

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Graduate School of Oceanography
University of Rhode Island
15-16 October 1984**

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Introduction; Welcome.
2. Minutes of previous meeting; adopt agenda.
3. National Science Foundation report.
4. Joint Oceanographic Institutions Inc. report.
5. Science Operator report.
6. Wireline Logging Services Operator report.
7. Other operational reports.
8. Member Country reports.
9. Planning Committee report.
10. Future meeting arrangements.
11. Adjournment.

JOIDES OFFICE
Graduate School of Oceanography
University of Rhode Island
Narragansett, Rhode Island 02882
(401) 792-6725

MINUTES

JOIDES Executive Committee Meeting
15-16 October 1984
Narragansett, Rhode Island

Members Present

- J. Knauss, Chairman (Graduate School of Oceanography, U. Rhode Island)
- A. Berman (Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Science, U. Miami)
- B. Biju-Duval (Institut Francais de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer, France)
- J. Bowman (Natural Environment Research Council, U.K.)
- D. Caldwell (Oregon State University)
- H. Durbaum (Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, FRG)
- D. Hayes for B. Raleigh (Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory)
- C. Hellsley (Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, U. Hawaii)
- M. Keen for W. Hutchinson (Dept. of Energy, Mines, and Resources, Canada)
- B. Lewis (University of Washington)
- A. Maxwell (University of Texas at Austin)
- W. Menard for W. Nierenberg (Scripps Institution of Oceanography)
- W. Merrell for R. Reid (Texas A & M University)
- D. Spencer for J. Steele (Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution)
- J. Stel (European Science Foundation)

Liaison

- R. Anderson (Wireline Logging Services Contractor, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory)
- J. Baker (Joint Oceanographic Institutions Inc.)
- J. Clotworthy (Joint Oceanographic Institutions Inc.)
- R. Larson (JOIDES Planning Committee)
- P. Rabinowitz (Science Operator, Texas A & M University)
- S. Toye (National Science Foundation)

Guest

- J. Carvalho (Brazil)

JOIDES Office Liaison

- M. Burdett (Office Coordinator)
- D. Keith (Science Coordinator)
- A. Mayer (Executive Assistant to PCOM Chairman)

JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Narragansett, Rhode Island

15-16 October 1984

ACTION ITEMS

<u>Page</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Subject</u>
9	JOI Inc./JOIDES Office	Distribution of Science Operator's report
10	EXCOM Chairman	ODP requests for drilling clearances
13	EXCOM Chairman	Membership
14	EXCOM Chairman	Membership

303 Introduction: Adoption of Minutes

The Executive Committee met 15-16 October at Narragansett, Rhode Island. J. Knauss (EXCOM Chairman) welcomed meeting participants. The minutes of the 21-23 May 1984 Planning Committee meeting were amended to state that B. Lewis represented the University of Washington.

304 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION REPORT

S. Toye (NSF, Ocean Drilling Program Director) reported.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with France will be signed in Paris on 23 October 1984. Grant Gross (NSF) will head the U.S. Delegation.

The new director of NSF, Erich Bloch, has been briefed on the Ocean Drilling Program and is very enthusiastic, particularly with regard to the international aspects of the program.

The NSF budget for FY 85 is nearly complete, the appropriation bill has been passed and signed. The FY 86 budget is being formed with the Office of Management and Budget, and thus cannot be announced.

As of the January sail date for the drillship, membership status will change. If 4 long-term members are not aboard or clearly in view, the viability of the Ocean Drilling Program is at issue. NSF will be faced with 2 alternatives: either cancel the program and pay penalties or put together another funding coalition of presently signed member countries and other new members (e.g. other agencies such as U.S. Geological Survey or other countries such as the U.S.S.R.). A clear position on membership intent must occur by January 1985 or restructuring of the program will be necessary.

Tetra-Tech has been contracted by NSF to provide environmental impact statements, as required under U.S. law, in order to conduct drilling operations. Tetra-Tech will meet with the Science Operator (TAMU) at College Station on 23 October 1984 to address this subject.

SEDCO has agreed to a takeover bid by Schlumberger. NSF sees no legal problems with this situation as a long-term contract was signed with SEDCO/BP before the take-over offer and this will be honored by Schlumberger.

305 JOINT OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTIONS INC. REPORT

J. Clotworthy reported.

A definition of the procurement protocol for interactions between LDGO, TAMU and non-U.S. partners was completed and mailed on 20 September 1984. A summary of major JOI budgetary decisions was presented to PCOM and EXCOM and is found in the Interface Working Group (IWG) minutes and the monthly JOI report to NSF. Distribution of the JOI reports is currently behind schedule but the gap will be closed by the end of 1984, after which the report will be distributed within 30 days before the closing of each month.

Responding to a request for a definition of responsibility for downhole measurements, the IWG met 28-29 August 1984 at TAMU and recommended that LDGO be responsible for all routine measurements on the logging wireline on each leg while TAMU is responsible for all other downhole instrumentation that is nonroutine.

The IPOD Data Bank has been transferred to co-mingled funding as this reflects its international function. The IPOD Data Bank is mandated to catalogue and archive site survey records, to assist the Chairman of the JOIDES Site Survey Planning Committee and to provide data packages to each co-chief scientist for every drilling leg. There is no additional cost to the program as co-mingled funds had previously been used for scientists' travel and this is no longer the case. It was emphasized that the position needed to be reviewed and, recognizing this, JOI had only placed a 6-month contract with LDGO for the Data Bank.

Motion: It is moved that co-mingled funds be used to support the IPOD Data Bank and further, the name of IPOD Data Bank be changed to the ODP Data Bank.

Proposed by Durbaum, seconded by Maxwell.

Vote: for 12, against 0, abstain 1. (Two members absent.)

The U.S. had agreed to provide site surveys for the Kane Fracture Zone and the Chile Triple Junction. JOI had issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) and had awarded a contract for the Kane Fracture Zone work. Responses for the Chile Triple Junction

survey were rejected by the peer review panel advising JOI. The USSAC Field Programs Panel made suggestions on combining and revising the proposals, but the re-submitted proposal was rejected because cruise objectives could not be met. Since PCOM has designated the Chile Triple Junction as a cruise leg (Leg 113), there are 2 choices: either resolicit RFPs in early 1985 for surveying in Fall 1985, or ask the JOIDES Office to poll each member country to determine if all or part of the site survey might be accomplished.

Discussion:

EXCOM expressed apprehension that there would not be adequate time for site selection if the site survey was conducted in early 1986.

Toye (NSF): NSF is open for proposals to do regional geophysical field studies (RGFS) for site surveys, however, as of this date, no proposals have been received. NSF will consider unsolicited proposals at any time with funding decisions being made some 3-6 months after receipt of the proposal.

Larson (URI): Where would the survey ship equipment come from? The multichannel system initially proposed for the Chile Triple Junction was rejected. However, another USSAC site review approved the same system for the Peru Margin.

Biju-Duval (France): The JEAN CHARCOT will be in the S.W. Pacific in 1985 and may be available in 1986 to do some aspects of the site survey.

Clotworthy: JOI recommends that the drilling proposal site data be reviewed by the JOIDES Site Survey Panel before the end of November 1984 and a determination made if the U.S. should resolicit.

Helsley (HIG): The timing of the decision is very important because an NSF-sponsored ship with the necessary equipment is available January-March 1985.

Maxwell (UT): If no satisfactory site survey is done by the end of Winter 1984-85, the PCOM should reconsider the proposal.

Baker (JOI): If the USSAC panel decision is to be appealed then there must be a formal appeal process.

Hayes (LDGO): Since there is no formal committee to deal with proposal rejections, possibly EXCOM could get the USSAC panel to reconsider the proposal.

Clotworthy: The USSAC Field Programs Panel has said that it would not reconsider the rejected proposal.

Lewis (UW): It appears PCOM recommends drill sites before adequate data is available, then needs the data to justify the site. PCOM should only consider those sites with adequate site survey data.

Helsley: The PCOM site selection committee did its job well in that it brought to attention the need of additional site survey data.

Larson (URI): PCOM recommended the Chile Triple Junction site because it provides an opportunity to study the poorly understood process of ridge subduction and thereby provides for an opportunity to do "new" science.

Knauss (URI): This example raises the complicated issue of how to avoid the constraints of the U.S. RFP form of site selection which is done parallel to and is independent of PCOM site selections. Any advice that PCOM can give to EXCOM concerning this matter will be appreciated as the issue will seemingly be raised again.

Consensus: EXCOM will not interfere with panel decisions concerning proposal recommendations. Further, the Chile Triple Junction site survey problems are primarily a U.S. community issue, but the decision to include the Chile Triple Junction in the drilling program is a JOIDES decision.

306 SCIENCE OPERATOR REPORT

P. Rabinowitz reported.

Staffing for the lab officer and marine technician slots has been completed. The science service group, the computer group (both sea and ashore) positions have been filled. All key shipboard positions have been filled. The East and West coast repositories are completely staffed with the Gulf Coast

repository slot remaining to be filled. Almost all engineering positions are filled with B. Harding hired to replace A. McLerran. Publications still remain to be staffed.

The staff scientists are:

R. Kidd - Manager of Science Operations	(U.K.)
A. Meyer - Assistant Manager	(U.S.)
A. Palmer - Micropaleontologist	(U.S.)
E. Taylor - Physical Properties	(U.S.)
C. Auroux - Tectonics	(FRA)
A. Adamson - Alteration Petrology	(U.K.)
B. Clement - Paleomagnetism	(U.S.)
G. Haase - Downhole Measurements	(FRG)
L. Gamboa - Seismic Stratigraphy	(U.S.)

The drillship is at M&M Shipyard, Pascagoula, MS presently undergoing construction of a seven-deck science laboratory. The decks are divided as follows:

1 & 2	- refrigerated core storage
3	- electronics and photo lab
main	- computers and science lounge
5	- chemistry lab
6	- sediments lab and drilling operations
7	- downhole logging

The ship went into the shipyard at the end of August for removal of non-essential equipment. In mid-September, the derrick was removed for strengthening and construction of the library and geophysics lab was begun, with a ready date of late October/early November. Lab furniture will be installed during early November. During mid-November, the long lead time items (e.g. the heave compensator) will be delivered with the shakedown cruise scheduled for early December. Delays in midNovember could delay the shakedown cruise date. Realistically, the science operator sees a midDecember date for the shakedown cruise with a ten day contingency buffer factored in the schedule. If difficulties occur during shakedown, the ship could leave from Ft. Lauderdale instead of Galveston resulting in a 5 January 1985 start-date for ODP. However, the number of operating days would be the same as the 1 January sail date from Galveston.

Consensus: The 01 January 1985 sail date from Galveston, TX should be revised to 05 January 1985 from Ft. Lauderdale, FL.

Discussion:

R. Larson (URI): Is a two-leg shakedown cruise still planned? What is the contingency if the shakedown cruise is only one leg?

P. Rabinowitz (TAMU): A two-leg shakedown is scheduled, however, a final decision will be made 19 October 1984. In the latter case, the remaining bunks would be filled with members of the second drilling crew.

The State Department has made affirmative verbal commitments to clearances from the government of the Bahamas but as of the Rhode Island EXCOM nothing has been sent in writing. The clearance procedures might be more complicated because of the Liberian registration of the drillship.

The costs of conversion, long-lead time item procurement, shakedown and other items were reviewed:

	<u>BID</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>
A) Design	550	750	+200
B) Procurement	6961	7837*	+876
C) Conversion (shipyard)	2100	4900	+2800
D) Conversion day rates, shakedown, testing	1437	1437	0
E) Other	<u>0</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>+200</u>
	11048	15124	+4076

*includes \$375K for lab furnishings

The cost overruns are the product of increased purchases and complexities such as the addition of 50% more lab and storage space than accounted for in the original RFP. This particular item has resulted in \$2.8M of the actual \$4.8M overrun for shipyard conversion.

Discussion:

Hayes (LDGO): In late May, SEDCO reported that the original estimate for lab design was accurate. Why did they not anticipate the cost overrun and why had EXCOM not been told of the size of the overrun?

Helsley (HIG): The question is not that there were cost increases but why we were not warned earlier of the range of the increase.

Merrell (TAMU): The cost increases had been discussed by the Interface Working Group. The committee did have background information and the RFP evolved with advice from JOI and others.

Rabinowitz (TAMU): The original conversion estimates were with SEDCO, not with the M&M Shipyard.

Subsequent discussion centered on the chronology of events that led to a re-evaluation and increase in the amount of laboratory/storage space. The 20 March PCOM meeting found the originally proposed lab space inadequate. Subsequent changes were approved by EXCOM, based on a budget with 4 non-U.S. member countries. These changes occurred within the guidelines as set by PCOM and EXCOM and within the overall budgetary constraints of the ODP contract. Toye (NSF) indicated that due to time constraints involved, the final decision was to go ahead as planned because the costs of delay necessary to further refine the designs would have been unacceptable. Merrell (TAMU) also added that alternatives were mentioned in the IWG minutes of 28-29 August 1984.

The financial summary (see below) for FY 84 (exclusive of conversion costs) shows that there is a savings of \$1.76M. Applying this savings against the \$4.1M deficit yields a new total of \$2.4M. Applying the anticipated FY 85 savings of \$0.6M to \$2.4M deficit results in total deficit of \$1.8M. Clotworthy (JOI) noted that \$1.5M of the \$1.8M is from NSF to JOI; \$0.3M is from travel and other JOI expenses:

Total Conversion, Long Lead Time Items, Shakedown and Additional Costs	: \$ +4.1 M
FY 84 Total Savings*	: <u>-1.7 M</u>
*from operational cost centers and start-up equipment	+2.4 M

TAMU FY 85 Total Savings (anticipated from operational cost centers)	:	$\frac{-0.6}{+1.8}$ M
NSF Reprogrammed Funds	:	$\frac{-1.5}{+0.3}$
JOI Savings Anticipated FY 85	:	$\frac{-0.3}{0}$

The overall program plan looks like:

FY84	19.1M	
FY85	26.9M	
	<u>46.0M</u>	
	+ 1.8M	(JOI reprogrammed \$\$)
	<u>47.8M</u>	

The \$47.8M represents an increase in program costs of 4%.

Editor's note: Clarification of above analysis

An inadvertent error has been made in applying the \$1.5M "NSF Reprogrammed Funds" as additional funds for FY 84-85. This amount is included in the original NSF ODP funds for FY 84-85. However, NSF has agreed in principle that an upper limit of \$1.35M can be contemplated as additional to the FY 85 budget. Therefore, the above bottom line is \$150,000 too high and requires an adjustment by JOI in program priorities.

Discussion continued:

Helsley (HIG) expressed cautious optimism that FY 85 budget costs would remain stable. Rabinowitz replied that possible savings could be found in the following items:

- a) Insurance (about 100-200K)
- b) Salary excesses (about 100K)
- c) Other salary deferments (150K)
- d) Equipment deferral
- e) Ship operations (fuel/day rate escalations, reimbursables, port stays; up to 500K)
- f) Bare rock drilling
- g) Shakedown cruise
- h) Other cost savings
- i) Fuel
- j) Conversion change orders
- k) The purchase of excess CHALLENGER drillpipe (about 200K)

Merrell (TAMU) added that savings in fuel and day rates could reach as high as \$10K/day, if the drillship was operated under fuel conservative operations.

Consensus: EXCOM suggests that a summary of the science operator's report be distributed to the scientific community via JOI publications so to relieve concerns that the \$4.1M overrun might result in a \$4.1M reduction in funds available within the U.S. for ocean science.

Discussion on staffing for Leg 101 focused on the selection procedure of non-U.S. scientists.

Rabinowitz: Do we select non-U.S. participants from a list of all potential scientists or do the non-U.S. JOIDES representatives present us with a list from which we then select participants ?

Mayer (URI): Staffing in the U.K. has been delegated to the PCOM representative who presents a listing of potential selections.

Berman (RSMAS): Are berths available for countries not in JOIDES but in whose territorial waters we are operating?

Rabinowitz: Berths are available.

Larson (URI): With regard to the technical support staff, does the list include the 4 logging people as scientists or technicians? This issue was extensively debated at the Hawaii PCOM meeting as the PCOM is concerned from which group these slots will come from. There is nothing stated in the MOUs concerning this matter, but PCOM does not want the drillship loaded with excess technical support sailing as members of the scientific party.

Rabinowitz: I was not aware that this was a sensitive issue.

Potential names for SEDCO/BP 471 were submitted to the president and vice-president of SEDCO and to the Board of Directors of BP. The legal renaming of the vessel was rejected by these executives. However, they are amenable to placing a logo in a prominent location on the vessel. Through common usage,

this name would eventually become the ship's name. The name submitted was JOIDES RESOLUTION. Subsequent discussion focused on possible communications problems associated because of the two names for the drillship. Many EXCOM members noted that many oil industry drillships have dual names as well as the ships of the U.S. Navy Agor class. It was the consensus of EXCOM that a motion was needed to close the matter.

MOTION: It is moved that EXCOM accept the name JOIDES RESOLUTION as the non-legal name of the drillship, SEDCO/BP 471.

Moved by Knauss, seconded by Berman.

Vote: for 13, against 1, abstain 1.

The JOIDES Safety Panel met at TAMU on 30-31 August 1984. Safety advisors agreed with all the safety panel's recommendations except site BB-3A in Baffin Bay. The panel also informed the State Department that clearances for the Galicia Leg in mid-April are needed by mid-January or alternate drilling plans would be considered.

Discussion:

Knauss (URI): It seems that the State Department might respond sooner to ODP requests for clearances if NSF and JOI could meet with the State Department (possibly the Assistant Secretary).

307 WIRELINE LOGGING SERVICES OPERATOR REPORT

R. Anderson, Director of Wireline Logging Operations, reported.

Contracts with Schlumberger have been signed and Schlumberger is also providing insurance for the logging tools of the program for \$5K/yr. The package from Schlumberger consists of 3 nuclear tools that determine lithology, porosity, and bulk density. The tools are scheduled to be calibrated at a U.S.G.S. test hole in Denver. The package further consists of a single component seismic sonic tool (a vertical seismic profiler) that produces a synthetic seismogram for comparison with multi-channel seismic data. Within 3 years a 3 component tool will be available for ODP as would a full waveform sonic logging tool. Contracts for speciality tools have been signed with WBK (FRG) for a digital borehole televiewer in FY 86, and with M. Zoback at Stanford University/U.S. Geological Survey. No new tools are scheduled to be purchased in FY 85. Presently, logging services

has an older, analogue, borehole televiewer, calibrated in a test hole in the Palisades Sill, and a 12-channel sonic seismic tool.

C. Broliia has been hired as a log analyst staff scientist to develop computer software for logging operations. Scientists outside of LDGO and Schlumberger with an interest in well log information are urged to contact the logging services operator.

Schlumberger is developing 2 pieces of new hardware for the wireline heave compensator: a servo mechanism for the J frame to compensate for the ship's heave and an accelerometer-altimeter to interface with the servo-mechanism. Schlumberger also has a warranted guarantee that the problem of heave compensation will be solved.

Subsequent discussion agreed that the accelerometer/altimeter would compensate for the heave of the ship but would the heave also be compensated at the bottom of the drillhole and how could it be measured? Anderson stated that about 10% of the ship's heave (up to 2 ft. in a 20-ft. swell) would be seen by the tools in the drillhole.

Helsley (HIG): Using a seismometer, the downhole acceleration could be measured.

Anderson: Attaching a seismometer to the cable would limit the space available for real time data transmission. However, the data could be recorded and read later.

Knauss: How critical is the heave compensator for the downhole tools to work?

Anderson: Without the heave compensator, the tools probably will not be able to operate at optimum digitizing speed and unprocessed information will not be preserved.

The wireline pump tester for porewater chemistry is being developed by AMOCO. The patent has not yet been submitted but once it is, ODP must purchase a limited license from AMOCO. This particular patent arrangement is somewhat in conflict with the general ODP policy of making technology available to all participants. The present diameter of the pumps reaches the optimum diameter of the drill string. A miniaturized version will be available in FY 86 in time for the Barbados Leg.

308 OTHER OPERATION REPORTS

D. Keith, Science Coordinator of JOIDES Office reported.

The JOIDES Office at the University of Rhode Island officially opened its door on 1 October 1984. The office is presently obtaining the hardware and software necessary to establish a computer telecommunications link to JOI and TAMU. The JOIDES Office anticipates establishing a mailbox in the Telemail system under the name JOIDES.URI. Bids for the publication of the JOIDES Journal are presently being taken with final selections occurring before the end of October.

309 MEMBER COUNTRY REPORTS

Federal Republic of Germany - H. Durbaum reported.

The German company, WBK will supply ODP with the digital downhole televiewer, and the 3-D magnetometer is presently being readied for Leg 102. The geophysical ship, POLARSTERN, will conduct site surveys in the Weddell Sea in 1985, 86 in conjunction with the U.K. survey. The METEOR will be placed out of service at the end of 1984. The new METEOR is presently under construction with completion scheduled sometime in 1986-87. Upon completion, the METEOR will begin in the Indian Ocean and the FRG would like to offer to conduct regional site surveys.

France - B. Biju-Duval reported.

On 7 August 1984, a decision was made to sign an MOU with NSF. The Ministry of Technology is very concerned with geosciences and considers the ODP important. Two million francs will be available in support of science with IFREMER funding linked to the development of new technology. France has also decided to play a larger role in data acquisition for site surveys and in 1985 the JEAN CHARCOT will do site surveys in the Mediterranean and the SW Pacific. In late 1985, discussion will be held to determine cruise plans for the Indian Ocean and Pacific Ocean.

United Kingdom - J. Bowman reported.

Presently, the U.K. does not have the funding to participate as a full member. Government policy requires that government monies be used in conjunction with contributions from the private sector to finance the membership. Scenarios with and without industry support are being developed before the matter is considered by Ministers.

U.K. panel participants are pleased with panel development but are maintaining a low profile until the membership issue is resolved.

The RRS DISCOVERY will be carrying out in 1984/85 geophysical work in the Weddell Sea. The RRS DARWIN has not yet been delivered due to technical problems but is scheduled to do site survey work in the Indian Ocean in 1985.

Discussion:

Knauss (URI): Would it be useful for JOIDES to express additional concern over the membership issue to the U.K. government?

Bowman: Any concern to the U.K. government should stress the consequences of non-participation rather than the virtues of the program.

Larson (URI): If the U.K. is not a full member the results could be disastrous to the planning structure as 3 panel chairmen and 1 PCOM member are from the U.K.

Canada - M. Keen reported.

The new government has been informed concerning ODP and has expressed a great interest in R & D programs. However, the administration has also expressed a great interest in cutting expenditures. The issue of full membership is presently being discussed with a decision to be made by 1 January 1985. Possible a letter from JOIDES could be beneficial.

The site surveys for the Labrador Sea have been completed. The CSS HUDSON is scheduled in January 1985 for site surveys of the Kane Fracture Zone. The vessel will be equipped with an acoustic video system to aid in bare rock drilling. There is also work scheduled along the Canadian west coast on the Explorer Fracture Zone cruise.

European Science Foundation - J. Stel reported.

It is impossible to make decisions concerning full membership before the end of 1984. Presently, the 5 members will be able to provide 40% of full membership, and if additional countries join then that could be raised to a 50% commitment. Spain is enthusiastic to join but has yet to make a firm commitment. Italy and the Netherlands also have not made final

commitments. The ESF will meet in Fall 1984 to confirm commitments from consortium members and discuss negotiations for a major partner. A JOIDES letter to the ESF General Assembly might be beneficial.

Japan - The Japanese EXCOM member was not present. S. Toye (NSF) commented on Japanese membership.

The monies for full membership have been placed in the Japanese budget request for FY 86. NSF feels comfortable with the present situation as the Japanese have given a written commitment to the program.

Guest Countries

Brazil - J. Carvalho reported.

There presently is no news concerning membership. There will be further discussion within the next 2 years. Brazil has not yet discussed a joint effort with any other country.

310 PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

R. Larson, Chairman of JOIDES Planning Committee reported.

Short-term Planning and Ship Schedule

After reviewing the recommendations of thematic and regional panels with regard to Legs 111-113, each panel-endorsed proposal was ranked and voted on yielding 3 distinct groupings consisting of two proposals per group. The Peru Margin and EPR 13°N were clear winners for Legs 111 and 112. Leg 113 was extensively discussed and the Chile Triple Junction was the PCOM consensus. However, it was understood that the Chile Triple Junction needed additional site survey data. Contingencies for all legs up through 113 were voted on and following a close vote resulted in:

- 1st priority - Yucatan
- 2nd priority - NW African Margin
- 3rd priority - DSDP Hole 504B

The proposed cruise dates for Leg 114 (Weddell Sea) were discussed, especially in regard to the formation of pack ice. The weather window which totals approximately 70 days creates an awkward situation of either one long cruise leg or 2 short cruise legs. EXCOM members asked if panel priorities could be changed if a large influx of proposals from different sites should occur.

Discussion:

Hayes (LDGO): PCOM decided long ago to drill in the Weddell Sea and there will be many new proposals as time progresses.

Larson: In regard to bare rock drilling, the problems associated with spudding into the bare rock of a slow-spreading center such as the Mid-Atlantic Ridge may be made more complicated by drilling along a fast spreading center such as the East Pacific Rise, due to problems of fracturing and high temperatures.

EXCOM asked if alternative sites are available if the 3 bare rock drilling legs could not be done and would PCOM consider going to DSDP Hole 504B.

Discussion:

R. Anderson (Wireline Logging Ser. Contractor): Two major technical problems make 504B an equally complicated situation. First there is the high temperature environment to consider (about 170°C) and second, there are recovery problems associated with working in this environment.

Co-Chief Scientists Situation:

Co-chiefs have been selected for the first through the fourth legs with additional recommendations for Legs 105 and 106.

Long-term Planning:

Serious discussion of plans for the Indian Ocean and Southern Ocean will be conducted at the January PCOM meeting in Austin. Tentative plans, however, were made at the September PCOM for the ship to spend austral summer '87 in the Weddell Sea, mid '87 to the Indian Ocean, and austral summer '88 to the Kerguelen Plateau. The Indian Ocean Panel would like the ship to remain in the Indian Ocean into 1989 but the tentative feeling of PCOM is to bring the ship into the western Pacific.

Mayer (URI): With regard to the EXCOM request that proposals be published in the JOIDES Journal, the lists of received proposals will be computerized for ease of retrieval. According to procedure, proposals should be sent to the JOIDES Office for appropriate distribution to panels and the Data Bank. The method will allow for tracking the evolution of proposals from immature to mature status. Publication of the listing will begin with the February 85 issue of the Journal.

Site Survey Panel:

Mayer reported that the problem with the JOIDES Site Survey Panel is partly one of the timing of the site survey reviews. In theory, after the site survey panel has examined prospective sites, the PCOM should have enough evidence for its decision making. The Site Survey Panel could also assist the JOIDES Safety Panel which should also be brought into the decision-making process at an earlier time. In addition, the Site Survey Panel had a role in developing site survey planning on a full international community basis. It had been suggested that co-mingled funds could be used for site survey funding. Durbaum asked about mid-term planning. Mayer responded that the short timescale for planning the early stages of drilling had created difficulties in terms of site surveying. However, as the planning process moved into maturity with a general two-year lead time, then problems with obtaining site surveys should be much reduced. The coordination of the surveys will be handled through the members of the JOIDES Site Survey Panel and by the JOIDES Office. It was noted that the next meeting of the Panel will be at the end of November 1984.

Durbaum: Specific objectives for the Indian Ocean should be identified as there are several surveying plans proposed for the new METEOR. These objectives should be on the agenda for the November Site Survey Panel meeting.

Consensus: EXCOM does not favor the use of co-mingled funds to fund site surveys.

Bare rock drilling:

A meeting of a Lithosphere subgroup resulted in basic specifications for bare rock spud-in. These include the ability to spud in on bare rock sea floor with 20° regional slope and ±1 meter random relief. The ODP-TAMU engineering group responded with a design of a 3-legged platform that holds a 20-foot (diameter) stabilization box filled with 50K lbs. of sand or cement. The center of the platform holds a gimballed re-entry cone to receive the drill string. Drilling of the hole might begin with a series of increasing diameter pilot holes that will eventually reach a diameter of 20 inches. The FRG has suggested using pneumatic hammer drilling and Sandia Labs suggests using shape charges (explosives). The design contract has gone to SEDCO with a 8 January 1984 deadline. ODP is planning to do this type of drilling in October 85, and two units will be made to go to sea (this takes into consideration the 5-6 months needed to develop, construct and test the system). Helsley stated that pilot hole drilling was done at U. of Hawaii in regard to geothermal drilling and was very time consuming (After 3 months a

depth of 500 ft. was reached.). Helsley strongly urged this technique not be used and suggested the SEDCO engineers talk to U. of Hawaii.

As an alternative, Keen (Canada) noted that a system already exists that will drill a pilot hole independent of the main drill string. Lewis (UW) noted that CHALLENGER routinely did this for years with no problem in an environment that was sediment covered. It was noted that spudding into bare rock is a very different problem. Berman (RSMAS) suggested that the Navy has had previous experience with shape charges and should be contacted. Larson (URI) indicated that the field test for the system is Leg 106. EXCOM urged PCOM to have "fall-back" programs if bare rock drilling is not successful for the first couple of years. It was further noted that a fully funded program with a schedule is in place at TAMU to deal with the problem.

Riser Drilling:

TEDCOM reports that now is not too early for riser drilling and that the ship will probably have 4500 ft. available for riser drilling. Rabinowitz and Merrell disagreed, citing the amount of logistics and associated problems as being the real upper limit for riser drilling and not space availability.

Emergency PCOM:

The purpose of meeting would be to develop a damage control scenario and it was the recommendation of the EXCOM Chairman to defer this matter pending membership discussion.

Leg Staffing:

There is some feeling of uneasiness within the U.S. community concerning the U.S. percentage of the scientific party and the number of co-chiefs from U.S. institutions which was initiated by the selection of co-chiefs for Leg 104. Under DSDP regulations, this probably would not have happened. However, the MOUs are now worded in a way to guarantee a specific percent participation of non-U.S. scientists and not U.S. scientists. Merrell responded that TAMU tried to make the program as international as possible using the best scientists available.

Larson asked if the U.S. members of EXCOM feel uncomfortable with the guarantees of the MOUs. Toye (NSF) noted that this is not the first time that this issue has been raised and commented on the insistence of some PCOM members to apply DSDP guidelines to this program, which is a fresh start.

Consensus: EXCOM concluded that presently no problem exists and that the MOUs are subject to a wide range of interpretations. However, if a problem rises then, at that time, rules and regulations may have to be established but not for the present.

311 GENERAL DISCUSSION OF MEMBERSHIP

It was the general feeling of the full members of EXCOM that under the terms of the MOUs, those members who have not made a written commitment to participate in the Ocean Drilling Program should not attend the January PCOM. Those members potentially affected by the situation concurred.

Discussion focused on the impact that the decision would have on the structure of the thematic and regional panels. It was the consensus of EXCOM that panel representation on the basis of nationality for those countries that have not made a full commitment would be discontinued.

Discussing the state of Japanese membership it was noted by Toye, that a special relationship exists as of the sailing date because of their stated intention to become full members in October, 1985. Based on letters on file at NSF, the Japanese will have observer status at EXCOM and PCOM meetings.

After extensive discussion of the consensus, EXCOM considered ideas for dismantling and restructuring the thematic and regional panels and working groups. Merrell proposed that a very carefully worded resolution is needed to aid the PCOM Chairman with regard to the PCOM Austin invitations. Toye stated the MOUs provide that JOIDES switches from the planning period to the operations period when drilling begins. At that time the planning phase MOUs expire. It was agreed that the membership of the scientific party for the first 2 cruise legs would be left intact with changes starting before the third leg.

It was further agreed that the January PCOM would only have members or observers present. It was suggested potential member countries accept responsibility for determining their status prior to the January meeting and notify their representatives regarding meeting attendance. It was agreed that PCOM should not be burdened with this latter responsibility.

It was further stressed that PCOM has the prerogative to identify and redesignate key people on the various committees. It was the consensus of EXCOM that PCOM should evaluate panel membership in January and then bring the panels to full strength by April (so as to not jeopardize long-term planning). Further, the meetings that are scheduled during the interim (Jan.-Apr.) should not be delayed.

The resolution was proposed by A. Maxwell and seconded by Durbaum.

Motion: The EXCOM recognizes that the Ocean Drilling Program is scheduled to begin its operational phase on 5 January 1985. At that time, JOIDES membership will consist of those countries which have a regular member MOU agreement with NSF. Further, those countries who have made a commitment to NSF to join ODP in the future will be given observer status on the EXCOM and PCOM.

Scientists from non-JOIDES countries which were formerly candidate member countries will no longer be members of PCOM and panels after 5 January 1985, but they shall be eligible for reappointment. PCOM should consider at its April meeting the completion of membership of panels, including scientists from all countries.

Vote: for 15, against 0, abstain 0.

312 Future EXCOM Meetings

16-20 February 1985: Miami/Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.

14-16 May 1985: Washington, D.C. area

16-17 September 1985: Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany