Healy & Polar Class cruise debrief, held via teleconference (Rev 01/10)

Date of post-cruise teleconference debrief:

Chief Scientist: Kevin Arrigo

Name of Project: ICESCAPE

Name of Ship & Cruise Number: Healy 1101

Start and end dates of cruise: 25 June 2011 – 29 July 2011

Please provide comments on the topics and questions that are appropriate for your cruise.

NOTE: This form must 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? 100%
- b) Please summarize positive and negative factors that impacted completion of the science objectives (for example, personnel issues, equipment performance, ice and weather conditions).

Good weather, equipment performed flawlessly, and the crew was familiar with our sampling strategy, having done it the year before.

2) Pre-Cruise Planning

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

Very beneficial – it keeps everyone on the same page and up to date.

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?

I think its quite comprehensive and appropriate as is.

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?

Communication was excellent between all parties involved.

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 was excellent between all parties involved.

5) Environmental Permitting

a) Was any environmental permitting required?

No

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?

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.)

Communications with locals were made prior to the cruise. No attempt was made to communicate with locals during the cruise, except when we had to offload a crew member from the ship in Barrow, AK.

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 smoothly.

8) Laboratory and Other Vans

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

We used 2 UNOLS rad vans.

b) How did the procurement go?

Very smoothly.

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

Very smoothly.

d) Was adequate time available to obtain the vans?

Yes.

e) How well did the vans perform?

Very well

f) Were they appropriately equipped with ship connections?

Yes.

g) How well did load and offload go?

Very smoothly, although there were contamination issues. Its not clear where the contamination originated..

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?

Very smoothly.

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?

Very smoothly.

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

No, but the new track the Healy installed for the CTD rosette worked great..

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?

Communications were 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?

Very smoothly.

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)

I love these systems. I can't imagine being on a ship without them.

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.)

Very smoothly. b) Do you think anything needs to be upgraded? Not from my perspective. 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 smoothly. 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? Very well.

14) Small Boat Operations

a) Adequacy of boat briefs

If appropriate, please comment on:

Very good.
b) Provision and availability of appropriate safety equipment
Very good.
c) Identification of science needs and requirements
Very good.
d) How well the operations went
Very well.
e) Other
15) Helicopter Operations
If appropriate, please comment on:
a) Adequacy of flight briefs
b) Provision and availability of appropriate safety equipment
c) Identification of science needs and requirements.
d) Other
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)? c) Other
Very good.
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 good.
d) Other
18) Medical
a) Were needs, if any, met?
Yes
b) Medical history questionnaires
i) Could the forms be improved?
I think that they are fine.
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?