Healy and Polar class cruise debrief (Rev 12/2013)

Date of post-cruise teleconference debrief: not applicable

Chief Scientist and contact coordinates:

Kevin Arrigo
Stanford University
arrigo@stanford.edu; (650) 723-3599

Name of Project:

SUBICE – Study of Under-ice Blooms In the Chukchi Ecosystem

Name of Ship & Cruise Number:
USCGC Healy 14-

Start and end dates of cruise:

May 13-June 23, 2014

Please provide comments on the topics and questions that are appropriate for your cruise.
NOTE: This form may be submitted as either a *.doc or *.docx file.

1) Overall Success of Cruise:

a) What percentage of the planned science objectives was met during this cruise?

About 60%

b) Please summarize positive and negative factors that impacted completion of the science objectives (for example, personnel issues, equipment performance, ice and weather conditions)

We could have completed our science objectives if our cruise had been a couple weeks later or the snow had begun to melt earlier.

2) Pre-Cruise Planning

a) How beneficial and useful is the cruise planning form and the Icefloe web site?

Very beneficial

b) Is it clear what is required to be provided to the ship and the schedule for receipt of that information (schedules, lists, plans, forms)?

Yes

c) Were the questions on the pre-cruise questionnaire appropriate and easy to respond to?

Yes

d) Were you able to submit the questionnaire fairly early in the planning process?

Yes

e) Did an operations (cruise?) plan get submitted in a timely manner? Was it useful for you and the ship before and during the cruise?

Yes

f) Do you have suggestions for how the website and questionnaire might be improved?

No

3) Pre-Cruise Communications

How were pre-cruise communications between the Coast Guard and the Science Party, especially the Chief Scientist? Were points of responsibility easily identified? Were responses to questions and concerns received in a timely manner? How were communications within the science party and did that impact communications between the Chief Scientist and the CG?

All communications went very well.

4) Communications and Coordination During the Cruise

How were communications and coordination during the cruise? Were lines of responsibility clear? Were the evening planning meetings effective for communicating information between the Coast Guard and the Science Party?

Communication on board ship was even better.

5) Environmental Permitting

a) Was any environmental permitting required?

Not that I am aware of.

b) If so, were these requirements identified at an early date and were there clear means to accomplishing those needs? In other words, how well did it go?

N/A

6) Communications with Local Alaskan Native Communities

How well did communications between the CG and science and local Alaska Native communities go during the cruise? (Examples: notifications to local communication centers, communications between Chief Scientists and/or CG and entities such as village tribal governments (e.g. IRAs), village corporations, the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission and other appropriate wildlife co-management organizations, village whaling captains' associations, and other locally based interest groups.)

We brought a native observer (Jason Christenson) on board and he communicated with ant communities in our study area. This worked out very well.

7) ***Cargo/Hazmat/Materials Handling***

a) How did any and all aspects (scheduling, communication, etc.) of the cruise onload and offload go?

Very smoothly

b) How did materials handling, including hazmat, go during onload/offload and during the cruise?

Very well so far. We haven't offloaded the ship yet.

8) Laboratory and Other Vans

a) Did you use vans from the UNOLS van pool or from another source (specify)?

Yes, one radiation van and one general lab van.

b) How did the procurement go?

Very well.

c) Were lines of responsibility clear for obtaining appropriate vans and for setting up and maintaining the vans on board?

Yes.

d) Was adequate time available to obtain the vans?

Yes.

e) How well did the vans perform?

The scintillation counter on the radiation van never worked.

f) Were they appropriately equipped with ship connections?

Yes

g) How well did load and offload go?

Loading went well, offloading is scheduled for Sept 30, 2014

9) Lab and Your Science Equipment Setup/Installation

a) How well did set-up of the labs and science equipment go? For example, were you able to have the lab counters and unistrut adjusted appropriately to fit your needs?

This went very well. The new main lab design is great.

b) Did installation of science equipment outside of the ship's equipment go well? Were there any unexpected surprises in terms of needs or ability to support such scientific equipment? How clearly were special requirements for science equipment defined prior to the cruise?

This went very well. The on-deck incubators froze up at first, but this was quickly remedied.

c) Was anything identified during your cruise that should be recommended as a permanent addition to the ship's science equipment?

No

10) Information Technology On Board and On Shore

a) Communications (Local and remote E-mail, account set-up, internet access, data transfer on/off and within ship or between ships, Inmarsat and Iridium, radio). Were you satisfied with the capabilities? Were there computing resources or communications enhancements that you could have used but that were not available on board?

This was fine

b) How did the shipboard data collection, management, and archiving go? Were these services provided efficiently and made available in ways that promote rapid transfer of data to users?

Yes

c) How well did operational technology work? (Map Server, board of lies, web cameras on board, monitors for changing among closed-circuit cameras, functionality of the closed-circuit cameras on board, winch display on back deck)

All was fine except for Map Server. RADARSAT data availability was spotty and we never got either SSM/I or MODIS data throughout the entire cruise.

11) Shipboard Science Systems

a) How well did these perform? This includes deionized water, multibeam, winches, environmental chambers, freezers, refrigeration, science seawater , underway data acquisition systems, ADCPs, depth sounders, etc.)

These all worked very well.

b) Do you think anything needs to be upgraded?

For some reason, Milli-Q water was not consistently available, and whenever we needed it, we had to get an MST to turn it on. This was inconvenient, but it worked OK.

12) Deck Operations and Deployment/Recovery of Science Gear

a) How well did the planning, understanding of responsibilities and approaches, and implementation go for both science and crew?

Very well

b) Was appropriate and appropriately sized safety equipment available?

Yes

c) Were operations safe? Did everyone comply with safety requirements? Were any unexpected safety issues identified and were they dealt with?

Yes

d) Was there enough assistance as needed and/or requested with deployments and recoveries?

Yes

e) Were communications effective with the bridge and winch control during deployments?

Yes

g) Other

13) Ice Conditions

How well was information about the ice conditions in the area of operations provided to the ship and to the scientific party?

Not well. RADARSAT data availability was spotty and we never got either SSM/I or MODIS data throughout the entire cruise.

14) Small Boat Operations

If appropriate, please comment on:

a) Adequacy of boat briefs

N/A

b) Provision and availability of appropriate safety equipment

N/A

c) Identification of science needs and requirements

N/A

d) How well the operations went

N/A
e) Other

15) Helicopter Operations

If appropriate, please comment on:

N/A

a) Adequacy of flight briefs

N/A

b) Provision and availability of appropriate safety equipment

N/A

c) Identification of science needs and requirements.

N/A

d) Other

N/A

16) Food Service

a) How well were special dietary requirements (vegetarian, vegan, low-fat, etc.) identified and met?

Very well

b) How was the quality of service and food, including outside of the three main meals of the day (e.g., (quality and availability of food/experience for those working overnight)?

It was great. No complaints about the food – especially the deserts.

c) Other

17) Berthing and shared spaces (science conference room, gyms, laundry)

a) How did all aspects of housekeeping go?

Very well

b) How did the berth assignments go?

Very well

c) How were the check-in/check-out processes?

Very well

d) Other

18) Medical

a) Were needs, if any, met?

Yes

b) Medical history questionnaires

i) Could the forms be improved?
No need

ii) How did the submission process go? (timing, acknowledgement of receipt, etc.)
Very well

19) Other comments (if any)

Appendix – Additional Questions for Specific Activities or Instruments. Answer only if appropriate for your cruise.

1) Multibeam

a) How much real-time watchstander effort was required?

b) How much onboard ping editing was done in the post-processing?

c) In both cases, who provided the people? Who was responsible for training the people?

d) Other Multi -Beam issues?

2) Diving

If you conducted scientific diving on your cruise, how did it go?

3) Operations on the ice

a) Were on-ice operation briefings adequate?

Yes

b) Was appropriate safety equipment provided and readily available?

Yes

c) Were science needs and requirements adequately identified?

Yes

d) How well did the operations go overall?

Very well

e) Other on-ice operations issues?

No

4) Science Support in Barrow