

JOIDES OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

**LONG MARINE LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ**

17 August 1999

Members

R. Carter	Australian Geological Survey Organisation, Canberra, Australia (PacRim)
W. Hay (Chair)	GEOMAR Research Center, University of Kiel, Germany (OPCOM Chair)
D. Hodell	Department of Geology, University of Florida, USA
J. C. Moore	Department of Earth Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA
J. Natland	Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Sciences, University of Miami, USA
K. Tamaki	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan

Liaisons

J. Baldauf	Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, USA
M. Ball	U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, USA (PPSP Chair)
J. Diebold	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia Univ., USA (SSP Chair)
B. Malfait	National Science Foundation, USA
K. Moran	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc., USA
M. Reagan	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, USA

Guests

T. Davies	Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, USA
D. Goldberg	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, USA

JOIDES Office

W. Brückmann	Science Coordinator
--------------	---------------------

A. Approval of minutes from the last meeting

OPCOM unanimously approved the minutes of the last meeting.

B. Presentation of the FY 2001 budget

Moran presented the framework of the FY 2001 budget:

FY01 budget estimate:	
Avg cost/leg based on FY 00 :	5.5 \$M
Avg cost for 6 legs:	33.0 \$M
Cost of program services (+2%):	11.6 \$M
Project development technology Downhole tools	2.0 \$M (hammer drill, ADCB, PCS, Adara,
A-CORKs for Nankai	1.4 \$M (casing and packer system)
LWD for Nankai	0.5 \$M
needs additional money for three A-CORKS with multipackers	
Total	48.5 \$M
NSF projected target budget	46.1 \$M

There followed a general discussion of what the average cost of a leg includes. Moran clarified that the estimate of cost was based on the average cost of a leg for the current round of drilling.

C. Scheduling of cruises for FY 2001

For the benefit of the new members on the Operations Committee, Jack Baldauf explained to the panel the Project A strategy. The operator prepares a set of operational options that usually focusses on the perceived top 10 proposals. In the preparation of possible scheduling options the following operational issues are considered:

- Environment (weather windows, sea state)
- Special Oper items
- Minimization of the transit times
- LRP

Baldauf provided OPCOM members and liaisons with a document outlining the key operational parameters and constraints for the proposals selected for FY 2001. An overview of parameters is included below (table 1).

Table 1

Proposal #	Weather window	Time tot.	Site time	Transit time	Estimated total Cost
431C	Feb - May	32	24	8	\$129.636
465	Sept - May	58	37	21	\$137.575
486	anytime	77	62	15	\$111.314
499	anytime	29	14	15	\$111.491
500	anytime	53	45	8	\$399.792
505	Feb - Jul	61	56	5	\$266.670
510	Apr - Oct	58	54	4	\$180.699
517	Feb - Jul	64	60	4	\$1.800.213
523	Apr - Sept	56	39	17	\$190.245
534	Apr - Sept	67	51	16	\$199.411
546	Apr - Sept	58	54	4	\$838.074

The presentation of scheduling options starts off with the graphical layout of the weather windows using a „bubble plot“. From the presentation it became clear that the determining parameter is the Manus Basin Leg.

Model 1		Model 2	
#	rank	#	rank
431	-	505	8
517	-	431	-
523	1	517	- (LWD only)
546	7	523	1
500	5	546	7
486	3	500	6
465	2	486	3
		465	2

There was a discussion of the costs involved with the advanced CORKS and LWD. The question was raised whether the Japanese community might be willing to provide supplementary funds.

Hodell suggested that Shatsky Rise should be included in the program. Natland inquired about the the weather window for Shatsky. Baldauf replied that the beginning of 2001 may be too early.

Model 3	
#	rank
510	10
431	-
517	- (LWD only)
523	1
546	7
500	6
486	3
465	2

Model 4

#	rank	
534	9	
431	-	
517	-	(LWD only)
523	1	
546	7	
500	6	
486	3	
465	2	

There was a discussion of procedures on how the voting to finalize the schedule should proceed. Natland suggested voting on models 2,3,4, then do calculations, come back and vote on the result vs option 1. Hay agreed with this procedure, i.e. either option 1 vs options 2 (A or B or C). Malfait inquired why proposal 499 was not included. Baldauf, Moran, and Fox replied that 499 may be an option for later, on the way to the Atlantic.

The consensus was to present the following options to SCICOM:

Model 1

#	<i>rank</i>	<i>theme</i>
431	-	earth interior/ION
517	-	fluids (LWD & ACORK)
523	1	earth interior
546	7	hydrates
499 (or 500)	6/5	earth interior/ION
486	3	climate
465	2	climate/tectonics

Model 2

#	<i>rank</i>	<i>theme</i>
534 (or 510)	9/10	extreme climates or sea level
431	-	earth interior/ION
517	-	fluids (LWD)
523	1	earth interior
546	7	hydrates
499 (or 500)	6/5	earth interior/ION
486	3	climate
465	2	climate/tectonics

Model 3

#	rank	theme
431	-	earth interior/ION
517	-	fluids (LWD & A-CORK)
523	1	earth interior
546	7	hydrates
499 (or 500)	6/5	earth interior/ION
486	3	climate
465	2	climate/tectonics

Remarks:

Rank # 8 is 505 which is not SSP ready (7)

Rank #4 is MAR

D. Discussion of SciMP recommendations

SCIMP recommendation 99-2-15 had repeated a recommendation from the Houston Workshop, to send out TAMU drilling people to industry operations, that is to put observers on industry deep water vessels. There was doubt as to the effectiveness of this at the present time.

Hay raised Mike Coffin's point about reviewing, citation and referencing of the Preliminary Reports before they go on the web. After some discussion it was decided that this should be brought up by Mike Coffin again at the next SCICOM meeting.