

## Final (June 18, 1998)

### JOIDES SITE SURVEY PANEL MEETING

February 24 -26, 1998

*BGR Berlin, Germany*

- 
- Members:** Srivastava, Shiri (*GSC Atlantic, Canada*) -- Chair  
Casey, Jack (*U. Houston, USA*)  
Christeson, Gail (*U. Texas, Austin, USA*)  
Diebold, John (*LDEO, USA*)  
Enachescu, Michael (*Husky, Canada*)  
Flood, Roger (*SUNY, USA*)  
Hine, Albert (*USF, USA*)  
Lykke-Andersen, Holger (*U. Aarhus, Denmark*)  
Paull, Charles (*U. North Carolina, USA*)  
Peterson, Larry (*RSMAS, USA*)  
Sibuet, Jean-Claude (*IFREMER, France*)  
Silver, Eli (*UCSC, USA*)  
Whitmarsh, Robert (*SOC, UK*)
- Liaison:** Ball, Mahlon (*PPSP*)  
Ellins, Kathy (*JOIDES Office*)  
Klaus, Adam (*ODP/TAMU*)  
Malfait, Bruce (*NSF, USA*)  
Quoidbach, Daniel (*ODP Data Bank*)  
Tamaki, Kensaku (*SCICOM*)
- Alternate:** Nakanishi, Masao (*ORI, Japan*)
- Apology:** Driscoll, Neal (*WHOI, USA*)  
Hinz, Karl (*BGR, Germany*)  
Tokuyama, Hidekazu (*ORI, Japan*)  
Woodside, John (*SciMP, ESF*)
- Guests:** Dr. Beiersdorf, Helmut (*BGR, Hannover Germany*)  
Mr. Geng, Jianhua (*Shanghai, China*)  
Dr. Rascha, (*BGR, Berlin Germany*)  
Dr. Wong, How Kin (*IBMC, Hamburg, Germany*)

## AGENDA

### JOIDES Site Survey Panel Meeting February 24-26, 1998 BGR, Berlin, Germany

#### 1. PRELIMINARY MATTERS (Srivastava)

- 1.1 Introduction of members, liaison, guests and meeting logistics.
- 1.2 Charge and procedures for the meeting, Working of SSP
- 1.3 Watchdog assignments and feedback to proponents
- 1.4 Action items from July 1997 LDEO meeting

#### 2. REPORTS

- 2.1 SCICOM (Tamaki)
- 2.2 OPCOM (Srivastava)
- 2.3 PPSP (Ball)
- 2.4 ODPDB (Quoidbach)
- 2.5 TAMU (Klaus)
- 2.6 JOIDES (Ellins)
- 2.7 NSF (Malfait)
- 2.8 ISSEP (Diebold) and ESSEP (Paull)

#### 3. SITE SURVEY IMPLICATIONS OF RECENTLY DRILLED LEGS

- 3.1 Leg 175: (Flood/Klaus)
- 3.2 Leg 176: Return to 735B; 300 (Casey/Klaus)

#### 4. SITE SURVEY STATUS OF UPCOMING SCHEDULED LEGS FOR 97 & 98 \*

- 4.1 Leg 179: NERO & Hammer Drilling, 508(Christeson)
- 4.2 Leg 181: SW Pacific Gateway, 441 (Peterson)
- 4.3 Leg 183: Kerguelen, 457 (Nakanishi)
- 4.4 Leg 184: East Asian Monsoon History (Flood) PPSP
- 4.5 Leg 185: Mass Balance: Izu Mariana 472 (Diebold)
- 4.6 Leg 186: Western Pacific Seismic Network, Japan Trench, 431A (Christeson)
- 4.7 Leg 187: Australia-Antarctica Discordance, 426 (Sibuet)
- 4.8 Leg 188: Prydz Bay Glacial History, 490 (Paull)

#### 5. POTENTIAL FUTURE DRILLING: SSEP (Earth Int.)

- 5.1 431B: Western Pacific Seismic Network (Christeson)
- 5.2 445: Nankai Trough Accretionary Prism (Paull)
- 5.3 448: Ontong Java Plateau Origin (Whitmarsh)
- 5.4 450: Taiwan arc-continent collision (Sibuet) PPSP
- 5.5 451: Tonga Forearc (Diebold)
- 5.6 463: Plume Impact at Shatsky Rise (Diebold)
- 5.7 479: Pacmanus Basin (Silver) New
- 5.8 499: ION Equatorial (Christeson)
- 5.9 500: H<sub>2</sub>O Observatory (Christeson) New
- 5.10 504: Newfoundland Basin (Enachescu) New

## **6. POTENTIAL FUTURE DRILLING: SSEP (Earth Env.)**

- 6.1 455: Laurentide Ice Sheets, (Lykke-Andersen)
- 6.2 465: SE Pacific Paleoceanography (Peterson)
- 6.3 482: Wilkes Land Margin: Cenozoic Glacial History (Flood)
- 6.4 485: Southern Gateway Aus.-Antarctica (Casey) PPSP
- 6.5 486: Paleogene Equatorial Pacific APC transect (Hine)
- 6.6 489: Ross Sea, Antarctica: Paleoceanography (Casey)

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 7.1 Panel Membership (Srivastava)
- 7.2 Nominations for SSP Chair (Srivastava)
- 7.3 Liaison to SSEPs
- 7.4 Nominations for PPGs
- 7.5 Future SSP meetings (Srivastava)
- 7.3 Other business

--- For Legs 178, 180 and 182 data sets were approved at previous SSP meetings and no changes have taken place since.

PPSP - items in the proposal of concern to PPSP

## Executive Summary

### **Charge and procedures for the meeting** (Srivastava):

Srivastava explained the charge for this meeting and how this meeting is conducted. He also explained, for the benefit of those new to this panel, the role of this panel in JOIDES. The goals for this meeting were to: (1) to evaluate the site survey readiness of proposals recommended by the two SSEPs, (2) to evaluate the site survey readiness of legs scheduled for drilling, and (3) to assess any site survey issues arising from legs that were drilled since our July meeting. The main customer for the output of this meeting are the proponents of proposals and OPCOM, who will use the evaluations resulting from item (1) above as input into designing the drilling schedule for FY'2000 at their August meeting.

The discussion resulted in formulating the following recommendations, action items and point of consensus during the meeting.

**SSP recommendation # 1 to SCICOM** concerning getting portions of external reviews on the proposals to be considered by SSP. SSP recommends to SCICOM that they should request JOI to extract portion from each external review that addresses question # 4 below and send them directly to the ODP Data Bank for insertion in the watchdog books.

**SSP recommendation # 2 to SCICOM** : SSP recommends to SCICOM that the winter data deadline for submission of data to the ODP DB be changed from January 1 to February 1.

*Explanatory note:* SSP has noted that many proponents are finding hard to meet January 1 as the deadline for submission of supporting data to the ODP Data Bank. The reasons for this are: one, the proximity of this deadline to the major holiday period (Christmas); and two, the short time period for the JOIDES Office to provide feedback from the JOIDES Panels following their fall meetings to proponents. In the present schedule of JOIDES Panels meetings, SSP is required to meet in late February. It was for this reason January 1 was selected as the data deadline. However, by requiring SSP to meet during the last week of February or early March and shifting the data deadline to February 1 provides adequate time for the data bank to catalogue data received prior to SSP meeting.

4. What is the likelihood that the sections drilled will contribute significantly to the solution of the stated scientific problem.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Action item # 1:** All watchdogs to write to lead proponents of proposals they watchdogged at this meeting, reporting the sense of SSP discussion and enclosing the relevant section of the minutes. A copy of this letter must be sent to the DB. The letter can be sent by e-mail.

**Action item # 2:** Data Bank manager, Dan Quoidbach, to write to the co-chiefs of designated legs, reporting the sense of SSP discussion and enclosing appropriate section of the minutes.

**Action item # 3:** SSP Chair to bring the meeting time of August OPCOM/SCICOM meeting for discussion during next OPCOM meeting.

**Action item # 4 :** SSP Chair to discuss with the SSEPs Chairs on data requirements of highly ranked proposals at the PANCH or SCICOM/OPCOM combined meeting.

**Action item # 5:** Srivastava to communicate to SCICOM Chair the situation with the replacements of SSP members.

**Action item # 6:** Srivastava to write a letter to SCICOM including the list of candidates for SSP Chair together with some comments and send it to the SCICOM together with copies of their Cvs.

**Action item # 7:** Srivastava to inform SCICOM about the names of the two members who will be liaison to the two PPGs.

**Action item # 8:** Srivastava to ask for SCICOM's permission for holding the 98 and 99 meetings in LDEO and Sidney, Australia **respectively** .

\*\*\*\*\*

**SSP Consensus # 1:** Leg 179 (NERO and Hammer Drilling) will accomplish two objectives: 1) drilling a borehole into basement on the Ninetyeast Ridge for installation of a broadband ocean seismometer, and 2) test of the hammer drilling system near Site 735B. Plans call for reoccupation of either ODP Site 756 or 757 on the Ninetyeast Ridge, and tests of the hammer drilling system near Site 735B. Jack Casey, chief scientist of the leg, needs to submit to the data bank a reconstructed video survey map of the JOIDES Resolution video tape from Site 735B drilling with navigation for purposes of site selection for hammer drilling. Since site survey data for these previously drilled sites are already on file with the ODP Data Bank, SSP considers the site survey readiness status to be 1A.

**SSP Consensus # 2:** The site survey data package for scheduled Leg 181 (SW Pacific Gateway) is now complete and seven primary and two alternate sites have been approved by PPSP. Site survey readiness is now considered to be "1A" . SSP wishes the scientific party of Leg 181 every success.

**SSP Consensus # 3:** SSP acknowledges receiving migrated profile (RS180/201) and a stacked profile (MD47/10) from site KIP13A of Leg 183 (Kerguelen pl.) with a track map and a migrated profile from sites KIP 9B and 9C with a track map. It recommends that the proponents/co-chiefs of this leg should submit a migrated MD47/10 profile before July data deadline to DB, for the SSP approval during their Jul meeting. Any additional data collected during a French cruise in Feb-Mar 98 for sites KIP 2B and 3A must be processed and deposited with the DB before July 98 deadline to get SSP approval. Site Survey status for this leg remain 2B.

**SSP Consensus # 4:** The proponents of Leg 184 (S. China Sea) have made much progress in assembling a data package which demonstrates that suitable sediments are available for safely meeting leg objectives. Additional processing is needed for much of the data, and appropriate displays near the sites need to be generated as has been specified in the detailed comments. We remind the proponents that sites should be clearly labeled on all submitted lines, and that the proposed depth of penetration should be shown. Profiles also need to be annotated with vertical time scales and horizontal distance scales. Profiles should also be plotted in time if the navigation plots provided are in time. Page-size charts showing the locations of tracks near each proposed site are also useful at this stage.

**SSP Consensus # 5 :** An adequate data package has been assembled for Izu-Mariana Convergent Margin leg 185. If any paleoenography objectives are intended, a good quality SCS profile through site BON8 must be collected by the Joides Resolution.

**SSP Consensus # 6:** All required data with the exception of velocity data in support of Leg 186 (Seismic Network, Japan Trench) has been deposited with the data. Velocity information at the proposed sites as determined from OBS measurements is expected at the DB before our July meeting. Once this information is received the leg will be ready for drilling.

**SSP Consensus # 7:** Based on SSP evaluation of the data submitted at their July 97 meeting, 19 sites were found to have adequate data for drilling during Leg 187 (Aus.-Antrac. discordance). With this number of approved sites, it is the considered opinion of the main proponent that drilling objectives for this leg now can be achieved. In SSP opinion most of the required data for this Leg now exist and, hence, it is ready for drilling. Additional data will need to be collected by J/R to ensure the horizontal extent of the sediment pockets at the drilling sites.

**SSP Consensus # 8:** Most of the required site survey data has not been submitted to the Data bank for Leg 188 (Prydz Bay) and even the locations of many of the sites are not clearly established. Correspondence and discussions with the proponents at the fall 1997 ESSEP meeting in Hobart indicated that a substantial revision of the proposed site locations was intended. Adequate data to locate appropriate sites to both achieve the scientific objectives and to satisfy most of the SSP's needs probably exist. However, a serious data review by SSP will await the submissions of most of the data. The leg remains rated as 2A.

**SSP Consensus # 9:** No additional data in support of proposal 431B (Western Pacific Seismic Network) has been deposited with the DB since our July 97 meeting. Data needed for WP1 site is the velocity control for calculation of sediment thickness and for WP2 additional cross line or a tie line to the nearest DSDP hole where basement was drilled to ensure that basement as interpreted at the proposed site is correct. Site Survey readiness for the proposal is 1B for site WP1 and 2A for site WP2.

**SSP Consensus # 10:** No additional data with the exception of information on Kuroshio current has been received for proposal 445 (Nankai Trough) since the last meeting. Kuroshio current information has also been sent to TAMU. Detailed navigation plots that merge the major data types are still missing. It is requested that Japanese proponents of this proposal should make every effort of depositing this data in the data bank as soon as possible. The proposal readiness from site survey point of view still remains as 1B (some essential data not in the DB but believed to exist).

**SSP Consensus # 11:** SSP recommends that time migrated MCS data, sediment and basement velocity data, 3.5 kHz subbottom data and a compilation of all seismic tracks are required for all proposed sites in proposal 448-Rev4 (Ontong Java Plateau). The Panel noted that these data have probably been acquired during a recent (February 1998) cruise. SSP, therefore, recommends the proponents to submit time-migrated seismic lines over all sites, velocity and track charts and all other relevant site survey data to the ODP Data Bank by 1 July 1998. Site Survey readiness is classed 2A.

**SSP Consensus # 12:** All vital data have been deposited in the DB for proposal 450 (Taiwan arc-continent collision). The proposal was rated 1A which means that it is ready to become a drilling leg. However, a PPSP pre-review would be required for sites TC2A and TC7A where the BSR would be drilled. A true amplitude plot of Ewing line 29 or Moana Wave line 30 would be required for the PPSP pre-review. The proposal still remains 1A.

**SSP Consensus # 13 :** All required data for the Tonga Forearc proposal (451) resides in the Data Bank. This proposal, from an SSP perspective, is ready to be considered for drilling. Proponents should, however, address to some of the inconsistencies in the proposed water depths and drilling depths at the proposed sites given in the forms and those listed in the proposal. Site Survey Readiness Classification remains 1A for this proposal.

**SSP Consensus # 14:** 3.5 kHz PDR data, migrated, 6-channel seismic reflection data and detailed Hydrosweep bathymetric maps for all proposed sites are in the DB for proposal 463 (Shatsky Rise). Although the migrated seismic reflection data are considered to be adequate to identify the basement there remains some concern regarding the interpreted surface of the volcanic edifice at sites SRSB-2, -2B, -2C, -3, -3B. If the top of the distinct 0.15-0.2 (tw) thick sequence, interpreted by the proponents as basalt, is instead a depositional unit, the primary holes SRSB-2 and SHSB-3 will have to be deepened in order to reach the targets or sites to be moved. It may be possible to re-display the migrated data with different filter parameters, clarifying the basement identification. With this modification the data set will be complete, though deep penetration MCS data would greatly enhance the interpretation of the results of deep drilling. Short surveys by the drill ship would be desirable, to provide cross lines at those sites which lack them.

**SSP Consensus # 15:** Substantial amount of the required data for proposal 479 (PACMANUS Basin) has been collected but all items are not in the Data Bank. The proposal is thus classified as 2A under SSP ranking system. It is suggested that these items be deposited with the DB before July deadline so that they could be examined by SSP during their July meeting. The proposal calls for drilling very deep holes in Bare Rock environment, where not much success has been obtained so far. It is suggested that proponents contact TAMU engineers about drilling in such environment in case drilling strategies for this proposal have to be modified.

**SSP Consensus # 16:** Proposal 499 (ION equatorial) calls for drilling a hole near ODP site 852 for seismometer installation in support of the ION and OSN programs. SSP still requires: 1) new displays at an appropriate scale of the existing SCS profiles with site location, showing expected penetration, and 2) map of satellite gravity and magnetic for the region to insure that sites are free of major structure and outside of any regional anomalies. This site is classified as 2A in terms of site survey readiness. SSP encourages the proponents to supply the requested data

to the data bank by the July 1 data deadline so that it can be evaluated in time to be scheduled for year 2000 drilling.

**SSP Consensus # 17:** Proposal 500 (H2O Observatory) is for drilling a borehole, to be installed with a broadband seismometer as part of the ION network. A site survey cruise has taken place in the region but no data has been supplied to the DB. It is suggested that all required data be deposited with the DB before July 1 deadline so that it can be examined during next SSP meeting in July. Site Survey readiness is evaluated as 2A.

**SSP Consensus # 18 :** Limited specific site survey data was submitted for proposals 504 (Newfoundland Basin). However, a lot of site survey data submitted for earlier proposals, 504 and NARM, exist in the Data Bank. SSP suggests that this entire data base need to be properly organized, processed, compiled and better displayed. The data package should then be focused on site NB-3A, if an one-site proposal is approved by SCICOM. Site survey readiness according to SSP guidelines is considered 2A.

**SSP Consensus # 19:** No new data has been sent to the Data Bank since SSP July 97 meeting for proposal 455 (Laurentide Ice Sheet). Its site survey readiness thus remains 2A. (Substantial items of required data are not in the Data Bank, but are believed to exist and are likely to be available in time for consideration for FY 2000 drilling schedule). The proponents should make serious efforts in depositing the required data with the DB before July 1 deadline if they wish their proposal to be further evaluated for site survey readiness at SSP July 98 meeting.

**SSP Consensus # 20:** No new data for proposal 465 (SE Pacific Paleooceanography) have been submitted to the Site Survey Data Bank since our last meeting and the site survey readiness status remains as "1B". Contact with proponents indicates that they plan to have all remaining data items (e.g., 3.5 kHz data) and reprocessed SCS data submitted by the next data deadline (July 1). SSP thus anticipates having a complete data package for examination at our July meeting.

**SSP Consensus # 21:** The proposal 482 ( Wilkes Land) remains ranked 3A in anticipation of needed additional data to be collected in Feb-March 1999. However, additional review of existing data might result in some new sites.

**SSP Consensus # 22:** Drilling status for proposal 486 (equatorial transect) was changed from 2B to 2A based upon the email communication from the lead proponent during the SSP deliberations. The site survey cruise on the RV Ewing has been completed and the SSP believes that all appropriate data for Target A status exist. The SSP awaits submission of the processed seismic reflection data, 3.5 kHz data, core descriptions, navigation, and an updated list of sites by July 1, 1998.

**SSP Consensus # 23:** A nearly complete data package for proposal 489 (Ross Sea) has been provided in support of proposed drilling, although some required items are missing, but are thought to exist. As a result the site survey readiness is designated as 1B for this proposal. However, the proponents either visit the Data Bank to properly annotate and relocate revised sites and cross-reference different data types for each site (or alternatively resubmit data with proper site locations and designations) with DB help or do it elsewhere. But this need to be done soon if they wish this proposal to be considered for drilling in FY 2000. Also, there will be a need for the proponents to summarize core data and the occurrence of organic sediments in near shore drill holes (e.g., CIROS holes) and in outcrop on land. Data on sediments will also be needed, especially where reentry is planned. The proponents must supply a hard copy summary of velocity information for each site and show that the drilling time estimates are valid.

---

## **Minutes**

Note: These minutes are arranged in logical order for ease of reading, and do not reflect the exact order in which items were discussed at the meeting.

### **1. PRELIMINARY MATTERS (Srivastava)**

#### ***1.1 Introduction of members, liaison, guests and meeting logistics.***

Srivastava, SSP Chair, welcomed all to the meeting and mentioned the addition of three new members to the panel and an alternate of Japanese member who could not be at this meeting. He then asked Dr. Rascha and Dr. Beiersdorf to address the meeting as Karl Hinz, our host for this meeting, was not be there because of his injuries suffered from slipping on the icy sidewalk in Moscow where he had gone to attend the Zonenshine conference on Plate Tectonics the previous week. Dr. Rascha welcomed all the members on behalf of the BGR in Berlin and Dr. Beiersdorf outlined the use of various facilities for the members during the meeting. Srivastava then asked all the members to introduce themselves and mentioned Neil Driscoll's, the new member to this panel, inability to attend this meeting because of his illness. He mentioned absence of John Woodside, SciMP liaison to this panel, as he was at sea. The two guests, Dr. Wong and Mr. Geng, arrived about lunch time and spent rest of the day discussing data for Leg 184 with watchdog, Roger Flood. Also Mahlon Ball, our liaison from PPSP, could not be at the meeting the first day.

### ***1.2 Charge and procedures for the meeting, Working of SSP***

As a number of new members had joined the panel, Srivastava, the Chair, spend some time explaining for their benefit the mandate of SSP and how the meetings are conducted twice a year. He then explained the charge for this meeting which were to: (1) to evaluate the site survey readiness of proposals recommended by the two SSEP, (2) to evaluate the site survey readiness of legs scheduled for drilling, and (3) to assess any site survey issues arising from legs that were drilled since our July meeting. The main customer for the output of this meeting are the proponents of proposals and OPCOM, who will use the evaluations resulting from item (1) above as input into designing the drilling schedule for FY'2000 at their August meeting. He also explained, for the benefit of those new to this panel, the role of this panel in JOIDES.

### ***1.3 Watchdog assignments and feedbacks to the proponents***

Srivastava explained how the watchdog assignments are decided and asked if any one had any suggestion on it. He mentioned that Gail Christeson had volunteered to look after the proposal which Neil Driscoll was going to look after. John Diebold volunteered to look after Karl Hinz's assignment. Appendix E list the final assignments for this meeting.

Srivastava then explained how watchdogging a proposal is carried out and requested all members to follow the guidelines for sending a feedback to the proponent they had watchdogged at this meeting. He mentioned the urgency of communicating the comments of this panel to the proponents on their proposals as the watchdog forms the main link between the proponents and this panel. If for some reason a member is unable to do so he/she should let the Chair know about it so that the Chair may then send the comments directly to the proponent. The comments are to be cut out from the draft minutes of the meeting, which will be circulated by the Chair within a week after the meeting, and included with the covering letter. It was mentioned that a copy of this correspondence be sent to the Data Bank to ensure that all correspondences with the proponents are filed in the watchdog book. The correspondence can be on the e-mail.

Srivastava noted that Watchdogs were not filling out the data matrix forms and urged them to remember to do so. Adam Klaus stated that Jack Baldauf would like copies of the SSP site description forms (Data matrix ?) to ensure that the information that TAMU needs is collected. He explained that there are cost implications with respect to data. At reentry sites, for example, shear strength needs to be known to evaluate whether you need to wash in at a site or under-ream a site. He stressed the importance of the role of the TAMU liaison in conveying information as TAMU does not interact with proponents.

**Action item # 1: All watchdogs to write to lead proponents of proposals they watchdogged at this meeting, reporting the sense of SSP discussion and enclosing the relevant section of the minutes. A copy of this letter must be sent to the DB. The letter can be sent by e-mail.**

**Action item # 2: Data Bank manager, Dan Quoidbach, to write to the co-chiefs of designated legs, reporting the sense of SSP discussion and enclosing appropriate section of the minutes.**

### ***1.5 Action items from July 1997 LDEO meeting***

All action items from our July 97 meeting were carried out by designated persons with the exception of the followings:

**Action item # 3:** Srivastava to raise the question of external reviewers comments during OPCOM meeting. Srivastava did raise this action item at August OPCOM meeting and it was adopted by them.

Some discussion took place on the effectiveness of such a process as we have not been able to get either the complete reviews or portions from them relevant to this panel either from JOIDES Office or JOI. Therefore, it was decided to stress to SCICOM our concerns about getting relevant portion of the reviews as soon as possible.

**SSP recommendation # 1 to SCICOM concerning getting portions of external reviews on the proposals to be considered by SSP. SSP recommends to SCICOM that they should request JOI to extract portion from each external review that addresses question # 4 below and send them directly to the ODP Data Bank for insertion in the watchdog books.**

**4. What is the likelihood that the sections drilled will contribute significantly to the solution of the stated scientific problem.**

**Action Item # 6:** Dan Quoidbach to have ready the new ODP guide booklet together with data forms for circulation to SSP members and liaisons for comments as soon as possible.

This was done by Dan and the forms together with explanatory text were to be published in the next Joides Journal but for some reason it got delayed. Kathy Ellins, Joides liaison, mentioned that some concerns have been expressed by some proponents on the layout of new forms. The items was to have been discussed with other items near the end of the meeting but it got left out and will be discussed at our July meeting.

## **2. REPORTS**

### **2.1 SCICOM (Tamaki)**

Tamaki reported the key points of the August SCICOM Meeting. He reviewed the status of PPGs. Five new PPGs were proposed by SSEPS. The only PPG approved by SCICOM, however, was the Gas Hydrates PPG, which had been recommended by SSP.

Global ranking of Proposals - new system, voting procedures were reviewed. He showed the rankings, and the top 11 proposals were sent forward to OPCOM for scheduling. He mentioned how SCICOM operates differently from PCOM. He explained that SSP input is for OPCOM. OPCOM does not vote, but decides the outcome from the discussion.

Publications: SCICOM discussed the Internet discussion and, accepted the EXCOM motion and recommended that there be a CD ROM IR, accompanied by booklet. The booklet will be short summary to guide the reader as to whether they want to load the CD with more information.

Another SCICOM liaison for SSP, Dave Hodell will be liaison for all the SSP meetings held in the US. Both are on OPCOM.

IODP: In this program two platforms are envisioned: a JR-style ship and a riser drilling vessel, which STA has proposed to construct. STA submitted a proposal last year to the Japanese Finance Ministry to design and construct the riser vessel (\$400 million dollars). This was not accepted last year. Tamaki explained that the proposal for construction was not rejected, but postponed. Instead, JAMSTEC was awarded \$20 million dollars for a new drilling system. This JAMSTEC technology project will involve collaboration with ODP/TAMU and there will be an MOU between TAMU and JAMSTEC.

### **2.2 OPCOM (Srivastava)**

Srivastava reported on OPCOM. He encouraged panel members to access the OPCOM minutes (and other JOIDES panel minutes) from the JOIDES web site. Items discussed at OPCOM of interest to the panel were:

Leg 179. Two Ancillary Program Letters were considered, resulting in the addition of two projects to leg 179.

Proposal 445. Srivastava summarized the problem arose at OPCOM with the Kuroshio Current. Klaus added that TAMU has collected recent information on these currents and will compile a report on Nankai operations for the March OPCOM Meeting. One of the action item formulated called for TAMU to formulate clear policy and procedures for drilling in strong currents along the lines of those previously developed for shallow water drilling.

Guidelines for Nankai may then serve as the basis for general guidelines for operation in regions with strong currents.

Site survey status for proposal 448, Ontong Java Plateau (OJP) was discussed and it was pointed out the two leading proponents of 448, Kroenke and Mahoney, will sail on this Japanese cruise early 1998.

The necessity of sending the Data Package from the Data Bank to the ship and TAMU as arose at OPCOM were discussed. Diebold noted that sometimes Co-Chiefs may have data that the Data Bank does not have. He questioned why this was the case. Quoidbach pointed out that the data package is a operations package to facilitate communications between ship and shore. Co-Chiefs and TAMU need data sets with a common data bank number on the pieces of data to cut back extensive discussions when site location need to be changed at sea. High lat. legs need a lot of options because of the uncertainty with respect to the potential ice hazard. Klaus said that the Data Bank cannot selective send data; the entire data package is needed. Quoidbach sends two packages to the ship, usually one day apart, to ensure that at least one package arrives at the ship.

### **2.3 PPSP (Ball)**

The safety panel has reviewed through Leg 182. Leg 183, Kerguelen, was also reviewed with the exception of 4 sites that will be presented at our May 98 meeting in salt Lake City. Previews have been carried out for Leg 184, South China Sea Monsoon and Leg 188, Prydz Bay. Suggestions were made for processing procedures that could improve the seismic data sets for both of these legs. Work on Leg 184 data should be completed in time for review at May 98, PPSP meeting.

### **2.4 ODP Data Bank (Quoidbach)**

Since the last meeting only 151 data items have been received by the Data Bank, and roughly half of these were for scheduled Legs. This is an unusually small amount of data, based on what has been received in past years. The January 1 data deadline was largely ignored by proponents due to, 1) many proposals being fairly complete as of the last SSP meeting, 2) the fact that many proposals are in the southern hemisphere and this is the field season, and 3) confusion over the new data deadline. Having the deadline immediately after the Christmas/New Year holidays means that the effective deadline in is mid-December. It might be better to move the deadline to 1 February, giving proponents the month of January to compile their packages. As long as the SSP meeting remains in late February or early March, there will be enough time for the Data Bank to processing these packages.

Some discussion took place on shifting the January data deadline to February 1. It was decided to make a recommendation to SCICOM for changing this deadline.

**SSP recommendation # 2 to SCICOM : SSP recommends to SCICOM that the winter data deadline for submission of data to the ODPDB be changed from January 1 to February 1.**

*Explanatory note:* SSP has noted that many proponents are finding hard to meet January 1 as the deadline for submission of supporting data to the ODP Data Bank. The reasons for this are: one, the proximity of this deadline to the major holiday period (Christmas); and two, the short time period for the JOIDES Office to provide feedback from the JOIDES Panels following their fall meetings to proponents. In the present schedule of JOIDES Panels meetings, SSP is required to meet in late February. It was for this reason January 1 was selected as the data deadline. However, by requiring SSP to meet during the last week of February or early March and shifting the data deadline to February 1 provides adequate time for the data bank to catalogue data received prior to SSP meeting.

The sections of the *Guide to the Ocean Drilling Program* which cover SSP, PPSP, and data submission guidelines, as well as the Introduction to the Data Bank, were rewritten for the upcoming revised ODP Guide. The revised text was circulated to SSP and the PPSP Chair for comment, and then the edited text was submitted to the JOIDES Office.

The main proponents of Leg 184 (Proposal 484, E. Asian Monsoon) visited the Data Bank in October. Prof. Pinxian Wang (University of Shanghai) and Prof. How-Kin Wong (University of Hamburg) worked with Data Bank manager Quoidbach to find cores and additional crossing seismic lines in the study area. Quoidbach compiled a overall navigation map for proposal and explained the PPSP review process.

Development of the Data Bank's new data tracking system was delayed over the fall due to the consultant over committing time. The project is back on track at this point and should be ready to demo to the SSP at the July meeting.

Development of the Data Bank's web site is proceeding as well. It is not yet complete, and is still changing rapidly as more information is added, but it can be previewed at <http://server-mac.ldeo.columbia.edu>. Please send feedback regarding the website to [odp@ldeo.columbia.edu](mailto:odp@ldeo.columbia.edu).

## **2.5 TAMU (Klaus)**

The detailed TAMU Report was circulated prior to the SSP meeting by Klaus. He covered some key points and passed out a report on the site survey implications of recent legs.

*Navigation and U/W Lab:* A new Ashtech GPS/GLONASS receiver was delivered to the ship (179). It utilizes both the US and Russian (undithered) satellite systems. It will serve as a back up to the U/W labs GPS/GLONASS receiver. The new receiver was installed in the dynamic positioning room (DP shack) to assist the DP operators in controlling the ship while on site and to act as an emergency positioning system in case the U/W GPS/GLONASS receiver is inaccessible. Another inexpensive GPS receiver was installed in the ship's bridge to replace the Magnovox 4400. This unit will be used by the mates on the bridge for general navigation purposes.

*Chart Recorders:* Replacement of the flat bed chart recorders is nearly complete (3 of 4). A new version of our navigation software (WinFrog) was installed on Leg 178 that is intended to fix the final bugs in the annotations sent to the chart recorder. The remaining chart recorder will be retrieved from Pelagos (where it is being used for software development) and sent to the ship (179/ 180).

Acquisition of a GI-gun was deferred during the budget process due to its level of priority.

*Staffing:* Dr. Tim Francis, Deputy Director of Operations, left ODP/TAMU on Dec. 31, 1997 after seven and half years of dedicated service. Dr. Jack Baldauf, Deputy Director of Services, has assumed operational responsibilities. Dr. Jeff Fox has assumed responsibilities related to oversight of functional activities. This step is taken to focus resources where they can most benefit the Program. As such, one Deputy Director position will be left vacant for at least six months giving us time to determine whether or not this method is workable.

Manager of Information Services: To be advertised Staff Scientist: To be advertised

### *Upcoming legs (179-188): CO-CHIEFS*

Leg 179: Nero/Hammer Drill: Jack Casey  
Leg 180: Woodlark Basin: Taylor, Huchon  
Leg 181: SW Pacific Gateways: Carter, McCave  
Leg 182: Great Australian Bight: Feary, Hine  
Leg 183: Kerguelen: Coffin, Frey  
Leg 184: East Asia Monsoon: TBN  
Leg 185: Izu-Mariana: Plank, Ludden  
Leg 186 : W. Pacific Network-Japan Trench: TBN  
Drydock  
Leg 188: Prydz Bay TBN

*Guidehorn failure:* On 20 January while enroute to the last site of Leg 177, the aft lower-guide-horn pin broke and the bottom 16 ft of the port lower-guide-horn broke off and was trapped in the moonpool. Special operational limits of 4- pitch and roll were imposed for operations conducted with the partial guidehorn. Four holes were cored at the last site, but coring was halted on 23 January due to high seas (12-14 ft seas combined with 16-18 ft swells), which caused the special operating limits to be exceeded. Since the forecast was for the weather to deteriorate further the leg was terminated with minimal impact to Leg 177 scientific objectives. An I-beam frame was secured in the moonpool to hold the broken part of the LGH, but it started moving in the moonpool during transit and had to be dropped. The ship proceeded to Punta Arenas early for the Leg 178 port call. During the Punta Arenas port call, the starboard LGH was shortened to 16 ft (to match the port LGH). Analysis of the impact of the shortened guidehorn

(ODP/TAMU, Stress Engineering) resulted in Leg 178 (Antarctic Peninsula) proceeding as planned with revised operational limits to protect the drill string. Expected to have only minimal impact on the leg. A new lower guidehorn is being fabricated and delivered to Cape Town for installation prior to Leg 179. Two days that have been added to the Cape Town port call for the installation and there are no other planned changes to the ship's schedule related to this situation.

*"Project A"*: In preparation for March and August SCICOM/OPCOM meetings, ODP- TAMU is preparing operational, logistical, and cost evaluations for proposals that will be candidates for scheduling.

*ODP/TAMU review of proposal/site survey forms*: ODP/TAMU wishes to review information provided to scientists who intend to submit proposals. This review will focus on information intended to facilitate preparing operational, logistical, and cost evaluations for proposals that will be candidates for scheduling.

There was a discussion of underway geophysics lab on the JR, which was discussed at SCIMP. SCIMP considered the cost savings that would accrue by not replacing elements of the underway geophysics lab which were deemed not essential for the safety of the ship. Ellins explained that this was done in response to a directive from the SCICOM Chair based on (1) an EXCOM motion directing SCICOM to prioritize the science of the LRP, and the services of ODP, and (2) the need for the development of a capital replacement plan by TAMU. Beiersdorf further clarified EXCOM's intent. Whitmarsh and Enachescu stated that if a leg is sent to sea with good data set, then there is less need to worry about the equipment in the underway lab.

SSP decided that until it is advised otherwise or a problem arises in collecting adequate quality of seismic data no further recommendations are warranted at this time.

## **2.6 JOIDES (Ellins)**

Ellins reported on the following:

The new International Liaison in the JOIDES Office is Christina Chronogianni (ESF). Seven PPGs have been established. EXCOM has directed SCICOM to set up a PPG on the Seismogenic Zone, identified as the first scientific priority at the CONCORD Meeting.

*The Science Plan*. SCICOM/OPCOM set the schedule for Legs 184 to 188. There are issues related to site survey readiness and political clearance associated with leg 184. Leg 188 is contingent on the results of Leg 178 and assistance from the ANTOSTRAT community in funding an ice support vessel.

EXCOM: France announced that 2/3 of a full membership is the MAXIMUM level at which they can continue to participate in ODP - it could be less! France is seeking partners to form a consortium.

EXCOM Motion 98-1-3: Recognizing France's leadership in the international geoscience community and its many contributions to scientific ocean drilling, EXCOM deeply regrets the intent of France to reduce its contribution to (at most) \$2 M/yr. and notes that, according to current EXCOM and ODP Council Policy, this will result in a reduction in French representation on JOIDES panels and participation on ODP legs, and could, under present policy, result in exclusion from the Program. EXCOM urges France to work within its national community to retain its full membership in ODP, rather than forming a consortium by including countries already directly approached by JOI as potential, additional ODP members.

EXCOM Motion 98-1-7: In light of a desire to increase the overall funding of ODP by addition of new members, EXCOM requests that JOI update its strategy for international participation. In particular attention should be paid to (1) identifying the benefits of Associate Membership so that there are adequate incentives for increasing contributions toward Full Membership, (2) suggesting the role that the ODP Council should play in assisting JOI, (3) identifying the elements of a multi-faceted recruiting strategy including appeals to industrial, political, and mission agency constituencies, as well as academic communities and international organizations (like the OECD).

*IODP Planning:* The International Working Group for an Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IWG/IODP) was established in April 1997 to explore the concept of a scientific ocean drilling program for the year 2003 and beyond. To stimulate science planning and address technical, management, organizational and financial arrangements, the IWG will draw on the expertise of the existing JOIDES planning and advisory structures. In a letter to the EXCOM Chair, the IWG asked for assistance in science, technical and budgetary planning.

In response to the IWG's request, EXCOM approved a timetable for a major IODP planning conference (Spring 1999); directed SCICOM to establish a Seismogenic Zone PPG; directed SCICOM to convene a Technology Drilling Workshop in the fall of 1998; will use the results of the conference (spring 1999) to advise JOI to issue an RFP for the conceptual design of a non-riser vessel; agreed that JOI, plus additional JOIDES panels, work with the IWG in defining the budgetary and management requirements of an IODP; named the EXCOM Chair as the official liaison from JOIDES to the IWG, and requested that the IWG name a liaison to EXCOM; requested that the IWG make provisions for additional funds to assist with JOIDES involvement in IODP planning.

Some discussion took place when Kathy Ellins informed the panel that JOIDES is seriously thinking of moving the August/September SCICOM/OPCOM meeting time to early August. SSP Chair to raise question for discussion during the OPCOM meeting.

**Action item # 3: SSP Chair to bring the meeting time of August OPCOM/SCICOM meeting for discussion during next OPCOM meeting.**

### **2.7 NSF (Malfait)**

NSB approval for 19998 - 2003 was received. The board was very happy with the Program and interested in planning for the future. The FY 1999 target budget of \$48.5 includes the new day rate increase for the ship and corresponding bonus (up to \$1.5) plus half of the \$6 million to upgrade the ship at an upcoming dry dock. The budget is not what NSF hoped it would be, but it could be much worse. There is a \$ 3 million increase, but all of this goes towards the dry-dock. As a consequence, NSF's share of the Program cost goes up to 63%.

International membership in the Program is uncertain. France (?) and ESF (Italy) are not certain of their contributions. New Members - NSF engaged in final discussion with China in December. China presently reviewing the MOU. China will participate at a 1/6 level.

Technical cooperation between JAMSTEC and ODP/TAMU will take place that will benefit ODP and OD-21.

1998 Field P programs include (1) Site 735 B - Dick and Natland. This is a joint effort involving Britain and Canada. (2) Shallow Water Assessment off New Jersey - Mountain and Miller. (3) Mid-Atlantic Ridge - Kelleman and Casey. The Shinkai submersible will be involved. (4) Middle Valley towed gravimeter survey. (5) Maldives sea level study - Droxler. (6) OSN experiment (in progress). Preliminary results reveal the detection of a recent earthquake in Turkey, which was not recorded at the Hawaii GSN site. (7) CORKdata recovery - Becker and Carson. In 1999 (or 98?) , there will be a 3-D survey of Nankai - Shipley and Bangs.

Jamie Austin has submitted a proposal to NOPP for funding for jack- up rig to complete the NJ Margin transect.

### **2.8 SSEPs (Diebold and Paull)**

John Diebold and Charlie Paull attended the two SSEP's meetings held at Hobart in Tasmania, Australia. Charlie also attended a special meeting, held before the SSEP meetings at the same place, concerning the data requirement for Leg 188, Prydz Bay. He was able to participate in the examination and resulting discussion on the data requirements for this leg on behalf of SSP. The meeting turned out to be very beneficial both to the proponent and SSP. It was his understanding that all required data will be deposited with the DB before our Feb meeting. But this did not turn out to be the case.

Paull reported that ESSEP examined 30 proposals, five of which had already been ranked by SCICOM. The ESSEP is still dealing with how to get proposals into the system, and nurture them. Three proposals were selected for external review: 482, 489, and 485. A proposal to drill in Tahiti using technology that ODP does not

have been forwarded to the Shallow Water PPG. A proposal to drill a deep hole in the Maud Land/Weddel Sea was considered an inferior idea, and the location deemed inappropriate. Paull reported that the EESEP was not particularly interested in potential problems related to site survey issues. Site survey issues were not high enough on their ledger. Although the SSP liaisons bring information back to SSP, Paull questioned whether there was a benefit to SSP in having liaisons at the SSEPs.

Diebold reported that the SSEPs met jointly. The new approach is to encourage Preliminary proposals; there is a new category of Ancillary Program Letters (APLs). ISSEP selected proposals 479, 500 (H2O site), and 504Full2 (Newfoundland Basin deep hole) for external review. ISSEP reiterated their strong support for Nankai (445). They commented on the PPGs and questioned whether it was appropriate for SSP to have proposed a PPG (Gas Hydrates).

It was decided after some discussion that SSP should maintain this liaison as they provide SSP first hand information on the proposals it would be considering at its meeting. SSEPs don't seem to be too concerned on SSP requirements on data adequacies on their highly ranked proposals or on the possibility of its acquisition within the foreseeable future. This is to be brought to the attention of SSEP's Chair by SSP chair at the next OPCOM meeting. A suggestion was made by the SSEPs Chair that SSP Chair should let them know as soon as possible the name of the SSP members to attend their meetings as soon as possible so that details about the meeting can be circulated to them before the meeting.

**Action item # 4 : SSP Chair to discuss with the SSEPs Chairs on data requirements of highly ranked proposals at the PANCH or SCICOM/OPCOM combined meeting.**

### **3. SITE SURVEY IMPLICATIONS OF RECENTLY DRILLED LEGS**

#### **3.1 Leg 175: (Flood/Klaus)**

Leg 175, Benguela Current had a very detailed site survey package and Volkard Spiess was onboard with his computer/data. The success of 175 would not have been possible without such a detailed preparation. The foundation for optimal site selection were high-resolution airgun profiles collected during two expeditions mounted for this purpose (Sonne S086 in 1993; and Meteor Expedition 34/1 in 1996). These preparatory expeditions were carried out by GEO Group at Bremen University; processing was done at the Alfred-wegener Institute in Bremerhaven.

#### **3.2 Leg 176: Return to 735B; 300 (Casey/Klaus)**

The ship returned to the SATNAV position of Hole 735B. When the drill string was deployed, the bit was very close (~5 m) to the reentry cone and Hole 735B was easily reentered. Drilling terminated after the drill string parted after drilling to a total depth of 100 m. The video tapes prepared for this leg were not used as no need arose for them. A very successful leg indeed.

#### **3.3 Leg 177:**

All sites were occupied using the GPS coordinates from the two site survey cruises and coring operations were started right away. Only 3.5 kHz data was collected during the transits to the sites. There were few surprises in terms of what was recovered. Site 1089 had disturbed strata at 94 m cored depth (approximately the B/M boundary) which limited the depth to which a meaningful composite section could be constructed. Site 1090 yielded much lower sedimentation rates and older strata (~46 Ma, mid Eocene) than anticipated in the spectacular section to a total depth of 398 m. This could not have been anticipated from the site survey data. The impact of this site on the scientific objectives are rather promising since the Eocene to lower Miocene section may well become a type section for the Southern Ocean.

### **4. SITE SURVEY STATUS OF UPCOMING SCHEDULED LEGS FOR 97 & 98 \***

#### **4.1 Leg 179: NERO - Ninety East Ridge Observatory & Hammer Drilling (508)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Christeson

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target Type:* G

This leg will accomplish two objectives: 1) drilling a borehole into basement on the Ninetyeast Ridge for installation of a broadband ocean seismometer, and 2) test of the hammer drilling system near Site 735B. No new site survey data have been submitted for this proposal, and the site survey readiness status of this proposal remains 1A. Jack Casey, chief scientist of the leg, has completed a reconstructed video survey map of the *JOIDES Resolution* video tape from Site 735B drilling with navigation for purposes of site selection for hammer drilling. This still needs to be submitted to the data bank.

*Site survey readiness status:* 1A

**SSP Consensus # 1: Leg 179 (NERO and Hammer Drilling) will accomplish two objectives: 1) drilling a borehole into basement on the Ninetyeast Ridge for installation of a broadband ocean seismometer, and 2) test of the hammer drilling system near Site 735B. Plans call for reoccupation of either ODP Site 756 or 757 on the Ninetyeast Ridge, and tests of the hammer drilling system near Site 735B. Jack Casey, chief scientist of the leg, needs to submit to the data bank a reconstructed video survey map of the JOIDES Resolution video tape from Site 735B drilling with navigation for purposes of site selection for hammer drilling. Since site survey data for these previously drilled sites are already on file with the ODP Data Bank, SSP considers the site survey readiness status to be 1A.**

#### **4.2 Leg 181: SW Pacific Gateway (441-ADD-2)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Peterson

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target Type(s):* all Sites A (Paleoenvironment)

At their December 1997 meeting, PPSP approved drilling at primary sites SWPAC-1C, -2B, -5B, -6B, -7B, -8A, and -9B, and further approved SWPAC-10B and -16A as suitable alternates. Based on the PPSP review, several site positions were shifted slightly to accommodate panel concerns. Proponents have responded to the SSP requests from our July 1997 meeting to supply better annotated, large working copies of key seismic lines and more readable navigation maps. All figures are updated with respect to the final PPSP-approved site positions. The site survey data package for Leg 181 can now be considered complete, and the site survey readiness status is upgraded to "1A". SSP wishes the co-chiefs and scientific party of the SW Pacific Gateway leg "good hunting" on this exciting paleoceanographic venture.

**SSP Consensus # 2: The site survey data package for scheduled Leg 181 (SW Pacific Gateway) is now complete and seven primary and two alternate sites have been approved by PPSP. Site survey readiness is now considered to be "1A" . SSP wishes the scientific party of Leg 181 every success.**

#### **4.3 Leg 183, Kerguelen Plateau and Broken Ridge: origin, growth and evolution (457-rev 4)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Permanent: Tokuyama, Acting: Nakanishi

*SSP Proponent:* None

*Target Type:* G (Topographically elevated features)

At our July 1997 meeting, SSP recommended to the proponents to submit 1) migrated data from site KIP 13A together with a detailed track map and 2) the reprocessed SCS profile from site KIP 9A.

One migrated profile, RS180/201, and one stacked profile, MD47/10, from site KIP 13A with a detailed track map was received at the DB. The migrated profile seems adequate to address the drilling target. SSP, however, would like to get a migrated MD47/10 profile before the leg begins.

PPSP approved sites KIP 9B and 9C on the C2708 profile to the west of site KIP 9A. The proponents submitted one processed profile of C2708 from sites KIP 9B and 9C with a track map.

A French cruise/ for sites KIP 2B and 3A is being conducted from February to March. SSP recommends to the proponents to submit any additional data collected during this cruise for sites KIP 2B and 3A to the DB before July 98 deadline to get SSP approval.

**SSP Consensus # 3: SSP acknowledges receiving migrated profile (RS180/201) and a stacked profile (MD47/10) from site KIP13A of Leg 183 (Kerguelen pl.) with a track map and a**

migrated profile from sites KIP 9B and 9C with a track map. It recommends that the proponents/co-chiefs of this leg should submit a migrated MD47/10 profile before July data deadline to DB, for the SSP approval during their Jul meeting. Any additional data collected during a French cruise in Feb-Mar 98 for sites KIP 2B and 3A must be processed and deposited with the DB before July 98 deadline to get SSP approval. Site Survey status for this leg remain 2B.

#### **4.4 Leg 184: East Asian Monsoon History (484-rev)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Permanent: Flood

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target Types:* All sites as Type B (Passive Margin)

Newly processed lines were brought to the SSP meeting by How Kin Wong (Hamburg) and Jianhua Geng (Shanghai). These processed lines are from a Sonne 95 cruise, and supplement existing Sonne 72 and other data. The processing steps greatly increased the usefulness of these data in site selection. Additional Sonne95 lines will be processed in the near future. We also discussed the type of processing that will be useful in PPSP review, *including a set of plots with low gain to allow amplitude anomalies to be observed. Seismic velocities should be evaluated in more detail at the specific sites (including newly summarized expanding-spread data) to allow better determination of subbottom depths to various reflections.* Also, the possible need for multiple APC holes at most of the proposed sites was discussed. No BSR layers have been identified on the data presented to us. It is possible that additional MCS data is available in the region because Fig. 3 of the Preliminary Safety Report for Leg 184 appears different from plots of LDEO MCS data. Sites SCS-1 through SCS-4 are in the range of 400 to 550 meters of penetration. Site SCS-5B goes to 850 m and Site SCS-8 goes to 1100 m.

**Site SCS-1 :** Two crossing lines (Sonne95 seismic and parasound) are available near SCS-1. One seismic profile has been processed, and the other will be shortly. The seismic lines show layered sediments to the target depth, although there is an unconformity at about 0.1 sec. in the region but possibly not at the site. Parasound records show layering in the upper appx. 20-40 m, although the sea floor dips at appx. 1:10. Evaluation of the seismic and parasound data suggest that an optimum site for recovering the near-surface layers may be slightly offset from an optimum site for recovering deeper layers.

**Site SCS-2:** One processed seismic line and a parasound profile is available from this site while two older Lamont SCS profiles are nearby. The parasound record shows conformable layering for at least the upper 60 m. The processed seismic record (which runs downslope) shows conformable layering to the target depth. The two older records show that there is some topography along slope, and that the proposed site is apparently on a high. *The old and new data need to be evaluated together to confirm the best location for this site. An additional suggestion is that a high-quality single-channel profile be collected crossing this site by the Joides Resolution to ensure that there are no unknown unconformities.*

**Site SCS-3:** This is the northernmost and shallowest (appx. 625 m water depth) site. The site was chosen on the basis of Sonne72 data, and thus lies off of the Sonne95 data now being processed. No parasound data is at this site, although nearby data shows appx. 20 m of layering. The newer data shows some structural complexity in the region above the target depth, including nearby faults and a possible unconformity at 0.3 sec. There are a number of older tracks near the proposed site (including the Sonne72 data), and these data need to be evaluated together with the newer data to create maps of sediment structure and sediment properties (such as thickness). This will allow the best site to be chosen in the region and provide data necessary to safety evaluation. *The data should be further processed using spike deconvolution. This site is also the closest to a producing well (which is 30 mi to the north in shallower water), although closer wells have been dry. We suggest that the proponents or ODP/TAMU request data on these wells (logs, etc.) if this site is to be drilled to provide the best possibility for safe drilling. The proprietary nature of this data can be respected.*

**Site SCS-4:** One processed seismic and parasound record is available at this site (trending downslope). The processed seismic record shows conformable layering to the target depth, and the parasound record shows about 50 m of conformable layers. A LDEO MCS line (from V3614) crosses the processed line upslope from the site, but the

layering is not as good at the crossing as at the proposed site. *We therefore suggest keeping the site as proposed, but collecting a SCS line with the Joides Resolution crossing the site to ensure that there are no unknown unconformities in the record.*

**Site SCS-5B:** This is a deeper site, extending to 850 meters. Two Sonne95 profiles (one processed to date) and two parasound records are available near the site. The processed profile is over migrated at the target depth. This, combined with nearby basement topography, makes the layering difficult to resolve at this depth. Parasound records suggest that near-surface layering is irregular at the site, and thus that multiple APC holes may not be necessary. The original site SCS-5 was moved upslope to SCS-5B following the observation that SCS-5 was located on a topographic high. After looking at available data, it appears that SCS-5B may not be optimally sited because of the poorly resolved structure at depth. Data in the area, including a Lamont MCS line (collected on V3608) need to be further evaluated to determine the optimal location for this site. *Two possible options are (1) moving to the south of SCS-5 where the upper layers are thinner and the target layers are thicker and (2) moving to a location near where the Lamont MCS line crosses the Sonne95 line (this is near SCS-5 and SCS-5B).*

**Site SCS-8 :** This deep site (to 1100 m) is chosen on a slight rise where two MCS lines from the Chinese Academy cross. A page plot of navigation is provided, but digital navigation data is desirable. Also, there is ambiguity in annotations made along the edge of the MCS profiles that needs to be resolved. *We suggested that the proponents seek to obtain digital data for these profiles near the proposed sites and process them further for safety and scientific considerations.* The two MCS profiles in this area show layering in the upper part of the profile (less than approx 6 sec.) with target depths in the faulted sediments. We suggest that more consideration be given to the nature of the deeper sediment layering where it is to be sampled as well as to the structural trends in the basement as determined by these profiles. Also, age estimates (and uncertainties) need to be better documented to determine more precisely (along with available sediment velocity data) the depths needed to reach proposed seismic targets. No high-resolution (3.5 kHz, parasound, or single-channel) profiles are available at this site, although there is a nearby core.

**SSP Consensus # 4: The proponents of Leg 184 (S. China Sea) have made much progress in assembling a data package which demonstrates that suitable sediments are available for safely meeting leg objectives. Additional processing is needed for much of the data, and appropriate displays near the sites need to be generated as has been specified in the detailed comments. We remind the proponents that sites should be clearly labeled on all submitted lines, and that the proposed depth of penetration should be shown. Profiles also need to be annotated with vertical time scales and horizontal distance scales. Profiles should also be plotted in time if the navigation plots provided are in time. Page-size charts showing the locations of tracks near each proposed site are also useful at this stage.**

#### **4.5 Leg 185: Mass Balance, Izu Mariana (472)**

*SSP Watchdog:* John Diebold

*SSP Proponent:* none

*Target Type:* D (open ocean crust with sediment more than 400m)

This proposal has been rated 1A: ready for drilling for some time, and is now scheduled as leg 185.

*Site Survey Readiness Classification:* 1A.

**SSP Consensus # 5 : An adequate data package has been assembled for Izu-Mariana Convergent Margin leg 185. If any paleoceanography objectives are intended, a good quality SCS profile through site BON8 must be collected by the Joides Resolution.**

#### **4.6 Leg 186: Western Pacific Seismic Network (431)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Christeson

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target Types:* E (Open Ocean Crust with sediments <400 m)

This leg will drill two sites into basement directly above the subducting plate interface; these boreholes will be instrumented with both a broadband seismometer and strain meters. The stations will provide new constraints on strain episodes and slow earthquakes in Japan Trench. Information regarding OBS velocity results from about 50 km north of JT-1 were submitted to the data bank, estimating sediment thicknesses of 1370 m and 1320 m at JT-1 and JT-2, respectively. Communications from Suyehiro during the meeting relayed that new OBS and MCS data were collected near the JT-1 site in 1997, and will be submitted to the data bank before the July SSP meeting.

The SSP is concerned with the sediment thickness estimates since errors will effect drilling time estimates. They were encouraged to hear that OBS velocity results will be submitted to the data bank before the July SSP meeting. *When the refraction data is interpreted could the proponents map sediment thickness along the seismic profiles? Could alternate sites along the seismic profiles positioned where sediment thickness is less and drilling times shortened be proposed?* The panel does not require that the sites be positioned exactly at the intersection of crossing lines. The panel rates the site survey readiness as 2A, and expect that all necessary data for a 1A rating will be available at the next meeting.

**Site survey readiness status: 2A**

**SSP Consensus # 6: All required data with the exception of velocity data in support of Leg 186 (Seismic Network, Japan Trench) has been deposited with the data. Velocity information at the proposed sites as determined from OBS measurements is expected at the DB before our July meeting. Once this information is received the leg will be ready for drilling.**

#### ***4.7 Leg 187: Australia-Antarctica Discordance (426)***

*SSP Watchdog* : Sibuet

*SSP Proponent*: None

*Target Type* : E (Open Ocean crust with sediments < 400m)

The intent of this leg is to locate and to characterize the boundary between sea-floor basalts that were derived from the mantle of the Pacific ocean and those belonging to the Indian ocean.

During our July 97 meeting we had examined the site survey data collected in support of this proposal onboard R/V Melville. Based on the result of this cruise together with data collected on previous cruises 19 sites were approved as ready for drilling. This was communicated to the proponents and now can be regarded as the prime sites. On the basis of this SSP ranked this proposal as 1A. Because cross lines could not be obtained at all sites, it is suggested that these be recorded on board J/R during the site approach to ensure the horizontal extent of the sediment pockets at the drilling sites.

Since our July meeting no changes have taken place in the data status of this leg. In SSP opinion it is considered ready for drilling.

**SSP Consensus # 7: Based on SSP evaluation of the data submitted at their July 97 meeting, 19 sites were found to have adequate data for drilling during Leg 187 (Aus.-Antrac. discordance). With this number of approved sites, it is the considered opinion of the main proponent that drilling objectives for this leg now can be achieved. In SSP opinion most of the required data for this Leg now exist and, hence, it is ready for drilling. Additional data will need to be collected by J/R to ensure the horizontal extent of the sediment pockets at the drilling sites.**

#### ***4.8 Leg 188: Prydz Bay Glacial History (490)***

*SSP Watchdog*: Paull

*SSP Proponents*: None

*Target types*: B (Passive margin)

No site survey data examined at Hobart meeting has yet been deposited with the DB.

**SSP Consensus # 8: Most of the required site survey data has not been submitted to the Data bank for Leg 188 (Prydz Bay) and even the locations of many of the sites are not clearly established. Correspondence and discussions with the proponents at the fall 1997 ESSEP meeting in Hobart indicated that a substantial**

revision of the proposed site locations was intended. Adequate data to locate appropriate sites to both achieve the scientific objectives and to satisfy most of the SSP's needs probably exist. However, a serious data review by SSP will await the submissions of most of the data. The leg remains rated as 2A.

## **5. POTENTIAL FUTURE DRILLING: SSEP (Earth Int.)**

### **5.1 *Western Pacific Seismic Network (431b)***

*SSP Watchdog:* Christeson

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target Types:* E (Open Ocean Crust with sediments <400 m)

This proposal seeks to drill two sites into basement in the western Pacific in order to install broadband ocean seismometers, as part of the Ocean Seismic Network. WP1 is located in the Philippine Sea, and WP2 in the Western Pacific.

Site WP1 was rated by the panel as having a site survey readiness status of 1B because it is lacking velocity control for sediment thickness. Suyehiro relayed to SSP during the meeting the sediment thickness encountered at other drill holes in the Philippine Sea. A compilation of these drill sites including 1) sediment thicknesses, 2) two-way travel time, 3) average sediment velocity, 4) distance of the drilled sites from proposed site needs to be deposited in the data bank, together with an interpreted sediment thickness for WP1. This will satisfy the panel concern for velocity for this site.

Site WP2 has a site survey readiness status of 2A because of panel concerns about basement identification and sediment thickness. MCS profiles for this site show reverberation, and it is not clear that the basement is properly imaged. Are there any tie lines available to existing drill holes where basement has been encountered? Until basement is better identified SSP is hesitant to upgrade this site to site survey readiness status of 1A. Also, a survey ship track with shot points annotated needs to be submitted to the data bank.

**Site survey readiness status:** WP1=1B, WP2=2A

**SSP Consensus # 9: No additional data in support of proposal 431B (Western Pacific Seismic Network) has been deposited with the DB since our July 97 meeting. Data needed for WP1 site is the velocity control for calculation of sediment thickness and for WP2 additional cross line or a tie line to the nearest DSDP hole where basement was drilled to ensure that basement as interpreted at the proposed site is correct. Site Survey readiness for the proposal is 1B for site WP1 and 2A for site WP2.**

### **5.2 *Nankai Trough Accretionary Prism: Deformation and fluid flow (445)***

*SSP Watchdog:* Paull

*SSP Proponent(s):* Tokuyama

*Target Type(s):* C (Active margin)

**SSP Consensus # 10: No additional data with the exception of information on Kuroshio current has been received for proposal 445 (Nankai Trough) since the last meeting. Kuroshio current information has also been sent to TAMU. Detailed navigation plots that merge the major data types are still missing. It is requested that Japanese proponents of this proposal should make every effort of depositing this data in the data bank as soon as possible. The proposal readiness from site survey point of view still remains as 1B (some essential data not in the DB but believed to exist).**

### **5.3 *Ontong Java Plateau Origin (448-Full)***

*SSP Watchdog:* Permanent: Whitmarsh

*SSP Proponent(s):* None

*Target Type(s):* D (Open Ocean Crust with Sediments >400m)

At its February '98 meeting SSP reviewed ODP proposal #448-Rev4 (also known as #448-Full). In the revised proposal the broad scientific objectives remain unchanged from the previous proposal (448-Rev3) but the rationale underpinning the proposal is more clearly presented. Further, Site OJ9A was re-instated as an alternate to Site OJ08. Thus the 2-leg plan proposes that during the first leg a set of holes to be drilled at Sites

OJ1a&b, OJ3, OJ6, OJ11A, and OJ12A (if time permits) while during a second leg, drilling a set of holes at Sites OJ2, OJ7a, OJ7b, OJ8 (or OJ9a), and OJ10A is proposed.

The proposed holes aim to penetrate 150-350 m into basement except at Site OJ2 where 1000 m is proposed. Upper acoustic basement is presumably composed of igneous rocks or mixed igneous and sedimentary rocks. In order to achieve the objectives, well migrated MCS profiles are required to image the top basement surface and to clarify riftward-dipping intrabasement reflectors and other structures. Sediment and basement velocity data are also required not only to determine the depth to basement but also to image, using time migration, the intrabasement structure under each site (particularly Site OJ2) and to correlate the planned TD of the deeper holes with the seismic reflection record. However, the proponents have not submitted any new geophysical data to the ODP Data Bank for this proposal since Spring 1995. Therefore, from SSP point of view this proposal still remains immature (see below).

The JOIDES Office representative was informed during the meeting by email that the proposed ORI geophysical cruise in the Ontong Java Plateau was currently taking place on board the R.V. Hakuho-maru. The email stated that (multichannel?) seismic reflection profiles had been obtained and Panel member Masao Nakanishi, who had participated in the first leg of the same cruise, informed the Panel that 3.5 kHz profiles and sonobuoy records may also have been collected. However at the meeting the Panel lacked precise details on the locations, quantities and types of data acquired.

The email from the R.V. Hakuho-maru also indicated that the proponents were considering submitting another revision of their proposal with a new lead PI. They were advised by the JOIDES office not to do so if they did not wish their proposal to be sent out again for external review. Whereas this is a decision for the proponents if they do not wish for their proposal to go through this route but simply submit their new data in the recommended format by 1 July 1998 (see below). In that case the Panel considers that, if scheduled, these sites could be ready to be drilled in FY2000.

**Site Survey readiness classification : 2A, only if the required data has been collected on board Hakuho-Mar. If it does then the following required data should be submitted to the ODP Data Bank by 1 July, 1998,**

- a) time-migrated multichannel seismic reflection lines over all sites
- b) a compilation of all seismic tracks in the area (preferably on a single chart)
- c) seismic velocity measurements from the sediment and basement.

**N.B.** failure to submit data by the 1 July 1998 deadline could lead to this proposal missing a scheduling window-of- opportunity.

**SSP Consensus # 11: SSP recommends that time migrated MCS data, sediment and basement velocity data, 3.5 kHz subbottom data and a compilation of all seismic tracks are required for all proposed sites in proposal 448-Rev4 (Ontong Java Plateau). The Panel noted that these data have probably been acquired during a recent (February 1998) cruise. SSP, therefore, recommends the proponents to submit time-migrated seismic lines over all sites, velocity and track charts and all other relevant site survey data to the ODP Data Bank by 1 July 1998. Site Survey readiness is classed 2A.**

#### **5.4 Taiwan arc-continent collision (450) PPSP**

*SSP Watchdog:* Sibuet

*SSP Proponent(s):* None

*Target Type(s):* C: Active margin for sites 1-5,7 and D: Open Ocean Crust with sediments >400m for site 6.

This proposal was previously rated 1A which means that it is ready to become a drilling leg. However, we suggested to PPSP during our July 1997 meeting to pre-review two sites where a BSR would be drilled (sites TC2A and TC7A). The BSR is obvious on Ewing line 29 and Moana Wave line 30 which are coincident EW oriented lines. All along these profiles, the BSR is a faint and discontinuous feature. The reflector will be drilled at both sites.

A PPSP pre-review of this proposal is still required if it becomes a leg. For that, it would be necessary to provide true amplitude plots of the seismics. If the proposal is accepted during the next OPCOM meeting (summer 98), the PPSP pre-review will take place during the December PPSP meeting. In that case, the Joides Office will directly contact the main proponent after the OPCOM scheduled meeting in August 1998.

**SSP Consensus # 12: All vital data have been deposited in the DB for proposal 450 (Taiwan Arc-Cont. Collision) . The proposal was rated 1A which means that it is ready to become a drilling leg. However, a PPSP pre-review would be required for sites TC2A and TC7A where the BSR would be drilled. A true amplitude plot of Ewing line 29 or Moana Wave line 30 would be required for the PPSP pre-review. The proposal still remains 1A.**

***5.5 Arc Evolution and Mantle Geodynamics in Space and Time at an Intra oceanic Subduction Zone: Ocean Drilling in the Tonga Forearc (451-Full5 )***

*SSP Watchdog:* John Diebold

*SSP Proponent:* none

*Target Type:* C (Active Margins)

This proposal was rated 1A; ready for drilling at the July 1997 SSP meeting at Lamont. Since then, the proposal was revised, favoring its geochemical goals over the previous version's tectonic ones. The proposed sites, however, have not changed, with the minor exception of TONG4, which was moved from 4B to 4C, nearby within the existing seismic profile coverage. The proposal is still rated 1A, though we note that slight changes in water and sediment depths have been made, and that there are inconsistencies in these values between site summary forms and in the site summary table, p. 25.

**SSP Consensus # 13 : All required data for the Tonga Forearc proposal (451) resides in the Data Bank. This proposal, from an SSP perspective, is ready to be considered for drilling. Proponents should, however, address to some of the inconsistencies in the proposed water depths and drilling depths at the proposed sites given in the forms and those listed in the proposal. Site Survey Readiness Classification remains 1A for this proposal.**

***5.6 Testing Hypotheses of Oceanic Plateau Formation by Drilling Shatsky Rise (463 - Add 3)***

*SSP Watchdog:* Permanent: Hinz; Acting : Diebold

*SSP proponents:* none, Adam Klaus (TAMU liaison)

*Target type:* G (Topographically elevated region) and E (open ocean crust with sediment <400m)

An eight-basement hole transect over the four main volcanic edifices comprising the Shatsky Rise is proposed. Objectives include testing a plume origin for the volcanics, dating them and determining plume dynamics. The proposed eight primary holes include two mini-core re-entry holes (SRSH-2 and SRNH-1) and two reference holes (SRSH-1 and SRSH-7).

All data acquired during cruise TN033 of *R/V THOMPSON* in 1994 have been submitted to the Data Bank, including migrated 6-channel seismic reflection lines, detailed Hydrosweep bathymetric maps and Xerox copies of the 3.5 kHz PDR data from all eight primary sites and from all 23 alternate sites.

Despite reassuring correspondence from W. Sager, SSP concern remains regarding identifying the actual surface of the volcanic edifice of the Southern High at e.g., sites SRSH-2, -2B, -2C, -3, -3B. It may be possible to clarify the identification of volcanic basement by reprocessing the migrated sections with different filter parameters. Otherwise, it will be impossible to rule out the possibility that the distinct sequence identified as basement represents a depositional sequence including volcanoclastic rocks, in which case the drilling plan will have to be modified in order to reach the targets.

***Site Survey Readiness Classification:* 1B**

**SSP Consensus # 14: 3.5 kHz PDR data, migrated, 6-channel seismic reflection data and detailed Hydrosweep bathymetric maps for all proposed sites are in the DB for proposal 463 (Shatsky Rise). Although the migrated seismic reflection data are considered to be adequate to identify the basement there remains some concern regarding the interpreted surface of the volcanic edifice at sites SRSH-2, -2B, -2C, -3, -3B. If the top of the distinct 0.15-0.2 (tw) thick sequence, interpreted by the proponents as basalt, is instead a depositional unit, the primary holes SRSH-2 and SHSH-3 will have to be deepened in order to reach the targets or to be moved. It may be possible to re-display the migrated data with different filter parameters, clarifying the basement**

**identification. With this modification the data set will be complete, though deep penetration MCS data would greatly enhance the interpretation of the results of deep drilling. Short surveys by the drill ship would be desirable, to provide cross lines at those sites which lack them.**

**5.7 479: PACMANUS Basin**

*SSP Watchdog:* Silver

*SSP Proponent:* None

*Target Type:* F (Bare rock drilling).

This proposal requests drilling of 4 sites into an active, felsic volcanic hydrothermal environment, located in the Manus basin of northern Papua New Guinea. The purpose of drilling these holes is to study the solid and fluid products of felsic rock - water interaction, responsible for global chemical fluxes and for ore formation. Drilling at these sites falls under the Bare Rock Drilling of SSP guidelines. Most of the required data have been collected, but critical information is lacking from the Data Bank. The panel requests that the following data items be sent to the Data Bank in time for examination at the July meeting:

- 1) All 3.5 kHz data over and near the proposed sites and any other shallow penetration data that would show information about the nature of surface materials.
- 2) All videos and photos showing the proposed sites and vicinities. In sending videos, as with other data, please indicate where in the data set the relevant material can be found. Documentation is important for data to be useful for the panel.
- 3) Any sidescan images of the proposed sites.
- 4) Details of relevant heat flow or temperature gradients for the proposed sites and vicinity.
- 5) An annotated summary of samples taken at or near the sites.
- 6) Large scale swath bathymetry and navigation maps showing the locations of sites together with well annotated seismic lines.

In addition to the data, the proponents should discuss in some detail the following problems, referring where possible to the data:

- a) Are each of the sites suitable for successful installation of HRGB? This question is one important reason why we need to see videos, photos, detailed side scan, and shallow penetration data of each site.
- b) Drilling 700 m through volcanic rock is rather wishful thinking and this could take an entire leg. Please discuss drilling time estimates with ODP engineers.
- c) There are really no successful ODP legs involving bare rock drilling on zero age crust. In light of this history it would be advisable to discuss the drilling strategies with TAMU engineers if this proposal is to become a drilling leg.

We emphasize the time urgency of these requests. There may be a narrow time window for drilling in the western Pacific. It is essential that our requests be completed prior to the July, 1998, panel meeting. We ask that the data be sent to the data bank before the July 1 deadline.

***Site Survey Readiness Status:* 2A**

**SSP Consensus # 15: Substantial amount of the required data for proposal 479 (PACMANUS Basin) has been collected but all items are not in the Data Bank. The proposal is thus classified as 2A under SSP ranking system. It is suggested that these items be deposited with the DB before July deadline so that they could be examined by SSP during their July meeting. The proposal calls for drilling very deep holes in Bare Rock environment, where not much success has been obtained so far. It is suggested that proponents contact TAMU engineers about drilling in such environment in case drilling strategies for this proposal have to be modified.**

**5.8 ION Equatorial (499)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Christeson

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target Type:* E (Open ocean crust with sediments <400m)

This proposal, which targets objectives of the ION and OSN programs, proposes that a cased, cemented hole be drilled and fitted with a re-entry cone in the equatorial western Pacific; a broadband seismometer will be installed in the borehole using wireline re-entry and does not require installation by the drilling ship. The site will fill in a major gap in coverage between Central America and the Pacific Islands which exists with the current seismic network. The proposed site is near ODP site 852 which was drilled on Leg 138. No new data was submitted to the data bank for this proposal. SSP still requires: 1) new displays at an appropriate scale of the existing SCS profiles with site location, showing expected penetration, and 2) map of satellite gravity and magnetics for the region to insure that sites are free of major structure and are outside of any regional anomalies.

*Site survey readiness ranking* : 2A.

**SSP Consensus # 16: Proposal 499 (ION equatorial) calls for drilling a hole near ODP site 852 for seismometer installation in support of the ION and OSN programs. SSP still requires: 1) new displays at an appropriate scale of the existing SCS profiles with site location, showing expected penetration, and 2) map of satellite gravity and magnetics for the region to insure that sites are free of major structure and outside of any regional anomalies. This site is classified as 2A in terms of site survey readiness. SSP encourages the proponents to supply the requested data to the data bank by the July 1 data deadline so that it can be evaluated in time to be scheduled for year 2000 drilling.**

#### **5.9 500: H2O Observatory. New**

*SSP Watchdog*: Christeson

*SSP Proponents*: None

*Target Type*: E

This proposal is for drilling a reentry hole at the Hawaii-2 Observatory (H2O) site in the Eastern Pacific. A seafloor observatory is currently planned at the H2O site; this proposal is for a borehole, to be installed with a broadband seismometer as part of the ION network. A site survey cruise over the Hawaii-2 cable proceeded in August 1997, and a cruise report was submitted to the data bank. SSP gives this proposal a site survey readiness status of 2A, and requires: 1) A site location map, 2) Processed single channel seismic reflection data over the proposed site, with the site clearly marked, 3) 3.5 kHz data over the proposed site, 4) Map of satellite gravity for the region (with site clearly marked) to insure that sites are free of major structure and outside of any regional anomalies, and 5) Sediment cores are required for re-entry sites. Crossing lines are recommended, but not required. SSP encourages the shore-based processing of the current data. Descriptions of cores from nearby DSDP sites, together with distance from H2O site, should be sufficient. SSP encourages the proponents to supply the requested data to the data bank by the July 1 data deadline so that it can be evaluated in time to be scheduled for year 2000 drilling.

**Site survey readiness status**: 2A

**SSP Consensus # 17: Proposal 500 (H2O Observatory) is for drilling a borehole, to be installed with a broadband seismometer as part of the ION network. A site survey cruise has taken place in the region but no data has been supplied to the DB. It is suggested that all required data be deposited with the DB before July 1 deadline so that it can be examined during next SSP meeting in July. Site Survey readiness is evaluated as 2A.**

#### **5.10 Newfoundland Basin NARM "Deep Hole" Site NB-3A (504-Full2)**

*SSP Watchdog*: Enachescu

*SSP Proponents*: Neil Driscoll, Jeanne-Claude Sibuet and Shiri Srivastava

*Target Type(s)*: B (Passive margin),

This proposal recently submitted (September 1997) is a re-write of an older proposal. It has a long history with ODP and is accompanied by a very large volume of data. However, lots of the data collected for the older proposals are not specifically referred to within this latest proposal. The present submission designated 504-Full2 is a "one deep

hole” site proposal. A similar proposal called NARM-ADD2 was submitted earlier by Austin et al. Similar objectives as for the earlier 504 multi-site proposal are considered in this proposal.

The main objectives of the proposal include:

1. to examine the age and composition of the crust that floors the Newfoundland Basin allowing testing of a geodynamics model of its origin,
2. to determine the age and origin of “U”, the inferred break-up unconformity reflector and its relationship to the onset of seafloor spreading.

Other objectives included are:

3. to specifically study a divergent margin rift basin, continental rift and break-up mechanism, drift and subsidence history,
4. to establish the nature of basement rocks at the proposed site (composition, geochemistry, age-depth history),
5. to establish the relationship of this margin with the conjugate Iberian margin and formulate a consistent geological model of the entire Mesozoic Iberian- Newfoundland Basin

The mechanisms of continental extension and breakup and the formation of divergent margins with accompanying rift basins are fundamental parts of plate tectonics, yet they are poorly documented and understood. The Newfoundland Basin is a suitable location to study the tectonic and magmatic processes that shape passive margins during transition between intra-continental extension to seafloor spreading. Moreover, as half of the NFL-Iberia transect was drilled during Legs 149 (1993) and 173 (1997), completing the conjugate margin transect by drilling at least the proposed 3A site on the Newfoundland margin will be an obvious follow up.

One drilling site is re-proposed: site NB-3A along a CONRAD 1986 MCS line, oriented W-E across the East Newfoundland Basin Margin. At this site, in 2500 m water depth, the required penetration is 2300 m with the last 200 m in basement. Basement is expected to be either continental or oceanic in origin. Geochemical analysis of basement samples, obtained through drilling this site, will help elucidate the nature of the rotated blocks and the history of this Atlantic margin. The drilling proposal is in accordance with the ODP Long Range Plan: “Dynamics of the Earth’s Interior themes of deformation at extensional boundaries etc...” and was highly ranked in the past by TECP.

It is puzzling why the proposed site is chosen on CONRAD line when a detailed survey carried out by HUDSON lies immediately to the west of the proposed site and have intersecting lines over the site. Two of the co-proponents, members of the panel, were unable to answer the question as they seem not to have been consulted by the main proponent before the proposal was submitted.

The data deposited at the DB belongs to earlier proposals (NARM ) submitted in 80’s and early 90’s (NARM-ADD) and seems comprehensive. The submitted data includes:

1. An extensive CONRAD MC Deep Seismic Reflection survey lines,
2. Unprocessed Hudson Erable 1992 detail survey data centered on previously proposed sites,
3. Several vintages of MC industry reflection lines,
4. Single channel seismic data (Farnella),
5. Corresponding navigation data for the modern MCS data,
6. Refraction data,
7. Velocity information from seismic records and an exploration well on the slope,
8. 3.5 kHz data,
9. Gravity, magnetic, heat flow, swath bathymetry and bathymetry data,
10. Description of piston cores collected in the area,
11. Sea current information and reports.

Presence of dry exploration wells drilled near the area on the slope and shelf show little likelihood of hydrocarbon accumulation. However, processed MCS must be screened for shallow hazards, as stratigraphic trapping is possible. It is noted that oil and gas accumulations were drilled on the shelf in stratigraphic units similar in age with those expected above the basement at the proposed location.

An ODP Site Survey Form was completed for the designated site NB-3A. The quality of data accompanying the proposal varies from fair (MCS) to poor (SCS).

Our recommendations include:

1. Both CONRAD and HUDSON modern MCS data should be used to locate the best possible sites to drill into the basement. Proper tie points between the data sets should be displayed on the critical seismic lines. Intersecting lines at the location should be reprocessed and conveniently displayed to illustrate the drilling objectives.
2. The velocity information extracted from the newer Erable survey (OBS+ MCS) together with stacking velocities obtained from CONRAD MCS data should be used for depth conversion and to mark the hole trajectory and total depth on the seismic sections.
3. A base map should be re-drawn to include all vintages (similar to Figure 4 in the proposal); lines should be displayed with different colors and the drill site should be clearly marked at intersecting lines. Exploration well location should be included. A larger scale map of site 3A should be produced as inset or separate map.
4. Depth structure maps for U unconformity and Top Basement in the vicinity of site 3A should be interpreted from all pertinent lines.
5. If the one site leg proposal is accepted by the SCICOM, then the data base should be consolidated around this location. An adequate data package needs to be put together by the proponents and deposited with the DB, separately from the old multi-hole proposal.

We found the proposal 504-Full2 well presented and recommend the proponents to improve on the documentation submitted for both scientific and Site Survey reasons. We have reservations regarding the sufficiency of a single hole in meeting all proposal's objectives. Integration of all pertinent data is necessary.

**SSP Consensus # 18 : Limited specific site survey data was submitted for proposals 504 (Newfoundland Basin). However, a lot of site survey data submitted for earlier proposals, 504 and NARM, exist in the Data Bank. SSP suggests that this entire data base need to be properly organized, processed, compiled and better displayed. The data package should then be focused on site NB-3A, if an one-site proposal is approved by SCICOM. Site survey readiness according to SSP guidelines is considered 2A.**

## **6. POTENTIAL FUTURE DRILLING: SSEP (Earth Env.)**

### **6.1 Laurentide Ice Sheets outlets (LISO, 455-rev)**

*SSP watchdog:* Lykke-Andersen

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target Type:* A (Paleoenvironment) and B (Passive Margin)

No new data has been submitted to the Data Bank since the July 1997-meeting. The panel wants to reiterate the recommendations pointed out in the minutes from the July 1997-meeting to the proponents for completion of the site survey data package. The panel also wants to remind the proponents that the deadline for submission of data to be evaluated at the SSP-meeting in July 1998 is July 1.

**SSP Consensus # 19: No new data has been sent to the Data Bank since SSP July 97 meeting for proposal 455 (Laurentide Ice Sheet). Its site survey readiness thus remains 2A. (Substantial items of required data are not in the Data Bank, but are believed to exist and are likely to be available in time for consideration for FY 2000 drilling schedule). The proponents should make serious efforts in depositing the required data with the DB before July 1 deadline if they wish their proposal to be further evaluated for site survey readiness at SSP July 98 meeting.**

### **6.2 SE Pacific Paleooceanography (465)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Peterson

*SSP Proponent:* None

*Target Type:* All sites A (Paleoenvironment)

No new data have been submitted to the Site Survey Data Bank since last June's arrival of the large, high quality data package from the *R/V Roger Revelle* survey cruise examined at the July 1997 SSP meeting. Correspondence with the lead proponent prior to our Berlin meeting indicates that all high-resolution SCS data have been processed again and that work is proceeding on analysis of sediment cores collected at each of the 31 surveyed sites. In addition, 3.5 kHz data have been gathered in preparation for submission. Since it is likely that this program will be considered seriously for scheduling at the August SCICOM/OPCOM meeting, proponents are encouraged to have reprocessed SCS data,

original 3.5 kHz profiles, and any relevant new core data submitted to the ODP Data Bank prior to the next data deadline of July 1.

The site survey readiness for this proposal remains as "1B", with SSP recognition that all data required to select sites for either a one leg or two leg drilling program are available. SSP looks forward to seeing what we anticipate to be a largely finalized data package at our July meeting.

*Site survey readiness status:* 1B

**SSP Consensus # 20: No new data for proposal 465 (SE Pacific Paleoceanography) have been submitted to the Site Survey Data Bank since our last meeting and the site survey readiness status remains as "1B". Contact with proponents indicates that they plan to have all remaining data items (e.g., 3.5 kHz data) and reprocessed SCS data submitted by the next data deadline (July 1). SSP thus anticipates having a complete data package for examination at our July meeting.**

### **6.3 Wilkes Land Margin: Cenozoic Glacial History (482).**

*SSP Watchdog:* Flood

*SSP Proponent(s):* none

*Target type(s):* B (Passive margin)

A revised proposal has been submitted to ODP. Two new objectives have been added regarding sediment transport and deposition on ice-dominated shelves, high-latitude facies models, and development of drifts and channel-levee complexes. No new data has been submitted to the SSDB; however, correspondence was received from the proponent in response to SSP comments addressing especially the availability of longer seismic lines (especially from JNOC) and the integration of the drilling proposal with an upcoming OGS MCS survey (Feb-March, 1999).

The proponents recognize the need for collecting high-resolution seismic profiles and intersecting MCS profiles at proposed sites given the dipping seismic horizons that are to be studied, especially for the shelf sites. Better control is available for the deep-water sites in the SSDB, but new MCS and high-resolution data is planned for these sites also.

While waiting for new MCS data, the proponents might wish to reconsider site selection considering all of the existing seismic (especially MCS) data, perhaps by the July 1 SSDB data deadline. This will probably require increased access to JNOC data since JNOC lines cross several of the existing seismic (especially MCS) lines, perhaps by the July 1 SSDB data deadline. Apparently gaining full access to these data has been a problem because of the proprietary nature of the data. The proponents should be aware that the ODP SSDB has mechanisms in place to accept proprietary data and to allow its use only for necessary review purposes. This may allow JNOC data to be more fully utilized in site selection. Contact the SSDB for further details. Without further evaluation of existing data, it may not be possible to drill these sites in FY01.

Several other comments on the proposal itself:

Site forms for the alternate sites need to be submitted.

Table 1 does not agree in detail with the site forms.

It is not clear why the shelf sites do not include APC/XCB coring or what number of APC holes are planned at the rise sites

The number and location of sites should perhaps be reconsidered (especially on the shelf) given the added objective of studying sediment deposition and facies models.

*Site Survey Readiness ranking:* 3A

**SSP Consensus # 21: The proposal 482 ( Wilkes Land) remains ranked 3A in anticipation of needed additional data to be collected in Feb-March 1999. However, additional review of existing data might result in some new sites.**

### **6.4 Southern Gateway Aus.-Antarctic (485); PPSP**

*SSP Watchdog:* Casey

*SSP Proponent(s):* none

*Target Type:* B, D and G

No new data has arrived in the data bank for the sites proposed. A revised proposal was reviewed by SSP during this meeting. This revised proposal eliminated several of the previously proposed sites. The items that the proponents submitted prior to the February meeting included migrated AGSO cruise 125 (Tamante) MCS seismic profiles, as well as velocity information for each of the proposed sites, completing the data package. The data in the Data Bank includes all navigation files and maps, shot point data, SCS deep penetration profiles, migrated MCS profiles, velocity, 3.5 kHz, swath bathymetry, hi-resolution side looking sonar, magnetics, gravity, coring, and rock sampling data. This data package is comprehensive and detailed, but some data is still not present, especially the recent seismic data (AGSO) collected in November of 1997.

The proponents have indicated that new seismic lines crossing site ETP02A will be added to the data bank in the near future. These new fully processed lines should be added prior to the July, 1998 SSP meeting. In addition, the proponents have indicated that a new Site (STR02A) may be added as an alternative site to STR01A. Should alternative sites be added, the Site would have to be reviewed at the July meeting for proper consideration. The additional seismic lines and core data related to this Site should be sent to the data bank and again it is critical that the data arrive prior to the July 1998 meeting.

**Site Survey readiness ranking:** 1B (some items exist but are still not in the DB).

**SSP Consensus # 21: Proposal 485 involves drilling between Tasmania and the South Tasman Rise and Antarctica to address Cenozoic climate changes and paleo-ocean currents. Based on a revised proposal, new seismic and core data and suggestions of an alternate priority site, SSP requests submission of new cross seismic lines for Sites ETP02 and lines crossing a recently proposed alternative site (STR02A). In addition, core data for this alternate sites should also be submitted. This data should be sent to the data bank prior to the July, 1998 SSP meeting for consideration. Should there be any changes in Sites based on the new data, the Site data will have to be evaluated at the July meeting. The site survey ranking has been changed to 1B as some items are still not in the DB.**

#### **6.5 Paleogene Equatorial Pacific APC Transect (486)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Hine

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target types:* All sites A, Paleoenvironment

The February 1998 meeting in Berlin was the third time that this proposal was presented to the SSP. Members seemed to be well acquainted with the primary scientific objectives and the general drilling strategy. A recent email (Feb 25, 1998) from the lead proponent (M. Lyle) concerning the very recent cruise on the RV Ewing (EW9709) was presented and discussed. The following points were noted:

1. Nineteen possible drill sites from 33 to 0 deg N using hydrosweep swathmap bathymetry and 4 channel seismic reflection surveying were completed. The SSP assumes that 3.5 kHz was run along with these data.
2. Piston cores 10-15 m long were taken at each potential site. These cores penetrated through the red clay sequence into the fossiliferous sediments beneath.
3. Two transects were run: (a) one on 40 Ma age crust from about 17 deg N to the equator, and (b) a second one from the equator to 26 deg N. These transects were designed to follow magnetic anomalies and were spliced across fracture zones from different segments of the cruise.
4. The proponents plan to submit a new data package in March, 1998 to the Data Bank along with an addendum of the proposal outlining the new sites and an updated drilling strategy to SCICOM.

The SSP looks forward to reviewing the data submitted to the Data Bank. SSP reminds the proponents of the July 1, 1998 deadline for submission of these materials.

There was some discussion about the 4 sites in the proposal located south of the equator that seem to have been dropped from the recent site survey. We assume that they will be dropped from the new drilling strategy. By doing so, did the site survey collected enough data to propose 2 complete legs of drilling? Is it the intention of the proponents to develop drilling strategies for two legs? Obviously, SSP would prefer to see the sites preferred by the proponents for the first leg.

**Site Survey Readiness Status:** 2A

**SSP Consensus # 22: Drilling status for proposal 486 (equatorial transect) was changed from 2B to 2A based upon the email communication from the lead proponent during the SSP deliberations. The site survey cruise on the RV Ewing has been completed and the SSP believes that all appropriate data for Target A status exist. The SSP awaits submission of the processed seismic reflection data, 3.5 kHz data, core descriptions, navigation, and an updated list of sites by July 1, 1998.**

#### **6.6 Ross Sea, Antarctica: Paleoceanography (489)**

*SSP Watchdog:* Casey

*SSP Proponents:* None

*Target types:* B (Passive margin)

No new data has arrived in the data bank since the July, 1996 SSP meeting that is relevant to proposed drill sites for proposal 489 (Ross Sea). However, the data set is now extensive and includes all of the required data. The data added prior to the July SSP Meeting included lists of cores near the proposed sites, navigation lines for SCS, MCS and 2 Eltanin 3.5 kHz records. 3.5 kHz data are in the data bank for all Sites, except for primary site 8B and alternate Site 5B. In comparing previously submitted maps with proposal 489-REV, it appears that sites have been moved somewhat since the initial data submission and creation of the maps. This movement appears to accommodate SSP's request to move the sites short distances to be located at intersecting seismic lines (Sites with B designations). The old site designations and positions are on the maps and replotting is necessary for all sites that have been moved. *The proponents either visit the Data Bank to properly annotate and locate sites and cross-reference different data types for each site with data bank help or do it elsewhere prior to the July, 1998 SSP meeting.* Track maps such as the SCS navigation for site 4A (now 4B) and Site 5A (now 5B) include only one longitude tic and should be resubmitted with the correct Site designation and at least 2 longitude tics. Data submitted in support of all Ross Shelf proposed sites include ANTOSTRAT CD-ROMs, SCS, 3.5 KHz data near all sites except 8B, gravity, sediment thickness, and velocity data, and MCS lines received from Germany, Italy and France, as well as SCS lines received from the US. The ANTOSTRAT CD-ROMs contains velocity data, but the proponents must supply a hard copy summary of velocity information for each site and show that the drilling time estimates are valid.

All shelf sites are at or near crossing MCS lines and/or SCS lines. Portions of MCS lines (IT88A-34 and M\_87007, lines IFP 201-B1 and M\_89027-B) are in the region of most drill sites and should be plotted for the data package. The data is on the ANTOSTRAT CD submitted by the proponents to the DB, but the proponents should provide a hard copy plot of this data. 3.5 kHz data appears to exist at all sites except at 8B and 5A, although the proponents show ship tracks of 3.5. data near 8B and 5A, the Lamont data base contains only 12.5 data. 3.5 data was considered not critical to these two sites. However proper annotation of maps and submission of data in support of the Safety panel review (lithologic, organic sediment, hydrocarbon shows) should be submitted.

**SSP Consensus # 23: A nearly complete data package for proposal 489 (Ross Sea) has been provided in support of proposed drilling, although some required items are missing, but are thought to exist. As a result the site survey readiness is designated as 1B for this proposal. However, the proponents either visit the Data Bank to properly annotate and relocate revised sites and cross-reference different data types for each site (or alternatively resubmit data with proper site locations and designations) with DB help or do it elsewhere. But this need to be done soon if they wish this proposal to be considered for drilling in FY 2000. Also, there will be a need for the proponents to summarize core data and the occurrence of organic sediments in near shore drill holes (e.g., CIROS holes) and in outcrop on land. Data on sediments will also be needed, especially where reentry is planned. The proponents must supply a hard copy summary of velocity information for each site and show that the drilling time estimates are valid.**

**It is critical that the proponents complete the data package by the July, 1998 SSP meeting for consideration.**

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **7.1 Panel Membership (Srivastava)**

A number of vacancies will be coming up in this panel because of the rotation of a number of US and non-US members this and next year (Appendix D). The panel discussed these positions. The replacement of the following members will be joining the panel as listed below.

**Holger Lykke Andersen** ---- (ESF will be meeting the second week of March to find a replacement with similar background and expertise) new member will be joining in July 98

**Jean-Claude Sibuet** ----- Industry person with expertise in structural geology, interpretation of MCS data and deep drilling on the shelf and slope from Total oil company. New member will be joining in Feb. 99

**Karl Hinz** ----- person with similar expertise in collection and processing of MCS data. New member will be joining in Feb. 99.

**Shiri Srivastava** --- Dr. Park from Korea with expertise in high resolution seismic interpretation. New member will be joining in July 99.

**Mike Enachescu** ---- Mike is an industry member. His replacement will be open to all member countries. Therefore, the expertise needed for his replacement were then discussed. It was felt even if we have an industry member from France replacing Jean-Claude Sibuet that another industry member to replace Mike Enachescu would be needed. Such an Industry person should have experience in acquisition, processing and interpretation of 2D or 3D seismic data. Mike mentioned that he would be prepared to stay for another year if so desired by the panel provided it was acceptable to his employer. The Chair explained that without showing that we are unable to find a proper replacement for his position, the panel could not make any specific recommendation. However, to stagger the replacement membership it is possible to do so. The Chair to make enquiries about this possibility at the OPCOM meeting. The schedule calls for replacement member to join this panel in February 99.

### US members

**Jack Casey** is the only US member due to rotate off after our July 98 meeting. As Jack is going to be away on J/R during July meeting it was decided to have his replacement start in July 98 instead as this will stagger the new members joining the panel. It was decided to have his replacement by a person with expertise on petrology of Mid Ocean ridges or Ocean Floor. Several possible candidates were: Jeff Carson, Dan Fonari, Mike Perfit and Peter Lonsdale. These names will be passed on to USSAC through SCICOM Chair.

About the other US replacements members it was decided to discuss the specific specialities of these replacements at our July meeting as these replacements won't be joining the panel before July 99 (appendix D). The people to rotate off after our Feb 99 meeting are Roger Flood, John Diebold and Charlie Paull. Nonetheless it was felt that expertise in the following field will be needed considering the requirements for deep drilling and in polar regions.

1. Near sea bottom measurements
2. Person with experience with 3D seismic
3. Polar regions.

### **Action item # 5: Srivastava to communicate to SCICOM Chair the situation with the replacements of SSP members.**

The panel would thank the retiring members Jack Casey, Holger Lykke-Andersen and Larry Peterson for their association and numerous contributions to the working of this panel.

### **7.2 Replacement of SSP Chair**

Srivastava mentioned that he had gone round to almost all SSP members asking if they would like to be considered for nomination for this position to the SCICOM. He asked the new members Al Hine and Eli Silver if they would like to be considered for nomination. Both of them declined. The Chair then mentioned that members who agreed to be nominated were **John Diebold, Jack Casey and Bob Whitmarsh**. He then opened the floor for discussion explaining that he was instructed by SCICOM Chair to tell the panel that they had the option of making their recommendation in the order of priorities or leave it for SCICOM to decide. Most favored the later. However, they agreed to the Chair suggestion that he include in his letter comments on each of the candidates capabilities as a SSP member and send it to the SCICOM together with their Cvs.

**Action item # 6: Srivastava to write a letter to SCICOM including the list of candidates for SSP Chair together with some comments and send it to the SCICOM together with copies of their Cvs.**

### **7.3 Liaison to SSEPs**

During our July 97 meeting the followings were appointed as alternate to the two SSEPs.

Roger Flood ----- ESSEP

Jean Claude Sibuet ----- ISSEP

The *next SSEPs* is to meet in Edinburgh from *May 4 to 6*. Jean Claude mentioned it will be better if some one more permanent to this panel went as he will be retiring after July 98 incase he can't go. It was decided that **Bob Whitmarsh** will go to this panel meeting even though he can only go for the first two days and **John Diebold will be an alternate**. For ESSEP **Roger Flood** will check if he can go and in the meantime **Al Hine will be the alternate**.

### **7.4 Nominations for PPGs**

The following people agreed to serve on for the following two PPGs even though we were not asked specifically for any of them.

**Gas Hydrate** ----- this was the PPG which was recommended by SSP and we felt that there were enough site surveys issues which should be of concern to this panel that we need a liaison. Considering Charlie Paull's major interest in the working of this panel and his expertise the panel will recommend to SCICOM that he be considered as a member and a liaison to this PPG. On his retirement from the panel he should be retained as member of this PPG.

**Charlie Paull** ----- SSP liaison and a full PPG member.

It was brought to the Chair attention after the meeting that one can't be a member of a panel as well as of a PPG. However, during Charlie's SSP membership he will act as a SSP liaison to this PPG and after that as a full member.

**Seismogenic Zone** ----- No details were known at the time of the meeting. However, **Eli Silver** agreed to act as *our liaison* to this PPG.

**Action item # 7: Srivastava to inform SCICOM about the names of the two members who will be liaison to the two PPGs.**

### **7.5 Future SSP meetings (Srivastava)**

Discussion took place on the possible dates for our July 98 meetings in LDEO, New York. It was agreed that the meeting will be held at

**LDEO ----- From Wednesday July 29 to Friday July 31, 1998**

John Diebold and Dan Quoidbach will be host for this meeting.

For our February 99 meeting the possibilities mentioned were Sidney, Australia and College Station, Texas. Majority preferred Sidney, Australia. So the February meeting will be held in

**Sidney, Australia ----- Tuesday Feb. 23 to Thursday Feb. 25, 1999**

Jock Keene from Sidney University and head of Australian ODP office will be our host for the meeting.

**Action item # 8: Srivastava to ask for SCICOM's permission for holding the 98 and 99 meetings in LDEO and Sidney, Australia respectively .**

The panel warmly thanked Dr. Rascha and German ODP office for hosting this meeting and for making such fabulous arrangements for it. The meeting adjourned about 2 p.m.

## **Appendix A SSP Membership list**

Member	Appoint. Date	Rotation Date	Last meeting for the present member	Discussion at SSP meeting	Suggestion to SCICOM
Casey, Jack, <i>USA I</i>	Nov. 94	Feb. 99	July 98	<b>Feb. 98</b>	July 98
Christeson, Gail, <i>USA I</i>	March 97	Feb. 2000	July 99	Feb. 99	July 99
Diebold, John, <i>USA I</i>	July 95	July 99	Feb. 99	July 98	Feb. 99
Driscoll, Neal, <i>USA I,E</i>	Feb. 98	Feb. 2001	July 2000	Feb. 2000	July 2000
Enachescu, Michael, <i>Ind. Canada I</i>	April 95	Feb. 99	July 98	<b>Feb. 98</b>	July 98
Flood, Roger, <i>USA E</i>	July 95	July 99	Feb. 99	July 98	Feb. 99
Hine, Albert, <i>USA E</i>	Feb. 98	Feb. 2001	July 2000	Feb. 2000	July 2000
Hinz, Karl, <i>Germany ** I</i>	April 96	Feb. 99	July 98	<b>Feb. 98</b>	July 98
Lykke-Andersen, Holger, <i>Denmark, ESF ** E</i>	July 95	July 98	<b>Feb. 98</b>	July 97	<b>Feb. 98</b>
Paull, Charles, <i>USA I,E</i>	July 95	July 99	Feb. 99	July 98	Feb. 99
Peterson, Larry, <i>USA E</i> *	April 94	Feb. 98	<b>Feb. 98</b> (extended)	July 97	July 97
Sibuet, Jean-Claude, <i>France ***</i> (two yr.) I	March 97	Feb. 99	July 98	<b>Feb. 98</b>	July 98
Silver, Eli, <i>USA I</i>	Feb. 98	Feb. 2001	July 2000	Feb. 2000	July 2000
Srivastava, Shiri, <i>Canada</i> ACKT ---- Chair ** I	April 95	Feb. 99	July 98	<b>Feb. 98</b>	Feb. 98
Masao, Nakanishi, <i>Japan, ** I</i>	Feb. 98	Feb. 2001	July 2000	Feb. 2000	July 2000
Whitmarsh, Robert, <i>UK ** I</i>	Feb. 98	Feb. 2001	July 2000	Feb. 2000	July 2000

For US members USSAC wants to advertise for the replacement positions as early as possible (like six months before replacement). I --- ISSEP, E----ESSEP

\* ---- Mitch Lylle to replace Larry Peterson July 98

\*\* --- foreign members term 3 years, except for the Chair 4 yrs.

\*\*\* ---- special extension for two years

Terms of appointments for all members after 1996 is 3 years.

## Appendix B

### SSP Feedback to proponents

Watchdogs should send a letter to the lead proponent of the proposal. For proposals where the usual watchdog was not at the meeting, the acting watchdog prepares and sends the letter, with a copy to the permanent watchdog. In either case, in the letter you should identify yourself as writing in your role as SSP watchdog (or acting watchdog). **For scheduled legs the letter will be sent by Dan Quoidbach in consultation with the watchdog.** If Co-Chiefs for this leg have been named and are not the leading proponent, send copies of the letter and the enclosure to Co-Chiefs as well. The letter should convey the sense of the discussion, plus any additional informal advice or insight you may have to help the proposal/proponent progress through the ODP approval process. With the letter, you should enclose a copy of the section of the draft minutes dealing with the proposal, plus the SSP worksheets (if any) that you filled out for the proposal. Finally, you should send a copy of the letter to the ODP Data Bank, attention Milly Giarratano.

List of things to include:

- \_ the name and contact information of the watchdog,
- \_ a copy of the section of the draft minutes dealing with the proposal,
- \_ copies of the SSP worksheets, if the data package is sufficiently mature to enable the watchdog to fill out worksheets.
- \_ the target types within the SSP guidelines against which each site will be evaluated,
- \_ for each data type classified as "X\*" or "Y\*", an indication of whether SSP will or will not require this particular data type for these particular sites,
- \_ an indication of additional data types that SSP might require in support of secondary or non-standard drilling objective in circumstances not well covered by SSP guidelines,
- \_ an indication of any potential safety issues,
- \_ for sites in areas of hydrocarbon exploration or production, a reminder that data from commercial wells in the area will eventually be needed for safety review
- \_ for sites in <200m water depth, a reminder of shallow water drilling hazard survey requirements
- \_ for sites in heavily traveled areas or near shore sites, a reminder that information on potential manmade hazards (cable routes, dump sites) will be needed for operational planning by TAMU
- \_ advice on other investigators who may have relevant data in the region,
- \_ advice on survey ships that may be able to visit the area.
- \_ reminder of timing of next data deadline and next SSP meeting.
- \_ mention about the need to place suitable markers if a HRGB is planned to be used and that the proponents should be in contact with TAMU engineers, in particular with Jay Miller, about it. Enclose a copy of the guidelines on marking these sites using submersibles as outlined by Jay Miller from TAMU.
- \_ Send a copy of your watchdog letter to Milly Giarratano, ODP Data Bank.
- \_ Send the watchdog letter to the lead proponent of the proposal. Ask SSP Chair for advice if there is not a single obvious lead proponent with whom to communicate or any other matter

\_ Send a copy of "Quantitative Classification of proposals" with your letter.

## Appendix C

### Quantitative Classification of proposals Site Survey Readiness Classification Scheme.

1. **Presently viable proposal for FY 2000 drilling.**
  - 1A. All required data are in the data bank
  - 1B. A few required items are missing from the data bank, but data are believed to exist and to be readily available.
  
2. **Possibly viable proposal for FY 2000 drilling; likely for FY 2001**
  - 2A. Substantial items of required data are not in the data bank but are believed to exist and are likely to be available in time for consideration for FY 2000 drilling schedule.
  
  - 2B. Substantial items of required data are not in the data bank, not believed to exist but could be available in time for consideration for FY 2000 drilling if a **scheduled** site survey proceeds as planned.
  
  - 2C. Substantial items of required data are not in the data bank, not believed to exist but could be available in time for consideration for FY 2000 drilling if a **proposed** site survey proceeds as planned.
  
3. **Unlikely for FY 2000; possible for FY 2001.**
  - 3A. Required data are not in the data bank, not believed to exist but are likely to be available in time for consideration for FY 2001 drilling if a **scheduled** site survey proceeds as planned.
  
  - 3B. Required data are not in the data bank, not believed to exist but could be available in time for consideration for FY 2001 drilling if a **proposed** site survey proceeds as planned.
  
4. **Impossible for FY 2000:** Required data are not in the data bank and not believed to exist. Data could be available after FY 2000 if a **proposed** site survey proceeds as planned.
5. **Impossible for FY 2000 :** Required data are not in the data bank and not believed to exist. A site survey needs to be conducted but is not proposed at this time.
6. **Not considered** because data in the Data Bank does not match present proposal; awaiting a new proposal.
7. **Not considered** because no data has been submitted to the data bank.

**Appendix D SSP Ranked proposals**

Site Survey readiness classification of proposals considered, Feb. 98									
	1. Viable for 2000		2. Possibly viable for 2000; likely for 2001			3. unlikely for 2000; possible for 2001		4. Imposs. for 2000	5. Imposs. For 2000
Type	1A	1B	2A	2B	2C	3A	3B		
I S S E P		431B WP1	431B WP2						
		445							
			448**						
		450***							
		451							
		463*							
				479					
				499					
				500					
			504***						
E S S E P			455						
		465							
						482			
		485** *							
			486						
	489** * (* )								

\*\*\* ---- PPSP preview will be required

(\* ) ---- see comments minutes.

\* ---- more processing

\*\* ---- provided sites are adequately covered by the recently completed cruise.