

McMurdo Area User Committee (MAUC)

Recommendations and NSF responses from the annual meeting 17 July 2006

The full meeting report is available online at

<http://www.usap.gov/conferencesCommitteesAndWorkshops/userCommittees>

Recommendations

Staging Space

Staging space is needed for assembly, testing, and re-packaging scientific equipment for transport to the field. All groups surveyed in 2004 reported that they will require increased staging space in the future. The ANDRILL project will displace 70% of the science in Phase 2 during the 2006-07 field season. No plans are in the works for improved staging space for science groups.

Note: Last year's (2005) MAUC recommended allowing science groups to use a temporary structure for staging space while ANDRILL requires much of the Crary Lab space. They also recommended that a longer term solution be determined.

Recommendation #1

A working group needs to be established to investigate options for providing additional staging space in McMurdo. Options to be considered should include establishing temporary structures adjacent the Crary Lab and identifying suitable space in existing structures which can be reallocated for this purpose.

Suggested committee structure: Tom Neumann (chair)

Potential Members:

Terry Wilson, OSU
Joe Mastriani, Independent
Cara Sucher, RPSC
UNAVCO Rep
Al Sutherland, NSF
Member of the oceanographic buoy community

NSF Response:

NSF concurs that a working group is needed to work with RPSC in defining requirements for the staging space. The NSF tasks RPSC (Jim Scott, McMurdo Area Director) to review possible existing space for use as staging space and then communicate the findings to the NSF.

Crary Lab Space

Over the coming years it is expected that space in Crary Lab in general will become exceptionally tight. The committee considered that one solution to this problem would be to allow grantees wireless access in areas outside of CSEC so that they might do the equivalent of a telecommute, thereby reducing the pressure on office space.

Recommendation #2

Recommendation #5

During the development of online safety courses consideration should be given to allowing for individuals with similar prior training at home institutes to be able to opt out of the RPSC training.

NSF Response:

The NSF is skeptical that the opt out option for RPSC safety training of the scientists will be effective. NSF tasks RPSC EH&S (Environmental Health & Safety) to continue to work with the NSF EH&S to develop improvements in the safety training program, which optimize the training time spent by scientists

ii. MAUC was very interested in the concept of online courses prior to deployment as a way to reduce course time in McMurdo and decrease the time between arrival in McMurdo and carrying out the scientific objectives.

Safety Training for Scientists and online instruction

Recommendation #6

RPSC consider other course work which can be accomplished prior to deploying. For instance, the field safety refresher courses are about two-thirds class work and 1/3 hands-on (e.g. setting up tents, stoves, and radios). Could the course work go online thereby shortening the length of this on ice course?

NSF Response:

The NSF tasks RPSC to refine training requirements for each project and determine what courses can be presented in web format. RPSC should assess if the experience of USAP participants can be determined pre-deployment and factored into the “refresher training” required.
