Schedule Letters of Intent by mid April.	Rose Dufour and Liz Brenner (complete)
UNOLS Office Competition – A subcommittee was formed to review the operation of the current office, and make recommendations about whether or not the Office at MLML is suitable for continued operation. In the process of doing this review, they should seek input from all the UNOLS representatives and ask if any other institutions would be interested in competing to host the office. They would indicate that MLML has stated their desire to host the office for one more three-year period of time and will submit a proposal for doing so. The Committee should notify the UNOLS members before the summer, with a recommendation to the Council by August/September.	Peter Wiebe (Chair), Margo Edwards, and Wilf Gardner
Safe Working Load – Contact Tom Althouse, Safety Committee Chair, to request that the committee address this item.	UNOLS Office
Fall Meeting dates - Finalize FIC, Council, and Annual meeting dates.	UNOLS Office, Peter Wiebe, Dave Hebert (complete): FIC- 10/5, Council 10/13, Annual 10/14.
Identify Keynote speaker for Annual Meeting	UNOLS Office and Peter Wiebe
Summer Council Phone/web meeting – UNOLS Office will poll Council for dates in July.	Complete, July 13-14

Appendices:

I	Meeting Agenda
II	Participant List
III	Larry Clark (NSF) Letter dtd 2/25/05 to UNOLS
IV	National Science Foundation Report
V	Summary of Community comments to Larry Clark's Letter
VI	UNOLS Letter to RADM Cohen dated March 7, 2005 and Appendices (3.1 MB)
VII	FOFC Fleet Renewal Plan - Update
VIII	FIC Fleet Improvement Plan Outline

X	BBSR Application to Designate <i>Seward Johnson II</i> as a UNOLS Vessel
XI	National Oceanographic Seismic Facility - Adhoc Committee Report
XII	Global Class Science SMR Committee Report
XIII	GYRE Decommissioning Plans
XIV	R/V <i>Marcus Langseth</i> Conversion Plans
XV	Reporting of Mooring Locations, Safety Zones and Release Code Conflicts
XVI	Over The Side Handling Study
XVII	UNOLS Committee Reports

Meeting Minutes:

Call the Meeting: The UNOLS Council met at the National Science Foundation (NSF), Stafford II, Room 595, Arlington, VA on Tuesday, March 29, 2005. Peter Wiebe, Chair, opened the meeting at 0830. Agenda items were followed in the order as reported below. Meeting participants introduced themselves. The agenda and meeting participants are included as *Appendix I* and *Appendix II*, respectfully.

Accept Minutes – A motion was made and approved to accept the minutes of the [October 2005](#) Council Meeting with minor editorial changes as indicated by Tim Cowles and Wilf Gardner.

Nominating Committee – Two Council positions will open in 2005. Denis Wiesenburg (At-Large rep) is completing his second term and Peter Ortner (Operator Rep) is completing his first term. Peter Wiebe appointed a Nominating Committee of Bruce Corliss, Chair; Eileen Hofmann, and Denis Wiesenburg to prepare a slate to fill the Council positions. Annette DeSilva will send the committee the nominating procedures and a draft Call for Nominations. A slate of candidates shall be prepared for distribution at least 30 days in advance of elections consisting of at least two candidates for each position being considered.

Agency Budget discussions – The discussion on agency budgets began prior to RADM Cohen's phone call. However, for continuity the entire agency budget discussion is reported in these minutes after RADM Cohen's phone call.

RADM Cohen, Chief of Naval Research, - Ocean Class Vessel Acquisition - RADM Cohen, Chief of Naval Research (CNR), addressed the Council meeting participants via phone link. He thanked UNOLS for their recommendations regarding the Ocean Class hull form. Peter Wiebe thanked the Admiral on behalf of UNOLS for the opportunity to comment. Peter explained that the UNOLS committee looked very hard at the X-Craft, SWATH, and monohull. JJMA was very helpful in the process. Although RADM Cohen indicated that he is not sure what the right hull type should really be, he is satisfied with the thoroughness of UNOLS' response. The initial ship construction costs and life cycle costs are critically important. A cost of \$80M per ship construction would not be supportable, but a cost under \$60M would be. RADM Cohen reiterated the requirement for the ship to accommodate eight vans in a covered area and a "lily pad" for UAVs and Helo hover. Seakeeping, survivability, coring capability and other SMRs requirements are important as well. They would like to be able to go to contract for design in FY06. The construction contract would have options for additional ships. They would seek multi-year spending authority for advanced procurement. Assuming the cost is under \$60M per ship,

there could be four ships, one every two years.

RADM Cohen believes that there would be a requirement to use an Integrated Product Team (IPT) approach for the acquisition. The Oceanographer of the Navy, CNR for program requirements and NAVSEA would partner for the contract process.

RADM Cohen discussed the prospects of funding for Ocean Class R/Vs. He included funds in the ONR budget request. [Note: the phone connection was weak and it was difficult to decipher all that was said.] The SECNAV response to Congress indicated that the Navy would commit to construction funding in FY06. Options for SCN money and R&D money for ship construction were not available in FY06. As a result, RADM Cohen used the only option available to him, which was to request the construction funds from 6.1 money (Science funding). The community responded to this strategy with concern that this method of funding would jeopardize science support money. However, the budget went forward that way. The Congress is aware of the issues and it will ultimately be up to them on how to handle the funding for these ships.

RADM Cohen discussed the decreasing size of the Navy's fleet and the traditional response of Congress to increase the number of commercial vessels that could be used in the time of war if necessary (i.e. a ready reserve). RADM Cohen suggested the concept of a dual-use platform for the Ocean Class vessels; general oceanography and mine-countermeasures as needed. Their configuration and ability to support sensors would allow them to support mine countermeasures. When needed, research on the Ocean Class ships could be suspended during active warfare. The ships would be manned by the Navy and be able to support AUVs and mission modules. RADM Cohen explained that this would make the Ocean Class vessels easier to promote with Congress in a time when the Grey Fleet is shrinking. This opens up the potential for putting the funding line for these ships where it should be.

The phone link with RADM Cohen ended and Frank Herr provided a recap. The FY06 ONR budget request is for \$4M to start the Ocean Class design process. Starting in FY07 the budget would include \$25M per year to build the ships from the 6.1 budget line. The Admiral is working with Congress to find an alternate source for funding. ONR would have to take a 39% cut in their science budget in order to support the construction of Ocean Class ships starting in FY07. It is difficult to balance the need for infrastructure funding with the science budgets so that you have the proper tools, but still have the funds to operate and use them.

Frank explained that they don't have an immediate schedule for choosing operators for the Ocean Class ships. ONR is constructing an RFP for the operators along lines similar to the *Kilo Moana*. The process would require the retirement of a ship so as to not increase the size of the UNOLS Fleet. ONR plans to move forward this spring or summer with choosing an operator (depending on funding decisions).

Frank indicated that ONR would become much more involved with NAVSEA to define the selection process for the design/build team. The team will be contracted to create preliminary designs and a firm cost bid package by the end of 2006. ONR is looking for savings in the out-years with a multiple ship construction contract. The number of change orders would be limited so that the benefits of the single design could be achieved. Operators could propose minor changes to the design.

Frank concluded by adding his thanks to UNOLS and Peter for the hull evaluation work and the unique document that UNOLS prepared. He also added that with regards to the prospect of making the Ocean Class vessels available for reserve duty, the AGORS are presently in that status and the impact will not be significant.

Agency Reports, Budget Projections, and Future Fleet Utilization – Agency representatives from

NSF, ONR, and NOAA provided reports. The following topics were covered and discussed:

- Letter from NSF asking for advice on reducing NSF's overall Fleet Operating Costs (*Appendix VI*)
- NSF utilization and budget projections
- Utilization by other agencies
 - NOAA DART moorings and other requirements
 - NAVY programs

Peter Wiebe explained that budget shortfalls have been experienced and as a result fleet operations have been impacted. NSF has sent a letter to UNOLS asking for recommendations on how to reduce operating costs.

National Science Foundation: (Larry Clark) - Larry Clark discussed the NSF budget and issues raised in his letter of February 25th. Larry's letter is *Appendix III* and his slides are in *Appendix IV*. He noted that he worked at the UNOLS Office in 1976 and has worked in ship operations, technical services and ocean sciences so he is very familiar with the difficulty of what he is asking us to advise on. Within NSF there has been budget increases for other divisions because of a commitment to support the operations of new MRE facilities. OCE does not yet have new starts in the MRE account, but major facility efforts are in the MRE queue: ODP, OOI and the ARRIV. OCE has experienced a budget cut from FY04 to FY05 and there is a minimal increase in the budget request from FY2005 to FY2006. Details of the OCE budget show flat funding for operation of the academic Fleet and a slight decrease in IODP. There have been some positive activities. NSF has undertaken planning to improve the condition of the facilities with long-term investments: replacement for *Alvin*, *Ewing* replacement, and construction of Regional Class ships.

Larry showed a pie chart with the FY04 funding for the Academic Research Fleet. Support for ship operations was \$42.5M and there was \$13M for technical services. Larry presented a chart showing the increasing total NSF ship ops costs as compared to the slightly decreasing costs for other agencies. There has been a significant cost increase to NSF for fleet operations. This is exacerbated by the decline in support from other agencies. Also presented was a chart showing the increase in Global Class day rates over the recent years.

A chart showing the NSF research grants funding rate from FY1999 to FY2004 was presented. The rate is decreasing from 30% in 1999 down to 21% in FY2004. At the same time the number of proposals is increasing and the number funded are more or less even. An increase in R&E funds of 4.9% is paying back the research accounts for the money borrowed to cover 2004 and 2005 ship operations costs. The budget shortfall could mean the lay-up of multiple ships in 06. They are asking for UNOLS advice, but are prepared to make the decision.

Peter Wiebe offered Mike Reeve an opportunity to follow up on Larry's presentation. Mike Reeve reiterated the fact that their costs in the past few years have been higher than ever and that it is not sustainable in the current budget environment. At the same time they have made commitments to infrastructure renewal.

Bruce Corliss asked if NSF considered any scenarios for reducing costs. Mike Reeve stated that they have not. They haven't looked at specific ships in terms of lay-up scenarios.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) (Beth White) – Beth White discussed the new initiatives for tsunami response and warning system and the DART moorings. There is an emergency funding supplement for the system in Congress, but it has not passed yet. Bill O'Clock handed out preliminary information on DART mooring requirements. NOAA plans call for 39

moorings to cover the Pacific, Atlantic and Caribbean by mid 2007. A buoy summit was held at the end of February. There is a supplemental budget for FY05/06 to support the buoys in Congress, but will not be funded until May or June. NOAA can't move forward until the funding is approved. There are currently six operational buoy sites in the Pacific and the proposal is to add 33 more. There is no prioritization for the mooring deployments and there is no budget. The timeline and table presented in Bill's handout is a best guess of the requirements. The installation will depend on actual support. Servicing of the DART moorings is a concern. Bob Detrick asked about the level of support required for DART installation and servicing. Bill replied that approximately one day is needed to map the area and one day is needed for deployment. Servicing requirements should require less time. They would like to be able to take advantage of ships working in the area where the moorings are to be located. They are also hoping for international support. The NOAA scientists are still finalizing the mooring positions. They are looking at vandalism avoidance.

Linda Goad asked when NOAA would have funding commitments for 2006 operations. Bill replied that they have asked NOAA leadership for a commitment for FY06 funding by July 1 so they can make firm scheduling decisions. There was discussion on the number of potential ship days and possible funding amount. The required days will depend on transits, etc.

NOAA's UNOLS ship time support for FY06 was discussed. It includes \$1.5M for PMEL work in the Pacific (*Ron Brown* is in the Atlantic), \$2.4M for OAR programs, \$2.7 for NOS (Ecohab), and some supplemental funding for DART and possibly OE. The amount of Ocean Exploration funding is unclear. Terry Whitledge asked about the cost of operating the new Ocean Exploration vessel. Reply – Operations support would come from the OAR budget at around \$5M.

Navy - John Freitag (ONR) provided information about the Navy budget for fleet operations. FY05 ship days were down for programmatic reasons (low field work demand) rather than budget. FY06 use seems to be up with some new programs, such as Plus Net with 120 to 140 days. The total ONR budget covers about 750 days with approximately \$9M support for ships operations plus outside money from NRL, NUWC, and NPS (approximately \$1M). There has been some NOPP ship time in the Navy budget. Bruce Corliss asked about Ocean Class acquisition funding impacts on ship operations. John explained that since the ONR Research Facilities budget is supported by 6.1 money, it would be affected if the ship construction were funded from this source. John reported that in the case of catastrophic failures on the Navy-owned UNOLS ships, ONR supports the repair.

Summary of Community Input regarding Larry Clark's Letter - Peter Wiebe summarized the community response to Larry's letter. Comments were received from Kennell/Knox (SIO), Cowles (OSU), Taggart (U.Del), Lamerdin (MLML), Dufour (SIO), and Detrick (WHOI). The full list of comments is included in *Appendix V*. The comments/suggestions varied and included suggestions such as:

- Select reductions that do least harm to science.
- Balance reductions in ship use with reductions in research program funding.
- With prospect of new construction, consider retirement of an old ship in advance of new ship for cost reduction, if needed.
- Look at both reducing costs and increasing revenue. Get other federal agencies involved – increase the user base.
- Historically underutilized vessels should be permanently removed from the UNOLS Fleet first.
- Keep regional vessels below regulatory thresholds (300 GRT/500 ITC) as method for reducing operating cost.
- The replacement cost for new vessels should be a funding partnership with the operating institution – particularly for the Regional vessels.

- Institute a “cancellation penalty” for an agency that removes scheduled programs which has repercussions for other funded cruises
- Take a longer view than just 2006 - don't make short-term decisions.
- In the short term, ship lay-ups should be preferred over early ship retirements.

Bob Detrick recommended that an ad hoc committee be established to develop recommendations to NSF in response to Larry Clark’s request. He recommended that the committee should include representatives from at least all of the global and intermediate ship operators and possibly 2-3 reps from local/regional operators. Mike Reeve commented that the NSF program managers should not be included as members of the Ad-hoc committee.

Peter Wiebe indicated that the subject would be revisited later in the meeting.

Other Agency and CORE Reports:

Department of State - Status of Clearances Database (Elizabeth Tirpak) – Liz Tirpak reported that she has been at the Department of State since 1999 and it has been her long-term goal to make the clearance process as easy as possible. Last year they had approximately 400 requests for work in foreign waters and about 60 requests for work in U.S. waters. A web-based system is desired. They purchased a prototype database program for tracking and managing clearance paperwork and reports. The original purchase (~\$30k) did not cover the job. The actual cost of the program to develop the database application is \$300K. She will not be able to fund this with just State Department money and will need help from other agencies. If they don’t get the money soon the contractor will stop work and all momentum will be lost.

On a positive note, Roberta got a raise after 20 years. There are some new interns who have been hired to the office. Online clearance information has been updated over the past few years to provide current country information.

The Advisory body of experts on the Law of the Sea advises on how the Law of the Sea impacts the activities of UNESCO. The group will be looking at marine policy and issues related to maritime boundaries. This year will focus on marine scientific research.

Liz has been appointed as chair of a working group to look at State practices on clearances for research. They issued a questionnaire to coastal states and received responses from 70 out of the 120 polled. When the working group report is approved, she will post it.

United States Coast Guard (USCG) (Jon Berkson) – Jon reported that the presence of the large icebergs in the vicinity of McMurdo since 2001 has doubled the operation tempo for the USCG *Polars* and reduced their availability for maintenance. *Polar Sea* is currently in the shipyard unavailable for service pending funding for repairs. The *Polar Star* is undergoing overhaul to get ready for DEEP FREEZE 06. *Healy* is in good shape and is getting ready for Arctic deployment including a trans-Arctic leg. USCG has been working with NSF and others to get full funding for the operation and maintenance of the icebreaker fleet. There is a proposal in the President’s budget for funding of the icebreaker fleet for FY06. This is pending congressional action. For the long term, the *Polars* need replacing or overhaul. There are two studies: Mission Needs Analysis by Booz Allen Hamilton (BAH) that is nearing completion and the National Research Council (NRC) study that will evaluate the role of the Coast Guard in supporting polar icebreaking needs. The USCG is waiting the outcome these studies and the budget.

Academic Fleet Renewal Activities and Plans:

Status of FOFC Fleet Renewal Plan - Bob Winokur, Technical Director, Oceanographer of the Navy and FOFC Chair provided an update on the FOFC activities. His presentation is included as *Appendix VII*. Bob began by commenting that the Naval Oceanographic fleet is faced with the same dilemma of reduced operations funding and lay-up considerations. The updated Federal fleet renewal plan will be a coordinated agency plan spanning the years 2005 to 2025. It expands the FOFC December 2001 National Academic Research Fleet Plan. Agencies represented include the Navy, USGS, EPA, USCG, NOAA, NASA, NSF, and MMS. They will coordinate with UNOLS. The working group is developing an initial draft for completion by 30 April. They hope to have a technical writer by mid April and have a draft available for NORLC approval by 31 July 2005. The report release is planned for 30 September 2005.

The initial assumptions for the FOFC update are that ocean research and operations will continue to be a national priority in support of agency missions and special programs (Tsunami Warning System, OOI). Vessels will be available for a minimum 30-year service life. As in the last report, the plan only considers vessels greater than 40 meters. Requirements for heavy lift capability, such as those required by ocean observatories will be contracted to industry.

The FY05 science funding levels resulted in overcapacity. FY06 and outyear science funding levels will be less than FY05. The Fleet identified in the FOFC plan will have fewer but more efficient ships with greater capability. Compliance with complex regulations will increase operational costs. National icebreaker renewal issues will be resolved by 2006.

Bob reviewed the plan outline, which includes Fleet requirements and gaps, concept designs and technology infusion, and implementation. Bob presented a few charts showing fleet costs by agency, and percentage of fleet operating costs by class.

Bob indicated that there are 43 Federal oceanographic ships in the plan. He presented a chart showing all of the Federal Global Class ships included in the FOFC plan. These include general-purpose ships, survey vessels, and USCG icebreakers. The Plan will indicate no replacements for *Knorr* and *Melville*, which will reach retirement age by 2014.

For the Ocean/Intermediate class the FOFC plan includes six NOAA fisheries survey vessels. One Alaska Region Research Vessel (ARRV) is planned for 2007 construction and the Navy proposes three additional ships. Five UNOLS ships will be at/beyond retirement age by 2010.

For the Regional Class, three ships will reach their retirement age by 2011 and NSF has planned for three new Regional vessels.

The floor was open to questions and discussion:

Question – Are there any significant changes from the original report? Bob W. – The revised plan is primarily a continuation and update. No big changes are expected other than the inclusion of all Federal ships.

There was a question regarding the interaction between FIC and FOFC. Bob W. explained that Dave Hebert attended the last FOFC meeting and Bob Houtman and Dolly attended FIC.

There was discussion about projected NOAA needs for renewal and how they might impact the requirements for UNOLS vessels. NOAA has in recent year acquired new vessels and vessels through Navy transfers. Additionally, the Ocean Exploration program is converting a Navy vessel for their use.

There is concern that this will result in a decreased use of UNOLS vessel from NOAA.

The FOFC plan will be updated every five years.

There was discussion about the Integrated Oceanographic Observatory System (IOOS) facility requirements. The requirements have not been defined yet. There will be a need for some UNOLS support, but it is not clear to what level. Industry can play a role as a provider.

FIC Fleet Improvement Plan Update –Dave Hebert reported on the status of the FIC Fleet Improvement Plan update. His viewgraphs are included as Appendix VIII. FOFC is developing their plan based on fiscal restraints. FIC's plan will be based on science needs. Dave reviewed the plan outline. The major sections are:

- Executive Summary
- Identify Future Science Initiatives
- Current Fleet Composition and Utilization Trends –
- Future Fleet projections
- Fleet Budget projections and requirements.
- Recommendations

The FIC hopes to have a draft available for the Council in the fall.

Wilf Gardner asked if there is a big difference between the FOFC and UNOLS plan. Dave replied that the Academic Fleet of the FOFC plan would be able to accommodate significantly fewer days than the current UNOLS Fleet. There will be fewer days available for science in the future.

Peter Wiebe commented that the IOOS plan isn't available yet from Ocean.US. Peter asked if industry has enough vessels to support IOOS, or will they have to come back to UNOLS. Bob Winokur indicated that he has not heard a decision. Bob Houtman reported that the IOOS Implementation plan has not gone forward because Ocean.US does not have funding. The agencies will have to provide the funding and approve the plan.

Lunch Break

Regional Class Acquisition Process - Mike Reeve (NSF) reported on the status of the Regional Class Acquisition process. At the moment they are on track with creating specifications and Request For Proposals (RFPs). There is a plan to have UNOLS representatives on the selection team for the Integrated Project Teams (IPTs) and as members of a technical advisory group. NSF plans to issue a solicitation for IPTs this summer (2005). Once the RFP is issued, there would likely be a 60-day response period. An RFP for operator selection is also slated for this year and a 90-day response period is expected. Mike Reeve turned the discussion over to Pete Kilroy and Lorena Castro, both from NAVSEA.

Pete Kilroy reported that during the next year and half there will be two periods of source selection where government teams will be reviewing proposals from industry. The first source selection period is for selection of the two IPTs and is slated to take place during September 2005. The RFP for design/build teams is expected around the beginning of July. The performance specifications will be an attachment to the RFP along with other materials. [Note: the timeline has slipped a couple months since the Council Meeting.]

During Phase I, Each IPT will be performing work under a government contract to develop designs and prepare a construction bid package. Phase I will be a one-year effort. The second source selection will take place at the end of Phase I. The Government team will select one design for ship construction from

the two competing teams. There will be options for follow on ships. Pete indicated that the Government would own the designs from each team (winning and losing). There may be some aspects of the design that are proprietary; these items need to be identified by the teams along with a cost.

Lorena Castro continued with details about selection of the UNOLS representatives for the source select team and the technical advisory team. The Phase I and II source selection periods are planned for fall 2005 for 2 weeks and fall 2006 for 3-4 weeks. They will be held in a secure work area at the Washington Navy Yard, National Science Foundation or other Government site. Two individuals from the UNOLS community are needed to review the data submitted with the team proposals and provide technical advice.

A second UNOLS group, a team of 6-8 UNOLS operators and scientists is needed during the Phase I design period. The individuals will review technical data to verify that it meets the contract requirements and they will provide technical advice. The group would provide advice for both design/build teams. When one team asks a question the questions and answer goes to both teams. Information will be available on a secure web site. Reviewers may also attend all shipbuilder design reviews. The advisory group should have broad disciplinary and profession experience with ships. The time commitment for the group would involve travel to three design meetings and probably consume a minimum of six to eight weeks of time.

There was a question regarding conflict of interest and Pete Kilroy replied that NAVSEA does not see a conflict with having a member of the advisory committee from an institution with an interest in becoming an operator of the new vessel. Mike Reeve indicated that this probably would not be a problem with NSF as well.

NAVSEA will need the names of all UNOLS team members (both teams) by 6 May 2005. Each individual would be required to submit conflict of interest/non-disclosure of information form and a Confidential Financial Disclosure Report. The question was asked why the names would be needed by May 6th and the reply was that the names would be included in the RFP document. Lorena reviewed the dos and don'ts for the UNOLS representatives.

Discussion followed. Peter Wiebe stated that a process for selecting the UNOLS representatives is needed. He appointed the Chairs from the Fleet Improvement Committee (FIC), Dave Hebert; Regional Class Advisory Committee (RCAC), Wilf Gardner; Research Vessel Technical Enhancement Committee (RVTEC), Bill Martin; and the Research Vessel Operators' Committee (RVOC), Tim Askew as an ad-hoc committee to recommend the members of the two teams of UNOLS representatives. A motion was made and passed to form this ad hoc committee. The committee tasking is to:

- Draft a message for Community distribution calling for volunteers to participate on Regional Class Government Teams (2 people as advisors on the Government source select team and 6-8 individuals as a UNOLS Advisory Group). Articulate the responsibilities and time commitment of the team members. The two individuals on the source select team can also be on the technical advisory team.
- Send the draft message to NSF for review and comment prior to distribution.
- Identify representatives for both the Government Source Select team (2-person) and the UNOLS Advisory group (6-8 people). The Source select team should include one sea going scientist and one individual from ship operations. The Technical Advisory group should include representation from the four major science disciplines, marine superintendents, ship captains, and marine technical support groups.
- Provide the UNOLS Chair with nominations by May 5th

Dave Hebert commented on the community concern regarding input during the design process and the

need for a mechanism to provide input. FIC has requested that NAVSEA and NSF clearly outline in the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the IPT teams the need for a defined - feedback" process. FIC suggested that IPT proposals must explicitly define how they will seek out and obtain input from the academic community to the design process. Additionally, the RFPs should require that each IPT agree to at least one community design review meeting. Pete Kilroy replied that they were not intending to include a requirement for anything as specific as a process for community input in the RFP.

Regional Class Performance Specifications- Mike Prince stated that the Performance Specifications could represent the last time that the community will have direct input into the Regional Class acquisition project. There have been 509 performance specification comments to date from the community. Mike has provided these as preliminary input to Dolly and Mike. Some of the comments conflict with each other. Mike will narrow the comments down to those that need vetting and provide that list to Council/FIC/RCAC for review and discussion/decision. The comments will need to be sent to NSF by mid-April. Mike Prince asked NSF if UNOLS would have the opportunity to review the Performance Specifications after the next revision that considers the UNOLS comments. Mike Reeve replied that they would try to get them to UNOLS.

Ocean Class Acquisition - Peter Wiebe reviewed the process that UNOLS used to evaluate the hull forms for the Ocean Class design. At the 2004 UNOLS Annual meeting RADM Cohen tasked UNOLS to evaluate various potential Ocean Class hull forms. UNOLS visited the X-Craft. It is an impressive vessel, but the configuration is not optimal for oceanography. With the help of JJMA, UNOLS looked at about eight hull form variants. Through a series of web/phone and in person meetings, the variants were evaluated. Dan Rolland came to us with a template for weighting the Ocean Class SMR parameters and scoring the hull variants. Additionally new Navy SMRs were introduced and evaluated. There were about 11 UNOLS reviewers. In the process of weighting, two approaches were taken, one in which all parameters were weighted regardless of source, and the other where the Navy parameters were all weighted high. In both cases, the monohull scored the highest. Attractive features of the monohull included:

- Lower cost for construction and operation.
- Access along the rail. This was important for operations such as coring, etc
- Access to the water – reasonable freeboard
- Sea keeping
- Survivability
- Draft

UNOLS circulated their evaluation to the community for comment and 82 responses were received. They mostly recommended the monohull. In the UNOLS letter to RADM Cohen the process was described and the recommendation of a monohull provided. The letter was sent with lengthy appendices. Frank Herr indicated that the information in the UNOLS hull selection letter would be provided to bidders for the Ocean Class design/build teams.

Frank Herr reviewed the budget process and acquisition process for the Ocean Class. How the project is carried out is dependent on how the ships are funded and this may control the cost structure. If construction were funded out of 6.1 funds, the funds would be available over multiple years.

Peter Wiebe asked Frank if a set of performance specs would be developed similar to the Regional Class. Frank had not seen the Regional specifications, so could not comment.

ONR is interested in low operating costs and may specifically ask for that in the RFP to the design/builders. ONR would like to have the operator selected early so that they can have the operator involved in the IPT process of putting together the design. The vessel operators will all be competed.

Consortia operation is a possibility. Once they select the operator, the operator would have an important role. ONR paid for Robert Hinton to be a full time employee representing the University of Hawaii on the design and build team. Robert was there from the beginning until the end of the Warranty period. This attention to the details and commitment is needed. After the design is complete, changes would be minimal, so as to avoid costly change orders.

Frank asked UNOLS whether or not aluminum is an appropriate material for a research vessel. Marcia McNutt replied that MBARI would probably not build another aluminum vessel. The cost is twice as much for aluminum. Survivability is an issue. Getting repairs done is a problem. Aluminum superstructures on steel hulls can be a good, workable compromise.

There was a question from Brian Taylor about whether or not all the operators will be picked at once or in sequence as the ships are funded. Frank said they were still considering this issue and were open to advice. He felt that they would likely select the operator for the first ship only, but would be open to input. If there is language to indicate multiple vessels, ONR might be able to select all operators. Brian Taylor commented that if the acquisition were for a class design, then not having the second and third operators involved would keep them out of decisions on design and construction. Frank said that they expect to have a selection board for the operator, which would not include any UNOLS institutions, but would be people we all trust. There will be a second board to select the design/build teams. They haven't decided what the UNOLS input to the design process will be. It may be similar to the NSF process, but the Navy hasn't decided.

Break

Ship Design, Construction, and Operational Changes:

BBSR plan to acquire *Seward Johnson II* from HBOI and retire the *Weatherbird II* – Bermuda Biological Station for Research (BBSR) has submitted a proposal to replace *Weatherbird II* with *Seward Johnson II* (**Appendix X**). Peter introduced Linda Glover (BBSR Trustee), Dr. William Jenkins (From WHOI, Chair of BBSR's External Review Committee), and Capt. Lee Black (BBSR Marine Supt.). Linda Glover, Chair of the governing board for BBSR and Chair of their ship committee introduced the subject and said that they considered lengthening the *Weatherbird II* but when the opportunity for a larger vessel became possible, they decided to recommend acquiring the *Seward Johnson II*. *Weatherbird II* is 115 ft LOA and *Seward Johnson II*'s length is 168 ft. *Seward Johnson II* is owned and operated by Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institution (HBOI).

Bill Jenkins talked about the benefits of having a larger vessel to support the time series work, the larger moorings, etc. There are four time series off Bermuda (BATS, OFP, BTM, and Hydrostation S). Maintenance of the high quality of these programs is important and dependent on an adequate platform. Quality and size of labs on *Weatherbird II* is inadequate. Limited deck space on the ship requires that moorings be brought to shore for servicing, increasing the amount of ship time needed. Programs could be enhanced with a larger vessel.

Linda Glover followed up with more details about the benefits of a larger vessel. *Seward Johnson II* is much more capable and can carry multiple 20-ft vans. BBSR has made a formal letter of offer to HBOI.

Marcia McNutt had a few questions. What is the difference in day rate? Reply – The day rate for *Seward Johnson II* is approximately \$10.5K and \$9.5K for *Weatherbird II*. The difference in total costs is about \$500K annually. Linda Glover pointed out that although there is a cost increase, total Fleet costs would decrease with one ship being taken out of service.

Marcia asked about the amount of transit costs from the east coast that could potentially be saved. The round trip from the east coast to Bermuda is about 8 days and outside ships charge operational days when away from homeport. About five round trips annually would pay for the difference in operating cost for *Seward Johnson II* home ported at BBSR. In addition, the days lost to weather would decrease with the availability of a more capable ship, which would mean that there would be an overall gain in available science days for the increased costs.

BBSR is planning to make upgrades to the port facilities. There would need to be some dredging in parts of Ferry Reach. A high-speed ferry service is planned and they will carry out the dredging. Dock upgrading would be needed, but BBSR is already in discussions with the government and thinks that this would not be a problem. They are also planning to make some improvements to the CTD garage/launching area. Dolly asked how the improvements would be paid for. Reply - The sale of *Weatherbird II* would generate some of the funds and they would borrow or seek donations for the balance.

Tim Askew commented that *Seward Johnson II* is very well maintained. It is 23 years old. HBOI would not be looking for a replacement. They are selling an intermediate vessel and it will become a "regional" ship. The ship has been out of service since December 2004.

Linda Glover said that BBSR would like to have Council endorsement, so that they can move forward and perhaps schedule operations on the ship for summer 2006. Linda Goad commented that there is currently about 132 days funded for work off Bermuda in 2006. To fill a 200-day schedule, the ship would need to pick up additional ship time. This is work that other east coast ships would normally carry out. Projections currently show excess capacity on the east coast ships as compared to funded days. 2006 might not be the best year to bring *Seward Johnson II* into operation at Bermuda.

Wilf Gardner said that the last day rate for *Seward Johnson II* was \$12,300. How will BBSR get the rate down to \$10,500? Tim Askew replied that the HBOI day rate included depreciation for modifications.

Peter Wiebe commented that when Hawaii applied for UNOLS designation for R/V *Kaimikai-O-Kanaloa*, NSF considered the ship an Ocean Class vessel and asked UNOLS which existing Ocean Class ship would be removed so as to not expand the Fleet size. What is NSF's stance now? Reply from NSF – The FOFC classification of ships is not merely size, it also represents how the ship would be operated. In terms of operations, the *Seward Johnson II* could be considered a large "local" vessel. Dolly added that they agree that *Seward Johnson II* is more capable for the region.

A Council motion was made to "approve the designation of *Seward Johnson II* as a UNOLS vessel to be operated by Bermuda Biological Research Station pending:

- (1) The acquisition of *Seward Johnson II* by BBSR,
- (2) The successful completion of the NSF inspection of *Seward Johnson II*, and
- (3) The retirement of *Weatherbird II*."

(Wiesenburg/Cowles). The Council approved the motion with one abstaining.

UNOLS requests that BBSR send written notification to the UNOLS Office when the conditions stated in the motion have been successfully carried out so that the designation can be made official.

UNOLS Discussion Items:

National Oceanographic Seismic Facility – Marcia McNutt provided the Ad hoc Committee Report.

Her slides are included as **Appendix XI**. The Ad-Hoc Committee membership includes Marcia McNutt (chair), Jamie Austin, John Collins, Cindy Lee Van Dover and Graham Kent. Their charge is to draft terms of reference for a new UNOLS standing committee to oversee science and ship operations for a National Oceanographic Seismic Facility. They are also to develop a slate of nominees for the committee's initial membership. The recommended name of the committee is the *Marcus Langseth Science Oversight Committee (MLSOC)*. Marcia reviewed the draft terms of reference. The major items included in the MLSOC's draft charge are:

- Overseeing the scientific operation of the *Marcus Langseth* as a National Oceanographic Facility.
- Maintaining and enhancing the *Langseth's* capabilities for general geophysical and oceanographic research
- Providing advice and input on the annual and long term scheduling of the *Langseth*.
- Identify and recommend hardware and procedure upgrades.
- Encourage geophysical research worldwide and encourage the advancement of cooperative international programs.

Marcia explained that Mike Purdy has raised the issue that there are a growing number of non-technical users that would like seismic data from the Facility. In the past, seismic ship users were responsible for providing technical expertise in order to get the data needed. There is a need for the Facility to provide this expertise to users. This will be one of the issues to be addressed by the MLSOC.

Membership would include nine voting members with representation from general oceanography, 3D and 2D seismic, industry, OBS, and PASSCAL experience. Ex-Officio RVTEC and RVOC representatives would probably be from LDEO to save travel expenses. The ad-hoc committee solicited nominations from the community and a list of potential members has been compiled. Two meetings a year are recommended. One meeting would provide a forum for community feedback and input. The other meeting would generally be devoted to scheduling, permitting, advising on specific programs, and other near-term issues, and should occur just before the UNOLS scheduling meeting each summer. The MLSOC would begin when *Marcus Langseth* comes on line.

Discussion:

Dolly Dieter raised the issue of archiving and suggested that it would need to be addressed.

Bill Martin raised the issue of data acquisition. If the MLSOC and Facility operator provide recommendations regarding data acquisition policies, would these policies then apply to the other ships in the Fleet, and if so how? A new policy might not be a bad thing, but it might be difficult to implement.

Linda Goad commented that the charge to the committee is very ambitious. The short term scheduling responsibilities for the committee are of concern. Linda indicated that the wording pertaining to scheduling by the committee should be revised.

Marcia stated that she would revise document and circulate it for review.

GYRE Decommissioning Plans - Wilf Gardner reported R/V *Gyre* will be decommissioned by Texas A&M in August of 2005. The ship has been in service for 32 years. The announcement is included as **Appendix XIII**.

Global Class Science Mission Requirements – Annette DeSilva reported on the status of plans to draft general-purpose Global Vessel SMRs. The slides are included as **Appendix XII**. The Global Class

Steering Committee chaired by Bruce Howe (UW) met during the Fall AGU meeting and have had a couple phone/web conferences. The task items for the committee include:

- Review the past SMRs and other documentation to form the basis of the SMRs.
- Solicit input and feedback from the larger science and operator community throughout process
- Produce the SMR document.
- As a follow-on activity incorporate Heavy Lift considerations, and Seismic Capabilities

A website has been posted that contains information about the project: <http://www.unols.org/committees/fic/global/global_smr.html>.

The committee has taken on a variety of activities. They will review past SMRs and evaluate construction projects under development in other countries (UK ship, GOSars vessel). They plan to identify modifications that have been made to the current Global Vessels since they entered service. Past workshop recommendations as well as the ORION requirements will be considered. They plan to investigate technology developments in new commercial ship construction. Large ship utilization trends and ship demand have been reviewed. A community survey is being drafted and will be post for community input regarding Global Vessel SMRs. Mike Prince briefly reviewed the draft survey. The survey is modeled after the surveys conducted during the Regional and Ocean Class efforts.

Cape Henlopen Replacement Vessel – Annette summarized a report from Matt Hawkins (U. Delaware). Construction is moving along well and on schedule/budget. The final module (stern section) is nearing completion and will be added to the vessel in April 2005. Installation of major electrical components in the auxiliary machinery space has begun. The stern A-frame and starboard trawl winch is expected to arrive at the yard in May. The CTD handling system (based on Load Handling System (LHS) study findings) is going out for bid in April. The ship launch is tentatively scheduled for June 12th. Dock trials are planned for July, with sea trials in August. The ship will be delivery to Florida in October 2005. UNOLS Council should expect an application for "preliminary" acceptance as a UNOLS vessel during their summer meeting.

Alaska Region Research Vessel (ARRV) – Denis Wiesenburg briefly reported that the ARRV design is complete. Funds for construction of the ship are included as a request in the NSF Major Research Equipment account (MREFC) for FY07.

R/V Marcus Langseth - Paul Ljunggren provided a written report, which is included as **Appendix XIV**. Annette DeSilva briefly summarized the report. On March 9, after the ship's final cruise, *R/V Maurice Ewing* was moored astern *R/V Marcus G. Langseth* in Quonset Point, Rhode Island. Columbia University took title of the *Langseth* on 20 September 2004. The *Langseth* reflagging plans have been submitted to the Coast Guard and several determinations have been made. The bulkheads will require subdividing the Engine room and the Recording Room. Also, the Halon fire suppression system will have to be replaced and a CO2 system installed. All required drawings have been submitted to ABS for change of class and a shipboard survey has been completed. An interim class certificate has been issued and they await final issuance of class. A detailed list of capabilities and the status of equipment acquisitions is provided in the written report.

A plan for the *Langseth* IT and Data System is currently posted on the web at <<http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/res/fac/oma/replacement/index.html>>. There is a link from the UNOLS website. LDEO is looking forward to receiving community comment.

Berthing remains an issue with the 8-person berthing clusters presenting a challenge. It has generally been felt that ADA provisions for visually impaired and hearing-impaired individuals could be effectively responded to. Addressing the issues of mobility impairment remains a matter of concern for an existing ship.

Shipyard specifications completion has been delayed. LDEO expects to put the final package of specifications before EROCC next month after which they will be submitted to NSF for review and approval.

Several potential buyers for the *Ewing* have expressed interest in the vessel. All funds from the sale of the ship will be applied to the conversion. Currently efforts are underway to cross deck equipment from the *Ewing* to the *Langseth*.

Dolly Dieter commented that there are a lot more steps and new requirements under the new charter agreements for construction efforts. Both LDEO and WHOI have had to deal with these. The new requirements require approval for purchases over \$250,000. This is slowing down the process considerably. Langseth will probably not be available for operations until summer 2006 at the earliest.

Brian Taylor asked how the *Langseth* would accommodate a 1-degree multibeam system. Reply - LDEO will use a gondola to accommodate the system.

Notification and reporting of mooring locations, safety zones, and release code conflicts - Mike Prince summarized a message from Maureen Conte (BBSR) regarding mooring hazards and implementation of a centralized UNOLS mooring directory. Her message is included as *Appendix XV*. An increasing amount of science is being conducted using moorings, many of which are subsurface. These can present hazards to science (equipment and people) when research ships conduct operations in areas where moorings are located but are unaware of their location. Currently there is no effective way for scientists who have moorings to communicate where their moorings are.

Marcia McNutt suggested that there be a web site on the UNOLS page where people installing the moorings could post the mooring coordinates. Others planning fieldwork could search the site to see if there are any moorings in the area of their work. It was pointed out that there is some fear in publicizing the mooring locations because of vandalism.

Mike Prince said that the UNOLS Office would investigate ways to collect information regarding installation and locations of moorings.

Ocean Class Vessel Security Plans - Tim Askew provided an update on the status of Ocean Class Vessel Security Plans. The USCG changed the ruling such that security plans would now be required for ships 500 gross tons international or larger. Tim polled the Intermediate/Ocean Class operators. Of the Intermediates, Endeavor, Wecoma, Seward Johnson, and Seward Johnson II have plans. New Horizon's plan is in progress. The plans will need to be in place by July 1, 2005. Western Flyer's plan is in progress.

Frequency Spectrum Management – Mike Prince reported that there has not been a lot of activity on this issue since the last meeting. He will look to see who replied to his newsletter article and form a small committee to liaison with the frequency management agency managers.

Adjourn Day 1

Day 2 – March 30, 2005

Open Day 2 Council Meeting: Peter Wiebe, UNOLS Chair, called the meeting to order.

ADA Guidelines – Mike Prince reported that the Univ. Delaware and LDEO were asked by NSF to address Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements in their new ship design and conversion plans. Guidelines are available on how to implement ADA requirements for passenger vessels. These are being reviewed to determine how they could be implemented on research vessels. LDEO and U. Delaware both have tried to implement the ADA requirements as much as feasible. The agencies are interested in having a set of ADA guidelines for research vessels that best address the intent of the law. The UNOLS Risk Manager, Dennis Nixon, is following an ADA court case that involved a passenger vessel. He is waiting for the final recommendation from the Supreme Court ruling.

Terry Whitledge indicated that the University Alaska and Glostern have attempted to accommodate the ADA requirements for mobility, hearing and vision impairments in the design of the ARRV. Terry has drafted a white paper that provides ADA guidelines for research vessels. He provided the first draft to FIC at their last meeting.

ADA guidelines should take into consideration the size of the vessel, as well as the nature of the disability (hearing, vision, and mobility). There are levels of accommodations that can be made. Wilf Gardner commented that Terry has done a good job of addressing the issues. His draft should be reviewed to determine if anything is missing.

The question was asked if NOAA has any ADA guidelines in place for work from their research vessels. It appears that they have not addressed the ADA requirements with the FRVs.

The Council agreed that an ad hoc committee should be formed to address ADA guidelines for new ship construction/conversion. The ad hoc committee should review and provide input to the paper drafted by Terry Whitledge. Additionally the group should recommend how procedural guidelines could be established for accommodating seagoing scientists with disabilities. The ad hoc committee should include Terry Whitledge (FIC), Dennis Nixon (Risk Manager), one person from the Safety Committee, seagoing scientists with disabilities, Eric Buck (Ship Master, SIO), and Dolly Dieter as ex-officio. Suggestions for scientists included Amy Bower and/or Dave Glover. The Committee would be asked for a status report at the July Council meeting.

Tim Askew indicated that he would contact Tom Althouse, Chair of the Safety Committee, to let him know of this task.

Overboard Handling System Report – Mike Prince provided a summary of the Load Handling System Workshop report provided by Matt Hawkins at the last FIC Meeting. The presentation is included as *Appendix XVI*. The goal of the workshop was to develop a conceptual design for the “next-generation” over-the-side load handling system for the UNOLS Fleet.

•Committee members included Matt Hawkins, Chair, Tom Althouse, Andy Bowen, Marc Willis, and Jim Holik. It was a one-year effort joint-funded by NSF and ONR. It focused on ship visits and field evaluations of existing systems. They were tasked to address:

- Loading Handling System design standards
- Incorporation of “Next-generation” UNOLS wire
- “Next-generation” science packages
- Motion compensation
- “Hands-free” deployment and recovery

- Size/Weight: “Scale-able” to different vessel classes

The report describes the handling apparatus and winch systems. The handling apparatus in general is an articulated crane. There are three different arrangements: “Aft Deck,” “Side,” and “Overhead.” They should be able to reach very near the water surface. The winch may be electric or hydraulic depending on vessel. It may be direct pull or traction depending on vessel and use. The winch should be co-located with the handling apparatus to simplify the cable path. Details are provided in *Appendix XVI*. Animations of the handling system in operation were presented. As part of the workshop, institutions looking to acquire a handling system can contact Matt for a copy of the guidelines, which they in turn can provide to the winch manufacturers.

Brian Taylor reported that U. Hawaii has been working with Matt on handling system recommendations for *Kilo Moana*. A winch doesn't exist that could reach the water for use on *Kilo Moana*. They have requested that Dynacon develop a modified design.

The workshop report and findings will be provided to NSF and ONR. Once accepted, the handling system guidelines could be incorporated into the UNOLS SMRs.

The RVOC Safety Committee will review the report and will likely provide it to the USCG for comment and ruling on alternate applications of the load handling design requirements. Pete Kilroy expressed concern that if the report is incorporated into the Regional Class CFR as a ship builder requirement, they should have some reasonable expectation that it would be approved.

Acoustic Marine Mammal Permitting Issues – (Sandy Shor) - Sandy Shore reported on progress with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regulatory processes, the programmatic permit for *Langseth* and the studies being completed on the affects of noise on marine mammals. The studies/reports are not being well received by environmental groups. The National Research Council (NRC) Report was presented at their last advisory meeting in New Orleans. The environmental groups were very unhappy with the study.

Sandy reported that for the final *Ewing* cruise it was difficult to get clearances from Mexico. The cruise finally took place in January and February 2005. Unfortunately, after the science program was complete, the ship hit an uncharted reef (not a live reef). The Mexican Government claims that since the *Ewing* was sailing in Mexican waters without Mexican charts they will likely be fined. The Mexican charts in the Yucatan are old and to 1/1,000,000 scale. UNOLS operators are not familiar with this requirement. On the *Ewing* cruise there were six observers (3 Mexican and 3 US). There were also aircraft observations and two spotter boats in the water at all times. They observed two porpoises and one turtle.

NSF requested UNOLS to post a link to the NSF Guidelines for Acoustic Work Permitting on the UNOLS website. The Office will get the link from Carolyn Ruppel.

Marcia McNutt suggested that there be a more proactive method for putting out press releases that provide the truth about seismic activities. She will provide some input on how the Monterey Bay Aquarium does their press relations to Sandy.

In preparations for *Langseth* operations, LDEO is working on addressing acoustic permitting issues through the Environmental Impact Statement. Whether it would be a 5-year impact statement or if it would be handled on a case-by-case statement is still up in air. There will be a minimum of three marine mammal observers on each seismic cruise. The UNOLS standing committee (MLSOC) will have to address marine mammal monitoring strategies.

Break

Response to Larry Clark's Letter (continued from Day one) – Peter continued the discussion from the previous day on how to provide a UNOLS response to Larry Clark's letter. He presented the recommendation that a small ad hoc group work with the Scheduling Committee to address NSF's request for advice. Draft terms of reference were presented and Tim Cowles suggested a few changes:

Draft Terms of Reference:

- 1) Scheduling committee determines a best estimate of the UNOLS Fleet utilization based on funded science by class, by region/season, by special requirements.
- 2) UNOLS Office, in concert with federal agencies, provides a best estimate the 2006 ship operation funding from all sources. Evaluate the probability of NOAA funds and additional Navy funds.
- 3) To the extent that the funds available do not meet the operational needs (defined in #1), the Ad Hoc Committee develops a plan for ship lay-ups that will fit the budget realities and minimize impact on funded scientific programs. This plan should take into consideration longer term issues such as the impact of retirements versus lay-ups or the various forms of lay-ups ("ready to go" versus mothballed) and funding prospects in the out years (Observatories). Marine Superintendents and Deans/Directors should be asked to provide their recommendations regarding a lay-up process.
- 4) Circulate a draft plan by end of June to UNOLS leadership. Submit revised draft to Council in advance of the Summer UNOLS conference call meeting.

It was recognized that the composition of the ad-hoc committee is sensitive and they should be unbiased.

Brian Taylor indicated that he feels a more direct approach is needed. He is attending the meeting because this issue is so important. In his opinion, the Council should address the issues identified in Larry Clark's letter now and leave the meeting with a recommendation. It should not be assigned to an ad hoc committee. Peter Wiebe replied that additional information is needed, including firm budget estimates from the agencies. A UNOLS decision and recommendations would not be provided at this time. Community input is needed. Rose Dufour added that the details are important in the decision process. Various issues need to be addressed, such as permitting issues, before a recommendation could be made. Tim Cowles said that we recognize that at least one or two ships will need to be laid up, but unless we know where the ship time requests areas are located and when ships are needed, we cannot move forward with a recommendation. Brian Taylor emphasized that he feels that it is ultimately the Council's responsibility to provide recommendations.

As a first step, Mike Prince, Rose and Linda Goad will send a message to the ship operators asking that they provide 2006 Letters of Intent. Although this is before the May panel decisions for 2006 program awards, Linda indicated that there will be no ship time funded from the May panel unless it replaces ship time already funded and provides a cost savings.

There are short term and long term issues to be considered. Input for 2006 scheduling and lay-ups are needed by summer. Retirement issues need to be addressed, but are not needed by June.

Peter Wiebe appointed an Ad-hoc committee of Marcia McNutt (Chair), Eileen Hofmann, and Denis Wiesenburg. The terms of reference for the committee will need to be finalized. Input from the

operators, schedulers, UNOLS Office, and agency representatives are needed. The cost of ship lay-ups should be identified and various scenarios for lay-ups considered. The Ad hoc Committee was asked to provide a status report to the Council by June 1.

UNOLS STR/Scheduling Database (Mike Prince) – Mike reported that the Office is in the process of developing the code for the new UNOLS Ship Time Request scheduling database. They are importing the data from the existing ship time system. It will be a database web application. Principal Investigators would need to have only one password to access the system. The new system will not be ready for this ship scheduling cycle, but a demonstration will be presented during the summer scheduling meeting. A feature of the system will be a calculator for estimating the cost of the cruise.

UNOLS Office Competition – The MLML UNOLS Office will complete their second 3-year term on April 30, 2006. Peter reported that NSF has indicated a new requirement that the Office be competed every five years. This conflicts with the current process and would present inconsistencies with the UNOLS Charter. Peter reported that the Charter states that the UNOLS Office could be held at one institution nine years in three-year increments. The charter indicates that the office would be periodically reviewed and recommendations made.

Mike Reeve remarked there is no strict NSF rule regarding a competition every five years, but this would be more consistent with the agency's other agreements. The ships are an example of 5-year agreements. The position of NSF is to keep the review and competition process shorter and more stringent. They feel that UNOLS should make an effort to advertise the office on a more regular basis (less than nine years). They don't have a problem with the Council indicating that the current office has an interest to continue as host.

Mike Prince indicated that MLML would like to host the office for another three years, not five years.

The Council agreed that Peter should appoint a small committee to review the performance of the current office and make a recommendation about whether or not the Office at MLML is suitable for continued operation. In the process of doing this review, they should seek input from all the UNOLS representatives and ask if any other institutions would be interested in competing to host the office. They would make it clear that MLML has stated their desire to host the office for one more three-year period of time and plans to submit a proposal for doing so.

There was discussion by the Council on whether or not the process and Charter should be changed to have competition every five years with a two-term limit for any institution. No recommendation for a change was made at this time.

Peter Wiebe appointed a review committee of himself as Chair, Wilf Gardner, and Margo Edwards. They will send an announcement to the membership by summer with a recommendation in the fall.

Administration response to Ocean Commission Report - Peter Wiebe commented that basic research does not seem to get much attention in the response. The facilities renewal is included in the report and seems to be in the hands of FOFC and NORLC. The role of NORLC will transition into a new organization.

Committee Reports – Committee Chairs had an opportunity to raise issues requiring Council attention. Full written Committee reports are included in *Appendix XVII*.

RVOC – Tim Askew reported that at the October 2004 RVOC meeting they voted to change their annual meeting time from the fall to the spring. Their next meeting will be in April 2006.

RVTEC – Bill Martin reported that the RVTEC nominated Steve Hartz to serve as a liaison to SCOAR. The Council endorsed the nomination and appointed Steve to the SCOAR. Another area that Bill brought to the attention of the Council was the need for the Safety Committee to address safe working loads. While Dale Chayes was RVTEC Chair he sent a message to the Safety Committee Chair indicating that safe working loads and safety factors were areas of concern for RVTEC and requested that it be addressed. Tim Askew replied that this item is high on the Safety Committee list, but they just haven't had an opportunity to address it.

SSC – Rose Dufour reported that the ship scheduling committee has been busy scheduling and rescheduling. In November 2004, the schedulers learned that NOAA overscheduled ship time by approximately 100 days. The schedules began to unravel. NSF also had to remove some scheduled work. The ship schedules were reduced. The written report includes tables indicating deferred work, costs and agency support levels.

AICC – Margo Edwards reported that *Healy* is doing exceptionally well. Unfortunately the USCG Polar Class Icebreaker news is not good. The AICC has completed a science requirements report for the *Polars* and the USCG has completed an engineering feasibility study. The USCG and Booz Allen Hamilton have the final draft mission needs analysis, which AICC will review.

Margo reported on the President's budget regarding the USCG Icebreakers. The Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessment of the Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program yielded an outcome of "Results Not Demonstrated," due to a combination of poor alignment of the program with the user community and inadequate performance measures. By contrast, NSF's Polar Tools, Facilities, and Logistics program received an "Effective" PART score. The budget proposes to transfer funding for the Polar Icebreaking Program from USCG to NSF to better align resources with those who benefit from the program. While the Coast Guard will continue to operate the polar icebreaking fleet on a reimbursable basis, NSF will ultimately be responsible for the long-range planning required to refurbish or replace the ships, as necessary, which are nearing the end of their serviceable lives. The Government is not allowed to discuss this issue.

SCOAR – Mike Prince summarized a report from John Bane. The SCOAR has a new committee member and will establish a committee rotation to bring on additional new members. An advertisement is planned in the fall. The SCOAR has had two articles published this year that provide information about their committee and plans. They are pleased that the aircraft facilities will be included in the FIP update. Funding for aircraft operations appears to be a challenge. Increasing access to the Aircraft facilities is a focus of SCOAR.

FIC – Dave Hebert reported that Niall Slowey is completing his first term and FIC nominates him for a second term. The Council approved the nomination.

DESSC – Debbie could not be present, but she provided a written report. The DESSC includes many new members. A current action item for the committee is to define the criteria / process for bringing new assets into the National Facility.

Other Business:

Annual meeting – The fall meeting dates were reported. The Council Meeting will be held on October 13th and the Annual Meeting will be on October 14th. Keynote speaker suggestions are needed and can be sent to the Office by email.

Summer Council Phone/web meeting dates were discussed. Early July was suggested as a possible date.

1215 Adjourn