

<b>PI:</b> Mitchell, Measures, Zhou <b>Event#:</b> B-228, B-225, B-248			<b>Ph:</b> <b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Cruise #:</b> LMG-0402	<b>MPC:</b> Brent Evers  <b>Date:</b> 20 Mar 04
<b>Yes</b>  X   X   X	<b>No</b>  X	<b>Planning</b>  SIP process adequate?   RSP helpful and timely?   POC responsive?	<p>Comments on the SIP process were mixed. The grantees liked the simplicity of shipping and being able to see what equipment was available for selection. However, they also found the system extremely rigid and felt that it unnecessarily placed an additional set of people between them and the vendors they needed to buy supplies from. They felt significantly more time is required on the part of the grantee to obtain needed supplies with less certainty that the correct materials have been supplied.</p> <p>An example of this system breaking down was 200 feet of Teflon tubing that was ordered but came to the ship as four 50 foot lengths, an unacceptable solution in the grantees opinion. In addition the grantees surmised that the lack of fiscal discipline associated with this procurement system leads to significant over-ordering and excessive cost to the NSF.</p> <p>One PI noted that he was at sea during the planning process, rendering the web based system useless. Most grantees already have systems in place for procuring their supplies, and to then go through an intermediary who is not familiar with all of the details of the grantees needs is neither efficient nor cost effective and will inevitably lead to errors, no matter how diligent the POCs are.</p> <p>One of the PI's tested the web based SIP process in a beta version, noted problems, and still had to use it. They all felt that the Excel spreadsheet format that was eventually used work better.</p> <p>Most were very uncomfortable with the idea that they would not see their supplies before they arrived at the ship, and felt that having everything first shipped to their institution worked out well. This however resulted in a lot of extra shipping via Pt Hueneme .</p> <p>The grantees felt that the communal use of property (CTD's) was excellent. Some grantees were not aware of the RSP. They felt that the RSP was of marginal use to them since they have their own way of organizing for a cruise anyway, but that it was a good thing for RPSC personnel.</p> <p>The grantees were not informed that the POC changed during the planning process and found this point of transition very confusing. They also were not made aware of the crisis that took place on the NBP (engine failure). There appeared to be a period of time when almost the entire office was incommunicado during the NBP engine failure, and this group had no idea why. They felt it would have been fine for RPSC to tell them that a crisis situation had arisen and that they would have to wait a week or two while RPSC worked to resolve it, but would liked to have been apprised of the situation.</p> <p>Issues would arise where the POC would email a question, but 5-6 other people might be copied. The Grantee would then end up engaged in several different email exchanges and found this a bit confusing.</p> <p>The switchboard at RPSC HQ needs to know who to contact when one of the planning people are out of the office. It appeared to the grantees that no chain of command structure was known to the switchboard operator.</p> <p>The grantees felt that the PI/pre-cruise planning meeting was, in retrospect, an excellent idea and that many issues were resolved by it. They also felt that in would be beneficial if the MPC for the cruise were directly involved in that meeting.</p> <p>OPP needs to coordinate their ship allocation schedule with the UNOLS schedule. It is unacceptable for two NSF ship allocation programs to be operating under different schedules as it makes it extremely difficult for grantees who are involved in other NSF shipboard programs to plan equipment staging, personnel etc. and thus provide the information needed by RPSC in a timely manner.</p>		

X		<p><b>Medical</b></p> <p>Kits sent out on time?</p>	<p>The grantees felt that the level of medical requirements are excessive for one month at sea and noted that UNOLS vessels operate in similarly remote regions with no medical screening process.</p> <p>The PQ time frame was too short – i.e., too soon before the cruise started and should have been begun one month earlier. One science party paid to have other people PQ in case some of the primary people did not PQ.</p>
X		<p>Questions answered?</p>	<p>They would like to have the option of doing the blood work at another, local lab. One grantee had to had all blood work redone, presumably because the sample needed to be shipped from Hawaii to Colorado.</p> <p>The TB test doesn't consider those who have been inoculated against it and therefore fail the test. Those who have been inoculated as a child and have no documentation of it are then required to submit to an xray, even if they have been xray'd before. They felt it was wrong to submit someone to multiple xrays (every time they deploy) for what is essentially a known result.</p>

<b>Event#:</b> B-228, B-225, B-248		
<b>Date:</b> 20 Mar 04		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Travel</b>
X		TRW available and understandable?  The grantees would like the option to do their own travel and felt it would be easier to order their own tickets and then forward their itinerary to RPSC. One grantee did make his own travel arrangements after consulting with RPSC, others were unaware that this option existed.
X		Ticketing completed easily?  The hotel reservation for one PI came to Agunsa only one day before his arrival, resulting in a somewhat less than desirable hotel.
X		Meet and assist service met requirements?  Excellent!! Jimmy in Santiago and Ximena in PA were both fantastic and greatly eased the immigration/customs process.  They felt the excess baggage option was very helpful.
<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Equipment Availability</b>
X		<b>Requested</b> equipment available?  The grantees were pleased with RPSC's efforts to build the garage van. They thought it came out well and that RPSC did a quick and professional job. While it came out well, it caused a lot of anxiety in that there were still a lot of unresolved question in the November/December time frame. They felt that fabrication/modification of the incubator van needed to start earlier. There was some miscommunication (related to the design of the lighting and selection of bulbs) that caused some delay in receiving the van. This subsequently impacted their testing of it and forced them to make modifications to get it to work that could have been better thought out and planned had more time been available.
X		Damaged?  The Ashtech attitude reference GPS failed and caused the ADCP to have problems at the beginning of the cruise (in addition to the gyro problems). They feel that the system is dated and needs to be replaced.
X	X	Late?  All three centrifuges received were hot (traces of radiation – one from Palmer station and two from PA). This was unacceptable. The grantees were appreciative of efforts to get something that worked, but the units should not have been received hot.
X		<b>ECW gear in good condition?</b>  The grantees greatly appreciated RPSC's and AGUNSA's efforts to go the extra mile and get parts to King George Island. The CTD springs need to be changed ASAP (rusty). They would like to see different types of CTD configurations identified in the planning process. For example, for this type of work, this CTD will be configured with this type of o-rings and springs, for another type, this type of o-ring and spring. Several of the float coat zippers are bad and need replacing. Some float coats in general need replacing. Additional hard hats would be useful.

<b>Event#:</b> B-228, B-225, B-248		
<b>Date:</b> 20 Mar 04		
X	<b>Lab Space</b>  Adequate? (electrical needs, bench space, water, etc.)	<p>The ship needs more desk space.</p> <p>More chairs are needed that are reconfigurable to work at either a desk or a lab bench.</p> <p>The removable tables were not easily modified and are for all intents and purposes permanent. The grantees preferred the simple lab benches used on the Scripps ships.</p>
X	Remote Sensing support needs met? (QFax, Terascan, etc.)	<p>The grantees by and large did their own remote sensing work. A license was requested (and budgeted) for Seawifs data but Palmer Station did not have it. Discussion with the Palmer Station Science tech indicated that he was not sure how to collect Seawifs data and the grantees were unsure that they would have been able to receive data Seawifs even if the key had been received.</p> <p>The large inbound email account was broken at the beginning of the trip but resolved quickly.</p> <p>If useful to other grantees, it may be wise to start investigating how to make MODUS satellite data readily available on the vessels. The grantees would be willing to help in this effort if deemed useful to other groups.</p>
X	<b>Quality of Hotel Services</b>  Cabins clean and neat?	<p>There is a sharp drawer in the Chief scientists cabin that could be removed (preferably).</p>
X	Linens clean and in good condition?	<p>There were no pillow cases or towels the first day. Many of the linens are old and tired and need replacing. Some of the pillows were 'nasty'.</p>
X	Food quality and variety was good?	<p>Excellent!! Good selections, good quality. No complaints from the vegetarians either.</p>

<b>Event#:</b> B-228, B-225, B-248			
<b>Date:</b> 20 Mar 04			
<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Personnel Issues</b>	
	X	ECO?	Excellent.
	X	RSPC?	Excellent. The help on deck was greatly appreciated.
X		<b>Research Objectives</b>	
		All accomplished? If not, please explain (weather, ice, equipment, personnel).	The grantees felt that they more than accomplished their goals. One grantee indicated that they got 200% of an ambitious plan. All realistic expectations were exceeded. One grantee described it cruise as yielding "spectacular results". Another indicated that it was the most exciting cruise he'd ever done – especially the interdisciplinary work of the different groups onboard.

<b>Event#:</b> B-228, B-225, B-248		
<b>Date:</b> 20 Mar 04		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Surveys Completed?</b>
X		USAP Metrics Survey
X		GPRA Facilities Survey
		<b>Future Cruises</b>
X		<p>If returning for another cruise, are there any additional equipment or support needs your group anticipates?</p>
X		<p>Anything you would like to see changed?</p>
		<p>A short, 1000 meter winch cable would be useful for instruments that can't drive a full ocean depth cable. One grantee believes that the Dush 4 winch could be modified to overwrap an additional 0.322 cable by drilling through and passing the short cable out the side of the drum.</p> <p>The grantees feel that OPP should consider developing its own TM clean sampling system. The current cruise was able to take advantage of the NSF owned equipment that belonged to one of the grantees (bought for a different project). Trace metal investigations are likely to continue in OPP regions thus the development of pool equipment and maintenance procedures for future users would be advantageous to the entire community. The procurement of the garage van/clean room, conducting Kevlar, and refurbishment of Go_Flo bottles goes some way towards meeting this goal, but other elements, such as subsampling and clean analytical space are still needed.</p> <p>The cargo database is a bottleneck with single user only entry.</p> <p>They felt that the port calls were very tight given the amount of work that needed to be done but appreciated the large number of people that RPSC brought down for support. All indications are that the cargo and packing issues would have reached crisis/catastrophic proportions if the grantee cargo crates had not been transported to Palmer Station or another day planned to pack and offload in port.</p>

<p><b>Event#:</b> B-228, B-225, B-248</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 20 Mar 04</p>		
<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Other Issues</b></p> <p>Diving, Zodiac, E-mail support, interactions with stations, etc.</p> <p>The visual obstruction of the fantail by the science vans created a few problems with crane/winch/A-frame operations and was a potential safety hazard. This might be resolved by having a better camera system on the back deck.</p> <p>The use of only one winch operator is a potential safety hazard, especially his need to operate some of the controls with a stick (too far to reach by hand) when operating both the winch and A-frame. The grantees felt that they could easily lend a hand in these operations with some minimal training.</p> <p>There are not enough cleats and deck-eye sockets on deck for tag lines etc. Using rails to tie off to is a poor substitute.</p> <p>The side A-frame doors need to be serviced. The pins are bent and the doors can be difficult to close.</p> <p>The alarm in the Baltic room needs to be louder or an additional one needs to be installed.</p> <p>The limiting factor to their ability to do science was the ship and its ability to hold station in wind and its relative tendency to roll significantly in moderate seas. The grantees felt that it hits those limits rather quickly.</p> <p>The ship was in general too small for this size project.</p> <p>The level 1 and 2 access (no access/ access to vans only) to the aft deck worked well, but would have been better had they known that the ship could be turned to weather for brief access.</p> <p>The TMC landing cups could be enlarged, although they worked better than expected.</p>

**Event#:** B-228, B-225, B-248

**Date:** 20 Mar 04

**Additional Comments/Overflow:**