



#### Review of Technical Studies Polar Research Vessel

#### Presented to ARVOC

Arlington, VA

18 October 2005



## Agenda

- Welcoming remarks Rob Dunbar
- Introduction and project objectives for 2005 Al Sutherland
- Documentation and justification of science and operational requirements Jim Holik
- PRV mission sensitivity study Jim St John
- PRV project timeline Jim St John
- Interim results from 2005 technical studies Jim St John/David Karnes

#### Welcoming Remarks

Introduction and Project Objectives for 2005 Documentation/Justification of Science/Operational Requirements

#### Initial Science and Operational Requirements Provided to Design Team

- Acoustic profiling including bottom mapping during icebreaking
- Towing of nets and instruments from the stern during icebreaking
- Conduct of Autonomous Underwater Vehicle (AUV) / Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) operations from a moon pool
- Geotechnical drilling through a moon pool
- Acoustically quiet
- Comply with International Maritime Organization (IMO) guidelines for Arctic vessels
- Accommodations for 50 scientists
- 80-day endurance
- Reduced air emissions from diesels and incinerator
- Enhanced icebreaking capability
- Helicopter hangar

# Sources of Refinements to Requirements

- Input from series of ARVOC/SSC meetings in May 2003; June/July 2003; November 2003
- Poster sessions at Town Meetings held at AGU, December 2003; Ocean Sciences, January 2003
- Community Memo from ARVOC Chair
- Last input from ARVOC/SSC was November 2003

#### Refined Science and Operational Requirements

- Moon pool size reduced to 10' by 15' and relocated because drill rig and AUV/ROV should not be built in
- 80 day endurance defined as 20,000 NM @ 12 Knots in open water
- Accommodation for 50 scientists; minimum 3 single PI cabins
- Jumbo piston core capability for 50 meter core, using design under development by WHOI
- Endorsed concept of podded propulsors for stationkeeping, towing in ice and maneuverability but further investigation necessary – EMI and reliability

#### Refined Science and Operational Requirements (Cont)

- ABS A3 (PC3) Classification: 4.5 feet level icebreaking at 3 knots; operations in Central Arctic Basin in Summer
- Box Keel for transducer placement gives superior ability to survey in ice
- Helicopter Hangar
- Reduced emissions ('green' vessel)
- Portable lab containers (2 on 01 deck and 3-4 on Main deck)

#### Refined Science and Operational Requirements (Cont)

- 8 ft wide passageway on main deck for palletized cargo handing; intra-deck elevator
- 2 microscope rooms; 2 environmental rooms
- Investigate gyro-stabilized platform/lab for microscopy, micro-balances and ultra-centrifuge
- Walk in freezer, 200 sq ft
- Improved container handing in holds
- Two point winch system for large otter trawls
- No 'water-wings'

#### Science and Operational Requirements - Issues

- Vessel delivery in 2012 could be adversely impacted with delays in defining scientific and operational requirements
- An initial set of "baseline" requirements should be established to assess one or more viable vessel options
- Activities of ARVOC in formulating and defining requirements unclear with pending NAS/PRB study

## **PRV Mission Sensitivity Study**

- 2004 effort redirected to conduct a mission sensitivity study.
- Objective were to:
  - Study the cost associated with individual science requirements
  - Determine what drives ship cost

#### Construction Cost Sensitivity of Added PRV Mission Capabilities





Significance of Individual Mission Requirements on Construction Cost

#### Selected Mission Options with 3 ft Icebreaking

	Level icebreaking	Box keel	Reduced diesel emissions	Length for 50 m jumbo piston core	50 science accommodations	80 days endurance	SHALDRIL capable	Expanded moon pool	Double hull	Length for 80 m jumbo piston core	Cost (\$M)	% of baseline cost	% of 3 ft baseline cost
baseline	3 ft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107.9	100%	100%
	3 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	105.7	98%	98%
	3 ft	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	111.4	103%	103%
	3 ft	•	•	•	0	•	0	0	0	0	113.0	105%	105%
	3 ft	•	•	•	0	0	•	0	0	0	109.8	102%	102%
	3 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	•	0	0	109.8	102%	102%
	3 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	•	0	112.5	104%	104%
	3 ft	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	118.8	110%	110%
	3 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	122.6	114%	114%
	3 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	126.8	117%	117%
	3 ft	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	0	135.0	125%	125%
	3 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	136.9	127%	127%

= feature not selected

• = feature selected

#### Selected Mission Options with 4 ft Icebreaking

	Level icebreaking	Box keel	Reduced diesel emissions	Length for 50 m jumbo piston core	50 science accommodations	80 days endurance	SHALDRIL capable	Expanded moon pool	Double hull	Length for 80 m jumbo piston core	Cost (\$M)	% of baseline cost	% of 3 ft baseline cost
baseline	4 ft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150.6	100%	140%
	4 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	147.0	98%	136%
	4 ft	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	152.5	101%	141%
	4 ft	•	•	•	0	•	0	0	0	0	155.7	103%	144%
	4 ft	•	•	•	0	0	•	0	0	0	150.4	100%	139%
	4 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	•	0	0	152.5	101%	141%
	4 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	•	0	154.5	103%	143%
	4 ft	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	161.3	107%	149%
	4 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	164.8	109%	153%
	4 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	170.1	113%	158%
	4 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	178.9	119%	166%
	4 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	178.9	119%	166%

 $\circ$  = feature not selected

• = feature selected

#### Selected Mission Options with 4.5 ft Icebreaking

	Level	Box keel	Reduced diesel emissions	Length for 50 m jumbo piston core	50 science accommodations	80 days endurance	SHALDRIL capable	Expanded moon pool	Double hull	Length for 80 m jumbo piston core	Cost (\$M)	% of baseline cost	% of 3 ft baseline cost
baseline	4.5 ft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170.8	100%	158%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	168.3	99%	156%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	173.8	102%	161%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	0	•	0	0	0	0	176.6	103%	164%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	0	0	•	0	0	0	171.6	100%	159%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	•	0	0	173.1	101%	160%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	•	0	176.0	103%	163%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	182.2	107%	169%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	185.5	109%	172%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	190.2	111%	176%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	199.1	117%	184%
	4.5 ft	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	199.1	117%	184%

 $\circ$  = feature not selected

• = feature selected

#### Construction Cost for Selected Mission Capabilities



## Sensitivity Study Conclusions

 The selection of 1.4 m icebreaking capability provides a large ship where many of the other features can be incorporated at no additional cost.

## **PRV Project Timeline**

	YEAR									
ACTIVITY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Pre-RFP Development										
Compile RFP Documents and Issue										
Bidding, Evaluation, and Contract Award					12.6					
Shipyard Design and Construction			R. S.							
Acceptance Trials				1.2	1					
Transit to Southern Hemisphere Port		225			2					

#### Interim Results from 2005 Technical Studies

- Principal vessel characteristics
- Ship performance characteristics
- Cabin alternative arrangements
- Arrangement drawings
- Propulsion machinery
  - diesel electric
  - alternative propulsors
- Summary of efforts
- Next step
  - feedback on technical studies
  - completion of 2005 effort

#### **Principal Vessel Characteristics**

- Length Overall 115.3 m (378.4 ft)
- Length, Water Line 103.9 m (340.9 ft)
- Beam 22.7 m (74.5 ft)
- Draft 9.0 m (29.6 ft)
- Displacement 11,200 MT (11,000 LT)
- Propulsive Horsepower total, both podded propulsors 16.8 MW (22,400 HP)

#### Ship Performance Characteristics

- Icebreaking performance
  - 4.5 ft (1.4 m) at 3 kt continuous
- Open water performance
  - Cruising speed 12 kt
  - Maximum speed 17.6 kt

## **Cabin Alternative Arrangements**

- criteria and standards
- arrangement alternatives
- overall arrangements

## Cabin Criteria & Standards

- Bottom berth to have drawers below
- Upper berth to be of Pullman type that can folded against the bulkhead
- Berths to be in fore and aft direction
- Berths have draw curtains to close off light
- Desks for two with two chairs, one phone, and various electrical outlets including LAN, and others (consider extra lighting at desk)
- Two clothing lockers for bulk clothing such as Polar outdoor clothing
- Lockers or other suitable location for two life preservers
- Lockers suitable to hang clothes and some drawers
- Head for two occupants of room

#### Cabin Criteria & Standards Two Person

- Carpeting on floor
- Porthole in each stateroom with Plexiglas sheet covering to act as insulator
- Stateroom door to have kick-out panel and lockable
- Eight foot high ceiling
- Electrical outlets suitable for vacuum cleaner
- Flat panel TV monitor suspended from ceiling
- Optional features for some alternative arrangements
  - Two person settee
  - Coffee table
  - Shelving at bed
  - Lighting in bed

- Several alternative two person cabins are shown and compared to a standard cabin on NBP (blue)
- Selected cabin for the arrangement is highlighted in red



11.8' X 17.3'

11.8' X 17.3'

9.8' X 19.7'

## Cabin Criteria & Standards

One Person with Day Room

- Stateroom
  - i. Single bunk under porthole
  - ii. Head
  - iii. Locker
  - iv. Phone next to bed
  - v. Shelving next to bed
- Day-room
  - i. Desk with special lighting and chair
  - ii. Phone at desk with other electrical outlets
  - iii. Table with wrap around seating
  - iv. File cabinet
  - v. Other items associated with day-cabin

#### **Cabin Arrangement Alternatives**









MAIN DECK



![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

04 LEVEL

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Propulsion Machinery Diesel Electric Selected

- Multiple generators produce power
- Common bus all equipment powered by the same set of generators
- Excellent torque characteristics for operation in ice
- Quiet operation
- Flexible plant for varying loads
- Motor generators for clean power

#### Propulsion Machinery Alternative Propulsors Considered

- Podded propulsors
  - Azipod open propeller & motor in pod
  - Mermaid open propeller, motor in ship & Z drive
  - Aquamaster nozzle, motor in ship & Z drive
  - Siemans-Schottel open propellers on both ends (Counter-rotating) & motor in the pod
- Conventional propulsion
  - Twin propellers, shafts and motors in the hull with conventional rudders and skegs
  - Slight increase in length with this alternative

## Summary of Output

- Documentation and justification for science and operational requirements
- Vessel dimensions and characteristics that satisfy the requirements
- Lines plan, hydrostatics, and stability
- Outboard profile and deck plans
- Standard scientist cabin plan
- Construction cost estimate
- Initial set of vessel specifications based on feasibility studies

## The Next Step

- ARVOC provides feedback on technical studies
- MARAD/STC completion of 2005 effort

#### Closing Remarks/Adjourn