

McMurdo Area User Committee (*MAUC*)

Additional information, handouts, presentations

Annual meeting

16 July 2007

[Space survey results](#)

[Dry Valleys management plan review, slides \(pdf\)](#)

[Dry Valleys management plan review, handout](#)

[Support contractor role in proposal reviews, handout](#)

[Changes to ECW gear \(extreme cold weather\)](#)

## ***Space survey results***

### **Results of Space Survey 16 Jan 2007**

**39 sent out, corresponding to ~30 different projects. 14 replies.**

**Space needs:** Sorting and repacking gear. Drying gear. Staging space to assemble / test instrumentation.

According to the survey results, projects which have (or have had) staging space needs are the deep field projects (glaciology, some geology, and some AWS / meteorology). These groups are characterized by their small size, large amount of field instrumentation, and variable field schedules. It is important to point out that, in the past, science groups and McMurdo personnel solved space issues on a case-by-case basis, which requires significantly flexibility on the part of both science and support. We suggest exploring alternative staging space to make things easier and more efficient for all interested parties.

**Requirements:** Heated, shelter from wind, hard floor (or carpet), accessible (to trucks), clean, good light, power, no water, access to rock.

#### **Suggested feasible(?) alternatives:**

Thiel Earth Science Lab

Airdrop Assembly Barn (packing location for parachutes)

Set up a Jamesway at the transition (or a pair)

Jamesways out near chalet.

Second floor of new Fstop space (Science Support Center)

#### **Other Notes / Comments:**

\* For earth scientists and field scientists, being able to somewhat replicate field conditions is important - so things like testing solar panels, shelters, cables, seismometers, GPS, towers - all things that are difficult in Crary. The Crary is nice for office, library, computer, and the chem/bio labs, but not too good for us.

\* For more general issues in Crary, I see a problem for office space. It is getting tight every year I heard. I would suggest converting current library space for a more comfortable shared office space. We need shared computers but few ones are fine. Rather, we need desks without desktop computers (people usually have their laptops) but with shared telephones. Let imagine university building. Dedicate office space for PIs and shared offices for graduate students. Except for students whose carry out McMurdo-based research for a long term, it is quite acceptable. I would like to provide more solid office space for my students, but I know that dedicate separated office for all students are more than USAP can provide.

# Review of the McMurdo Dry Valleys ASMA



Request for input from the field


Emily Kelly

[emkelly@nsf.gov](mailto:emkelly@nsf.gov)

NSF Office of Polar Programs

# The current ASMA management plan

- ASMA management group webpage:  
<http://www.mcmurdodryvalleys.aq/>
- Management plan:  
<http://www.antarcticanz.govt.nz/downloads/environment/ASMA/ASMA2mgmtplan.PDF>
- ASMA pocket manual



# Why review?

- Antarctic Treaty Protocol on Environmental Protection established a 5-year review process for ASMA and ASPA management plans
  - DV ASMA plan approved in 2004
- Things have changed in the last 5 years!
  - Updates, improvements, changes to facilities locations, etc;



Lake Bonney Helo pad; Margaret Knuth

# Review Process

1. Solicit input from MCM DV ASMA users
2. Review in the field- 07/08 field season
3. Update management plan
4. Final review in the field- 08/09 field season
5. Update management plan
6. Submit updated management plan to ATCM XXXII (April 2009) for approval

# Soliciting input

- Has the ASMA plan served your needs in the field?
  - Are there guidelines that were unclear to you when using the plan?
  - Are there additional guidelines that should be added to the plan?
- In your experience, are the maps included in the ASMA management plan helpful/accurate?

# Soliciting input

- Are there additional Special Features that should be included in the ASMA management plan?
  - Do you think the descriptions of Special Features in the plan require additional guidance or parameters?



Don Juan Pond; Glen Synder, NSF



# Soliciting input

- What has changed in the Dry Valleys since 2004 that should be reflected in the updated ASMA management plan?

Consider:

- Environmental values
- Scientific values
- Historic values
- Aesthetic values
- Wilderness values



Taylor Valley; Karen Cozzetto, MCMDV LTER



Megan Balks; Antarctica New Zealand

- Given these changes, are there updates to the management plan you would suggest?

# To provide input

- Contact: Emily Kelly [emkelly@nsf.gov](mailto:emkelly@nsf.gov)  
(703) 292-8571
- Send comments/suggestions by October 1, 2007
- Are there others who might have additional suggestions?

**Thanks for your time and input!**

## **Review of the McMurdo Dry Valleys ASMA (handout)**

### Request for input from the field

Contact: Emily Kelly [emkelly@nsf.gov](mailto:emkelly@nsf.gov); (703) 292-8571  
Comments/suggestions by October 1, 2007

- Has the ASMA plan served your needs in the field?
  - Are there guidelines that were unclear to you when using the plan?
  - Are there additional guidelines that should be added to the plan?
- In your experience, are the maps included in the ASMA management plan helpful/accurate?
- Are there additional Special Features that should be included in the ASMA management plan?
  - Do you think the descriptions of Special Features in the plan require additional guidance or parameters?
- What has changed in the Dry Valleys since 2004 that should be reflected in the updated ASMA management plan? Consider:
  - Environmental values
  - Scientific values
  - Historic values
  - Aesthetic values
  - Wilderness values
- Given these changes, are there updates to the management plan you would suggest?



Thank you for your time and input!



### The logistical support contractor’s role in NSF proposal reviews

- Planning support managers review proposals and ORWs for logistics only
- Contact grantees, if needed, for clarification, more details, possible options
- Planners consult with workcenter supervisors about availability of requested resources
- Report to NSF on availability of critical resources needed for the proposal
  - critical resources vary from year to year
  - examples are heavy duty/light duty snowmobiles, helicopter hours, fixed-wing missions, large tents

Phase	Documentation or action
Proposal submission	PIs submit proposals and ORWs online.
Panel review	NSF conducts panel reviews on the scientific merit of the proposals. RPSC has no involvement.
“Bucket” review (resource-centric view)	Planners review the ORW and any details in the proposal about the field plan. Assign magnitudes (small, medium, large) to resource requirements.
	RPSC sends resource graphs to NSF.
	Meet with NSF to review resource requirements of new proposals within the context of ongoing projects’ (already promised) support requirements.
Detailed review (proposal-centric view)	Planners review the proposals in more detail, contacting the PI if necessary.
	Send “resource table” for each proposal to NSF.
	Send resource schedule for critical resources, ie Twin Otter, helicopter time, to NSF.
	Meet with NSF to review individual proposal support requirements. Discuss options where resources may not cover requests.
Ops Review	NSF advises RPSC which proposals are funded. RPSC drafts “operational support review” (ops review) memo based on the proposal’s resource table and subsequent discussions
	RPSC sends draft ops review to the PI for concurrence
	If the PI does not concur, he/she discusses with NSF &/or RPSC, depending on the nature of the disagreement. Ops review is amended.
	RPSC sends draft ops review to NSF, noting that the PI has concurred.
	NSF reviews, makes changes if needed, and sends the ops review to the PI for concurrence.
Award phase	NSF grants office. RPSC has no involvement.



# United States Antarctic Program

## In-Flight ECW Changes & ECW Availability for USAP Participants

Melissa Rider, RPSC Planning Support Manager

Summer 2007

**Raytheon**  
Polar Services



# U.S. Antarctic Program

---

- Topic: In-Flight ECW Clothing Requirement
  - Raytheon presented a proposal at the Annual Planning Conference (May 2007) to reduce the hand carry ECW clothing required for USAP passengers traveling to & from Christchurch.
  - Recommendation: Reduce required ECW clothing that must be carried on the flight from the current 14 separate items to “4 Core” ECW items.
    - Parka
    - Bibs
    - Boots
    - Goggles
  - Proposal still pending approval of Air Force, Air National Guard, and NSF. Look for notification of any changes in ticketing paperwork & upon arrival at CDC.



# U.S. Antarctic Program

---

- Topic: Future Vision of the ECW Allowance for USAP Participants
  - The NSF has asked Raytheon Polar Services to consider altering the ECW clothing allowances for USAP participants. There are many options for change and goals include:
    - Inventory Reduction
    - Maintain Participant Safety
    - Consider Survival Clothing vs Work Site Specific Clothing vs Creature Comforts
    - Gather User Input



# Future Vision of the ECW Allowance

---

- The opinion of the science community is a strong consideration. Please poll your colleagues and offer recommendations.
  - Clothing Items – General Comments Requested
    - Outerwear: more or less?
    - Innerwear: USAP or user provided?
    - Extremity Accessories: generic issue or station specific?
  - Communicating Changes
    - 'ECW Expectations List' in Medical Packet
    - USAP Participant Guide (on-line only in 2008)
- Reporting
  - Consolidated feedback to Raytheon in mid-August for inclusion in a recommendations report that RPSC will provide to NSF on 1 September 2007.