(12/87)

JOIDES PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
26-28 August 1987
Nikko, Japan

MEETING MINUTES

Members:

N.Pisias (Chairman) - Oregon State University
G.Brass - University of Miami
J.P.Cadet - France
W.Curry - Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute (for D.Ross)
O.Eldholm - ESF Consortium
T.Francis - United Kingdom
S.Gartner - Texas A&M University
R.Hey - Hawaii Institute for Geophysics (for W.Coulbourn)
M.Kastner - Scripps Institution of Oceanography
M.Langseth - Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory
R.Larson - University of Rhode Island
R.McDuff - University of Washington
U. von Rad - BGR, Federal Republic of Germany
P.Robinson -Canada
T.Shipley - University of Texas Institute for Geophysics
A.Taira - Ocean Research Institute, Japan

Liaisons:

T.Pyle - Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
L.Garrison - Science Operator (ODP/TAMU)
X.Golovchenko - Wireline Logging Services (ODP/LDGO)

Guests / Observers:

E.Kappel - JOI, Inc.

JOIDES Office:

S.Stambaugh
M.Wiedicke

666 INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS

N.Pisias opened the meeting and introduced Dr.Taro Kanaya, who welcomed JOIDES participants to Nikko and the historic Kanaya Hotel. A.Taira, the PCOM host, provided logistics information. He also notified PCOM of the recent death of Kazuaki Nakamura, who served on the Tectonics Panel and was TECP liaison to WPAC.

Pisias welcomed PCOM alternates Dick Hey (HIG) and Bill Curry (WHOI). Xenia Golovchenko (LDGO) was introduced as the Wireline Logging Services liaison for this meeting (replacing Rich Jarrard who was at sea with Leg 117).

667 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Agenda Item M (Publications and Information Handling Report) was moved to follow the JOI, Inc. report as items discussed at the last IHP meeting affected the FY88 budget.

PCOM Motion:

The agenda for the 26-28 August 1987 Planning Committee meeting is hereby adopted. (Motion: Brass, second Larson)

Vote: 16 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

N.Pisias read a list of handouts to this meeting (Appendix A, with subsequent meeting handouts added). Minor changes to the previous minutes were recorded.

668 APPROVAL OF PCOM MINUTES

PCOM Motion:

PCOM approves the amended minutes of the 10-12 April 1987 Planning Committee meeting. (Motion Robinson, second Brass)

Vote: 16 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

669 EXCOM REPORT

N.Pisias, PCOM liaison to the Executive Committee, reported on the 28-29 April 1987 meeting, and referred PCOM to the summary in the agenda book.

Pisias emphasized that EXCOM had endorsed PCOM's motions for setting aside 4% of each fiscal year's budget for special operations and purchases and that the standard operations budget should include on-going engineering developments. EXCOM's recommendations on ODP publications reflected PCOM's: that 1000 of the 2000 volume press run for ODP Proceedings Part A would be microfiched and that Volume B would consist of author-prepared, photo-ready copy. Although significant subsequent decisions had been made at the August IHP meeting (see JOI

report), Pisias said that the scientific community would still be responsible for absorbing part of the costs for Volume B.

In closing, Pisias said that EXCOM had discussed all budget recommendations thoroughly and their votes were unanimous. EXCOM deferred to PCOM's scientific objectives for the FY88 program and tried to maintain the program within the budget restrictions. He also noted that a key EXCOM member, John Knauss (URI) would be rotating off the committee. Another key EXCOM member, Ross Heath (U.Wash), will be represented at future EXCOM meetings by alternate, Brian Lewis.

Discussion:

Robinson reiterated "strong dissatisfaction:" over the decision announced at the last EXCOM meeting regarding ODP membership to the Soviet Union. Pisias said that the telex from the U.S. government read at that meeting indicated that the membership could not be considered "at this time." Brass noted that he and John Knauss had contacted U.S. Congressional representatives on this matter. Non-U.S. EXCOM members had been notified by NSF to contact their appropriate governmental office to express their dissatisfaction with the decision, but the JOIDES Office has not been aware of any such contacts.

670 NSF REPORT

Nick Pisias read a short report (Appendix B) from NSF ODP Program Director, Dick Buffler, who is returning to the U. of Texas. Bruce Malfait, formerly at Marine Geoscience and Geophysics at NSF, will become Director of ODP at NSF and assume the role of NSF liaison at future PCOM meetings.

Discussion:

Robinson said that the initiative for Canadian/Australian joint membership has made no progress since last year and is not being pursued further. J.P.Cadet mentioned interest of a possible Asian Consortium, with Australia as a member with Taiwan, S.Korea and others, but no details were available.

671 JOI,INC REPORT

Tom Pyle reported for JOI. He distributed the new JOI brochure on the Ocean Drilling Program and asked for comments. Pyle deferred extensive comments on COSOD II until after the October meeting of the Working Group Chairmen and Steering Committee.

FY88 PROGRAM PLAN

The FY88 TAMU budget cuts, as proposed by PCOM (Appendix C in April meeting PCOM minutes), were reviewed by the Budget Committee before the April EXCOM meeting. At that meeting, EXCOM adopted "the spirit of Option 4" as its recommendation for FY88:

Option 4 reductions consist of:	Est. savings:
1000 Part A and B Publications (microfiche 1000 copies)	50 K
TAMU headquarters	200
Computer services	100
HQ: 5 grad. res. assts	50
2 positions, Databases	42
Res. elec. eng., travel	88
Camera-ready Part B pubs.	171
3 Staff Scientists	143
Labs and techs.	211
	1150 K

In the final FY88 Program Plan, publications were cut as advised by BCOM, EXCOM and PCOM. JOI made adjustments in technical support, as shown in Table E-1 of Appendix C. After this iteration of the FY88 budget, the Information Handling Panel met to make additional recommendations on the publications budget. Tables E-2 and E-3 in Appendix C compare the FY88 and FY87 budgets: FY88 shows a budget increase over FY87 (less than the original request) and a decrease in personnel, mostly at TAMU.

The FY88 Program plan has been sent to NSF and EXCOM approval is pending. As PCOM did not advise JOI on specific cuts to shipboard services, the XRF/XRD & SEM labs were eliminated. TAMU has agreed, however, to try to adjust usage on the XRD/XRF lab according to individual cruise needs. L.Garrison added that no dedicated technician would be available for the lab, and that it would cost more to remove it than maintain it on a limited basis.

PUBLICATION RECOMMENDATIONS FROM IHP

N.Pisias, PCOM liaison to the 3-6 August IHP meeting, reported on developments since EXCOM's review of the publications budget. Two options were explored: reduction of publication costs and alternatives to publishing by TAMU. A proposal from AGU for publishing ODP Proceedings Vol.B. was reviewed by IHP. In addition, TAMU personnel provided IHP with budgets for ODP publishing costs: Volume A ($618K), Volume B ($417K), other ODP publications ($90K), and other program support ($265K) for an annual total of $1.2M. BCOM did not have the budget item breakdown of these figures when it made its original recommendations to EXCOM.

TAMU Publications identified $182K in additional savings from their budget and these funds were reprogrammed to effect the recommendations of IHP (See Appendix D, Table 1). Pisias discussed the individual recommendations in Table 1 and others listed in the IHP summary. IHP recommended microfilming the ODP volumes to get a high quality master for future microfilm/microfiche runs. Cutting the estimated number of pages in Part A from 1000 to 800 was recommended because the Leg 108 volume, for instance, has only 600 pages. Pisias summarized IHP recommendations: Part B Volumes will be typeset by TAMU from manuscripts formatted for electronic capture (with author-prepared figures), two editors at TAMU will be retained, and support for data bases will be increased.

Pisias also discussed the preliminary AGU proposal, which was not pursued for several reasons: the possibility that AGU would renegotiate costs during the contract, possible continuity problems, copyright issues and the need to keep a viable publications operation at TAMU so that other ODP publications would not suffer.

Discussion:

Kastner supported the AGU proposal, citing the need to get away from "gray" literature for ODP and the potential for wider distribution for the Proceedings volumes. Eldholm said that the publications decisions from the last PCOM meeting had caused a great deal of concern to the JOIDES community; he felt the IHP recommendations settled many publication issues and urged their acceptance by PCOM. Brass, a BCOM representative at the last EXCOM meeting, pointed out that the changes made to Part B by EXCOM's acceptance of the publication budget did not affect the content, only the format of Part B. Pisias added that even before the IHP recommendations, the MOU requirements for numbers of volumes to JOIDES institutions had been met, which was one of the strongest concerns of the non-U.S. members.

Pisias and Pyle provided further details on the model proposed by AGU, although directly comparing cost figures was not possible from the format of the AGU proposal. Pisias read some of the items in the proposals, which was prepared shortly before the IHP meeting. He pointed out that an outside publishing contract would have to go up for bid, and that PCOM should not drag out publication issues much longer.

PCOM Motion:

PCOM accepts the "spirit" of the recommendations from the 3-6 August 1987 Information Handling Panel meeting, particularly with respect to ODP Proceedings Parts A and B. (Motion: Robinson, second Eldholm)

Vote: 15 for, 1 against, 0 abstain

Discussion:

Pisias added that one AGU recommendation that was favored by IHP was to establish an editorial review board, which would consist of a TAMU editorial representative, the TAMU staff scientist, the two cruise co-chiefs and one outside scientist (to be chosen by the TAMU Science Manager in consultation with the co-chiefs). This scientist could be a proponent, a cruise participant or a regional expert, for instance. Although the manuscripts are currently reviewed by two outside scientists, this editorial board could develop better peer review and rejection criteria.

TECHNICAL SERVICES BUDGET

Pisias asked PCOM to advise JOI on its recommendations for cutbacks to technical services as shown below:

SHIPBOARD TECHNICAL SERVICES
(Lab Specific)

		Maint. & Supplies	Sal	[# Techs]	Total*
1.	X-Ray Lab	$ 59K	$ 70K	[2]	$ 129K
2.	Sem Lab	12	--		12
3.	Chem Lab:				
	a. Total	150	140	[4]	290
	b. All but Safety	50	70	[2]	120
4.	Computer Maint.	58	70	[2]	128
5.	Offices/Library/Yeopers.	31	70	[2]	101
6.	U/W Geophysics	130	--		130
7.	Paleontology	16	--		16
8.	Thin-Section Lab	5	--		5
9.	Phys. Prop.	20	70	[2]	90
10.	Paleomag.	43	70	[2]	113
11.	Downhole Tools	65	--		65
12.	Core Lab/General	--	420	[12]	420
13.	Photo Lab	--	70	[2]	70
14.	Elec. Techs.	--	140	[2]	140
15.	Superv./Lab Officer	--	70	[2]	70
	TOTAL	$639	$1,260K	[34]	$1,899K

[Note: These numbers represent "full service" cost. Compromises in level of service and budget amount may be possible.]

Several PCOM members felt that reducing support for the XRF would hurt hardrock legs and reducing XRD support would hurt all legs. Robinson said that TAMU's compromise to have the XRD/XRF lab available on a leg-by-leg basis would result in difficult calibration and maintenance problems. Some members felt that through proper scientific party staffing, the labs could be used every leg, even without a dedicated technician. Pisias said that TAMU budget figures showed that $59K/year are required to maintain the XRD/XRF labs, which is not available for the coming fiscal year.

Several PCOM members felt that heave on the ship made the SEM the least useful of the tools, and that removal would not hinder shipboard science.
Pyle said that a total of $235K had been cut from technical support including XRD/XRF/SEM technician salaries. He urged, for future budget negotiations, that PCOM inform JOI on priorities for such cuts.

PCOM Consensus:

For FY88, the XRD will be available for all ODP cruises. The XRF will be available on legs for which XRF work is essential. Given sufficient notice, TAMU will try to staff cruises with invited scientists having XRF expertise such that operators will be available for these instruments.

Finally, PCOM asked that for future ODP budgets, $60K (the figure provided by TAMU for XRF/XRD lab maintenance) be set aside each fiscal year for full XRF/XRD support.

672 TAMU REPORT

L.Garrison reported for TAMU and gave updates on Legs 114 through 116, as well as the status of underway Leg 117. The co-chiefs of these legs will report further on the scientific results at the December PCOM meeting.

Garrison reported on the severe weather conditions on Leg 114 which resulted in only 1.48 days downtime. He did not feel that pipe triptime was slowed considerably on Leg 114 but recommended as much contingency time as possible be retained for the upcoming Kerguelen legs.

Garrison reported on the clearance problems with Legs 115 and 116, which were resolved with minimal loss to the science programs. At the time of this meeting, a verbal okay for clearance to drill the Oman sites for Leg 117 had been received.

SHIPBOARD LOGGING OPERATIONS

M.Langseth, DMP liaison, reported DMP's concern that logging time had been cut in half on Leg 115. Garrison responded that the co-chiefs were not solely responsible, as the Operations Manager knew the policy is to log all loggable holes greater than 400m deep. He said logging was a site-by-site decision on the leg and reviewed them: Sites MP 1, 2 and 3 and CARB-1 were required to be drilled by PCOM but MP 2 was not drilled due to clearance problems. MP 3 (705, 706) was shallow (121 mbsf) and not logged; Site 707 (CARB 1, 443m) was logged , but tool and bridging problems were encountered during Schlumberger runs 1 and 2 and the third suite was not run; Site 713 (191m) was not logged; and Site 715 (187m) was logged with the first two suites.

X.Golovchenko reported good cooperation with logging on Legs 114 and 116, but said the Operations Superintendent deferred to co-chief decisions on Leg 115. She said the side-entry sub (SES) was not rigged up for Leg 115 Site 707 when bridges were encountered. PCOM discussed whether ample time is alloted to use the SES when needed. Golovchenko said that the odd-numbered legs seem not to have taken time to deploy the SES; she estimated rig up time at 2.5 - 3 hours.

Garrison said that the logging policy would be reiterated to TAMU Operations Managers.

TAMU ENGINEERING

Pressure Core Barrel:

Garrison reported on the pressure core barrel Working Group meeting. Engineering funds have been set aside for FY88 and a prototype system is expected by FY89. The TAMU engineering group needs direction on types of data needed and testing requirements for the PCB system from PCOM. M.Kastner agreed to provide information to TAMU through the JOIDES Office. Pisias said that the pressure

core barrel group who provided the initial report to TAMU would also be asked to respond.

Navidrill Update:

The rotor system and flow-through latching mechanism failed on the Leg 114 testing of the Navidrill. Analysis was done by TAMU and the Clausthal petroleum engineering group and the Navidrill is expected to be modified and ready for Leg 118. U.von Rad suggested that a test in cherts at a German testing site be done, but Leg 118 will be the "real time" test of the system.

Mining Coring System:

Work for the MCS system is on schedule and a prototype for testing could be ready in late 1988. RFPs were sent out for a design for the system and several are under consideration; return mud flow systems, weight on bit, and adequate heave compensation are of concern to TAMU engineers.

Garrison reported on recent efforts to upgrade the shipboard 3.5kHz system (mounting an array with a dome on the bottom of the hull where the 12kHz system is currently mounted). Additional work will be done on the system, if needed, during the next drydock, probably in Nagasaki during November, 1990.

ODP CLEARANCES

Clearance updates from Garrison indicated that the French and Australian permissions should be no problems for the Kerguelen legs. A total of eight Kerguelen sites are in the Australian-claimed EEZ. Permission to drill both primary and back-up sites for Leg 120 was requested from the Australian government in early August. Garrison noted that because Australia has provided site survey data, Australians have been invited on Legs 119 (one scientist) and 120 (probably two participants).

LEG 116 REPORT

G.Brass and S.Gartner, PCOM participants on Leg 116, provided preliminary scientific results from the leg.

Brass reported on unusual temperature inversions at Site 718. He also discussed operations problems with bit releases. At 717, a record for XCB penetration (935mbsf) was achieved. He said that recovery in sandy turbidites was poor and will have to be addressed before the Nankai legs. S.Gartner reported on the stratigraphic results. Paleontological correlations were difficult as most forams and coccoliths were redeposited; thick fan sequences (to the top of the lower Miocene) were penetrated.

673 WIRELINE LOGGING SERVICES REPORT

X.Golovchenko reported for the Borehole Research Group. Good logs were obtained during the past four months, despite mechanical and operations problems. Sites 700, 703 and 704 were logged on Leg 114. The GST tool was run through the pipe

at Site 704 and lithologic units were clearly indicated. Corresponding Ca and Si signals appear cyclical, perhaps Milankovitch in origin.

On Leg 115, Sites 707 and 715 were logged. Only one complete suite was obtained from 707. Two standard Schlumberger logs were run at 715, even though this hole was shallower than 400mbsf. The section consisted of nannofossil ooze over carbonate reef , then basement; the changes in the reef structure were detected even with logging through the pipe.

On Leg 116, logging attempts were made at Site 717, but the BHA was lost with the pipe end above the seafloor and logging was not possible. The first logging attempt at Site 718 was only partially successful; after Site 719 was completed, the ship returned to Site 718, the hole was washed down and the logs completed. Successful logs were obtained at Site 719, with the changes in turbidite lithologies apparent from the logs.

POST-CRUISE ANALYSES

Spectral analyses from the Leg 113 logs are showing possible Milankovitch cyclicity, especially the obliquity signal. Work is being done on repeatability of logging results using Palisades diabase samples, and the logs are accurately picking out mineral zonations seen in the samples.

LOGGING TOOLS UPDATE

Golovchenko showed a schematic of the TAM wireline packer. Because it may not be ready for Leg 118 due to inflating problems, part of the packer will be used with Keir Becker's system on Leg 118. The U.Washington magnetic susceptibility tool will be tested on Leg 118.

A top priority for the DMP is purchase of a high resolution dipmeter for ODP use as a standard tool. This tool was originally recommended for FY87; DMP has reiterated that it is their top priority. Schlumberger can modify (slim for ODP) their existing formation microscannner (FMS) system for $160K. The DMP placed the acquisition of this FMS above the purchase of a third wireline packer. DMP felt the resolution with the FMS would be much greater than with the BHTV. Golovchenko showed overheads of two processed images from the FMS.

Discussion:

PCOM discussed possible heave problems with the FMS. M.Langseth, DMP liaison, further explained DMP's priority for this resistivity tool. He said the FMS could be used in sediments and semi-consolidated sequences whereas the BHTV is a basement tool. The FMS calipers can also determine hole orientation. Pisias explained that PCOM had accepted the third wireline packer purchase, and the FMS was the fallback tool in the DMP recommendations.

PCOM members then discussed cost/benefit of the tool, how much time would be required to run it, and the possibility of diverting these funds for additional back up tools for the ship. Langseth added that DMP "demoted" the third wireline packer for FY88 because its effectiveness has not yet been demonstrated. Golovchenko pointed out that once the standard tools are digitized, only two runs

would be necessary; the reduction in time for standard runs should free up time for running tools such as the BHTV and the FMS, if purchased. Some PCOM members pointed out that a decrease in time for standard logging runs did not necessarily guarantee that more time would be available for running additional tools.

U.von Rad asked that thematic panel input be available before purchase of the FMS. Pisias agreed that SOHP and DMP should be asked for ideas on this tool as its purchase has impact on the FY88 Program Plan. Golovchenko was to provide a short summary of the FMS capabilities for von Rad to take to the SOHP meeting. She also explained the financing for the tool: $100K for FY88 would go to Schlumberger to slim the tool; an additional $60K would be necessary for FY89 completion of the modification.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM defers recommendation on the purchase of the Schlumberger Formation Microscanner until reports from the Downhole Measurement Panel and Sediments and Ocean History Panel have been reviewed.

LOGGING SCHOOLS

Logging short courses were briefly discussed. An October course is scheduled in Germany. G.Brass noted that he has submitted a USSAC proposal to schedule a U.S. school in conjunction with the spring AGU meeting. K.Becker will attempt to organize the school.

674 COSOD II REPORT

M.Kastner, COSOD II Steering Committee member, reported.

The Steering Committee and the Working Group Chairmen will meet on 19-21 October to write the introduction and synthesis chapters of the COSOD II document, which will be based on the edited "White Papers" presented in Strasbourg. The final document will be out in late 1987 or early 1988 and will consist of:

1) An introduction and synthesis by the Steering Committee;
2) The revised "White Papers" from each Working Group;
3) A paper on logging/downhole measurements from DMP;
4) One technology paper, to be written by T.Francis, which will summarize the TAMU contributions;

5) An edited version of the APC vessel paper presented by Yves Lancelot at the COSOD II meeting; and
6) A list of all participants at the Strasbourg meeting.

Each Working Group report will include major scientific objectives, required technologies to achieve them and strategies for drilling. Prioritizations of drilling programs will be included in each "White Paper" and in the Executive Summary of the final report. At the post-COSOD II Steering Committee plus W.G. Chairman meeting in Strasbourg, some W.G. Chairmen wanted additional input on drilling times and other advice from the Working Groups before ranking important objectives.

Initial Requirements From COSOD II Working Groups:

Two distinct requirements are emerging from COSOD II. Working Group 1 (Global Environmental Changes) and 5 (Evolution and Extinction of Oceanic Biota) require a global program and increased drilling time, primarily APC/XCB. Needed technology includes tools for better recovery in sediments of varying composition and degrees of induration, and higher precision logging instruments.

The other Working Groups [W.G.2: Mantle-Crustal Interactions, W.G.3: Fluid Circulation and Global Geochemical Budget, and W.G. 4: Stress and Deformation of the Lithosphere (renamed from "Brittle and Ductile Deformation of the Lithosphere")] have more focused drilling strategies. Less global navigation is needed, and with the exception of an array of geochemical reference holes, fewer sites and deeper penetrations are recommended. Major new technologies and improved drilling techniques (speed and recovery) are required.

In the COSOD II report, two options will be presented for resolving these diverse requirements for ocean drilling:

Option 1: Moderately increase the present budget to allow for development of technologies for drilling holes up to three kilometers deep. Retain a single drillship - a less desirable option but probably more realistic for the next 10 years of programming.

Option 2: Significantly increase the present budget to develop technology for up to six kilometer penetrations and to provide for multiple drilling platforms. This option is envisioned as an optimal request for the next 20 years of scientific planning.

Initial Ideas for PCOM Consideration:

Kastner forwarded several items from the Steering Committee discussions with particular relevance to PCOM:

1) PCOM should recognize the existence of several fundamental differences in priorities between the COSOD II Working Groups and the recommendations of the current advisory panels.

2) The effectiveness of the present advisory structure for achieving the long-term goals set out by COSOD II must be examined.

3) The Steering Committee endorses the concept of a thematically driven program with focussed drilling plans and an advisory structure best suited for achieving it.

4) PCOM should consider the role of drilling proposals in a thematically-focused program.

5) Establish links with existing programs such as the Global Change Program, seismic networks (IRIS) and DOSECC, and also with industry.

6) Devote more time and funds for developing new tools. Routinely set aside leg time for testing of instruments and methods.

Discussion:

O.Eldholm was concerned that the Working Group recommendations would be prioritized by the Steering Committee only, and several PCOM members agreed that the COSOD II document should clearly state how and who made the final recommendations.

Robinson, a COSOD II participant, said that several Working Group 2 recommendations were not feasible (e.g.,6 km holes); he said that the LITHP white paper was a more viable document for the next five years of planning.

Pisias noted that an agenda item at the October EXCOM meeting will cover the instructions on how PCOM should incorporate the changes suggested from COSOD II. He noted that improved technology would be a major issue in achieving COSOD II recommendations. Without the COSOD II document in hand at that meeting, however, it may be too early to formulate any action by PCOM or the JOIDES panels.

675 INDIAN OCEAN PROGRAM

LEG 118

(P.Robinson, Leg 118 co-chief, was absent during this discussion.)

Pisias made note of letters received from Robinson and von Herzen which request clarification of the directive from PCOM for the deployment of the hardrock guidebase (HRGB) if weather and logistics require alteration of the Leg 118 drilling plan. The Leg 118 prospectus stated that if weather did not permit deployment, then the second priority "pogoing" would occur. Both co-chiefs were concerned about the possibility of achieving a deep hole in the gravel pit and then having to return to the median ridge to complete the PCOM mandate of HRGB deployment, therefore sacrificing science for an engineering test.

Garrison gave TAMU Engineering's concerns. The PCOM priority of median ridge drilling presumed using the HRGB. von Herzen is concerned that, if basement is reached early with RCB drilling in the gravel pit, then a cone could be set and the drilling continued. Garrison said it was unlikely that weather problems would effect the setting of the HRGB.

At the April 1987 PCOM meeting, the following motion was passed:
"To add the ten days gained through the delay of Leg 119 to the Southwest Indian Ridge Program, with deployment of the guidebase a first priority. With the additional time, the pogoing of the gravel pit is an option."

When this decision was made, PCOM considered that the 10 extra days could also be used for deployment of the HRGB if weather became a problem. In the letter from von Herzen, several scenarios were presented that discussed the operation plan of the leg in the event that weather did not allow deployment of the HRGB as outlined in the leg prospectus.

Garrison presented possible trade-offs in the scenarios from von Herzen, adding that the HRGB has been modified since the last use and approximately five days would be needed for a full engineering test of the HRGB itself. He presented figures compiled at TAMU Engineering which indicated that a total of $515K had been spent in FY87 on engineering and development costs (such as coring motors and bits) for the HRGB. Pisias added that the test would require TV surveying and spud-in time, and a total of between 9.3 to 15 days was a more realistic timeframe. However, this time would be committed at the beginning of the leg and could be completed in more severe weather than the setting of the HRGB.

PCOM discussed the various options for setting the HRGB and pogoing, and the following motion resulted:

PCOM Motion:

If weather conditions permit, a full engineering test, of 15 days duration, for the hardrock guidebase and drilling system will be conducted on Leg 118. (Motion: Larson, second Brass)

Vote: 13 for, 2 against, 0 abstain, 1 absent

Discussion on whether the TV will be properly heave compensated followed this motion.

LEG 119

L.Garrison provided an update on the safety review for the leg. The PPSP reviewed not just recommended sites, but large sections which could be safely drilled as backup. Drilling depth will be limited to 500m. Procurement of the MAERSK MASTER for ice support is complete and the logistics are underway for the leg.

He said that R.Schlich (IOP Chairman) had asked for a slight variation to PCOM's adopted drilling plan for the leg. Schlich proposed setting a re-entry cone at KHP-1 so as to have the option to return, if time allows, to get a deeper basement section since PCOM had not included basement site KHP-3. TAMU has no problems with this plan.

Nominated co-chief, K.Hinz, is unable to participate on Leg 119 and Birger Larsen (ESF) has been invited. J.Barron is the other co-chief. Staffing is underway for the cruise. Garrison said that the iceboat would be available for the southernmost Kerguelen site, as well as Prydz Bay, and will be released as soon as ice conditions permit.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM endorses the addition of two days to the Leg 119 program as outlined by TAMU (because of Freemantle port call logistics) and setting of a re-entry cone at KHP-1.

Auxilliary Science:

PCOM discussed proposed auxiliary science on the iceboat to be conducted during Leg 119. These are NSF-funded programs for sediment trapping and plankton studies. Garrison explained that TAMU had no objections and any extra fuel charges would be billed to USSAC. Some PCOM members were concerned that the auxiliary science programs were not solicited programs and suggested that future programs should be opened to the scientific community.

PCOM Motion:

PCOM approves the auxiliary science program (NSF-funded plankton and sediment trapping studies) scheduled to be conducted on the Leg 119 ice support vessel. (Motion Brass, second Langseth)

Vote: 16 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

LEG 120

Garrison reported that R.Schlich (F) and S.Wise (US) had been selected as co-chiefs. SKP-2 target depth has been re-estimated at 1000-1300 mbsf from the original 700m depth. If SKP-3 is dropped for safety reasons, then Schlich recommends setting a re-entry cone at SKP-2, which has been accepted by TAMU. The safety review for the Kerguelen sites has been rescheduled for October.

LEG 121

No changes were proposed to the program accepted at the last PCOM meeting for this leg. New site survey data has been processed and is now available for the south 90ER sites. There is time on the leg to drill all three 90ER sites and the four Broken Ridge sites.

Garrison noted that the termination port call has been changed to Singapore. Total leg time is now estimated at 54 days. He said that two days for testing of the mining coring system are scheduled if all of the scientific objectives have been met for the leg.

P.Robinson supported the addition of at least two days contingency time to all legs for such testing, if possible. Some PCOM members were concerned with co-chief decisions and how co-chiefs determine whether objectives have been sufficiently met. Garrison noted that the Navi-drill testing on Leg 114 was an integral part of the leg science but, that in some cases, engineering tests would be in addition to science. Pisias said that PCOM has the obligation to set aside extra days for testing that is separate from contingency time for weather and other possible delays.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM agrees that two or three days contingency time are warranted for Leg 121 in order to test the mining coring system.

LEG 122

(U.von Rad was absent during the discussion of this leg as he is a proponent of this program and has been suggested as a co-chief by some panels.)

A new estimate of drilling times for this leg was forwarded by U.von Rad at this meeting (Appendix E). PCOM members discussed the prioritizations of the Exmouth Plateau sites. In von Rad's revised summary of sites, it was stated that the proposed site EP12 will have better success than EP2. McDuff noted that DMP has recommended standard logging for this leg, although high resolution seismic work is desirable if the new digital sonic tool is available. A total of 53 days (42 for operations, 11 for transit) are currently planned. Pisias clarified that EP12 addresses the same objectives as EP2 and new site survey data suggest it will be a better site.

Co-chief recommendations for this leg appear in Appendix F.

LEG 123

At the last PCOM meeting, Leg 123 was scheduled to drill one Exmouth site (EP9B) and the Argo Abyssal Plain site (AAP1B). Pisias reported that the LITHP was particularly pleased that the Argo Abyssal Plain site was included on the Indian Ocean schedule. R.McDuff presented the DMP recommendations for the leg (developed at the August DMP meeting):

Site AAP1B: BHTV, VSP, hydrofrac testing, magnetic susceptibility tool run in basement section.

The SSP has noted that PPSP may find a safety problem with EP9B, and EP9E has been suggested as a default site.

Pisias reiterated that double coring of the Mesozoic section is not supported by the advisory panels. He stressed that old basement is a leg objective; Larson added that the chert problem in the Western Pacific make this the best site for recovery of very old oceanic crust.

Garrison reviewed the times for this leg: 10 days for the Exmouth site, 32 days for drilling and downhole measurements at AAP1B, 8 days for transit and 2 days contingency time (total 52 days); however, the available time for this leg is 56 days. PCOM also discussed the possibility of losing a deep hole at AAP1B, and, therefore, possible backup programs.

PCOM Motion:

Leg 123 is scheduled at 56 days, including transit. EP9B (or EP9E by default) will be drilled and the remaining time will be devoted to a deep hole at AAP1B. If this basement hole is lost, Site AAP2 is a backup site. The full logging program recommended by DMP (including the hydrofracture experiment) will be run at AAP1B (or AAP2 by default). (Motion: Robinson, second Brass)

Vote: 15 for, 0 against, 0 abstain, 1 absent

Co-chiefs nominated by PCOM for Leg 123 appear in Appendix F.

[Note: Garrison provided updated drilling times based on the revised program: 31 days to drill ca.250m into basement at AAP1B, 10 days for the logging program, 9.3 days for EP9B, and 8 days transit, for a leg total of 58.5 days.]

676 WESTERN PACIFIC PLANNING

Pisias opened the discussion. He reminded PCOM that a firm FY89 drilling program must be finalized at the Annual Meeting in December of this year. PCOM watchdogs were assigned to each of the top-ranked programs at the April meeting. Summaries of the programs, based on the WPAC Third Prospectus and pertinent proposals, were provided by the PCOM watchdogs before and during this meeting. The PCOM consensus items listed below were formulated and reviewed by the panel members and were included in a letter (Appendix G) to the Thematic Panel Chairmen and the Western Pacific Panel Chairman.

BANDA-SULU-S.CHINA SEA

G.Brass gave an overview of the objectives of the program. Concerns from Brass and PCOM included:

* Need for a unifying tectonic theme to address the ages of the basin openings and the structure and age of the crust between China and Australia.
* Many holes are proposed for 80-90 days of drilling; PCOM wondered if a reduced program could achieve the broad number of objectives in the area.
* The complexity of area, as evidenced in the magnetic anomalies, and whether limited drilling would address plate development, were discussed.
* Brass recommended a one-leg program consisting of one hole each in the Banda, Celebes and Sulu Seas, plus two in the S.China Sea, as a program which would address the first-order tectonic objectives.
* A "reconnaissance" leg in the area was suggested as DSDP did not drill in this complex area.
* The thematic panels should review the possibility of a hole in the Celebes Sea.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM feels that this program does not warrant more than one leg of drilling. PCOM feels that one leg would provide first order information on thematic problems related to the ages of these basins. PCOM requests WPAC to prepare a single leg program for this transect. PCOM suggests that the program should consist of one South China Sea Basin site, one Sulu and one Banda Sea site (with the latter sites being located on oceanic crust). For PCOM to consider more than one leg for this transect, WPAC must provide a well defined justification for drilling beyond one leg. A Celebes Sea site might be considered as part of this one leg program.

SUNDA

T.Francis gave an overview of the area and the scientific objectives. Concerns from Francis and PCOM included:

* The #9 ranking as a collision process leg by TECP
* Whether drilling results from the F1 and F2 sites can be used to time the thrusting and Australian collision
* The lengthy drilling time proposed.
* The late site surveys for the leg (less than a year before the leg could be scheduled).
* The amount of basement drilling proposed (about 68 days) and the short amount of time alloted to logging were discussed.
* New information (via a letter from D.Cowan, TECP Chairman, to E.Silver, a proponent) on the possible relocation of sites closer to Timor for a better relation of backthrusting in that area to the collisional process.
* Availability of Gloria data and possible postponement of the leg to follow the Japan Sea program.

PCOM Consensus:

Because of the low ranking by the thematic panels and the uncertainties about whether this leg can address collisional processes, PCOM cannot consider this leg for the FY89 program. However, if the planned site survey data and the proponents provide the TECP with justification that drilling in the Sunda region can adequately address collision processes, PCOM is willing to consider this leg for drilling beyond FY89.

T.Shipley expressed "amazement" that PCOM was making such constructive decisions.

S.CHINA SEA MARGIN

A.Taira gave the overview of the area and problems addressed there. Concerns from Taira and PCOM included:

* The proposed study area is an interesting passive margin with 30Ma crust and thin sediment cover; the area is complicated , however, by large nappe structures and may not be the best area for study of arc-backarc evolution and thermal history.
* The Western Pacific is better for active margin study
* New seismic data (with deep imaging of crustal structure) will soon be available and TECP may re-evaluate the program.
* This area may be the most accessible for drilling a back arc basin.

PCOM Consensus:

The South China Sea Margin continues not to be included in the WPAC drilling schedule. However, PCOM recognizes that new geophysical survey data available for this region, may result in a change in the thematic panel's ranking of this program.

BONINS

P.Robinson provided an overview of two legs proposed for the Bonin arc. Concerns and comments from Robinson and PCOM included:

* These programs integrate tectonic themes well in simple systems.
* The Bonin 1 program (Sites 1,2,5A,and 5B) addresses back and forearc progression and represents a solid leg of drilling.
* The Bonin 2 program (Site 7 diapir site, Marianas 2&3, and a Bonin reference site) is more problematic.
* LITHP is concerned with the proposed diapir drilling and whether the ridge itself is a better location.
* Drilling at least one diapir site to obtain information on hydrothermal fluids and alteration seemed a worthy objective; the Pacman seamount seemed a better choice if one is to be drilled.
* PCOM generally agreed that the Marianas sites be dropped.
* A better strategy for the proposed geochemical reference site at Bonin 8 is needed. PCOM agreed to deal with the reference site separately.
* The length of time to drill Bonin 6 (24+ days into basement) requires this site to be part of a second leg in the Bonins.

PCOM Consensus:

The Bonin program (Site BON 1, 2, 5a, 5b and 6) is considered by PCOM to be worthy of one and a half legs of drilling. TECP and LITHP are requested to provide scientific objectives which can be addressed with an additional half leg of drilling and their scientific justification. Specifically, PCOM requests scientific justification for drilling diapirs and/or the forearc terrace in the Bonins.

GEOCHEMICAL REFERENCE SITES

Because the Bonin program encompassed geochemical reference sites, P.Robinson also watched these dogs. Comments and concerns included:

* How to identify contributions to arc lavas from the components in the down-going slab and what tracers would be useful.
* A general review of proposed sites for a geochemical reference site (DPI, Marianas 4 and 5, Bonin 8 and 9).
* The need to drill a site in front of a well-studied arc was emphasized and whether results from a single site would be applicable to subduction zones elsewhere.
* TECP and LITHP views, as well as initial COSOD II remarks, views on reference holes were discussed. Robinson said that LITHP strongly endorses the concept in order to start understanding the problem.
* Whether an area with possible magma contributions from seamounts is an appropriate study area or if a simpler system is needed.
* A minimum strategy, comparing single deep holes versus several shallow holes, should be formulated.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM requests that LITHP provide the minimum strategy necessary for obtaining a reference hole(s) for the Bonin system. PCOM feels that the Bonins are the most appropriate place for drilling a geochemical reference hole(s). However, justification of drilling strategies are needed from LITHP.

NANKAI

M.Kastner reported on these programs and gave an overview of the proposals. (A.Taira, a proponent for Nankai, was not present during the discussion.) Comments and concerns of PCOM included:

* Whether the geotechnical leg is justifiably separable from the active margin and forearc basin program.
* High ranking from only TECP, not SOHP or LITHP.
* The interaction between hydrogeology, geochemistry and tectonics is not addressed by existing proposals: Is this a lost opportunity?
* Two deep sites are proposed by WPAC (NK1 and NK2). Kastner felt much science was lost in reducing the program to one leg; she suggested that as many as five to seven holes (to include NK1 and NK2) would be necessary to address fluid regimes, anisotropy, deformation and physical properties of sediments in the area.
* Problems similar to those on DSDP Leg 87 in penetrating the decollement and in recovering core may be encountered.

PCOM decided that a report on the geotechnical leg was necessary before a consensus could be reached concerning the Nankai program.

NANKAI GEOTECHNICAL PROGRAM

R.McDuff, watchdog, reviewed three elements of the program: 1) a series of special experiments contained in the Taira proposal, 2) the GEOPROPS probe proposal by Karig, and 3) the Japanese proposal for three years of temperature monitoring in the hole. Concerns and comments from PCOM and McDuff included:

* The Karig tool has only recently been funded by NSF and relies on the untested Navi-drill technology.
* TECP is still unsupportive of a separate hole for the geotechnical program.
* Downhole measurement time estimates are lengthy (13 days for NKT1 and 20 for NKT2). An oblique seismic experiment recommended at NKT2 has no identified proponent. Eleven days are devoted to the untested GEOPROPS probe.
* The DMP is concerned about leaving behind the temperature monitoring devices and whether the hole can be used for subsequent re-entries.
* A major concern of PCOM is whether the tools would be available for a FY89 program.

R.Larson, watchdog for the Zenisu program, thought its objectives needed to be considered in context to the Nankai program.

ZENISU

R.Larson reviewed the tectonic setting of the Zenisu Ridge in relation to the Nankai Trough. Concerns from Larson and PCOM included:

* Drilling in Zenisu may be needed to understand the timing and deformation relative to the main zone of crustal shortening.
* Only proposed sites ZE1 and ZE3 are recommended in order to constrain timing of the ridge formation; Larson considered the ZE3 site the more important if only one is to be scheduled.
* If the tectonics in Nankai are the most important objective, then Zenisu could be an important component.

PCOM Motion:

a) PCOM approves the Nankai Trough leg (NKT-1 and NKT-2) as presented in the WPAC Third Prospectus;
b) PCOM would consider at a later date (beyond FY89) a second leg which could include extensive geotechnical studies, downhole measurements and Zenisu Ridge drilling.

The thematic panels, especially SOHP and TECP, should examine proposed sites along the Nankai transect (NKT-3, NKT-5 and NKT-7) for possible development of a program to examine hydrologic processes in this accretionary prism.

PCOM recognizes that the Zenisu Ridge is part of the tectonic setting of the Nankai region. (Motion Brass, second Larson)

Vote: 14 for, 1 against, 0 abstain, 1 absent

Gartner forwarded a motion to vote separately on the recommendations contained in the above motion, but it was not seconded. Taira returned at the close of these discussions.

JAPAN SEA

M.Langseth, watchdog for the highly ranked programs in the Japan Sea, gave an overview of the area and reviewed the proposed sites. Eight separate proposals were effectively merged as many used the same sites. Concerns and comments from Langseth and PCOM included:

* The area is tectonically complex but because it has been extensively studied, has much available data (with the exception of the NW Japan Sea).
* Logging times were included in the prospectus, but extensive downhole measurements, including temperature at all sites, seemed appropriate.
* Vertical seismic profiling has been recommended at Site J1-B, along with oblique seismic and geoelectric logs, BHTV, magnetometer, and standard Schlumberger. Whether enough time is available for the downhole program at this site and at J2 and J2A was discussed by PCOM.
* THe balances and imbalances of the program were discussed. THe program has much basement drilling; Sites J3A, J1A, and J2A were discussed in context of

how rifting and rotation in the southern section could be determined. Langseth recommended that J3A be a re-entry site for stress measurements.

* Site Surveys: Cross lines are needed at the basin sites. Yamato Basin surveys should be reviewed to determine the what kind of crust underlies the area. Improved digital SCS is recommended for Site JS-2, but it could be drilled on the existing data.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM accepts the one and one-half leg program in the Japan Sea as presented in the Western Pacific Third Prospectus.

NORTHEAST AUSTRALIAN MARGIN

This program, formerly referred to as the Great Barrier Reef program, was reviewed by PCOM watchdog, S. Gartner. Pisias noted that the recent review by the Site Survey Panel was not encouraging, but problems may have been overstated. Proponents Davis and Symond informed PCOM by telex at this meeting that a new cruise for high quality survey work was being planned.

Gartner reviewed the geologic setting of the area. Concerns and comments from Gartner and PCOM included:

* The episodic nature of the subsidence of the carbonate platform since the Cretaceous will make it difficult to separate out the effects of eustatic sea level changes.
* Some PCOM members felt too many sites have been proposed. SOHP has indicated that two transects are needed to separate subsidence histories precisely for determining the sea level effect. A major concern was voiced that the overlap of the sequences occurred only in the mid-Miocene and separation would be impossible.
* Gartner noted that SOHP ranks the program highly because it is a mixed carbonate/siliciclastic regime.
* PCOM needed more definition of the phrase "diagenesis in an undersaturated ocean regime" as used in the Prospectus.
* Gartner pointed out that a major objective of the program is to determine why the extensive reef buildup stopped as subsidence alone was not fast enough.
* Some PCOM members thought Sites NEA1 and NEA2 had similar objectives. These sites, along with NEA3, are in a national park and drilling clearance will be an issue.
* Gartner confirmed that the program remains SOHP's first priority in the Western Pacific, although some PCOM Members still question it.
* PCOM briefly reviewed the Mississippi Valley Type deposits proposal submitted as an "add-on" to the program. WPAC did not insert the program because SOHP did not rank it highly. PCOM discussed the merits of studying the dynamics of the fluid flow system in the area even if MVT mineralization is not actually occurring.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM requests that SOHP provide PCOM with the specific objectives and their justification of this program, which holes address these objectives and how

these holes provide the necessary data to achieve these objectives. Specific concerns expressed during the discussions include how the effects of subsidence and sea level changes are going to be identified/separated. PCOM also found that some of the objectives listed in the WPAC Third Prospectus to be unclear and requests that the SOHP provide clarification.

LITHP is asked to provide its evaluation of the Mississippi Valley Type Deposits Proposal (268/D) for PCOM.

VANUATU

J.P.Cadet, PCOM watchdog, presented background on this proposal to study collisional processes and reviewed the proposed sites. Comments and concerns from Cadet and PCOM included:

* New French seismic data from the Bougainville Guyot is currently being processed. Good site surveys exist for the program in general (MCS, SCS and Seabeam).
* There is little sediment cover near the DEZ4 site for spud-in. Site surveys scheduled in winter of 1988 may help site location.
* The basin sites (Aoba and Coriolis) will address how the basins opened in response to collision. Less clear is how the D'Entrecasteaux Ridge reference site will address the collision.
* The lack of data from the Coriolis Trough make it a less convincing site for backarc study. No heat flow measurements exist from the Aoba Basin or the Coriolis Trough.
* Total time for the leg, as proposed, is two legs.
* Arc reversals are important in the area and it should be documented how timing will be constrained.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM presently considers this program to be a single leg of drilling. PCOM feels that the D'Entrecasteaux Ridge and Aoba Basin sites address an important thematic process and are of highest priority. The sites in the Coriolis Trough and also site BAT-2 are considered to be of lower priority. WPAC is asked to provide PCOM with a single leg program for this region.

LAU BASIN

U.von Rad, PCOM watchdog for the program, presented an overview of this young, actively spreading back-arc system. Comments and concerns from von Rad and PCOM included:

* The dredging of zero-age volcanics should help in location of the N.Lau spreading ridge; the Valu Fa system is a different type of volcanism, possible influenced by island arc magmatism.
* LG 2-7 (central Lau Basin) is a well-surveyed transect. LG4 has associated hydrothermal activity.
* The area has been well-surveyed, by groups from France, the U.S., Germany, and Japan. The current proposal represents contributions from five ODP

member nations and seven individual countries.

* More SCS work is suggested for the LG1, 2 and 7 transect. The success of this transect depends on the interpretation by proponent Hawkins of what type of basalt volcanism is present.
* Sediments are thin in some areas and drilling at LG1 (in a ponded basin) may not reach MORB-type basalt.
* The complexity of the area was discussed, ironically, in context of the wealth of data available. Some PCOM members felt that a single leg could not unravel the chronology of the spreading. The viability of the magnetic anomalies recorded in the area were discussed.
* In general, PCOM liked the back arc objectives of the leg.
* PCOM must know soon if barerock drilling will be involved.

PCOM Consensus:

At the present time, PCOM considers the Lau Basin to be an important region to examine backarc processes, specifically to examine volcanism and its relationship to the tectonics of the backarc. Drilling in the Lau region should focus on backarc processes. LITHP is asked to formulate two scenarios for a single leg of drilling; one leg without drilling on bare rock and one leg drilling on bare rock zero age crust. Specifically, LITHP should provide the scientific objectives for each of these scenarios and describe the relative merits of each. We wish to endorse the LITHP's recommendation that this program should be focused, and thus consider drilling the forearc not of prime importance.

TECP is asked to provide LITHP and PCOM with their views on the tectonic objectives to be addressed in the Lau backarc.

The Chairman concluded the deliberations on the Western Pacific with thanks to the "watchdogs" for their thorough reports.

[Note: PCOM subsequently agreed to continue the assigned Western Pacific watchdogs. The following switch was made to avoid any potential conflict of interest: M.Langseth for the Lau Basin and U.von Rad for the Japan Sea.]

28 August 1987

676 WESTERN PACIFIC PLANNING

STRAWMAN SCHEDULE FOR WESTERN PACIFIC

A strawman schedule was devised by Pisias and Garrison, using rankings of the programs, weather windows, and maturity of site surveys (Appendix H). Pisias made arrangements to get the results of the Western Pacific planning to the thematic panels and WPAC as soon as possible. The draft memo for WPAC and the thematic panels was prepared the evening of 27 August and discussed the next morning. Minor modifications were made and the letter (Appendix G) was to be hand-carried to appropriate panel chairmen by responsible members of PCOM.

677 EVALUATION OF ODP ADVISORY STRUCTURE

The Chairman opened the discussion on evaluation of the JOIDES panel system. He said it was important for PCOM to utilize the panels effectively so that planning, such as the previous day's dissection of the WPAC program, could also be effective. The thematic panels had been asked to provide PCOM with their views on the current structure for consideration at this meeting.

Issues of concern to Pisias were: approval of "off-season" panel meetings, early feedback to proponents, and possible implications of COSOD II on the current panel structure. He wanted to accurately represent PCOM's views at the October meeting of EXCOM, at which panel structure and a proponent-driven program will be discussed. Pisias presented a "flow chart" he recommended as a model for PCOM to consider (Appendix I).

Discussion:

G.Brass supported the model presented by Pisias and wondered if regional input could come from working groups instead of standing panels. He endorsed an "evolutionary, not revolutionary" approach to panel structure changes. Brass said that the proposal-driven concept did not work as well for broad thematic programs (e.g. global stress map and deep stratigraphic tests), but it ensured the openness in the program to non-JOIDES institutions and the scientific community at large.

M.Kastner presented viewpoints on both the current system and recommendations for a future system. She felt too much overlap existed between regional and thematic panels and recommended: retaining the thematic panels; inviting "regional experts" to the thematic panel meetings, when warranted; and increasing the scope (and possibly the number) of thematic panels. For a future system, she recommended:

1) appointing a subcommittee within PCOM to draft an expanded thematic panel system;
2) having PCOM as a whole vote on the subcommittee's suggestions and then revise the draft;
3) presenting the revised draft to the existing thematic panels for comment;
4) having PCOM then review the panels' suggestions. A final draft would be written by the subcommittee;and
5) presenting a final draft to EXCOM.

In reference to the upcoming CEPAC prospectus, Kastner suggested that the thematic panels prepare a prospectus for review by PCOM. PCOM would then send the prospectus to CEPAC for further evaluation. One more review by the thematic panels would be sent to PCOM for approval.

PCOM discussed the various proposals for the advisory structure, in particular, the role of regional panels as "proponents". Robinson suggested that expanded thematic panels and the Panel Chairmen structure be used to produce drilling prospectuses. Brass pointed out that PCOM had effectively used proposals and its own watchdogs to produce the six-leg Western Pacific schedule the previous day.

U.von Rad felt that data holders (e.g. site survey participants) should somehow be involved in the panel structure. O.Eldholm thought PCOM should be careful not to restructure the system without considering the contributions from the scientific community outside of JOIDES institutions. He also did not want to see a proliferation of thematic panels.

The various suggestions on advisory panels structure resulted in the following motions:

PCOM Motion:

PCOM should appoint a subcommittee, to include four PCOM members (2 U.S., 2 non-U.S.) plus EXCOM member, Ross Heath, who will consider and provide a draft of a revised JOIDES panel structure. (Motion Kastner, second Robinson)

Vote: 16 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

Pisias said he would try to draft a charge to the subcommittee (Appendix J) and thought PCOM had provided good information for presentation to EXCOM.

PCOM Motion:

PCOM accepts the solution presented by the Chairman (page 269 of the meeting agenda book and Appendix I attached) as the interim organization structure until a new panel structure is adopted. (Motion Brass, second Francis)

Discussion:

PCOM members discussed the interim solution especially with reference to CEPAC. Pisias said that the first input on a proposal should come from the thematic panels, and the regional panels should deal with the probability of success for given programs. He added that thematic panels currently look at proposals in depth (e.g. some assign watchdogs to proposals). PCOM agreed that major thematic issues should take precedence over "interesting problems."

Vote: 16 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

Discussion:

PCOM briefly discussed the situation of inactive panels (e.g. ARP). Unless the PCOM has specific questions of these panels, the Chairman suggested that meetings not be scheduled. PCOM concurred, but some members thought that inactive regional panels should provide long-range plans for their areas, thus should not be totally shut down.

The impact of the "interim solution" on CEPAC was discussed. PCOM agreed that CEPAC should develop a prospectus with programs previously defined by the thematic panels (see Central Pacific Planning below.)

[Note: PCOM also agreed to add the wording "probability of success" to the interim solution approved in the previous motion. See Appendix I which includes the rewording.]

ODP PROPOSAL PROCESS

PCOM discussed a "proposal-driven" program for ODP and how the interim structure would change the current process. Robinson felt that it would be difficult for an individual scientist to propose a broad thematic program. He suggested that PCOM and the thematic panels solicit proposals for important themes or develop them.

Kastner did not think a proposal-driven program would serve the long-term needs of ODP. Brass felt that the process should not be over-structured; he felt the thematic panels already operated much as described in the proposed interim solution. von Rad brought up the time lag factor for site surveys and whether the system would prejudice an interesting program just because the site survey is late. Pisias responded that a proposal is still the tool for considering a program, and new data should support a well-established scientific theme. He gave the example of Hole 504B as a program that has evolved with new data and continues to support thematic proposals.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM agrees that ODP will remain a proposal-based program.

Discussion:

PCOM discussed the membership of the Panel Advisory Structure Subcommittee and details of scheduling of meetings. [Note: The following PCOM and EXCOM members were asked to serve on and have accepted membership to the Subcommittee: G.Ross Heath, EXCOM; A.Taira and T.Francis, non-U.S.PCOM members; M.Langseth and M.Leinen (rotating onto PCOM for URI), U.S. members. See Appendix J.]

Pisias asked that PCOM consider adopting the process shown in Appendix K in order to keep proponents aware of possible deficiencies in their programs, as noted by the panels, so they have the opportunity to update them.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM approves the form (page 270 of the agenda book and Appendix K attached) as a method for the panels and the JOIDES Office to keep proponents better informed on the status of their ODP proposals.

678 ADDITIONAL IHP RECOMMENDATIONS

PART A PROCEEDINGS RECOMMENDATIONS

PCOM discussed additional (not FY88 budget related) recommendations from the IHP meeting in August (Appendix D) as well as addressed some concerns of the SSP that site survey data be included in the ODP Part A Proceedings.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM supports including summaries from pre-drilling site survey data in ODP Part A Proceeding volumes, whenever possible.

The above consensus assumed that the site survey chiefs would be bound by the same post-cruise publication restrictions agreed upon by ODP co-chiefs.

PCOM Consensus:

PCOM encourages publication of a preliminary scientific summary in the ODP Part A volumes, as was done in the Leg 104 volumes, whenever possible.

MICROPALEONTOLOGICAL REFERENCE CENTERS

Dalhousie University has proposed that the unclaimed (?) micropaleo collection be housed there. Confusion existed with PCOM over whether ODP had another to distribute. IHP has suggested that other institutions be offered the opportunity to apply for the curatorship, especially since Dalhousie is close to the Lamont collection.

PCOM Consensus:

IHP should provide more information on the requirements and recommendations for an additional ODP micropaleontological reference center.

OTHER IHP ISSUES

IHP made additional recommendations outside of publications at its last meeting (e.g. elimination of the TAMU DEC Pro350s. See Appendix D). PCOM agreed that these items should be deferred until the next PCOM meeting as they have budgetary impact for TAMU.

679 CENTRAL PACIFIC PLANNING

R.Larson (CEPAC liaison) opened the discussion as he needed information on planning to bring to the next CEPAC meeting. CEPAC has been given the thematic panel white papers and their rankings of proposals and themes. A major concern to PCOM is that the TECP listed example locations of its thematic interests, not proposals (see Appendix L).

As CEPAC has already begun its prospectus at PCOM's earlier direction, the instructions endorsed in the "interim solution" were reviewed in relation to CEPAC. PCOM agreed that CEPAC should evaluate programs in relation to maturity, adequacy of documentation and probability of success. Each of the thematic panels meet before the next CEPAC meeting and they were charged with providing CEPAC with their six highest priority projects for formulating the prospectus. An 18-month planning framework is still suggested for the CEPAC programs.

Pisias discussed the CEPAC planning in relation to the new mandate for PCOM to provide four years of planning ahead of the drillship. He said that an early sense of the CEPAC drilling will be needed for the PCOM annual meeting in December; a first prospectus from CEPAC will be needed for the spring PCOM meeting.

680 PANEL MEMBERSHIP

PCOM discussed nominations for several panel vacancies which should be filled for upcoming meetings.

LITHP

H.Elderfield (U.Cambridge, U.K. member-at-large) has been invited and agrees to serve.

Rotating off: J.Sinton (Hawaii)
J.Delaney (U.Wash.)

Nominations: L.Cathles (Cornell)
N.Sleep (Stanford)
J.Karston (U.Wash.)

[Note: Cathles, a hydrothermal processes geologist, has agreed to serve.]

DMP

PCOM previously nominated W.Givens, who declined. M.Salisbury (C) has asked to rotate off and Robinson was asked to follow-up with ODP Canada. S.Bell, a Canadian at-large member on DMP, is suggested as Salisbury's replacement.

Rotating off: F.Sayles (WHOI)

Nominations: R.Wilkens (HIG- physical properties)
D.Karig (Cornell - physical properties)
H.Vinegar (Shell - industry logging)

[Note: PCOM agreed that a physical properties member should be invited, but asked DMP to provide names of pore-water geochemists to replace Sayles. R.Wilkens has agreed to serve.]

TEDCOM

D.Wilson (Chevron) resigned and W.Lowe (Chevron) has accepted membership.

U.von Rad informed PCOM of the German ODP rotations which will be reflected in the October JOIDES Journal. PCOM briefly discussed the balance of membership expertise on PCOM as EXCOM has requested a tabulation of this for the October meeting (Appendix M). Kastner added that the non-U.S. members might take discipline balance into account when panel replacements are made.

681 PANEL CHAIRMANS' MEETING

Pisias asked that PCOM consider a Chairman for the Panel Chairman's meeting scheduled the day before the PCOM Annual Meeting (29 November 1987). D.Cowan (TECP) and L.Mayer (SOHP) were nominated. [Note: D.Cowan has accepted.]

682 DMP RECOMMENDATIONS

Several DMP recommendations were presented at their April 1987 and at the August meeting for PCOM action (See p.25 in PCOM agenda book and DMP Executive Summary from the August meeting).

R.McDuff (DMP Liaison) presented the recommendations from DMP, developed with the Physical Properties Working Group, on shipboard instruments suggested for FY89. The wireline packer/FMS issue impacts FY88. The item on vertical seismic profiling has been deferred until the VSP workshops results are in. McDuff reported that several of DMP's concerns on "acceptable risk" to the drillstring during logging have been resolved between LDGO and TAMU.

LOGGING THROUGH PIPE

DMP has asked that, whenever necessary, logging through the pipe with the geochem/neutron combination tool should be routinely carried out. PCOM agreed with DMP that a dedicated experiment for comparison of logs through the pipe with normal ones should be carried out, and endorsed DMP recommendation 1987/4:

PCOM Consensus:

> A more realistic definition of what constitutes an acceptable level of risk to the drillstring should be formulated. This definition should admit an element of risk since the occasional loss of a BHA is sustainable and would be costwise incremental to the cost of the drilling operation itself.

PCOM suggested that DMP provide possible sites and experimental design for a comparison test as LDGO does not have the data for a direct comparison. It was suggested that the physical properties members of DMP work with LDGO in designing such an experiment. Larson suggested the Argo deep hole as a possible test site.

683 FUTURE MEETINGS SCHEDULE

Pisias provided details of the upcoming 30 November- 4 December Annual meeting in Sunriver, near Bend, Oregon (Appendix N). He invited PCOM members to visit the JOIDES Office at Oregon State University if schedules permit. Robinson, who will be at sea then with Leg 118, announced that John Malpas would be his replacement at the meeting.

The next PCOM meeting is scheduled for 20-22 April, 1988, in College Station, TX.

PCOM tentatively blocked out the week of 29 August 1988 for the next meeting, to be hosted by the U.K.; this will be finalized at the Annual meeting.

R.Larson asked that the minutes reflect PCOM's thanks to Asahiko and Iko Taira for their logistics support and field trip planning during this meeting to which PCOM heartily concurred.

There being no further business to consider, the Planning Committee adjourned.