

### Post Cruise Assessment Report Information

**PCAR ID:** 102465

**Date Created:** 3/9/2016 4:06:00 PM

**Date Modified:** 3/9/2016 4:06:00 PM

### Cruise Information

**Ship:** Oceanus

**Area of Operations:** NP09

**Cruise Dates:** 2/15/2016 - 2/19/2016

**Chief Scientist:** Miguel A. Goni, OSU-CEOAS

**Cruise Number:** OC1602A

### PIs and Funding Agencies:

**PI:** Miguel A. Goni, OSU-CEOAS

**Funding Agency:** NSF/OCE/CO

**Type of Work:** Winter Carbon Cycle

**Grant #:** 1459480

### Ship Personnel

**Master:** Jeffrey Crews

**Marine Technician:** Andrew Woogen, Steve Lambert

### Completer's Information:

**Person's Name:** Prof. Miguel A Goni

**Position on this cruise:** PI/Chief Scientist

**Institution:** College of Earth, Ocean, and  
Atmospheric Sciences

### Assessment:

1. To what extent were the planned science objectives of this cruise met?

**rating:** 71%-80%

**comment:**

Collect water samples and hydrographic data along cross-shelf transects located along or near the OOI glider paths. Plankton net tows, microstructure profiler and hyperpro deployments at specific locations.

2. Rate how well the science party contributed to achieving the scientific objectives of this cruise (pre-cruise planning, communication, adequate personnel, equipment, attention to safety, organization, etc.).

**rating:** Very Good

**comment:**

The science party was instrumental in the success of the cruise. Flexibility and good communication is key for any planned cruises during this time of the year as weather dictates where we can go and what we can do. This is also crabbing season on the Oregon coast and so flexibility on station locations is also key. All of the P.I.'s are very aware of this and are very good about being flexible as well as communicating what they need and want to do next.

3. Rate how well ship operator pre-cruise activities (planning, coordination, and logistics) and shore support contributed to achieving the scientific objectives of this cruise.

**rating:** Good

**comment:**

The pre-cruise planning was challenging because of the short time in between Jan and Feb cruises. The shore support personnel were helpful in overcoming the challenges so overall we had great communication on pre-cruise planning. Maintaining the channels of communication open and keeping in mind the tight scheduling will help in this regard.

4. Rate how well the ship operator supplied scientific equipment and marine technicians supported this cruise (appropriate equipment, equipment operational and ready for cruise, calibrations, documentation, technicians trained and familiar with equipment).

**rating:** Good

**comment:**

We did have some issues with the ADCP and the computer back for the underway system that resulted in some delays and some lost data. Andrew Woogen addressed these right away and so we should be set for next cruise. The 24 hour ops was greatly facilitated by having two martechs on board and we support the efforts to continue to do so.

---

5. Rate how well the scheduling of this cruise supported achieving the scientific objectives of this cruise (appropriate ship, year, season & dates, communications regarding schedules, online systems and scheduling process).

**rating:** Very Good

**ship requested:** Oceanus

**comment:**

For us this was critical. Winter time studies require sailing in the winter under potentially challenging conditions. The scheduling allowed us to do so and provided needed flexibility to deal with the later.

---

6. Rate the level of safety in shipboard and science operations (safety briefing and instructions, procedures & equipment).

**rating:** Excellent

**comment:**

Ship and science personnel worked great together. Safety was always paramount and we communicated effectively on procedures and equipment.

---

7. Rate how well the officers and crew and the manner in which the research vessel was operated contributed to achieving the scientific objectives of this cruise (communications, ship handling, deck procedures, attitude towards the science objectives, training, adequate number of crew, shipboard routine, etc.).

**rating:** Excellent

**comment:**

Ship officers and crew were outstanding on facilitating the objectives of the cruise. We have an excellent working relationship with them and will strive to continue for the next cruise.

---

8. Rate how well the research vessel and its installed equipment contributed to achieving the scientific objectives of this cruise (material condition, readiness, living conditions and habitability, condition of lab spaces, design, layout, deck equipment, winches, cranes, frames, propulsion, power, etc.).

**rating:** Good

**comment:**

Most of the equipment and facilities on the ship worked great and facilitated the achievement of our objectives. A few of the issues we encountered included:

- a) draining of lab sinks with both underway pumps going
- b) ADCP failure at start of the cruise
- c) loss of underway data for a few hours following power surge
- d) issues with wireless communications on the ship

All are being addressed, including the set up of independent power back up for computer systems., during time at port.

---

**9. Number of science days lost:**

due to weather: 2.00

due to ship equipment:

due to ship science equipment:

due to user science equipment:

**comment:**

---