

### Post Cruise Assessment Report Information

**PCAR ID:** 100122

**Date Created:** 7/16/2012 5:51:00 PM

**Date Modified:** 7/16/2012 6:05:00 PM

### Cruise Information

**Ship:** Knorr

**Area of Operations:** NA06

**Cruise Dates:** 4/21/2012 - 5/4/2012

**Chief Scientist:**

**Cruise Number:** KN207-1

### PIs and Funding Agencies:

**PI:** Benjamin Van Mooy, WHOI

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

**Type of Work:** non-P lipids

**Grant #:** 1031143

### Ship Personnel

**Master:** Sheasley

**Marine Technician:** Simoneau & Zafereo

### Completer's Information:

**Person's Name:** Benjamin Van Mooy

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

**Institution:** Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

### Assessment:

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

**rating:** 91-100%

**comment:**

We did CTD casts and drifting sediment trap deployments. Every single one of our objectives were met.

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:**

In general, the science party performed very well. Of course there is always room for improvement.

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:** Excellent

**comment:**

I think this went OK. In the future, I think I will insist that we not take along every Tom, Dick and Harry's gear to Bermuda. Coordinating all of the additional cargo was a distraction for the shore-based crew, and I think that their attentiveness to the core missions of the first cruise of the leg suffered slightly. That said, there were no major mishaps and all of our objectives were met.

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:** Very Good

**comment:**

Simoneau and Zafereo are the two best marine technicians I've ever worked with. As a team, they provided a truly mind-blowing level of support.

Probably the biggest negative on the cruise was that the PAR sensor died, just as we were getting into our blue water stations. This is an ESSENTIAL sensor, and I couldn't believe that an extra was not aboard. Zafereo did his best to fix it, but to no avail.

---

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:** N/A

**ship requested:** Knorr

**comment:**

The objectives were met, but the scheduling did not go smoothly. Our cruise request was for late-March to early-April. In JANUARY we were still uncertain whether our cruise would be in March, April or May. Furthermore, our science teams were to be on both the WH to Bermuda leg and an Azores to Iceland leg, and it would have been SO MUCH EASIER if they were back to back.

---

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

**rating:** Excellent

**comment:**

We did a man over board drill, which are not done frequently enough across the UNOLS fleet. This shows a real commitment to safety on the part of the Knorr officers.

---

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:**

The Knorr crew, without question, was the best I've ever sailed with, by a large, large margin. While we will all dearly miss the Knorr when she is decommissioned, the greater blow to the field of oceanography will be the disbanding of this crew. From officer to oiler, there is a palpable commitment to excellence. Their level of professionalism was truly exceptional; watching them all work was a thing of beauty, it really was. Working with Sheasley and the other officers was a true joy.

---

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:** Excellent

**comment:**

The ship performed beautifully. The only minor incident was a blown hydraulic hose on one of our last days, but the crew responded amazingly and had us up and going in no time (we lost an hour at the most). This is an very powerful endorsement of the Knorr crew and WHOI ship ops. The Knorr has been to sea for nearly half a century, and we lost maybe one hour of deck ops over the course of two weeks (with many days at sea state 5 and 6). Wow.

---

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

due to weather:

due to ship equipment:

due to ship science equipment:

due to user science equipment:

**comment:**

---