Prior to the meeting, AICC sent a list of topics that we hoped would be discussed. These included:

- 1. A protocol for communicating important information through CG and the science community that is based on positions rather than people's names.
- 2. Clear agreement between CG and science about how and when to identify information that should not be released.
- 3. A joint CG/science plan for advertising the good works that HEALY is accomplishing.
- 4. A coordinated approach for interacting with northern communities.
- 5. An approach for planning and implementing major modifications to the ship systems that significantly impact science.
- 6. A strawman plan for addressing all of the recommendations that were published in the NAS report.

- AICC should facilitate a workshop to address the science requirements of the new icebreaker fleet. We need to be careful how this is handled as we don't want to "drive science" or take an official position on the NAS report, but it is appropriate for AICC to respond to the recommendations of the NAS report.
- This is also a useful process for the HEALY refit.
- We make sure that new ships get state-of-the-art equipment and not equipment that is specified early during the process.
- There should be a standing committee set up within AICC to keep this
 particular issue moving forward. ARVOC should be represented on the
 standing committee as they have much experience with this process.
 The standing committee will treat the workshop as an early step in a
 longer process of bringing new icebreakers into the fleet.

- AICC should develop new approaches for doing science on icebreakers.
- Get out the word that HEALY is available at times other than just during the summer, especially the shoulder seasons (fall/spring) if HEALY is to become a full-season platform. How can HEALY accomplish 300+ days of sea time per year?
- Develop an operational model for hybrid CG/science programs.
- AICC should encourage participation from and discussion of "science of opportunity" with funding agencies other than NSF including NOAA, NASA, Navy, etc.

We need a standardized process that allows for developing proposals for new instrumentation that would include community development of requirements. Main questions are who will prepare the proposal, who will get the funding and who will fund the equipment? AICC could set up a subcommittee or advise the CG and NSF on what process to follow. This should be a written protocol so that rotating CG and science personnel aren't an issue. Want to make sure that the state-of-the-art equipment is available for the new ships, not the older equipment that is specified in the original proposal.

- We want to improve the participation of PACAREA in AICC meetings. One suggestion was to hold some of the AICC meetings in Alameda to allow the participation of the PACAREA commander. Another was to continue to hold this smaller group retreat every year in the future. All agreed that this meeting had aired important issues that don't usually get discussed at AICC meetings.
- For advertising HEALY's good works, a potential way to increase HEALY's outreach is by hooking PI's into CG press and media releases. The CG is on TV every time an icebreaker comes back into port in Seattle, but science is rarely included. We can help each other.
- Marine Superintendent for icebreaker fleet?