

Spring 1996 OHP Minutes

I. Summary

ODP/TAMU drilling estimates not on Internet at time of meeting.

OHP fully supports the IHP recommendation to PCOM concerning publications policy and the question of further cuts to publications. The recent modifications to the publications policy should be kept in place for a sufficient period to document the effectiveness of the changes.

DCS - if feasibility tests look good then should aim to have DCS ready by the *beginning* of Phase III. If feasibility studies not satisfactory then cease development of DCS since it will not be ready for Phase III deployment.

Steve D'Hondt nominated as OHP alternate representative to SSP

Sampling party funding should not be cut. Sampling parties are an integral part of ODP legs. Funding for sampling parties should be considered as part of the funding of a leg and the sources for funding should be coordinated between JOI, JOI/USSAC and ODP/TAMU to ensure their continuation.

LRP implementation issues will be developed in a separate paper to be sent to the PCOM Chair.

II. In Attendance

Brad Clement	Steve D'Hondt
Elisabetta Erba	Rainer Gersonde
Anne-Marie Karpoff	Alan Kemp
Tom Loutit - Chair	Ted Moore
Delia Oppo	Brian Popp
Warren Prell	Christina Ravelo
Kozo Takahashi	

Guests

Gary Acton (ODP/TAMU)	Jeff Gee (LITHP)
Colin Jacobs (JOIDES)	

III. Absent

John Armentrout	Tom Crowley
Dave Hodell	

IV. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

In response to a recommendation from OHP to PCOM in December 1995 PCOM asked ODP/TAMU to place the drilling times estimate spreadsheets on the ODP/TAMU home page so that proponents could use a consistent method for calculating drilling times. At the time of the OHP Spring meeting this request does not appear to have been completed.

V. Meeting Objectives

Loutit emphasised that the main objectives of the meeting were to review new proposals, rank active proposals and respond to a number of issues raised by PCOM. He also reviewed the ODP yearly planning cycle for the benefit of new members.

VI. Reports from Liaisons

A. PCOM - Alan Mix

1. Commented on drilling schedule

a) N. Atlantic Sediment Drifts

PCOM has asked for DPG chaired by Greg Mountain to work with Keigwin to look at possibility of deepening some sites. Group has not met but the report is due soon to PCOM. Oppo on DPG but has not been consulted properly. Loutit asked Mix to ensure that Mountain does convene DPG and that the report is presented to PCOM at the right time.

2. Discussed publications issues in PCOM motion 95-3-23

3. SSP alternates - nominated Steve D'Hondt as OHP representative

4. LRP

Discussed implications of the LRP for ocean history related science. Panel to provide suggestions to PCOM - decided to set aside one day during the meeting to develop new implementation strategy for ocean-history related science with an emphasis on Initiative I on Natural Climate Variability and Rapid Climate Change. Mix outlined the suggestions by Kidd for a new advisory structure and planning cycle.

B. ODP/TAMU - Gary Acton

1. New Annual Report

OHP would like to commend ODP/TAMU for the quality and information content of the report. Panel members think that it is a very useful publication. However, the distribution does not seem to be uniform as 5 members of the panel had not yet received a copy.

2. Outlined budget scenario for 1996 and 1997

3. Discussed possible cuts in services - the following comments relate to OHP's opinions about the services and some suggestions for saving money

a) Try to reduce fueling if alternate cheaper sources of fuel can be obtained

b) Data migration - should not delay migration of paleo data since Fossilist is not working

c) DCS - if feasibility tests look good then should aim to have DCS ready by the *beginning* of Phase III. If feasibility studies not satisfactory then cease development of DCS since it will not be ready for Phase III deployment.

d) Summer curatorial workforce/student workforce

OHP believes that there should not be cuts in the workforce if the long term health of the cores would be at risk. But the panel also believes that there may be ways to decrease the maintenance of the cores and hence make savings each year.

OHP is strongly concerned about the adequate storage of cores in ODP core repositories given the potential for cuts in ODP budget affecting the staff (student contracts) in core repositories. Only adequate storage and vigilant curatorial assistance will allow continuous high-quality use of older cores for sampling and documentation using new automated tools. Experiences from a piston/gravity core repository in Germany (Alfred Wegener Institute) show that the replacement and watering of sponges in D-tubes may not be required if an alternative strategy is employed. The coverage of cores with plastic coats and hermetic closure of D-tubes would better prevent dehydration of cores and would additionally prevent disintegration of core material during pulling out of D-tubes. ODP/TAMU should investigate the effect of plastic coats on core chemistry particularly the organic component.

e) ODP/TAMU booth at GSA

Although this is a small item there is probably potential for savings across ODP if the marketing at meetings is properly coordinated.

OHP considers it critical for the future of ODP that ODP scientific and technological contributions be consistently communicated to the broader earth science community. Consequently, a reduction in the ODP/TAMU booth at GSA should be considered only if ODP can be successfully integrated into another (JOI?) booth without significant loss of outreach to the earth science community attending GSA. Coordination between JOI, ODP/TAMU and other ODP related groups is essential if ODP is to broaden its support base - there should be an ODP presence at as many geoscience meetings as possible.

f) Special Operating Expenses - the following SOE's were regarded as essential to OHP's thematic experiments

- (1) DCS - see comments above
- (2) JANUS Project
- (3) Digital imaging/Color scanner

At present the color scanner occupies 2 scientists per leg. If this operation were automated would there be significant savings? Was not clear what the digital imaging purchase was for. Is it a high resolution imaging device - if so what is the resolution. Is it critical for hi-res rapid climate change studies?

- (4) Split-core MST feasibility/purchase
- (5) Sampling party funding should not be cut. Sampling parties are an integral part of ODP legs. Funding for sampling parties should be considered as part of the funding of a leg and the sources for funding should be coordinated between JOI, JOI/USSAC and ODP/TAMU to ensure their continuation.

C. JOIDES - Colin Jacobs

1. International partners
 - a) China may join in October
 - b) Taiwan and Korea invited to join AusCan Consortium
2. LRP implementation
 - a) stressed importance of recent EXCOM motions
 - b) discussed significance of EXCOM request to look again at cost-savings within the Program before providing money for new initiatives.
 - c) panel discussed role of Ocean History related science within LRP

Loutit asked panel to split into four groups representing the current OHP experiments on orbital forcing (Moore, Prell, Clement), rapid climate change and internal feedbacks (Oppo, Ravelo, Popp, Gersonde, Kemp), long term climate change and abrupt events (Karpoff, D'Hondt, Erba, Takahashi) and global sea-level change (Loutit, Moore). The groups were asked to discuss the accomplishments of the experiments, the plans for the transition period leading to Phase III drilling, Phase III plans and any new directions or initiatives that needed to be put in place under the umbrella of the LRP.

VII. Review and rating of new proposals

Loutit reminded the panel of the review procedures, introduced the changes to the rating criteria, illustrated the old review forms and reminded the panel of the rules to avoid conflict of interest issues.

A. ANTOSTRAT Proposals reviewed in sequence

1. 452-Rev2

A1, B1.3, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2 - Review applies to drift sites

As with all the ANTOSTRAT proposals, we view the drift deposits sites to be of highest priority and have evaluated this proposal based solely on those sites. We anticipate that the sediments recovered from these sites will provide the good stratigraphic control, and when

placed within a detailed seismic stratigraphic framework, will permit accurate dating of the major depositional packages on the shelf.

We suggest that the proponents review their site locations in the drift deposits and determine whether the combination of two or more sites, one in an uneroded area and others in an eroded area, might together provide a deeper penetration into the drift deposits and permit the recovery of a longer stratigraphic record

2. 482

A1, B1.3, B2.1, C3, D1, E8, F2 ratings refer to WLT4 and WLT5

OHP accepts the high scientific value of the aims of elements of this proposal, particularly in relation to the history of the east Antarctic ice sheet and related sea-level changes. Within the ANTOSTRAT initiative the proposal represents one of those that besides a high-resolution Plio-Pleistocene record also includes drilling of older (Miocene - ?Paleogene) records that are of major interest to resolve open questions concerning sea level/East Antarctic Ice sheet changes.

In keeping with other ANTOSTRAT proposals, OHP objectives would best be obtained by concentrating on drift sites* although a more thorough rationale was required. In contrast to sites proposed for the shelf available ODP drilling techniques will give a high probability of recovery of more continuous sections from the drift deposits, that also can be dated accurately based on integrated magneto/biostratigraphy. Focusing more on the drift deposits, OHP recommends that the proponents include the following points in a revised proposal:

- specify APC/XCB coring rather than rotary coring for the drift sites;
- include site survey coring of the drift sites, and
- include additional seismic lines for delineation of drift deposit geometry.

3. 488

A1, B1.2, B2.1, C3, D1, E8, F2

The objectives of documenting the onset of the ACC through the Drake Passage and the northward flow of Southern Origin Bottom Water fit well within the Neogene circulation experiment and therefore is highly relevant to OHP objectives. The OHP was concerned about how the proponents could convincingly separate out the effects of horizontal (bottom water transport) and vertical (sedimentation through the water column) transport when biogenics are included in the grain size analysis. This appears to be of concern especially when surface water mass boundaries may be changing across this area. The OHP also asks the proponents to justify the site location for SEFALK - 01, Is it possible to add a site in thicker and younger sediment above EFP2?

4. 489

A1, B1.2, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2 refers to drift sites ranking

The drift sites located on the rise are highly relevant to OHP objectives and the above rankings apply to the drift sites. Drilling the drifts will provide the stratigraphic control required to achieve the objectives of the shelf sites, and of high relevance to OHP objectives is Site RSSHEL-07A which is sited to date reflector RSU6 which is interpreted to represent an unconformity formed at the onset of Antarctic glaciation. The OHP also notes that this is one of the few places where it is possible to obtain the Paleogene which is important to determine the cause of the differences between the isotopic and sea level records in the Paleogene. Combined

with the planned Cape Roberts project it may be possible to obtain a complete section in this area.

The panel asks the proponents to demonstrate the seismic correlation from the rise (drift) to the shelf, and to discuss how new drilling would achieve better recovery and records than previous DSDP sites in this area.

It is currently not feasible to XCB to 1000 mbsf as proposed here but instead a combined plan of APC/XCB and then rotary coring should be proposed.

The proposal presently contains two different drilling depths for Site RSSHEL-07A. Which is correct?

5. 490

A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2

The OHP feels that the rise sites have the highest probability of good recovery and overall success, and appreciate the proponents efforts to carry seismic horizons and interpretations into the slope region. We would like the proponents to look more carefully at site locations on the rise to ascertain whether there are other locations where two sites (in combination) would recover records that would reach further back in time. We would also like the proponents to provide any data they may have on cores taken in the area and copies of the cross lines through site locations. Please include any survey results that might better document the overall areal distribution and geometry of the drift deposits in this area. OHP encourages the proponents to submit a revised proposal (along the lines suggested above) within a single leg format.

B. 348-Add4 - not reviewed

The OHP endorses the scheduling of the four deeper sites listed in this proposal. The work done to date on the New Jersey transect (Legs 150, 150X) has made major advances toward dating the unconformities believed to be associated with sea level changes and the four sites now proposed will add significantly to these results. To fully achieve the original scientific goals in this proposal, however, it is clear that we must move forward to acquire the use of a jackup rig for drilling in shallow water. Because of this necessity, we further recommend that the Ocean Drilling Program contribute significantly toward meeting these technical needs by providing seed money and organizational support to the proponents.

C. 367-Rev3

A1, B1.1, B2.2, C1, D1, E0, F1

This proposal is of considerable interest for OHP, particularly for:

- circulation of currents and palaeoceanography
- sea-level history on a southern hemisphere margin (including the important Miocene)
- sea-level history on a terrigenous-poor, cold-water carbonate margin.

The general objectives are consistent with OHP long-term objectives.

The proposal is very well presented, and the supporting data and information is well documented. Based on outstanding seismic data, it is close to full maturity. The proponents have paid careful attention to previous OHP comments, providing clear responses to :

- safety issues (the very shallow sites are deleted in a alternate drilling program),
- weather window for best drilling period,

- shifting and deepening some sites in order to penetrate shallowly buried Paleocene and perhaps late Cretaceous section,
- shifting site (i.e. GAB 02A) from possible magmatic fluids/sediments alteration,
- stratigraphic framework,
- amended drilling time schedule.

OHP suggests that the proponents consider a slight shift (2-3 km) of sites GAB-05B and GAB-06B southward in order to better record the relationships between the high stand and low stand system tracts and provide estimating of the magnitudes of short-term sea level changes for sequences 6A and 7.

The panel commends the proponents for an outstanding presentation of the proposal. It is one of the best designed and presented that the Panel has seen.

D. 441-Rev

A1, B1.1, B2.1, C2, D1, E8, F2

OHP recognizes the importance of this proposal in its potential to deliver palaeo-hydrographic data in a key and hitherto un-documented part of the global ocean. As such it forms a critical part of the OHP Neogene circulation experiment. The depth transects are designed to document deep circulation, as well as intermediate and surface water mass variation. Although we recognize the importance of the deep sites in the drifts, we are concerned about adequate stratigraphic control to address the relevant issues. We would therefore advise the proponents to take the following action

- the leg should be scheduled for normal (58 day) length
- evidence for stratigraphic control should be included in the proposal (ie that presented at ICPV, Halifax)
- we advise the proponents to drop the Bounty Fan deep water site as this is poorly located to address OHP objectives.
- we recommend that all sites well above the CCD be triple APC cored. In other words single/double core sites 7 and 9 as time allows.

In general the proposal would be improved by limiting the duplication of general aims/ goals in the main text and integrating the site-specific/ transect strategy.

E. 455-Rev

A1, B1.2, B2.1, C2, D1, E8, F2

The objectives of this proposal include abrupt climate change, timing, distribution and mechanism of pulsing of the Laurentide ice sheet are highly relevant to OHP.

The panel's previous concerns were: accurate stratigraphy of the cores, the lack of continuous records, and the need to tie in to distal sites. The panel was pleased with the response to their comments, but noted that there were still some concerns. The panel was especially pleased with the addition of the Orphan Knoll site, but questioned the usefulness of the Sohm Abyssal Plain site. Calculations of sedimentary mass balance is not a high priority objective in OHP, and better justification would therefore be needed for that site. In this respect, the objectives need to be better formulated.

Documentation of available cores partly strengthened the suitability of drilling and likelihood that stated objectives could be met. However, there was still concern about the continuity of sections and the stratigraphic tools available and applicable

Gulf of Saint Lawrence. The panel was very excited about the LAW01A site, and agreed with the proponents that this as a unique opportunity to get high resolution Holocene material comparable to Saanich Inlet. We were still concerned about LAW02A, but felt the proponents had justified LAW03 and 04A. As noted above, the LAW06A addition needed better justification with respect to OHP objectives

The panel still would like an addendum including:

- a map showing locations of seismic cross-sections
- revised drilling strategy including triple APC of some sites
- revised drilling strategy clearly identifying how these sites would meet OHP objectives should include prioritization of sites in order to meet a 56 days leg.

F. 457-Rev3

A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2 - Review only represents OHP portion of Proposal

OHP interest in this proposal is limited to the paleoceanographic transect of sites KIP-15A, -16A, and -17A. The apparent focus of this transect on early Oligocene climatic transitions falls well within OHP's high-priority interests (e.g. orbital forcing and the operation of ocean-climate processes during geologic intervals of different climate states).

Some specific concerns raised by panel members: the proposal needs to better identify the age of sediments to be drilled (e.g. latest Eocene? early Oligocene?) and the possibility of recovering still deeper and older material. Additionally, it would be helpful to this panel's assessment of this proposal for the proponents to identify any utility of the LIP sites for ocean-history objectives. Finally, KIP-17a appears to be placed in a dicey location on the seismic line. This last point leads to the suggestion that the plan for site placement continue to be refined.

G. 465-Add1

A1, B1.2, B2.1, C2, D1, E8, F2

This proposal remains highly relevant to OHP top thematic objectives and incorporates depth and latitudinal transects to address multiple objectives concerning the dynamics of deep and shallow water mass structure and chemistry, paleoproductivity and tectonic-climatic connections.

OHP relevant objectives are well formulated and locations are appropriate to capture the desired vertical and latitudinal gradients. As designed, feasibility of achieving scientific objectives is high. The drilling technology required is mostly APC and XCB with minor RCB and is in hand and tested. No special technical difficulties are anticipated.

Final evaluation is still dependent on the site survey (scheduled for Jan./Feb. 1997) identifying sufficiently thick and continuous sections on the flanks of topographic rises. Preliminary data and shallow cores look good and will undoubtedly be updated as results from the upcoming site survey cruise are obtained. Upon reviewing new estimates on sediment thickness provided in this proposal, the panel was concerned with thin sediment cover at some sites (e.g., CBA-1A, NAZ-4B) which implies either very slow sedimentation rates or erosion. How will the presence of unconformities affect your objectives? If present, will proposed objectives need to

be modified, new sites chosen or sites dropped? Will proposal objectives change if no unconformities are present and the thin sediment cover result from low sedimentation rates?

The panel recognizes the potential for two drilling legs to address this topic. However, once the new site survey information is obtained, we ask the proponents to justify better a one vs. two leg scenario including the possibility (in the two leg scenario) of locating one or more sites to address the question of upwelling along the coastal margin. The panel felt that this proposal is on its way to becoming a mature drillable leg(s) and compliments the proponents for getting the site survey cruise funded.

H. 472-Rev

A1, B1.1, B2.1, C2, D3, E8, F2 - Review only represents OHP portion of Proposal

The sedimentary section at proposed site BON-8 is highly relevant to OHP thematic objectives. The following comments are related only to this part of the proposal.

The recovery of a Campanian to upper Valanginian section will allow reconstruction of a low latitude productivity history (intensity and geographic distribution) and long-term changes playing a major role in influencing the ocean-climate system. Dating of basement (magnetic anomaly M12) will greatly improve time scales by providing a radiometric age for the late Valanginian.

Proponents are encouraged to better formulate the OHP-related objectives including the role of massive volcanic events (Ontong Java Plateau LIP) in the global environmental system. How rapidly does the biosphere responde to such events and with what types of responses? How does the building of LIPs influence the oceanic circulation and the climate?

A comparison with existing data (e.g. sites 800 and 801) would allow reconstruction of a latitudinal transect across 15 degrees latitudes at various time slices.

To become highly relevant to OHP, the proposal needs an expansion of the drilling strategy of the Cretaceous sections at other sites.

The recovery of a chert/chalk sequence is still problematic and OHP strongly support future development of MDCB.

A summary of OHP-related objectives should be added in the Abstract.

I. 483

A1, B1.1, B2.1, C1, D1, E8, F2

The objectives of documenting the onset of the ACC through the Drake Passage and the northward flow of Southern Origin Bottom Water fit well within the Neogene circulation experiment and therefore is highly relevant to OHP objectives. The OHP was concerned about how the proponents could convincingly separate out the effects of horizontal (bottom water transport) and vertical (sedimentation through the water column) transport when biogenics are included in the grain size analysis. This appears to be of concern especially when surface water mass boundaries may be changing across this area. The OHP also asks the proponents to justify the site location for SEFALK - 01, Is it possible to add a site in thicker and younger sediment above EFP2?

J. 484

A1, B1.2, B2.1, C3, D6, E3, E4, E6, E8, F2

The OHP ranks the establishment of a detailed history of the development of Southeast Asian monsoon as a highly worthwhile project. We are also encouraged by the recovery of a very high resolution record in a piston core from a particular region within the South China Sea. We do not feel, however, that the data presented in the proposal indicate that our understanding of the timing and magnitude of global sea level changes (the parts of the sea level theme that are of main concern to this panel) will be greatly advanced by the proposed work. If the proposed sites are linked to a detailed seismic stratigraphic framework, we may gain some information on the timing of sea level change. However, given the complexity of the tectonic history of the region, we do not feel that we could gain accurate information on the magnitudes of sea level change.

Our main concern with this proposal is with the specific sites chosen. Given the structures on which several of the proposed sites are located, it appears that they might have serious problems being approved by the safety panel. Furthermore, a cursory inspection of the seismic sections suggests that significant erosional hiatuses exist at some of the sites and that the sequences sampled contain rapidly deposited sediment packages with sandy facies which might strongly affect hole conditions and make it impossible to recover a reasonably continuous sedimentary record. We recommend that the proponents review their selection of sites and revise the proposal to give us some assurance that the section drilled will recover a reasonably continuous (preferably hemipelagic) section from which a history of the monsoon development and short-term variation can be derived. These sites should be set within any existing seismic stratigraphic framework for the area and crossing lines through the sites should be shown. We would also like to see a map of the seismic coverage in the area

Please include the filled-out site summary forms and estimates of drilling and logging times for each site. It would be helpful if you would also include transit times to the likely ports.

K. 485

A1, B1.1, B2.1, C3, D1, E8, F2

This proposal to drill seven sites near Tasmania and the Tasman Rise is well prepared and much of the supporting data and information is well documented. The general objectives are consistent with OHP long-term objectives but the specific questions and strategies to measure and interpret the ocean history are not especially well developed. Are isotopic tools anticipated to be a major effort and if so are the deep burial depths likely to limit the usefulness of the isotopic data? Have any isotopic measurements been made on the dredges/cores that would address this problem?

The panel supported a level of effort consistent with a one leg drilling plan and would suggest better statement of what remaining program would accomplish. Drilling times need to be verified and transit times, change over from XCB/RCB, and double (?) HPC times to be included if not already. Will re-entry cones be needed or will wash through HPC section be more effective?

The paleoceanographic and ocean history questions need to be made more specific and probably needs to include input from scientists that would measure and interpret the paleoceanographic signals.

L. 486

A1, B1.2, B2.2, C3, D1, E8, F2

The study of long-term changes and driving mechanism of the evolution of the ocean, atmosphere, and biosphere is highly relevant to top thematic OHP objectives and the panel recognized the potential contribution of the proposed Paleogene transect in the tropical central Pacific. Here, due to a Recent to middle Miocene hiatus, we have the opportunity to recover well preserved Oligocene and Eocene sediments.

Although proponents addressed comments to LOI 56, the panel noted that there are still concerns. Site locations, both in the one- and two-leg scenarios, need revision depending on a better formulation of objectives in terms of time intervals. The present proposal appeared to be focussed on the late Eocene-early Oligocene time interval and therefore the proposed transect should be centered about the approximate position of the equator at 40-30 Ma rather than 50-60 Ma.

The scientific strategy should seek to minimize the effect of chert-caused poor recovery on the scientific objectives. Take advantage of triple-APC strategy to define paleocenographic advantages of high-resolution recovery.

The panel was also concerned about the possibility of encountering chert. The proposed sites are located very close to DSDP sites where cherts were recovered in the Oligocene, upper and middle Eocene also in sections thinner than 300 m. High quality site survey information will absolutely be necessary to assess whether the chert layers can be avoided in order to recover continuous Paleogene sedimentary sections.

The panel was also concerned about lysocline depth and the availability of well preserved carbonate for standard isotopic studies and carbonate biostratigraphy. Given the importance of a tropical transect for defining Paleogene meridional SST gradients, this last part was of particular concern. Obviously, the main point of this proposal is to recover continuous Paleogene records, however, given the fact that many DSDP sites are very close to the proposed transect, proponents should discuss the primary results from these previous studies in the context of what their expected results will be and what additional problems will be resolved.

Finally, some panel members questioned why the one-leg scenario is limited to 10 degrees of the equator rather than spread over the entire latitudinal band with more distant spacing.

VIII. Letter of Intent Reviews

A. LOI 65

The LOI 65 is to study basic paleoceanography, tectonics, and sedimentary history and to provide a comparison section with the Great Barrier Reef drilling and prospective cool water carbonate drill plan in the Great Australian Bight. Although it is locally important to study the paleoceanographic history of the western Tasman Sea and the onset and character of the East Australian Current poleward heat transport, it was felt that there was not sufficient primary OHP interest in the LOI to merit further effort from the proponents.

B. LOI 68

The authors of the LOI 68 are encouraged to submit a full proposal. The unprecedented high resolution paleoceanography record that they can unravel in the Palmer Deep can be linked with sediment trap record which is unique. This site provides an opportunity to study extremely high frequency climate variations analogous to high resolution sedimentary record from the Saanich Inlet, Cariaco Trench, and Santa Barbara Basin should be considered. A full proposal should include core data and further development of the rationale for studying the history of productivity at this site.

IX. Global Ranking

All active proposals were considered for inclusion in 1996 global ranking. 15 proposals were ranked. 488 and 449 in the Weddell Sea were considered as one proposal.

Since proposal 464 has been scheduled pending the results of the site survey cruise in 1996, OHP voted (12 for 1 abstention) to place 464 as highest ranked proposal in order to consider new range of proposals.

Number	Title	Score	S.D.
441-Rev1	Southwest Pacific Gateways	11.77	2.72
465-Add	Southeast Pacific Depth Transect	10.85	4.59
367-Rev3	Great Australian Bight	10.69	2.61
484	East Asian Monsoon	8.46	3.84
485	South Tasman Gateway	7.46	3.43
488/449	Weddell Sea	7.15	3.72
452-Rev2	Antarctic Glacial History	6.92	3.2
455-Rev	Laurentide Ice Sheet	5.92	4.46
483	ACC - Scotia Sea	5.77	2.94
457-Rev3	Kerguelen	5.54	4.09
490	Prydz Bay	5.38	3.25
477	Sea of Okhotsk	5.33	3.14
486	Paleogene -Equatorial Pacific	5.15	2.93
472-Rev	Crustal Fluxes - Marianas	4.15	4.35
482	Wilkes Land	3.77	3.53

X. Other Business

- A. Next meeting - Oct. 7-9 Strasbourg, France Host will be Anne-Marie Karpoff
- B. SSP Nomination - Steve d'Hondt
- C. Leg 164 report delivered by Gary Acton
- D. Leg 165 report delivered by Steve d'Hondt
- E. Recent OD21 meeting in Japan reviewed by Kozo Takahashi
- F. PCOM issues

Rob Kidd had asked the thematic panels to address a number of issues relating to the implementation of the LRP. Loutit asked the panel before it addressed the specific questions posed by Kidd to review the accomplishments of the current OHP experiments, review the status of the current OHP white paper, refine the plans for the transition to Phase III and think about future directions for ocean -history related science. The results of that review and discussion have been assembled in a separate paper that will be sent directly to the PCOM Chair as soon as it is completed.

1. Panel Structure

Based on the review of the OHP White Paper and the evaluation of the status of the current OHP thematic experiments the panel considered a number of options for panel structure.

The preferred panel structure would consist of four panels with sea level attached to a new Ocean Processes and History Panel (no name has been formally put forward by the current

panel), Fluids, Bacteria and Sedimentary Processes Panel, LITHP and TECP. An option would be to keep SL split and to form a SL subgroup specifically to review proposals in preparation for ranking by the 2 panels that currently handle sea-level. The gradual evolution of SGPP toward fluids and geochemical processes suggests that the most appropriate home for the SL theme is in OPHP. Currently there does not appear to be enough work for a separate SL panel. It is not clear that a separate panel would generate more work.

If a 5 panel structure is selected then Sea Level should be combined with Sedimentary Basins/Continental Margin Evolution in order to broaden the support base for ODP in the lead up to deep riser drilling with OD21.

OHP believes that it is important to increase the responsiveness of the advisory structure to its customers and to ensure that sites of opportunity such as Santa Barbara and Saanich Inlet continue to be drilled. Two panel meetings should be held each year with global rankings completed at both so that proponents know where they stand immediately.

2. Cuts in services - see also discussion in ODP/TAMU liaison report

These technological developments are important to OHP thematic experiments

Digital imaging

Automated color reflectance

Higher resolution down-hole logging

Shore-based split core MST (for old sites and for new sites where resolution compromised due to time constraints at sea)

Software to handle and distribute large amounts of data

Double to Triple APC

Increase speed of onboard automated measurements

Increased efficiency and effectiveness of ship-board labs

Drilling technology suitable for improved recovery of alternating hard and soft lithologies

3. ODP/TAMU - Dry Dock for JR in 1998/99

OHP recommendations centre on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of operations in the labs and improving accommodations for the science party. No specific suggestions were developed and will require further work from the Chair.

G. OHP fully supports the IHP recommendation to PCOM concerning publications policy and the question of further cuts to publications. The recent modifications to the publications policy should be kept in place for a sufficient period to document the effectiveness of the changes.

H. DPG for N. Atl Sediment Drifts - see comments in PCOM liaison report section

I. Loren Kroenke presented results from recent SWATH mapping over a number of possible anoxic basins in the South Pacific. Panel suggested a number of questions that he would need to ask before submitting a proposal to ODP for ocean history related objectives.