

**OCEAN HISTORY PANEL 27-29 September 1994**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Dates: 27-29 September 1994  
Place: Townsville, Australia  
Chair: Margaret Delaney  
Host: Robert Carter

**1. Attendees**

Panel members: Jan Backman, Robert Carter, Bradford Clement, Margaret Delaney (chair), Rainer Gersonde, Timothy Herbert, David Hodell, Anne Marie Karpoff, Dick Kroon, Mark Leckie, Theodore Moore, Delia Oppo, Kozo Takahashi, James Zachos

Liaisons and guests: Brian Huber (IHP), Alan Mix (PCOM), Carl Richter (ODP/TAMU), Sandy Shor (NSF), John Tarduno (LITHP, days 1 and 2), Tom Loutit (incoming OHP chair, days 2 and 3)

Absent with apologies: Gregg Blake, Warren Prell

**2. Panel Recommendations to PCOM**

RECOMMENDATION 1 TO PCOM. After thorough review of the plans for the North Atlantic and Arctic Gateways Leg II, Leg 162, OHP reaffirms our endorsement of the drilling plan, including the selection of sites and their assigned priorities, resulting from the Fall 1993 OHP-sponsored planning session. In addition, we state our strong confidence and enthusiasm for the scientific and logistical judgement and skills of the assigned co-chief scientists for this leg. (*Detailed minutes, item 8a*)

RECOMMENDATION 2 TO PCOM. In response to the request to prioritize needs relative to the budget situation, OHP emphasizes retaining support for (1) those things which cannot be done later, (2) those things which are necessary for stratigraphy and chronology and thus allow the definition of the completeness and continuity of recovered sedimentary sections, therefore potentially influencing drilling strategy in real-time, and (3) those things which communicate the objectives and results of the program to the community. As a programmatic, budgetary decision, OHP does not support further expenditure on the current diamond coring system. (*Detailed minutes, item 8b*)

RECOMMENDATION 3 TO PCOM. OHP recommends that PCOM request that SSP name liaisons to attend the OHP meetings (and those of the other thematic panels as well if those panels request this). Given the significance of SSP evaluations in constructing the 4-year ship track and the prospectus, it is important that SSP have a clear understanding of OHP priorities in general and of our interests in specific proposals. SSP liaison attendance at the spring OHP meeting for spring global ranking would be the highest priority. (*Detailed minutes, item 8c*)

**3. FY96 Prospectus Ranking** (Detailed minutes, items 6a, 6b)

| Rank Order | Program (Documents)   | Fraction Available Points Awarded | 1994 OHP Spring Global Ranking |
|------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1          | Caribbean Ocean History (415-Rev 2)                                 | 0.89                              | 1                              |
| 2          | California Margin (386-Rev2/Add/Add2/Add3, 422-Rev)                 | 0.83                              | 2                              |
| 3          | Western North Atlantic Sediment Drifts (404)                        | 0.51                              | 7                              |
| 4          | Blake Plateau and Blake Nose, Paleogene and Cretaceous (404-Add)    | 0.38                              | not yet submitted              |
| 5          | Bahamas Transect--two deeper sites (BT3-4) only (412/Add/Add2/Add3) | 0.23                              | 12                             |
| 6          | Caribbean Basalt Province   | 0.16                              | -                              |

i. The **Benguela Current and Angola/Namibia upwelling** program (354-Rev2/354-Add3) is of strong, continuing interest to OHP (#6 in spring 1994 OHP global ranking). This program was not in the prospectus because it was not in the geographic area of interest defined by PCOM for FY96. Although we did not include it in our prospectus rankings, we emphasize OHP's interest in this program and its maturity. We expect that it would have been highly competitive in these rankings had we included it in voting.

ii. We noted that the **South Florida margin sea level** program (427/427-Add) is still of strong interest to OHP (#8 in spring 1994 OHP global ranking). This has sites in a geographic region that could be combined with the sites of OHP interest (BT3 and BT4) of the Bahamas Transect.

We nominated co-chief scientists for these legs. (Detailed minutes, item 6c)

**4. Summary of Proposal Reviews** (Detailed minutes, item 4b; Appendix)

| No. | Short Title | Review Criteria [Proponents excluded] |
|-----|-------------|---------------------------------------|
|-----|-------------|---------------------------------------|

**Thematic relevance -- Highly relevant to top thematic objectives**

354-Add3 Benguela Current and Angola/Namibia upwelling  
A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F1

386-Add3 California Margin drilling  
A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F1 [Mix]

- 404-Add Paleogene and Cretaceous IW...Blake Plateau and Blake Nose  
A1, B1.2, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2
- 415-Rev2 Caribbean multi-objective drilling (OHP focus, one leg)  
A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E0, F1
- 458 Southern Ocean Transect  
A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2 [Hodell, Gersonde]

**Thematic relevance -- Relevant to thematic objectives**

- 455 High resolution record of sediment fluxes: NW Atlantic  
A2, B1.3, B2.2, C4, D4, E8, F4
- 456 Tjornes FZSB: Paleoceanography and sedimentation history  
A2, B1.3, B2.2, C3, D1, E8, F4
- 459 Norwegian Sea overflow  
A2, B1.3, B2.2, C3, D1, E8, F4

**Thematic relevance -- Portions are relevant, interdisciplinary approach required**

- 411-Rev Caribbean Cretaceous Basalt Province: a major LIP  
A3, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E0, F4
- 412-Add3 Bahamas Transect: Neogene/Quaternary sea level and fluid flow  
A3, B1.3, B2.1, C1, D5, E0, F1
- 452-Add Antarctic glacial history and causes of sea level change  
A3, B1.3, B2.2, C4, D4, E8, F3

**Thematic relevance -- Not relevant to thematic objectives**

- 333-Add2 Evolution of pull-apart basin, Cayman Trough
- 355-Rev4 Formation of a gas hydrate: Peruvian margin
- 376-Rev3 Vema F.Z.: Upper mantle, gabbro/dyke, limestone cap
- 400-Add3 Mass balance of Costa Rica accretionary wedge
- 400-Rev2 Mass balance of Costa Rica accretionary wedge
- 435-Add Mass balance: Nicaragua margin
- 440-Add Hydrothermal circulation at East Juan de Fuca
- 448-Rev History of the Ontong-Java Plateau through basement
- 451-Rev Tonga forearc
- 454 Paleooceanography of WBC: East Australia Current
- 457 Large igneous province in Kerguelan Plateau
- 460 Extension of E. Greenland Transect (former NARM-Add2)
- 461 Basement of OCT W of Iberia (former NARM-Add3)
- SR-Rev3 Sedimented Ridges II

**5. Future Meeting Dates**

Spring 1995: 2-4 March 1995, Miami, Florida, hosted by Brad Clement. Loutit will be contacting Hay about joint OHP/SGPP sea level sub-group meeting with possible dates around 27 February through 1 March 1995.

Fall 1995: 5-7 October 1995, either Providence, R.I., or Halifax, Nova Scotia, depending on availability of host for dates and locations.

**6. Liaisons for 1994/1995**

Gregg Blake as OHP liaison to SGPP

**7. Membership Activity** (*Detailed minutes, item 7*)

U.S. members Delaney, Herbert, and Zachos are rotating off. Given the entire balance of panel expertise, the prioritized slates of candidates for the three positions are:

POSITION 1: Tom Crowley  
Gary Klinkhammer

POSITION 2: Christina Ravelo  
John Jasper

POSITION 3: Brian Popp  
Steve D'Hondt  
Lowell Stott

**8. Liaison Reports at the Meeting** (*Detailed minutes, item 3*)

PCOM report by Alan Mix  
NSF report by Sandy Shor  
IHP report by Brian Huber  
LITHP report by John Tarduno  
ODP/TAMU report by Carl Richter

**9. Sea level report**

As mandated at the time of acceptance of the Sea Level-Working Group Report, OHP reviewed the status of sea level efforts in the program.  
(*Detailed minutes, item 5b*)

**OCEAN HISTORY PANEL 27-29 September 1994**  
**DETAILED MINUTES**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The Ocean History Panel held our Fall 1994 meeting 27-29 September in Townsville, Australia, hosted by Bob Carter. The meeting opened with the introduction of all present and with welcomes from the Chair and Carter. The chair reviewed the major tasks for the meeting, including an explanation of how the ship track is set and the prospectus constructed.

The attendees were:

Panel members: Jan Backman, Robert Carter, Bradford Clement, Margaret Delaney (chair), Rainer Gersonde, Timothy Herbert, David Hodell, Anne Marie Karpoff, Dick Kroon, Mark Leckie, Theodore Moore, Delia Oppo, Kozo Takahashi, James Zachos

Liaisons and guests: Brian Huber (IHP), Alan Mix (PCOM), Carl Richter (ODP/TAMU), Sandy Shor (NSF), John Tarduno (LITHP, days 1 and 2), Tom Loutit (incoming OHP chair, days 2 and 3)

Absent with apologies: Gregg Blake, Warren Prell

**2. PRIOR MINUTES**

No comments or changes were required. The chair thanked Mark Leckie for his able assistance with note-taking.

**3. REPORTS**

**a. PCOM news Alan Mix**

Alan Mix reported on PCOM news from the past two PCOM meetings. The panel gratefully acknowledged PCOM's enthusiasm for our white paper. Mix discussed the revisions to the FY95 schedule; the long range plan revision process, including requesting panel feedback on the science vs. facility nature of ODP; the role of alternate platforms; the MST upgrade news; the status of the DCS; the computer upgrade; the new SSP guidelines; and other PCOM motions. Mix reviewed the process of establishing the FY96 prospectus and the defined area of operation. He requested OHP review the plans for NAAG II drilling. He reviewed the budget and requested panel response on budget priorities as stated in the PCOM motion.

**b. NSF news Sandy Shor**

Sandy Shor reviewed the budget status and the news from NSF, with summary of the news from the ODP Council Meeting. He commented on funded site survey proposals in the U.S. system. OHP expressed its concern that funded site survey can be the limiting factor in when programs can move onto the drilling schedule and noted the obstacles this had posed for programs of strong OHP interest.

The chair asked whether the non-U.S. member representatives had other budget news to report; no reports were given.

**c. IHP news** Brian Huber

Brian Huber supplied a detailed written summary of IHP news. In particular, he commented on potential budget cuts in publications; on Fossilist software status; and on the DSDP/ODP Stratigraphic Data Center.

**d. LITHP news** John Tarduno

John Tarduno commented on LITHP's interests in Caribbean drilling, on the impact of the cancellation of the return to Site 735B from their perspective, and on active proposals potentially of interest to both panels.

**e. ODP/TAMU news** Carl Richter

Carl Richter reviewed the news from the Science Operator, including the status of Fossilist; Georef for the ship's library; the Minolta color scanner; the restoration of marine specialist positions; the planned MST upgrade; the paleontology microscope; core-log integration status; underway geophysics; staffing of scheduled legs; the data base upgrade; the hold on VPC development; logging while drilling from Leg 156; and various ODP/TAMU personnel changes.

**4. REVIEWS OF NEW PROPOSALS AND COMMENTS ON LETTERS OF INTENT**

**a. Procedures.**

The chair reminded the panel of the "Review Criteria" for reviewing proposals. Proponents are excluded from the room during discussion of their proposals. Proposals are the documents from which the drilling program is constructed, and the goal of the review process is to provide useful, constructive feedback to the proponents. Proposal watchdogs are encouraged to contact proponents at all stages of this process. Proposals are evaluated with regard to their scientific interest and maturity and their consistency with White Paper, COSOD, and Long Range Plan themes. Written reviews reflect the collective opinion of the panel as summarized by the assigned watchdogs. We noted the importance of complete site survey information submitted to the Site Survey Data Bank in moving a proposal to scientific maturity and drilling readiness and therefore to the prospectus and ultimately the drilling schedule.

**b. Summary of proposal reviews.**

We reviewed the 25 new submissions, with panel views summarized in written reviews (circulated to all panel members and submitted to the JOIDES office as an appendix to these minutes). In addition to these 25, there were three other new submissions about programs already scheduled for drilling; these were not reviewed.

| No. | Short Title<br>Review Criteria [Proponents excluded] | OHP<br>Watchdogs |
|-----|--|------------------|
|-----|--|------------------|

**Thematic relevance -- Highly relevant to top thematic objectives**

|          |   |                              |
|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 354-Add3 | Benguela Current and Angola/Namibia upwelling<br>A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F1                 | Carter<br>Karpoff<br>Leckie  |
| 386-Add3 | California Margin drilling<br>A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F1 [Mix]                              | Blake<br>Clement<br>Hodell   |
| 404-Add  | Paleogene and Cretaceous IW...Blake Plateau and Blake<br>Nose<br>A1, B1.2, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2 | Backman<br>Clement<br>Leckie |
| 415-Rev2 | Caribbean multi-objective drilling (OHP focus, one leg)<br>A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E0, F1       | Leckie<br>Moore<br>Zachos    |
| 458      | Southern Ocean Transect<br>A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2 [Hodell, Gersonde]                    | Karpoff<br>Moore<br>Zachos   |

**Thematic relevance -- Relevant to thematic objectives**

|     |   |                     |
|-----|---|---------------------|
| 455 | High resolution record of sediment fluxes: NW Atlantic<br>A2, B1.3, B2.2, C4, D4, E8, F4      | Backman<br>Hodell   |
| 456 | Tjornes FZSB: Paleoceanography and sedimentation<br>history<br>A2, B1.3, B2.2, C3, D1, E8, F4 | Clement<br>Herbert  |
| 459 | Norwegian Sea overflow<br>A2, B1.3, B2.2, C3, D1, E8, F4                                      | Clement<br>Gersonde |

**Thematic relevance -- Portions are relevant, interdisciplinary approach required**

|          |  |                               |
|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| 411-Rev  | Caribbean Cretaceous Basalt Province: a major LIP<br>A3, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E0, F4                | Backman<br>Clement<br>Leckie  |
| 412-Add3 | Bahamas Transect: Neogene/Quaternary sea level and<br>fluid flow<br>A3, B1.3, B2.1, C1, D5, E0, F1 | Leckie<br>Moore<br>Zachos     |
| 452-Add  | Antarctic glacial history and causes of sea level<br>change<br>A3, B1.3, B2.2, C4, D4, E8, F3      | Carter<br>Gersonde<br>Karpoff |

**Thematic relevance -- Not relevant to thematic objectives**

333-Add2 Evolution of pull-apart basin, Cayman Trough  
355-Rev4 Formation of a gas hydrate: Peruvian margin  
376-Rev3 Vema F.Z.: Upper mantle, gabbro/dyke, limestone cap  
400-Add3 Mass balance of Costa Rica accretionary wedge  
400-Rev2 Mass balance of Costa Rica accretionary wedge  
435-Add Mass balance: Nicaragua margin  
440-Add Hydrothermal circulation at East Juan de Fuca  
448-Rev History of the Ontong-Java Plateau through basement  
451-Rev Tonga forearc  
454 Paleooceanography of WBC: East Australia Current  
457 Large igneous province in Kerguelan Plateau  
460 Extension of E. Greenland Transect (former NARM-Add2)  
461 Basement of OCT W of Iberia (former NARM-Add3)  
SR-Rev3 Sedimented Ridges II

---

**c. Comments on letters of intent.**

We discussed all letters of intent, excluding proponents, and prepared written comments for those of OHP interest. Watchdogs are noted in ( ) and excluded proponents in [ ]. LOI's 33, 34, 36, 37, and 39 were not of OHP interest. LOI's warranting comments by OHP were:

LOI35 High-resolution Holocene paleoenvironmental record, Saanich Inlet, British Columbia, Canada (Clement, Hodell, Takahashi)

LOI38 ACC Variability and WSDW interaction in the northern Scotia Sea and Falkland Trough (Karpoff, Moore, Zachos)

**5. SEA LEVEL**

**a. Summary of "Guidelines for Shallow Water Hazards Survey"**

Moore summarized this document for the panel, including when these guidelines apply (<200 m water depth); the limitations on sub-bottom penetration that could potentially be approved in <200 m water depth (always <1000 mbsf); the requirements for the hazards survey, its interpretation, and its funding; and the need for procedures to be developed for dropping the drill string, monitoring seabed gas escape, and other safety contingency plans. These guidelines have important implications for how sea level objectives can be addressed and for any other drilling in shallow water. Of particular concern to the panel was the requirement that proponents are responsible for funding, as this presents a formidable obstacle.

**b. Sea level report**

At the time of acceptance of the Sea Level-Working Group Report, PCOM charged the relevant panels (OHP and SGPP) with responsibility for reporting on progress on sea level objectives relative to their interests on an annual basis. Panel discussion, led by the OHP watchdogs for sea level efforts, produced the following **statement on sea level efforts**:



OHP is heartened by the success to date of the New Jersey Transect project (ODP Leg 150 and associated on-land drilling). We congratulate the proponents for their continued efforts in the careful study of recovered sections, the incorporation of onshore sites in the transect, and the obtaining of detailed shallow water hazard surveys to meet safety requirements for the remaining shelf sites.

From these efforts we have already learned a great deal:

1) The planning and execution of sea level programs constitute a major expenditure of time and money. They cannot be done quickly. The "Guidelines for Shallow Water Hazards Survey" have significant cost and time implications for programs which include sites with shallow water depths.

2) The integration and interpretation of the data derived from the study are complex tasks. Developing a reliable model of the timing and magnitude of sea level changes requires that all available geochemical, geophysical, stratigraphic, and paleontologic techniques be brought to bear.

3) The more sites available, the more reliable the interpretation. Because of the complexity of the history of sea level fluctuations and the difficulties in the recovery of complete sections with sedimentary components that provide reliable ages and paleo-water depth estimates, a two or three site transect is not likely to be adequate to address the questions of timing and magnitude of sea level fluctuations.

We are still on a steep "learning curve" in addressing the primary questions of sea level fluctuations, and have only recently begun to appreciate the difficulties involved. Sediment diagenesis, the reworking of microfossils, the estimation of paleo-water depths, and relating cores, logs and seismic data to each other all offer significant challenges to the stratigraphic interpreter. The payoff, however, will be a greatly increased understanding of the processes controlling the architecture of the continental margins and of the links between sea level and climate change.

## **6. RANKING OF FY96 PROSPECTUS/NOMINATIONS OF CO-CHIEF SCIENTISTS**

### **a. Procedures**

All programs in the prospectus had new documents in for review this meeting, so had been discussed once at this meeting. Based on prior review, five programs were not of OHP interest and were not included in our ranking process. These were: Costa Rica (400-Rev2), E. Juan de Fuca hydrothermal (440/440-Add), Return to Iberia (NARM), SE Greenland Margin (NARM), and Sedimented Ridges II (SR-Rev3). The remaining programs were presented by their watchdogs, along with the SSP evaluations and the TAMU time estimates for each program. Because of the different levels of maturity of 404 and 404-Add (which appeared for the first time in this review cycle and had not yet been evaluated by SSP), the panel decided to rank these two programs separately. Voting was conducted by each member ranking the 6 programs under consideration from highest (5) to lowest (0) priority. There were no proponents voting, and one panel member voted in absentia via e-mail. Points awarded for each program were totaled and normalized to the maximum possible score. This fraction of available points awarded is the best measure of relative ranking, with the highest possible score 1.00 and the lowest 0.00.

**b. FY96 PROSPECTUS RANKING**

| Rank Order | Program (Documents)  | Fraction Available Points Awarded | 1994 OHP Spring Global Ranking |
|------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1          | Caribbean Ocean History (415-Rev 2)                              | 0.89                              | 1                              |
| 2          | California Margin (386-Rev2/Add/Add2/Add3, 422-Rev)              | 0.83                              | 2                              |
| 3          | Western North Atlantic Sediment Drifts (404)                     | 0.51                              | 7                              |
| 4          | Blake Plateau and Blake Nose, Paleogene and Cretaceous (404-Add) | 0.38                              | not yet submitted              |
| 5          | Bahamas Transect--two deeper sites (412/Add/Add2/Add3)           | 0.23                              | 12                             |
| 6          | Caribbean Basalt Province  | 0.16                              | -                              |

Important notes on ranking:

i. The **Benguela Current and Angola/Namibia upwelling** program (354-Rev2/354-Add3) is of strong, continuing interest to OHP (#6 in spring 1994 OHP global ranking). This program was not in the prospectus because it was not in the geographic area of interest defined by PCOM for FY96. Although we did not include it in our prospectus rankings, we emphasize OHP's interest in this program and its maturity. We expect that it would have been highly competitive in these rankings had we included it in voting.

ii. We noted that the **South Florida margin sea level** program (427/427-Add) is still of strong interest to OHP (#8 in spring 1994 OHP global ranking). This has sites in a geographic region that could be combined with the sites of OHP interest (and likely to be approved) of the Bahamas Transect.

iii. Of the **Bahamas Transect** sites, OHP supports drilling only two sites (BT3 and BT4, relocated as necessary based on mature seismic data). These deeper slope sites can be expected to yield better recovery and better age resolution for major sequence boundary conditions, and thus are more suitable for testing the global sea-level model, OHP's interest in this proposal. These two sites do not constitute a full leg of drilling.

iv. After thorough comparison of both programs, we noted the substantial loss of objectives of OHP interest in the Caribbean Basalt Province one-leg scenario (411-Rev) relative to the one-leg scenario of Caribbean multi-objective drilling (415-Rev2) or the two-leg scenario of that document. These differences include the loss of the high resolution Quaternary site (CB-1), the lack of sites with an explicit Neogene focus (NR-1/2, NR4), and an eastern site which is too deep to satisfactorily meet OHP objectives (CCBP C-1 vs. S-7).

**c. Co-chief scientist nominations for prospectus programs**

For Caribbean Ocean History, the U.S. nominees are: Larry Petersen, Tim Herbert, Mark Leckie, James Zachos, and Timothy Bralower. The non-U.S. nominees are: Hugh Jenkyns (U.K.) and Elisabetta Erba (ESF).

For the California margin program, the U.S. nominees are: Alan Mix, Mitchell Lyle, Robert Thunell, John Barron, and Lisa Pratt. The non-U.S. nominees are: Tom Pedersen (Can/Aus), Steve Calvert (Can/Aus), and I. Koizumi (Japan).

For the Western North Atlantic sediment drifts/Blake Nose and Blake Plateau program, the U.S. nominees are: Terri Hagelberg, Robert Thunell, Lloyd Keigwin, Bill Curry, and James Zachos. The non-U.S. nominees are: Frank Bassinot (France), Gert de Lange (The Netherlands), Hisatake Okada (Japan), Nick Shackleton (U.K.), and Torsten Bickert (Germany).

For the Bahamas Transect, the U.S. nominees are: Timothy Bralower, Albert Hine, Gregor Eberli, and Rick Sarg. The non-U.S. nominees are: Jan van Hinte and Wolfgang Schlager.

For the Caribbean Cretaceous Basalt Province program, in addition to the nominees listed for Caribbean Ocean History, we nominate Robert Duncan (U.S.) and Alain Mauffret (France).

**7. PANEL MEMBERSHIP**

We discussed the upcoming changes in panel membership. Spring 1995 will be Jan Backman's last meeting, with the ESF replacement Elisabetta Erba as of 1 July 1995. For the U.S. members Delaney, Herbert, and Zachos, this meeting is the last. The panel nominated a prioritized slate of names for each position after reviewing the current panel expertise, the panel needs, and the CV's of suggested individuals. These nominations will be communicated directly to the PCOM office.

Gregg Blake has agreed to serve as the OHP liaison to SGPP.

**8. OTHER ITEMS**

**a. NAAG II Priorities**

As per PCOM's request, we reviewed the drilling plans and priorities for NAAG II drilling. This is now scheduled as Leg 162. We noted that Backman and Oppo were proponents on proposals included in either the original NAAG-DPG report or in the OHP-sponsored Fall 1993 planning session for Leg II; neither are shipboard scientists on the scheduled leg. Hodell is a shipboard scientist for that leg. All remained in the room for discussion.

Herbert presented an overview of the results from Leg 151 and of the scheduled drilling for Leg 162 resulting from the Fall 1993 planning session. We reviewed the scientific objectives of the overall program. We thoroughly discussed the individual sites and their assigned priorities as primary or secondary sites. We noted that the assigned co-chief scientists were the highest priority nominees of the panel. As part of the reviews of new proposals, we discussed several programs in the same geographic region. In each case, we determined that scientific objectives of OHP interest addressed by these proposals were better addressed by the existing drilling plan.

RECOMMENDATION 1 TO PCOM. After thorough review of the plans for the North Atlantic and Arctic Gateways Leg II, Leg 162, OHP reaffirms our endorsement of the drilling plan, including the selection of sites and their assigned priorities, resulting from the Fall 1993 OHP-sponsored planning session. In addition, we state our strong confidence and enthusiasm for the scientific and logistical judgement and skills of the assigned co-chief scientists for this leg.

**b. Budget discussion and priorities**

In response to PCOM's charge to prioritize our needs regarding program services and facilities and identify areas where programmatic costs can be reduced, we arrived at the following two consensuses.

First, we identified our priorities for efforts which must be maintained. These are (1) those things which cannot be done later, (2) those things which are necessary for stratigraphy and chronology and thus allow the definition of the completeness and continuity of recovered sedimentary sections, therefore potentially influencing drilling strategy in real-time, and (3) those things which communicate the objectives and results of the program to the community. Categories (1) and (2) assign high-priority to shipboard efforts. For example, Category (1) includes such things as MST scanning of cores, physical properties measurements, logging, and interstitial water chemistry. Category (2) includes biostratigraphy, core-to-core and core-to-log integration, database upgrades, MST scanning of cores, logging, color sensing, magnetostratigraphy, etc. Category (3) includes the Initial Reports, with core photos, the Scientific Results volumes, and other means of communication.

Second, we note that the complete and continuous recovery of sediments of all lithologies is of highest scientific priority to OHP. However, if asked what to eliminate, OHP does not support further expenditure on the current diamond coring system (DCS). We still wholeheartedly support the drilling capabilities the DCS is intended to supply and the resulting scientific objectives which could be addressed, but note this lack of further support as a programmatic decision when asked what should be eliminated to address budget problems.

RECOMMENDATION 2 TO PCOM. In response to the request to prioritize needs relative to the budget situation, OHP emphasizes retaining support for (1) those things which cannot be done later, (2) those things which are necessary for stratigraphy and chronology and thus allow the definition of the completeness and continuity of recovered sedimentary sections, therefore potentially influencing drilling strategy in real-time, and (3) those things which communicate the objectives and results of the program to the community. As a programmatic, budgetary decision, OHP does not support further expenditure on the current diamond coring system.

**c. SSP/Thematic panel communication**

Panel members discussed their concerns that OHP interests were apparently not well-understood by SSP as represented in the SSP evaluations of prospectus programs. We discussed possible remedies, including inter-panel liaisons. An effective mechanism to ensure SSP has a clear picture of thematic panel priorities and interests would be to have SSP liaisons to the thematic panels.

RECOMMENDATION 3 TO PCOM. OHP recommends that PCOM request that SSP name liaisons to attend the OHP meetings (and those of the other thematic panels as well if those panels request this). Given the significance of SSP evaluations in constructing the 4-year ship track and the prospectus, it is important that SSP have a clear understanding of OHP priorities in general and of our interests in specific proposals. SSP liaison attendance at the spring OHP meeting for spring global ranking would be the highest priority.

**d. Discussion of draft LRP documents**

We discussed the draft documents for the LRP revision circulated by Mix. In particular, we discussed the science vs. facility nature of the program and the appropriate content for vision and mission statements.

**9. FUTURE MEETING DATES**

Spring 1995: 2-4 March 1995, Miami, Florida, hosted by Brad Clement. Loutit will be contacting Hay about joint OHP/SGPP sea level sub-group meeting with possible dates around 27 February through 1 March 1995.

Fall 1995: 5-7 October 1995, either Providence, R.I., or Halifax, Nova Scotia, depending on availability of host for dates and locations.