

# DRAFT

## JOI Site Survey Planning Committee

### Meeting Minutes

July 27, 1983, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory

#### ATTENDEES:

##### Committee Members

F. Duennebier, HIG, Chairman  
J. Hertzler, WHOI (for A. Uchupi)  
D. Hayes, LDGO  
J. Austin, UT  
J. Delaney, UW  
R. Hey, SIO (for L. Dorman)  
P. Rabinowitz, TAMU  
D. Bibee, OSU  
J. Detrick, URI

##### Others

J. Clotworthy, JOI  
A. Luhtanen, JOI  
C. Brenner, IPOD Data Bank  
G. Claypool, JOIDES Safety Panel  
D. Heinrichs, NSF  
P. Berella, NSF  
S. Shor, LDGO  
J. Ladd, LDGO  
R. Flood, LDGO  
P. Stambaugh, LDGO  
B. Naso, LDGO  
S. Cande, LDGO  
R. Leslie, LDGO  
G. Mountain, LDGO

#### CONTENTS:

- 1) Minutes
- 2) Letter from S. Shor
- 3) Blake-Bahama Report
- 4) Page 16, PCOM minutes (AODP work areas)
- 5) Harrison letter on Hawaii Peru-Chile proposal.
- 6) Rough draft of "general" RFP idea

#### AGENDA:

- 1) Drilling Program Status (JOI, J. Austin)
- 2) Review of Mississippi Fan Data (Shor)
- 3) Review of Morocco Data (Hayes)
- 4) IPOD Data Bank Report (Brenner)
- 5) Bahamas Site Survey Request (Ladd)
- 6) Barbados Site Survey ? (Ladd)
- 7) Chile Rise Survey ? (Cande)

- 8) Peru-Chile HIG-JOI negotiations
- 9) Review of Proposed Drilling Schedule
- 10) Generate RFP's

1. Meeting opened at 9:08 a.m. Reading of last minutes waived. D. Hayes questioned what happened to the "Letter of Intent" proposal we had worked on. Fred said letter was "put on hold" while new structure for decision making is worked out.

Jack Clotworthy went over program status. \$26.3 + international money for 1984. \$5.2 million for U.S. science program. ISAC looking at funds earmarked for U.S. science program. Drilling start target is Oct. 1, 1984.

Hayes: In JOIDES, the U.S. is represented by 10 different committees, foreign by one committee representing their country.

Austin: IUSAC draft proposal to JOI membership on U.S. National Science Activity due in September.

Hertzler (?): U.S. drilling-science will be run through USSAC and a Geophysics Committee and Special Experiments Committee. Soon to be passed by JOI Board of Governors.

Duenebier: SSPC still mandated to generate RFP's for site survey and act on PCOM minutes. To keep lead time of surveys ahead of drilling, we must act now if surveys are needed during the first two years of AODP--with or without a clear mandate from PCOM.

2. S. Shor: Review of Mississippi Fan Data. Survey successful. Four sites rejected by Safety Panel, four sites approved in middle fan. Good SeaMARC data, reflection, 3.5 kHz data. Series of holes approved on cross-line to lower fan. Good data from digitally recorded water gun (G. Mountain), and 3.5 kHz near-bottom pinger (R. Flood). S. Shor made several recommendations on site survey procedures. His letter is enclosed.

RFP's should be more clear about what data are required to be passed to JOI and IPOD data bank. "All data" not reasonable in SeaMARC and multi-channel operations.

Claypool: Fan sites rejected for possible production potential. SIO safety panel rejected some middle fan sites. Guidelines for safety requirements should appear in RFP. Many safety decisions more political than technical if area is possible production area.

3. (7/27, 11:20 a.m.) Hayes: Review of Morocco data. 2/3 NSF funding, 1/3 JOI. Two legs, mostly MCS with four 460 cu. in. air guns. Total sonobuoy coverage along MCS lines. Objective of defining eastern limit of oceanic crust. Excellent data acquired, suggest re-occupation of site 416 with basement hole, also site 547. Area around diapiric front of primary interest in terms of continental evolution.

4. IPOD Data Bank (Brenner)

Need distinct guidelines as to how and what data should be submitted to data bank. Currently only have LDGO multi-channel seismic data. Need data in reproducible form. Large negatives best. Will write guidelines (enclosed).

Data Bank has almost no data from foreign site surveys and no way to get it.

Rabinowitz: Let's suggest that site data must be in the data bank before drilling is even considered (really a PCOM problem, not SSPC)

Brenner: New catalog of IPOD data available from data bank. Will send copies to every marine institute and JOIDES panel.

Discussion about future of IPOD data bank. Future in question. Will it stay at LDGO? Funded by U.S. funds or International? What is level of proposed funding? Need answers from USSAC or PCOM.

5. J. Ladd: Bahama Drilling Program. Drilling in Bahamas endorsed by PCOM and PMP. Necessity for site survey discussed by ad-hoc committee of which J. Ladd was a member. Ladd discussed report of committee noting definite need for site survey (enclosed).

Discussion followed as to necessity of site survey. Obvious consensus that while much data was available, more is needed to define drilling targets. While essential data may be there, it is extremely desirable to get more.

6. J. Ladd: (This is a site proponent presentation.) Barbados is listed in the PCOM minutes as not in need of further site survey. Ladd noted a need for more surveys done to satisfy scientific goals rather than just drilling goals. While data are satisfactory to site drilling, they are not adequate to tie down science.

The usual discussion on the purpose of site surveys followed. Pertinent points (flavored by my personal bias follow):

Ladd: Site Surveys should address science--not just drilling and safety requirements.

Duennebier: SSPC by mandate supports drilling. Science is funded by ONR, NSF. We cannot compete with them, cannot accept unsolicited proposals, and can only write contracts for performance of specific tasks, not grants like NSF.

Hertzler: Mission is changing.

Hayes: Drilling is tool to solve problems. Must be concerned with science and not be so site specific.

Clotworthy: Bahamas only area clearly mandated for site survey at this time.

Duenebier: We must write RFP's--we cannot grant contracts for unsolicited proposals. This may change, but it hasn't yet. Unfortunately, SSPC is responsible for surveying sites as defined by PCOM, NOT NECESSARILY AREAS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO U.S. SCIENTISTS. Hopefully, this will change.

Hayes: We can write RFP's for any area listed in PCOM minutes. (See later discussion.)

7. (Due to constraints on S. Cande's schedule, his presentation was made directly after lunch.) Note: This is the presentation of a site proponent. Dr. Cande requested time to make a presentation to the panel to convince us of the necessity of a survey and synthesis in the Chile Rise area prior to drilling. The problem with how the panel should react to such presentations is discussed later.

S. Cande noted that with the R/V MOANA WAVE being in the area (Peru Chile Site Survey) in the fall of 1984, there is an excellent chance to conduct a much-needed survey at the Chile Rise drilling site. The area has many targets that would benefit greatly by use of SeaMARC II swath-map capability on the MOANA WAVE. Still many questions on the dynamics of the triple junction. In addition to survey, a synthesis of available data is needed.

Meeting Minutes  
July 28, 1983

AGENDA:

- 1) Discuss latest PCOM minutes
- 2) Discuss USSAC Proposal
- 3) Review drilling plan
- 4) Per-Chile contract status
- 5) RFP's:
  - Bahamas
  - Chile Rise ?
  - Others ?

1. PCOM Minutes Review.

Drill string loss. Where will core repository (ies ?) be? AODP vessel equipped with ZODIAC. January 1985 more realistic start-up date. Motion on p. 19 - surveys needed in Norwegian and Weddel Sea.

2. USSAC Proposal Draft Review.

No mention of data bank. Duenebier: Emphasis on international program, not enough emphasis on U.S. interests. Looks like U.S. could end up picking up dregs of site surveys again. How will JOI-funded committees handle unsolicited science proposals?

How will new ideas get into the system? Funding Workshops? Need some other method besides NSF to promote good (and wild) ideas. Maybe publish "letters of interest" in a particular problem so people with similar interests can get together.

### 3. Drilling Plan.

Bibee: How can we get ahead with site surveys? Site surveys should be done before drilling plan is set. USSAC, or equivalent, should define where JOI SSPC (or equivalent) will request surveys. JOI SSPC should think of U.S. interests. Need more presentations like Cande on Chile Rise to evaluate potential and problems.

Page 16 of PCOM (TABLE A, attached) minutes gives list of proposed sites. Panel members disagree with PCOM evaluation on status of site data for many areas, but we don't have data on hand, so can't evaluate objectively.

How do we get data needed to evaluate problem, access necessity for survey or synthesis, and write RFP's?

- 1) Have site proponents make presentations? JOI could fund.
- 2) This panel collate all data through IPOD Data Bank?
- 3) Ask that data be submitted to data bank before consideration.  
Request PCOM to comply.

John Ladd was formally requested to collect all data relevant to areas of possible interest to SSPC from p. 16 of PCOM minutes. Also get ship schedules.

MOTION: Hayes. "Have JOI, IUSAC, clarify status of SSPC at earliest possible time". Passed.

Fred will send letter to JOI, Schlanger, Davies (not done yet).

### 4. Peru-Chile.

C. Harrison (review committee chairman) reviewed new Hawaii proposal and recommends acceptance by JOI (letter attached).

MOTION: Made and passed to recommend JOI accept Harrison recommendations and write contract for Peru-Chile survey.

Hayes noted that SSPC too filled with conflict of interest in this area--that Harrison committee recommendation should hold anyhow.

### 5. RFP generation.

Discussion on status of SSPC. Lame Duck? What is needed? Are we mandated to allocate \$5 million for site surveys and syntheses? When will new committees start?

Decision made to write RFP for Blake-Bahama site survey based on Schlager ad-hoc recommendation. J. Delaney given task of writing specifications for survey.

G. Claypool. Proposed standard paragraph safety requirements for site surveys. Noted that it is a great idea to have Safety Panel member at SSPC meetings--especially important at proposal evaluations. Paragraph was written, accepted by panel, and incorporated in RFP.

Discussion on necessity for data synthesis in equatorial fracture zone (Atlantic). John Ladd to write for afternoon discussion.

Panel noted lack of warning and clarity of mission. If we are to write RFP's we need more information. If panels and site proponents request drilling and/or site surveys in a particular area, they should present a formal package to the appropriate groups including the SSPC (or its equivalent).

Recommend that PCOM demand formal data package for any site to be considered for drilling, and that this package be submitted to the IPOD data bank for use by the panels, and the SSPC.

Discussion on whether Chile Rise RFP appropriate. General concensus was that while it may be appropriate, so might other areas and can't give preference just because a pitch was made for it.

Hayes. Should we submit "general" RFP asking for mini-syntheses of all areas on AODP list? Fred will attempt to write and circulate to panel members (very rough draft attached).

Bahamas RFP reviewed and revised by Austin, Ladd. Subsequently edited and passed to hotel to deliver to Clotworthy for inclusion in formal RFP. Subsequently lost by hotel, rewritten by Duennebier.

Equatorial Fracture Zone RFP delayed and put in same group as all other areas where drilling is proposed.

Meeting broke up at approximately 4:00 p.m., July 28.

Next meeting will probably be at the Fall AGU.