

Welcome to the P & A JCMT survey results

hello dscott

Response #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Research	Job	Comments
R1	1	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	1	Galactic	Other	Thank you for setting up this survey. I hope there are many (positive) respondents!
R2	1	2	4	5	5	5	5	2	5	4	1	Theoretical	Faculty member	The JCMT has historically been an extremely productive facility and a "bargain" in terms of dollars spent for its high research output. Canadian astronomers have invested significantly in the new suite of instruments that are about to become available, and have waited a long time for their arrival. I find it extremely disheartening that Canada is about to end its involvement in JCMT, right at the dawn of what promises to be the JCMT's most scientifically productive era yet. Canada's involvement in "Big Science" with ALMA and TMT is important, but I think the pendulum has swung much too far in this direction. This comes at the cost of smaller facilities like JCMT, which is powerful

																	have a careful discussion as a community of the cost-benefit of continuing our involvement in an existing competitive telescope such as the JCMT versus going to the expense and environmental impact of participating in a new (albeit larger) facility such as CCAT.
R13	1	4	4	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	1	Galactic	Faculty member	no ans			
R14	1	3	5	5	5	3	3	3	5	5	1	Galactic	Support astronomer	no ans			
R15	1	2	5	4	4	4	2	5	5	5	1	Galactic	Graduate student	no ans			
R16	3	3	4	4	5	5	2	3	4	4	1	Galactic	Faculty member	If the choice is between ALMA or JCMT, my choice will be ALMA. I'd feel more excited about SCUBA-2 if it had been deployed with a longer window before ALMA comes online.			
R17	1	1	5	3	4	5	3	3	5	5	2	Extragalactic	Graduate student	no ans			
R18	3	5	4	5	4	4	3	2	5	5	1	Galactic	Other	The potential scientific impact of SCUBA-2 is immense and given that Canada has invested so much into SCUBA-2 we need to ensure that Canada gets a science return on that investment. Furthermore, the SCUBA-2 legacy surveys will provide essential input to many proposed ALMA targeted observations and should be completed as fully as possible. However, we have to			

R21	5	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	Extragalactic	Faculty member	no ans
R22	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	3	5	5	1	Extragalactic	Postdoc	Despite the existence of other ground-based submm imaging facilities (e.g. LABOCA on APEX, AzTEC on the LMT when it begins operations), and the Herschel/SPIRE surveys presently being undertaken, the combination of SCUBA-2 and JCMT will provide unique (and cost effective) capabilities to the Canadian astronomical community as we move into the era of ALMA observations. The impact of the original SCUBA extra-galactic observations is still being felt. Despite its success, it has been challenging identifying counterparts to the 850um "SCUBA Galaxies" that were detected at 850um with the 15 arcsec FWHM: there are many potential counterparts within the error circle of the centroid, and deep maps are confusion limited, and hence limited, to detecting only the most luminous sources ($L_{IR} > 10^{12}$ solar luminosities). The capability to undertake deep observations at 450um with twice the resolution greatly circumvent this

problem, and also sample the peak thermal emission of the SCUBA galaxies that are now known to exist primarily in the redshift interval $\sim 1.5-4$ (peak thermal emission at rest-frame wavelengths $\sim 100\mu\text{m}$). There have been few convincing detections of such galaxies from the ground at either $450\mu\text{m}$ with SCUBA, or at $350\mu\text{m}$ with SHARC-II on the CSO due to atmospheric noise and extinction. SCUBA-2, with its large complement of detectors, will be the only instrument capable of conducting blank-field surveys in this wavelength range from the ground to detect hundreds to thousands of such objects. Neither BLAST, nor Herschel compete directly with SCUBA-2 at this wavelength range due to their significantly larger beam sizes (> 30 arcsec FWHM), and therefore much higher confusion limits. Therefore, in order to understand the total bolometric luminosity produced by more normal star-forming galaxies at redshifts $z > 1$, SCUBA-2 data will be absolutely essential. While some small

																	facility in order to be able to provide the best targets for detailed study with ALMA.
R24	1	3	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	1	Other	Graduate student	With the JCMT, Canada has frequent access to an excellent facility for submillimetre observations. While I understand the perspective that ALMA will soon become a main detector for submillimetre data, I think it would be premature to discard JCMT. The JCMT is different from ALMA in terms of sky exposure (can observe the Northern Hemisphere, where ALMA is in Chile) and in terms of scientific focus (a single dish telescope can perform different science with respect to a large array). For these reasons, I don't believe ALMA should be considered a substitute for the JCMT, but perhaps a compliment. Together, these instruments will fill in the gaps of our knowledge of the submillimetre universe.			
R25	2	4	4	5	2	4	5	3	4	5	2	Galactic	Faculty member	It would be very unfortunate if Canada chose to pull out of the JCMT without first considering the impact of not securing access to a premier submillimetre single-			

R41	1	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	1	Extragalactic	Faculty member	no ans
R42	3	4	2	4	1	4	2	2	5	4	2	Extragalactic	Faculty member	no ans
R43	1	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	5	5	1	Extragalactic	Support astronomer	no ans
R44	3	3	3	4	1	1	1	1	5	5	2	Galactic	Faculty member	Can we stay part of JCMT until ALMA is up and running, and then phase ourselves out of JCMT in favour of ALMA?
R45	1	4	5	5	5	3	3	3	5	5	1	Galactic	Postdoc	no ans
R46	5	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	Extragalactic	Faculty member	no ans
R47	1	1	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	5	2	Extragalactic	Graduate student	no ans
R48	3	4	3	4	1	1	1	1	4	3	2	Galactic	Faculty member	no ans
R49	1	3	4	4	5	5	3	3	5	4	1	Galactic	Other	no ans
R50	2	5	4	3	2	4	3	3	5	4	1	Extragalactic	Faculty member	no ans
R51	1	5	3	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	1	Galactic	Faculty member	I will send my comments by email.
R52	1	4	4	no ans	4	5	2	4	5	4	1	Galactic	Faculty member	no ans
R53	1	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	Extragalactic	Graduate student	no ans
R54	5	1	no ans	no ans	1	1	1	1	1	5	2	Other	Other	Through NAPRA, Canadians have access to ALMA. The community needs to direct its limited human resources to the exploitation of this world facility. SCUBA-2 would have done ground-breaking science had it been delivered on time. It hasn't.
R55	2	4	4	5	5	5	2	4	5	5	1	Extragalactic	Postdoc	I am not currently in Canada but hope to return to Canada at some point in before the end of 2012 (currently residing in the UK), so you can decide to include my comments or not.

																	employ similar detector technology to that of SCUBA-2. The experience gained by Canadian involvement in SCUBA-2 has the potential to reward Canadian know how on other missions well beyond the finite life of the JCMT. Technology remains the limit for far IR space astronomy, and access to ground based facilities that allow testing of the technology is key. In the regard, for Canadian scientists the JCMT is unique.
R59	1	2	5	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	1	Galactic	Postdoc	I am also a support Astronomer (for HIFI on the Herschel Space Obseratory) The JCMT is one of the few facilities that we have access to with which it is possible to take part in small projects (as well as large). This is important for individual research - for testing ideas prior to them becoming big projects, for example, or persuing ideas that are not fashionably mainstream, which will be our fate with ALMA. It is also an invaluable training ground for students.			
Count	59	58	58	57	59	59	58	59	59	59	58	Other - 3 Solar Systems - 4 Galactic - 27 Extragalactic - 23 Theoretical - 2	Faculty - 23 Other - 11 Support - 3 Graduate - 8 Postdoc -				

14

freq Table					
-	1	2	3	4	5
q1 -- I believe that Canada should end its involvement with JCMT in 2012	35 59%	11 18%	9 15%	0 0%	4 6%
q2 -- I think that the decision about when to withdraw from JCMT should depend on the scientific performance of SCUBA-2	4 6%	9 15%	7 12%	21 36%	17 29%
q3 -- There are other JCMT instruments (e.g. HARP, eSMA) which make me excited about using JCMT beyond 2012.	2 3%	10 17%	10 17%	23 39%	13 22%
q4 -- I think there should be more comprehensive discussions about the future of JCMT in the context of Canada's other ground-based facilities.	0 0%	2 3%	8 14%	22 38%	25 43%
q5 -- I have often used data from JCMT in my research.	9 15%	7 11%	2 3%	13 22%	28 47%
q6 -- I am planning to use SCUBA-2 data in my research.	5 8%	4 6%	7 11%	9 15%	34 57%
q7 -- I am particularly interested in using SCUBA-2 POL.	7 12%	15 25%	23 39%	7 12%	6 10%
q8 -- I am particularly	7 11%	13 22%	21 35%	12 20%	6 10%

interested in using SCUBA-2 FTS.					
q9 -- I believe that SCUBA-2 will provide ground-breaking science results (even although I may not be involved in them).	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	11 18%	45 76%
q10 -- Planning for JCMT Legacy Surveys has enabled Canadian astronomers to be involved in large international multi-wavelength projects.	0 0%	0 0%	8 13%	18 30%	33 55%
q11 -- Are the JCMT Legacy Surveys likely to become an important part of your research?	41 70%	17 29%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Names (in alphabetic order)

Jeremy Bailin
 Michael Balogh
 Pauline Barmby
 Pierre Bastien
 David Bohlender
 Filiberto Braglia
 Jan Cami
 Claude Carignan
 Ed Chapin
 Shadi Chitsazzadeh
 Robert Content
 Kristen Coppin
 Gary Davis
 Sean Dougherty
 Kevin Douglas
 Alexander van Engelen
 Ashley Faloon
 Michel Fich
 Jason Fiege
 James Di Francesco
 Wesley Fraser
 Rachel Friesen

Andy Gibb
Jennifer Golding
Patrick Hall
Mark Halpern
Gil Holder
Martin Houde
Ray Jayawardhana
Doug Johnstone
Gilles Joncas
Scott Jones
JJ Kavelaars
Helen Kirk
Pamela Klaassen
Roland Kothes
Christian Marois
Gaelen Marsden
Brenda Matthews
Carolyn McCoey
Bill McCutcheon
David Naylor
Allison Noble
Tara Parkin
Rene Plume
Rene Racine
Michael Reid
Erik Rosolowsky
Sarah Sadavoy
Douglas Scott
Alison Sills
Locke Spencer
Elisabetta Valiante
Tract Webb
D. V. Wiebe
Chris Willott
Chris Wilson
David Woods
Ming Zhu