# In light of **RCRV Phase I- Project Refresh**, *R/V Hugh R. Sharp* debrief process has high importance.

- What have we learned so far?

(8 questions/Responses from L.H. Tyler)

- How to proceed with debrief process and forwarding findings to NSF and UNOLS community?

# Responses: L.H. Tyler OCEANEERING INT. cruise dates 1/4/10-1/11/10

1. Size: **Has the overall size of the vessel either enabled of hindered you in meeting the science objectives of your cruise? Please explain how with specific examples.**

The Hugh R. Sharp was contracted by my company OCEANEERING Int. as a support ship for a series of equipment tests for the U. S. Navy. She was required to place a series of test shapes and ground tackle on the sea floor in 350 to 400 feet of water. In addition, weather permitting she would support remotely operated vehicle (ROV) operations. The Sharps, large, clear after deck made pre-rigging and handling of the 1800 feet of ground tackle and line an easy and safe operation, the ship was comfortable and provides ample lab and berthing space.

2. Over the side Handling system: **Has this system had a positive impact on your work and if so how. Are there any negative impacts associated with this system?**

The ships A-frame and deck winch was used to launch and recover our test system and a large recovery basket which weighed 400 pounds. The A-frame allowed us to safely place our gear over the side in winter conditions, with winds to 30 knots and 10 foot seas.

3. Retractable Centerboard with mounted acoustic transducers: **Has this arrangement had any significant positive or negative impacts on your work?**

We did not mount any equipment on the centerboard during this operation.

4. Acoustically Quiet: **Have you noticed any difference compared to other vessels, and has this had any positive or negative impacts on your work?**

The ship is quiet and while the work we were doing was not noise sensitive in nature the low ambient noise on board makes the ship very comfortable to live on, even during dynamic positioning operations.

5. Vans and Deck Space: **If you have used the vans, how well did they accommodate your internal space requirements? Did this modularity have a positive or negative impact on your cruise planning and work at sea?**

We did not mount vans on this operation, the clear afterdeck was however of great utility for our work.

6. Variable Berthing Capacity: **Did your project have need for the full berthing capacity of *Sharp*, and what do you see as the benefits and drawbacks to the approaches available on *Sharp*?**

We had ample berthing space on board, in fact everyone was able to have a private state room, they are clean and comfortable and provide a quite area to complete paper work. For longer cruises a locker for personal gear would be welcome to free up deck space in the rooms by allowing one to empty their duffel bag and stow it and their personal gear..

7. Dynamic Positioning: **How important was the DP system to your work? How well did this system operate during your cruise(s)? Was noise from the DP system disruptive?**

The DP system was vital to our success in placing gear on the sea floor in the precise location we required it. The ships maneuverability made it possible to operate in high winds and seas that are common to the central east coast in winter. We would not have been successful in our operations if the ship did not control as well as it does.

8. Other features: **Can you describe other design, outfitting or operational features of the *Sharp* that had significant positive or negative impacts on your work at sea? Should these features be requirements of other Regional Class Research Vessels (RCRVs)? Were there any important design features missing that should be available on RCRVs?**

I would only add that the Captain and crew of the Sharp were a pleasure to work with. Everyone was helpful, welcoming and flexible. The food was varied and well prepared all in all a very professional operation.

# Summary