DRAFT MINUTES
JOI Site Survey Planning Committee
March 29, 1983, DSDP, La Jolla

ATTENDEES:

MEMBERS:

Dr. F. K. Duennebier, HIG, Chairman
Dr. J. A. Austin, Jr., UT-Austin
Dr. L. D. Bibee, OSU
Dr. R. Detrick, URI
Dr. L. Dorman, SIO
Dr. C. Harrison, Miami
Dr. J. Ladd, L-DGO (Alt. for Dr. D. Hayes)
Dr. M. L. Holmes, UW
Dr. P. Rabinowitz, TA&M
Dr. E. Uchupi, WHOI

XOFFICIO:

Mr. Carl Brenner, IPOD Data Bank
Mr. Andrew Luhtanen, JOI

GUESTS:

Dr. M. Salisbury, DSDP
Dr. J. Natland, DSDP
Ms. Terri Duennebier, HIG

I. Convene meeting.

The meeting was convened at 0840 by the Chairman.

II. Voting on new member:

Dr. Detrick was asked to leave the room while the panel debated his qualifications, fitness, and desirability as a member of this panel. There was no discussion and the approval was unanimous.

III. Report on Last Proposal Review by Dr. Harrison:

1. Discussion:

a) Chris noted that Dr. Hussong, PI on the selected Peru-Chile proposal, had objected to several of the cuts recommended by the panel, particularly cutting Dr. T. Hilde. It was

noted that PI's often do not justify all personnel mentioned. Omissions of this sort should be brought to the attention of PI's in the preliminary review.

b) Chris noted that part of the success of HIG's proposal was that they could do more science for less money because of their low ship cost.

c) Chris noted that the Morocco survey was much less expensive than Peru-Chile because of cost-sharing with NSF (Heinrichs). They will pay about 2/3, JOI 1/3. A letter from R. von Huene objecting to funding this proposal and not Peru-Chile was unjustified in that both proposals received high reviews, and Morocco was certainly not marginal. Peru-Chile funding was deferred due to lack of money.

d) El Uchupi offered that the review panels should feel free to cut and chop budgets as they see fit. A. Luhtanenn agreed, it being the panel's charge to come up with the best survey contract possible. Phil Rabinowitz disagreed with the view that PI's should be given a "bottom line" and allowed to allocate as they see fit. Andy returned that this would be fine for a grant, but not for a contract.

e. J. Austin questioned whether the Peru-Chile proposal review would be reopened now that HIG will put in a new budget, almost certainly higher than the original because of inflation and use of a different ship. Dr. Duennebier suggested that since the proposal in question was from HIG, that he should not take part in this discussion (but he did anyway). The panel decided that if the new funds become reality, HIG's final proposal will be reviewed by the original review panel with the object of approval or reopening the review process based on expected changes.

f) J. Austin questioned procedures in having PI's attend review panel meetings, in that only PI's are invited, not subcontractor PI's or co-PI's. C. Harrison noted that the PI is responsible for bringing as many persons as he sees fit to present his proposal in the best light.

g) El Uchupi noted that the panel should review the Morocco data prior to processing to recommend what MCS data, if any, should be processed as part of the site survey package. (See later discussion on next meeting.)

h) C. Harrison noted that most PI's left after their presentation at the review meeting and were not available during discussion to answer questions. An agenda for such a panel meeting was discussed with the first day being proposal review by the panel alone, the second day presentations, and the third day (if needed) for further discussion. PI's should be aware of what is expected of them as well as possible. Further discussion of

review process put off until next day.

IX. Report on PCOM Meeting (Dr. Duennebier):

Excerpts from minutes read to panel. SEDCO option, panel restructure. Recommended sites. The Safety Panel noted that they want more high-resolution survey lines (upper 500 m), more velocity information, regional information, denser line spacing, and earlier input into the survey process.

V. Report on JOIDES Site Survey Panel Meeting (Dr. Duennebier):

Maps showing recommended sites, sites scheduled for survey, and sites needing survey presented.

VI. Current Status at JOI (A. Luhtanen):

Revised drilling programs are sent to NSF. Almost certain to get enough funds returned to do Peru-Chile survey and possibly $500,000 for one more. Expect total of about $4M for surveys through FY 1984.

1. Fred noted that without a firm drilling plan, the allocation of this money is a great departure from our past mode of operation; in the past the panel was told explicitly where surveys were needed and charged only with seeing that they are conducted. We now are apparently also charged with deciding where they will be done.

VII. Drilling Status Report (Dr. M. Salisbury):

Review of last few legs and expected drilling to completion of program. Expect a 10-month hiatus in drilling before new ship is available.

VIII. FY 1983 Additional Funding:

F. Duennebier: Should we fund Peru-Chile if additional funds become available in FY 83, and possibly one other survey.

J. Austin: MOTION: Peru-Chile is the highest priority survey, recommended by several panels. Move that the contract not be awarded to HIG until the final proposal is reviewed by the review panel.

Motion passed by unanimous vote. (Duennebier abstained due to conflict.)

The panel decided that since there was only a small chance that we would lose the additional $500,000 if we didn't use it for an additional FY 1983 site survey, that we should not choose another special survey since none were particularly pressing.

IX. Post Survey Review:

The panel decided after much discussion that all surveys would be reviewed from three to six months after the survey cruise. The purposes of the review are:

1) Evaluation of methods as guidance for future surveys.

2) Evaluation of data adequacy. A Safety Panel member and the site proponent will be invited to the review.

3) Recommendations for further processing, and site survey package.

The first such review will be held in July to review the Mississippi Fan and Morocco site survey results.

This review will be made a requirement for all future surveys and funds for travel to a SSPC meeting should be included in all proposals.

X. Survey Request Review:

The panel than divided up to review all available information on site surveys requested by the various panels. SP4 should be commended on the completeness of their site request package.

After lunch, the recommendations of each panel were listed (OPP, AMP, OCP, SP4, PMP). Several important facts should be noted:

1) The panels are <u>international</u> panels and do not necessarily reflect the desires of U.S. scientists with regard to drilling priorities.

2) Many of the recommendations were made prior to knowledge that a significant amount of survey funds would be available, or that the drilling program would be continued for that matter.

3) So many sites are specified that need surveys, they would be hard to prioritize.

4) With panel structure changing, priorities will change.

Dr. J. Natland gave us a review of the OCP panel recommendations.

XI. RFP generation suggestions:

Several suggestions for proceeding with the intent of ending up with a request for site survey proposals were discussed:

1) Select the high priority sites from each panel's list.
<u>Problem</u>: Does not reflect desires of U.S. science community.

2) Let proposers choose any site on the map of sites needing surveys prepared at the IPOD Site Survey meeting.
Problem: Large number of sites, also may exclude sites of interest to U.S.

3) Select list of problems to be addressed and let proposers address site surveys in terms of scientific problems such as passive margin tectonics, back-arc spreading.
Problem: Too broad. Ignores site planning already begun by panels.

4) (P. Rabinowitz) Request letters of intent or interest from U.S. scientists and select areas for site survey RFP from letters.
Problem: Lengthens time necessary for review process.

After much discussion the panel decided to try option 4. This option has the advantage of potentially being the most fair to all U.S. scientists. It places U.S. site survey planning in a mode similar to that of other JOIDES countries rather than in the "mop up" mode we have been in in the past.

It was decided to think about it and call Jose Honnorez (PCOM Chairman) and Jack Clotworthy (JOI General Manager) before proceeding. The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:00 p.m.

F. Duennebier talked to Jack Clotworthy and Dr. Honnorez. Mr. Clotworthy wanted to make sure that JOI did not appear to be a granting agency competing with NSF. The RFP's are for specific contracts. Both Mr. Clotworthy and Dr. Honnorez agreed that the mode of operation of the JOI SSP must change. There is certainly some question as to whether this is the panel that should decide where surveys should be conducted, however.

The panel notes that the JOI Site Survey Planning Committee is the only completely U.S. science panel, thus it should be qualified to make such decisions.

XII. Request for Letters of Intent:

The meeting was reconvened on Thursday March 31 at 0845. A trial letter to be sent to U.S. scientists and published in EOS and Geotimes (first draft by Fred) was put on the board and discussed. With some revision, the letter was adopted (Appendix). The three maps from the JOIDES SSP meeting and reference to the COSOD and Post-1983 Planning Document will be included. The letter will be distributed by JOI with a deadline for submission of letters by June 15 to JOI. JOI will send the letters to Fred who will distribute them to SSP members for review. If there is a large response, every letter will be sent to at least two members. Letters will also be sent to subject Panel chairmen for comment. Generation of the RFP will be done at the JOI SSP meeting in July. Proposals would then be due in December 1983.

Although this adds another step in getting site surveys, the SSP agreed that input from the U.S. science community was necessary.

There was no discussion on how we will generate an RFP from the letters received. Since this is a "first" we will best decide that when we see what response is obtained.

XIII. Tape Copying:

John Ladd and Carl Brenner asked if the panel would support copying tapes that are now 3-5 years old and starting to lose their integrity. The panel agreed in principle but needs a concrete proposal. Are we talking about only data in the IPOD Data Bank or all data collected in site surveys (i.e., Texas MCS data)? The question was tabled until the next meeting. John Ladd and J. Austin will obtain more cost information.

XIV. Proposal Review Process:

The Panel reviewed the JOI, Inc. "Procedures for Conduct of the U.S. Site Survey Program and Contractor Selection" (Appendix C), and suggested several changes:

1) Page 10, delete Item B.1.

2) Page 11, Item C.1: change "Availability" to "Availability and Commitment".

3) Page 11, Item C.2: change "track" to "plan".

The survey evaluation plan form was modified as follows:

1) Item B.1: eliminated and scores changes from 100 to 125 for remaining four "B" items.

2) Item B.3: delete "and on board research and".

3) Item B.4: delete "R/V and".

4) Item C.1: add "and commitment" after "Availablity".

5) Item C.2: change "Track" to "Plan".

MOTION: J. Austin moved that the above changes be recommended. Seconded and passed unanimously.

Discussion: The panel agreed that the mail reviews should be sent to proposers in time for them to respond and rewrite their proposals as necessary in time for the review panel meeting.

MOTION: C. Harrison moved that JOI, Inc. should be encouraged to pay review panel members an honorarium equivalent to that NSF pays its review panels (currently $150/day).

Seconded and passed unanimously.

XV. Next Meeting:

The next JOI SSP meeting will be held at L-DGO on July 27 and 28, 1983. The following items will be included on the agenda:

1) Recommendation for tape copying.

2) Review of Mississippi Fan Site Survey.

3) Review of Morocco Site Survey.

4) Review of letters of intent.

5) Preparation of site survey RFP's.

Fred Duennebier will write to S. Shor and D. Hayes concerning their survey reviews. A safety panel member will also be invited.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

APPENDIX

DRAFT LETTER

Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. is planning to issue a request for proposals in August, 1983, to conduct site surveys for deep sea drilling in regions of particular interest to U.S. scientists. In order to determine what surveys would best suit the needs of the community, JOI, Inc. requests letters of intent to submit site survey proposals.

U.S. scientists and groups of scientists with interests in regions that would benefit scientifically from deep sea drilling are urged to reply to this request. In some cases, additional field work may not be required, but only synthesis of existing data; requests for this type of study will also be considered. Scientists with interests in an area, but without the facilities to conduct a survey should attempt to coordinate efforts with a potential surveyor.

From the results of this request for letters, JOI will determine what regions are of most interest to U.S. scientists, and those which have the best potential as scientific drilling targets. A request for proposals to conduct site surveys or data syntheses will then be issued.

Letters should be no more than 1,000 words long, including: (1) a statement of the specific problem or problems to be addressed by drilling; (2) a definition of the region to be surveyed; (3) a summary of existing data; and (4) survey methods and data necessary to prepare for drilling.

Letters are due at the JOI office by June 15, 1983.

Scientists requiring more information are referred to the following documents:

COSOD
Post-83 Drilling Doc.
included maps