

Operations Committee (OPCOM) Meeting

17 March 1998
Boulder, Colorado

DRAFT MINUTES

OPCOM Participant List

Members

Robert Carter	University of Townsville, Australia
Dave Hodell	University of Florida, Gainesville
Susan E. Humphris (Chair)	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
J. Casey Moore	University of California, Santa Cruz
Jim Natland	University of Miami, RSMAS
Kensaku Tamaki	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan

Liaisons

Mahlon Ball	US Geological Survey, Denver (PPSP Chair)
Jack Baldauf	Science Operator (ODP-TAMU)
Joris Gieskes	Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SCIMP Chair)
Bruce Malfait	U.S. National Science Foundation
Nick Piasias	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
Mary Reagan	Wireline Logging Services (ODP-LDEO)
Shiri Srivastava	Geological Survey of Canada Atlantic (SSP Chair)

Guests & Observers

Warner Brückmann	GEOMAR, JOIDES Office Science Coordinator (elect)
Christina Chondrogianni	JOIDES Office, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Kathy Ellins	JOIDES Office, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
John Farrell	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
P. Jeff Fox	Science Operator, ODP-TAMU
Dave Goldberg	Wireline Logging Services (ODP-LDEO)
Bill Hay	GEOMAR, SCICOM Chair (elect)
Kate Moran	Geological Survey of Canada Atlantic
Tom Janecek	Florida State University (SCIMP Chair - elect)
Shirley Waskilewicz	JOIDES Office, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

Apologies

Alister Skinner	British Geological Survey, TEDCOM Chair
-----------------	-----------------------------------------

Summary of OPCOM Consensus Items

Consensus 98-1-1

In response to the possibility of a loss of 2 days to Leg 179 due to the installation of the lower guide horn, OPCOM confirms the following prioritization of operations: hammer drill testing, drilling of the NERO/ION hole, the offset seismic experiment requiring a rendezvous with the RV *Sonne* (two ship experiment), followed by the other planned experiments.

Consensus 98-1-2

OPCOM recommends to SCICOM the following prioritization for the use of any additional SOE funds that become available in FY'99:

OPCOM Recommended Prioritization of ODP SOE Options for FY 1999

1.	GLT - Leg 185	\$ 87K
2.	1 Operational Hammer	\$157K
3.	WST - Leg 184	\$ 19K
4.	WST - Leg 183	\$ 19K
5.	VSP - Leg 186	\$ 45K
6.	ARI - Legs 183, 185, 186	\$ 30-40K each

Other Big Ticket Items:

DML	\$450K
Microbiology lab	\$200K
1 Operational Hammer	\$157K

Other Items (in no particular order):

Borehole Stability Project	\$ 16K
CORESEIS	\$ 27K
Gas Chromatograph	\$ 55K
XRD	\$150K (\$60K - used)
Data Migration	\$???

The following items were deferred pending further information:

Mirror Web Sites	\$ 50K per site
SSDB Computer Tech	\$ 72K

(Note: SCICOM/OPCOM made some changes to this priority list at their joint meeting the following day).

Consensus 98-1-3

OPCOM accepts the SSP recommendation that the winter deadline for submission of data to the Data Bank be changed from January 1 to February 1.

Consensus 98-1-4

OPCOM accepts SCIMP Recommendation 98-1 that the 6-month deferral period prior to sampling the Permanent Archive (PA) no longer be required. Implementation of the PA sampling should be overseen by the ODP Curator on a core-by-core basis, and the approval of the CAB for requests to sample the PA will be required in each case.

Consensus 98-1-5

OPCOM notes SCIMP Recommendation 98-5 regarding the importance of sequential drilling and logging of sections of a drillhole, and encourages Co-Chiefs to consider this in their cruise planning and operations.

Consensus (by E-Mail) 98-1-6

OPCOM accepts the recommendations made by the Micropaleontological Reference Center Lead Curator regarding the distribution of slides to various paleontological investigators.

Summary of OPCOM Action Items

Action Item 98-1-1A

ODP-TAMU will complete the document on the policy and procedures for drilling in strong currents in time for the August SCICOM/OPCOM Meeting.

Action Item 98-1-2A

OPCOM requests that ODP-TAMU provide a written report to the JANUS Steering Committee and SCIMP on the problems encountered on Leg 177 that resulted in no paleo-data being entered in the JANUS database. The JANUS SC will review this report to determine what changes need to be made.

Action Item 98-1-3A

OPCOM requests that the JOIDES Office work with ODP-TAMU to ensure that responsibilities for scientists participating on an ODP leg are clearly set out and communicated to scientists.

Action Item 98-1-4A

OPCOM request ODP-TAMU to investigate the possibility of requesting donations of used equipment (in particular, gas chromatographs) to ODP.

Action Item 98-1-5A

OPCOM requests that SCIMP develop a plan for the archiving and distribution of ODP data and publications in order that OPCOM can have adequate information to make decisions on such things as web sites.

Action Item 98-1-6A

OPCOM requests the LDEO-BRG conduct a critical review of the status of high temperature tools for a potential leg in the Manus Basin based on Proposal 479, the Pacmanus felsic-hosted hydrothermal system. In their review, LDEO-BRG should consider input from the SSEPs on the types of measurements that are desirable.

Action Item 98-1-7A

The JOIDES Office will request that the Nankai proponents work with the SSEPs, ODP/TAMU, and LDEO-BRG to clearly define their overall drilling and logging strategy prior to the August SCICOM Meeting. Note: Confusion is connected to whether the SSEPs support a one or two leg program, and which experiments (packers and CORKs) and logging programs will be carried out.

Action Item 98-1-8A

The SCICOM Chair will communicate with the SSEPs Chairs prior to the May meeting in order to clarify the role of the SSP liaisons as conveyors of important site survey information on proposals.

Action Item 98-1-9A

OPCOM requests that SCIMP develop an integrated policy for sampling, data, and publications in collaboration with the ODP Publications Office and the CAB. This will include revision of the section of the ODP Publications Policy that addresses the issue of "non-performance" and which defines the obligations of the scientists participating on ODP Legs.

Action Item 98-1-10A

The LDEO/BRG liaison to SCIMP will present a summary of the proposed logging plans of highly regarded proposals to SCIMP for their comment.

Action Item 98-1-11A

The SCICOM/OPCOM Chair will communicate with OPCOM members regarding acceptance of the of the recommendations made by the MRC (Micropaleontological Reference Center).

Action Item 98-1-12A

SCIMP will identify a liaison to the Deep Biosphere PPG.

Action Item 98-1-13A

The SCICOM Chair will inform the national committees of the need for an individual with microbiology expertise to serve on SCIMP when next there is a membership change on the panel.

Action Item 98-1-14A

OPCOM requests that ODP-TAMU include the plans for the expansion of the DML in the bid packages to go out to dry -dock vendors, with some caveat, so that it would be possible to fund this project in the event that sufficient cost-savings become available.

A. Welcome and Introductions

Humphris introduced members, liaisons, and guests. She extended a special welcome to the ODP Acting Director, Nick Pias, and also to Bill Hay and Warner Brückmann, the future SCICOM Chair and Science Coordinator respectively, of the 1999-2000 German JOIDES Office. Meeting host Jon Overpeck reviewed the logistics for the meeting.

B. Proposed Agenda - Addition of Any Other Items

Humphris reviewed the Agenda and noted that this meeting would include a one-day joint SCICOM/OPCOM session. The idea for this one day of overlap is to avoid reports being repeated, and to permit long range planning to be done in conjunction with SCICOM. OPCOM will consider outstanding issues for 1998 and 1999, and also the logistics status of proposals that might be under consideration for FY'00. In addition, OPCOM will consider recommendations from the recent service panel meeting. Logging plans for the dry-dock (Mary Reagan) was added to the agenda as item I-3.

C. Update on Action Items from August Meeting

Humphris reviewed action taken on Action Items from August Meeting.

Action Item: OPCOM requests information on the behavior of the Kuroshio Current and its eddies in order to determine how to adjust the drilling operations in real time. OPCOM believes that researching the available data is the responsibility of both the proponents and ODP-TAMU. In addition, preparation of a drilling strategy to address these concerns will be requested from the proponents.

Proponents have submitted a report to ODP-TAMU and to SCICOM (Agenda Book, Tab I), and the situation has been reviewed by ODP-TAMU.

Action Item: ODP-LDEO will explore the possibility of industry funding the production of an FMS Atlas.

LDEO-BRG has been in touch with AAPG regarding the FMS Atlas. AAPG intends to produce a similar Atlas, and LDEO/BRG will collaborate with them to include their FMS data as a chapter.

Action Item: Humphris will request from SCIMP a cost estimate for a containerized microbiological facility as envisaged by SCICOM, advice on the availability of containerized labs that could be used for specific legs, information about the use of radioisotopes on research vessels, and liaison activities with the Biosphere PPG in order to understand their needs.

This was addressed by SCIMP at their March meeting (see SCIMP Minutes- distributed) and will be discussed at this meeting.

Action Item: The JOIDES Office will provide the external evaluations to the SSP in cases where the comments are relevant to the panel.

The JOIDES Office has sent a set of all the external evaluations received in March 1998 to the SSP Chair.

Action Item: In April, SSP recommended to SCICOM that a PPG be formed to address Deep Drilling. Consideration was deferred at that time until after CONCORD. This will be examined at the next meeting as part of planning for the IODP.

The SSP proposed Deep Drilling PPG will be included in SCICOM discussions relating to the Seismogenic Zone DPG.

Action Item: The usefulness of the Co-Chief data packages will be an agenda topic at the next Co-Chief review meeting.

Discussion of Co-Chief data packages will be included in the agenda for the Co-Chief review in Fall 1998.

Action Item: SCIMP recommends that the use of wet sponges in the curation of the cores be replaced by shrink wrapping.

Shrink wrapping of cores is underway.

Action Item: A SCIMP web page and list server will be set up with assistance from TAMU and JOI to allow interaction among members and liaisons.

This is being undertaken.

Action Item: TAMU will develop a capital replacement plan for SCIMP to review next year, as requested previously by PCOM.

The ODP-TAMU Capital Replacement Plan was presented at the SCIMP meeting and is now in place for use in budgeting.

Action Item: SSEPs will be tasked with evaluating and commenting on proposed logging programs as they pertain to achieving the stated scientific objectives.

The SSEPs were instructed by the SCICOM Chair to evaluate logging science proposed in the proposals. This was implemented at the last SSEPs meetings, and their comments are incorporated into the SSEP reviews. Goldberg noted that the SSEP involvement in considering the logging plans is working very well.

Action Item: TAMU will formulate clear policy and procedures for drilling in strong currents along the lines of those previously developed for shallow water drilling.

This is not yet completed.

Action Item 98-1-1A
ODP-TAMU will complete the document on the policy and procedures for drilling in strong currents in time for the August SCICOM/OPCOM Meeting.

Srivastava noted that SSP had made a recommendation to OPCOM regarding the problems with the ASK system that occurred on Leg 174A.

Refurbishment/upgrade of the ASK system is part of the upcoming dry-dock. The problems with the ASK system that occurred on Leg 174A, noted in an SSP recommendation to OPCOM, are being addressed.

D. Update on Any Outstanding Issues for FY'98

1. Operational/Logistical Considerations (J. Baldauf)

Leg 176 deepened Hole 735B from 500 to 1508 mbsf, and recovered 866 m (86% recovery). Unfortunately, 1403 m of drill pipe/BHA were dropped in the hole; of this, 497 m were

recovered by fishing. The current hole remains filled with 734 m of 5" pipe and 172 m of BHA. If a return to Hole 735B is considered in the future, then there are two options:

- Continue fishing operations:
Advantages - 1 week effort will clear the hole OR indicate potential of continued effort
Disadvantages - success of such an operation is questionable
- Commence new hole:
Advantages - establishes a centered, cased hole for deep penetration
Disadvantages - 2 legs will be required to reach the current depth.

ODP-TAMU and the Leg 176 Co-Chief Scientists agree that the preferable approach is to drill a new hole rather than to continue to try to retrieve the lost pipe. Natland noted that Mike Storms calculated that drilling without coring to the current depth achieved at Hole 735B, and then coring to 3000 m would take 89 days.

On Leg 177, a portion of the lower guidehorn (LGH)/pin broke (see Appendix 1a for structure before and after damage). This resulted in restricted operations because of the pitch and roll. An operating limit of 4 degrees was set. Despite this, 4 holes were completed at the final site (171 mbsf) before the operational parameters were exceeded. During the transit, the unattached LGH was discarded after breaking free from its restraints because of concerns of more seriously damaging the hull. The lost section of the guidehorn will be manufactured and replaced at Cape Town. This may take two additional port days, which will come out of Leg 179.

An engineering analysis was carried out to predict the consequence of operating without a guidehorn. Leg 178 sailed with revised operating parameters:

- 0-4 pitch/roll Routine operations
- 4-6 Continue with caution
- 6-8 Stop rotation and vertical movement
- 8+ Recover drill string.

Leg 178 has not been negatively impacted by the operating constraints.

Leg 177 also experienced a 46.8% core-liner failure rate which appears to have been the result of damage caused by a worn drill collar seal. This failure rate has not been experienced on Leg 178.

Leg 177 also encountered problems with the speed and stability of the shipboard network, which currently consists of 2 100 MHz Pentiums acting as Novell servers, and 1 VAX. ODP-TAMU plans to replace 1 Pentium unit and the VAX with 2 266 MHz PII server class machines, giving a final configuration of 1 as the cc:Mail server, 1 as the science server, and 1 for Print queues/inventory.

Although training was provided prior to the cruise, the JANUS paleo-application was not used on Leg 177, resulting in no paleo data begin entered into the database. In addition, the paleo-dictionaries are incomplete. Leg 177 scientists found the application too cumbersome and not user-friendly. ODP-TAMU carried out a very preliminary analysis of all the paleo data in the JANUS database for Legs 171 -175 (Appendix 1b). Their findings show that the JANUS paleo-application has not been used consistently. For 171-173, JANUS database use is reasonable. Legs 175 and 177 are the two Legs of greatest concern. Several adjustments will be made by TAMU to address the problem:

- Shipboard training will be provided commencing with Leg 180. This will be provided by a member of the ODP-TAMU staff, who will be trained beforehand
- Paleontology dictionaries will be completed by Leg 180
- Independent groups will be established to review the shipboard applicability of the program

- A strategy will be developed to populate the database for the legs that have already occurred.

Leg 179 currently has the following objectives and time allocations:

- Hammer Drill-in Casing System (15 days)
 - test hammer, hammer drill-in system, maximum slope
- NERO projects (6.5 days)
 - establish a cased re-entry hole (Sites 757, 756) and drill 200 m into basement
- Seismic experiments (4 days)
 - 2 ship, std. logs, SWD, VSP, strainmeter.

OPCOM is requested to prioritize the leg objectives if extra time is required in Cape Town for the installation of the lower guidehorn. Tim Friend, a writer from USA Today, will sail on Leg 179 to complete articles on the hammer drill and NERO projects.

Consensus 98-1-1

In response to the possibility of a loss of 2 days to Leg 179 due to the installation of the lower guide horn, OPCOM confirms the following prioritization of operations: hammer drill testing, drilling of the NERO/ION hole, the offset seismic experiment requiring a rendezvous with the RV *Sonne* (two ship experiment), followed by the other planned experiments.

The **Leg 180** engineering plans have been reassessed based on a more detailed understanding of the scientific objectives. It will be important to be able to separate the hole into 3 zones for the packer and the downhole experiments, and will require the deployment of 20" casing for the first time, as well as a liner hanger for triple casing. Consequently, there are a number of engineering challenges for Leg 180:

- first deployment of 20" casing and liner hanger
- casing perforation
- designed cement plan
- potential hard seafloor (drill-in motor/under-reamer)
- casing (20", 16" - 600 m long)
- unknown thickness of the detachment fault (10-100 m)
- liner 10 3/4" (across fault zone)
- packers (1 basement, 1 fault zone, 1 above fault zone) and hydrofracturing
- cementing for annulus seal.

The success of these operations will have implications for potential future legs, such as Ontong-Java and Nankai. A film crew will sail on Leg 180 to contribute to a series on studying planet Earth.

Leg 181 will start in Sydney (instead of Townsville) to accommodate a PR event at the port call. The days have been correspondingly adjusted.

Discussion of the Janus Paleo-application:

The Janus steering committee (SC) evaluated the application of Janus on Leg 174B. They found the database, including the paleo-application, sound. One problem identified by the Janus SC was the lack of technical support in the paleo lab.

As each cruise proceeds and more cores are obtained, there is a decline in the amount of paleo data entered in Janus. Moran suggested that problems may have occurred on Leg 175 because it was a high recovery leg. She encouraged OPCOM to focus their discussion on Leg 177, and reminded OPCOM that training was given to the participants in port prior to cruise by Paul Albright.

Hodell (Co-Chief Scientist of Leg 177) indicated that Gersonde (the other Leg 177 Co-Chief) had worked with Paul Albright in Cape Town to learn how to use the paleo-application. According to Hodell, Gersonde had two fundamental issues with the Janus paleo-application. First, he questioned the value of putting paleo data, which he considered preliminary, into a database (biostratigraphers look at shipboard data). Gersonde felt that the real data are not collected until later during the post-cruise studies. Baldauf countered saying that there has always been shipboard database as all the age and zonal information is required, and not just the high resolution work done post-cruise. Hodell continued, noting that Gersonde and the shipboard party were unhappy with the time-consuming, cumbersome nature of the input procedure. Leg 177 scientists were interested in using the database and tried to do so, but JANUS was too slow and the value of using Janus became unclear. They found that they were able to produce Excel spreadsheets more quickly than punching the paleo data into the database. Natland suggested that it sounded as if on Leg 177, Janus became a sort of straight jacket; that the scientists found that their time could be better spent working on the high-resolution biostatigraphy that they were sailing to determine, rather than entering data. Moore asked why Janus worked in the core lab and not in the paleo lab. Pisiyas noted that the paleo-application had been used successfully on Leg 175 -- a leg that recovered 8000 m of core.

Humphris said that the Leg 177 situation raised two issues: (1) whether the database is set up in an optimal way as a user-friendly system that produces a useful and valuable database; and (2) the basic understanding that the individual responsibility of shipboard scientists is to the ODP, and not just to their own interests. Farrell said that Janus had a lot of user community input. Humphris agreed and noted that millions of dollars were spent on developing the database, and individuals were now making decisions not to enter the data and contribute to the ODP database.

Farrell requested a report from the SC detailing what had occurred. Moran said that if detailed comments were received by the Janus SC, then the issues could be addressed. She stated that Janus is more than just a shipboard database -- it is long term and useful archive of data. It was noted that comments already exist in the Staff Scientist's (Peter Blum) cruise report. Fox said that a report was already in progress under the direction of John Firth, with input from the Leg 177 Staff Scientist. Baldauf will send this report to SCIMP and the JANUS SC for further consideration. Gieskes acknowledged that this is a SCIMP issue, but noted that the Panel could not have an intelligent discussion about the matter since it came to their attention only at their meeting just after Leg 177 had ended. Gieskes stressed the importance of keeping SCIMP in the loop.

Action Item 98-1-2A

OPCOM requests that ODP-TAMU provide a written report to the Janus Steering Committee and SCIMP on the problems encountered on Leg 177 that resulted in no paleo-data being entered in the JANUS database. The Janus SC will review this report to determine what changes need to be made.

Action Item 98-1-3A

OPCOM requests that the JOIDES Office work with ODP-TAMU to ensure that responsibilities for scientists participating on an ODP leg are clearly set out and communicated to scientists.

2. Logging Considerations (M. Reagan)

Reagan reported that one tool string had been lost on Leg 175 (\$770K) and that LDEO had received a check from the insurance company to cover the loss (minus the deductible). LDEO is in the process of replacing all the tools that have been lost and working with JOI to eliminate deductibles, thereby obtaining complete coverage. Carter pointed out that for all 20 people who are required to sign off on the insurance to have done so, was proof that the system was working properly, and that the policy and procedures had been followed.

The WHOI VSP tool was certified by SCIMP for Leg 179. SWD preparations are on track for this leg.

Additional tools have been arranged and insurance issues clarified for Leg 180. The GHMT will be run without additional cost because Schlumberger allowed a long-term lease for the instrument due to the number of times (10) that the GHMT will be run in FY'98 and FY'99. Schlumberger will sail only one engineer on Leg 180 (originally, a second Schlumberger engineer was thought to be needed) who will undergo additional training prior to the cruise.

3. Budgetary Issues (N. Pisias)

There are no outstanding issues related to the FY'98 budget at this time.

E. Update on FY'99

1. Operational/Logistical Considerations (J. Baldauf)

Baldauf reported on the availability of ice boats for the proposed Prydz Bay leg in FY'00, which is as follows:

- Shirase not available
- Aurora Australis not available
- Cape Crafton available?
- John P. Tully available?
- Sir Wilfred Laurier available?
- Polar Sea/Polar Star available?

Costs range from \$800K to \$2.2M. A minimum of 1 year of lead time is required so that, if a decision is made at the August SCICOM meeting to include this program in the schedule, there will be enough lead time to acquire an ice boat. The Antostrat group has done a lot of work in identifying possible ships. Additional support in terms of funding has not yet come from the proponents, thus it is not clear what the cost to ODP will be.

The Ancillary Program Letter for the magnetic shoe experiment (Mike Fuller) is under consideration for Leg 182. The JOIDES Office has communicated with Co-Chiefs and others as necessary.

2. Logging Considerations (M. Reagan)

Due to budgetary constraints, the logging plans for Legs in FY'99 are different from those presented at the August SCICOM and OPCOM meetings. The new plans are as follows:

- Leg 182 - Std., WST, GHMT (Pirmez - LDEO; Spence - LUBR).
- Leg 183 - Std., DLL (Delius - Aachen; Revil - LMF)
- Leg 184 - Std., GHMT (Lauer - LMF; TBA)
- Leg 185 - Std. (TBN)
- Leg 186 - Std., BHTV (TBN)

A number of specialty tools will not be run, but were proposed as upgrades or additions as follows:

- Leg 183 - Add WST (\$19K), Upgrade DLL to ARI (\$30K)
- Leg 184 - Add WST (\$19K)
- Leg 185 - Add ARI (\$40K), GLT (\$87K)
- Leg 186 - Add VSP (\$45K)/WST (\$19K), ARI (\$40K)
- Total = \$254-280K

Reagan sought a recommendation on the prioritization of tools to be reinstated in FY'99 if there are cost savings. Terry Plank, Co-Chief for Leg 185, has requested the GLT (\$87K) -- copies of her letter and the response from Mary Reagan are included in the Agenda Book). Moore said that the Co-Chiefs requests should be honored if possible. Piasias requested a delay in prioritization so that all SOE's could be considered together. Natland asked if the matter was an OPCOM or SCICOM issue. Humphris indicated that she wanted OPCOM to review the matter, prioritize, and then make a recommendation to SCICOM. Malfait asked about the source of the list of logging tools. Reagan said that the list included tools that scientists had requested, as well as those recommended by LDEO on the basis of what the scientists said they wanted to do. Gieskes said that the logging scientists on SCIMP feel that they have no input to the logging plans.

F. Budgeting for FY '99

1. Presentation of Budget and Options for Carry-Over Funds (N. Piasias)

Piasias presented the projected budget for ODP Phase 3 in which the impact of the increase due to the new negotiated day rate of the JR, and the annual day rate bonus to Schlumberger, are indicated. For FY'99, the magnitude of the impact is estimated to be about \$77K. Over the next four years, ODP will have \$4 million less for the science of the Program. Piasias also reviewed the status of the budget deliberations between JOI, the SCICOM Chair, TAMU, and LDEO and presented the SOE options for FY'99. He requested a prioritization of items should there be any carry-forward from FY'98, or should other sources of funds become available. The items under consideration were as follows (after some items had their costs adjusted following discussion):

ITEM	COST
<i>Wireline</i>	
FMS Atlas	\$ 50,000
CoreSeis	\$ 27,000
Borehole	\$ 16,000
Drydock	\$ 79,170
Leg 183: WST (\$19K); ARI (\$30K)	\$ 49,000
Leg 184: WST	\$ 19,000
Leg 185: ARI (\$40K); GLT (\$87K)	\$127,000
Leg 186: ARI (\$40K); VSP (\$45K)	\$ 85,000
<i>Science Operations</i>	
2 Operational Hammers	\$314,000
Gas Chromatography	\$ 55,000
Microbiology Lab	\$200,000??
XRD	\$150,000 (~\$60,000 used)
Data Migration	\$?????
Mirror Web Sites	\$ 50,000 per site
<i>JOIDES</i>	
JOIDES Data Bank Computer Tech	\$ 72,000
TOTAL	\$1,633,173

Note: The Downhole Measurements Lab was added to this list at an estimated cost of \$450K.

2. Discussion and Prioritization of Options for Recommendation to SCICOM

Two items were immediately removed from the list: the FMS Atlas (being addressed in other ways) and the BRG drydock costs (already included elsewhere in the budget).

Humphris suggested that the discussion start with the big ticket items, of which the hammers and the expansion of the Downhole Measurements Lab are the two highest. She suggested that the purchase of operational hammers could be made dependent on the FY'00 schedule. C. Moore noted the importance of funding leg-critical science; he said that it was necessary to have the hammers to do science. Proposal 479 (PacManus) is the only potential program on the immediate horizon that will need hammer drilling. Humphris was concerned that delaying purchase of at least one hammer given the ever-decreasing budget could result in the scheduling of a leg requiring this technology and no funds to buy the necessary equipment. Carter suggested that if funds allow, one hammer should be purchased in FY'99 and then an attempt made to accomplish as much of the proposed logging programs as possible. OPCOM decided that a preliminary decision made at this meeting regarding the purchase of hammers could be revisited in August when the ship's schedule for FY'00 is set.

Moore and Hodell questioned why, given the estimated cost, the expansion of the DML was being considered. Downhole Measurements are currently being done at sea and, although very cramped, they can continue. Expenditure of such a large amount would not buy the Program anything new. They inquired whether a foundation could be put on the ship during the dry-dock to allow future expansion.

Confusion continues regarding the cost of a microbiology lab - estimates range from \$1 million (TAMU) to about \$200K (SCIMP) -- and there have been some indications that this might be provided as a third party tool (for instance by the European Union countries). In addition, Fox reported that at the Biosphere Sub-group meeting the previous week, there had been discussion of putting in a proposal for funding to DOE or other sources for a \$1M lab. Piasias expressed concern that if no commitment was made to the microbiology lab at the present time, then the message would be that the goals of the LRP Deep Biosphere Pilot Project would not be realized. Humphris countered saying that SCICOM had agreed that the approach should be to use a containerized facility initially for proof-of-concept, and that the PPG needs to start generating plans and proposals. Gieskes stated that the big push with respect to the deep biosphere is understanding the biodiversity, not merely conducting bacterial counts. This requires some type of lab, and at some point in the future, a van for a clean environment and for radioisotope work.

The gas chromatographs, which are required for safety monitoring are aging. Although TAMU had estimated a replacement cost for these items of \$95K, Gieskes stated that the replacement cost would be ~\$50K. Ball said that the GCs on the ship are working, but if new ones could be purchased, then PPSP would like to see that happen. Baldauf concurred but added that, although the GCs are functioning, increased effort and maintenance by the technical staff is required to keep them operational. Gieskes proposed that these should be treated as emergency items which can be replaced as the need arises. Hodell suggested that it might be possible to request industry to donate some old GCs to the Program.

<p>Action Item 98--1-4A OPCOM request ODP-TAMU to investigate the possibility of requesting donations of used equipment (in particular, gas chromatographs) to ODP.</p>

Gieskes suggested that TAMU's numbers for an XRD (\$250K new and \$125K used) are inflated and suggested that \$150K (new) and \$60K (used) are more realistic estimates. Gieskes commented that, in this time of financial constraints, replacement of the XRD, like the GCs, should not be an issue until it breaks down, at which time the necessity of a replacement should be evaluated.

Specialty logging tools were discussed in relation to their importance to achieve the scientific objectives of each Leg. Moore and Natland considered the GLT for the Izu-Mariana Leg essential for reconstructing the geochemistry and hence of highest priority. Carter said that he too considered the GLT as absolutely critical for Leg 185, and hence it was even more justifiable than an operational hammer. The WST, which is normally recommended by LDEO, is used to obtain check shots. C. Moore said that he considered check shots as second in priority to the GLT. Humphris asked which of the proposed WST deployment was the most important for the goals of the Leg. Goldberg said that the WST for Leg 184 is the highest priority of all because of correlating the sedimentary sequences. Humphris commented that the ARIs are upgrades of the DLL and so the data will still be collected but will be of lower quality. In addition, use of the ARI is usually recommended by LDEO rather than being requested by the scientists. Hence, they should be of lower priority.

The CORESEIS project is a joint project with the Chinese Academy of Science to develop software to integrate core and seismic data. BOREHOLE is a modeling package that predicts the stability of a hole before using the borehole televiewer. It is most important for very deep drilling, especially into basement, as it permits the identification of potential breakouts. Both BOREHOLE and CORESEIS represent innovation in the Program (perhaps BOREHOLE more so). Natland said these developments could be put off if absolutely necessary; Humphris agreed. There was some discussion as to whether these developments were a required part of the services that ODP should be offering. Moore noted that, as with other analyses in the past, if a CORESEIS type of activity was important to a Leg or to a scientist, then someone would step forward and do the job.

Data migration was determined to be of low priority by SCICOM in August 1997, and clearly must take a back seat when important parts of the science are unable to be conducted because of funding problems. Baldauf commented that TAMU hopes that some data migration can be started as time permits within the current budgets, but obviously at a low level.

Humphris asked where the mirror web sites SOE had come from as it was not something that had been presented at the August SCICOM meeting for discussion. Piasias pointed out that if the dissemination of ODP data and results via the Internet is going to be a key part of the ODP publications policy, then good access to this information is imperative; hence, there will be a need for mirror web sites. Tamaki expressed concern about the cost of maintaining the mirror sites after they are set up. Piasias stated that \$50K per site covers only the hardware -- not the long term maintenance costs. Humphris suggested that it might be more cost effective to maintain web sites if only one or two years of ODP publications and data are available on the web. Scientists who required access to older information would go to the archives -- hard copy or CD-ROMs. Carter registered his distress that the estimates under discussion represent guesses. He said that more stringent estimates were needed for OPCOM's consideration. He suggested deferring the matter until the future plan for the archival and distribution of ODP data and publications are fully known. He reiterated that OPCOM cannot be asked to make decisions without adequate information. Piasias commented that the issue of web sites should be incorporated into an overall, integrated sampling, publications and data distribution policy that should be prepared and presented to OPCOM.

Action Item 98-1-5A

OPCOM requests that SCIMP develop a plan for the archiving and distribution of ODP data and publications in order that OPCOM can have adequate information to make decisions on such things as web sites.

Based on these discussions, OPCOM then prioritized their 6 top items that included acquisition of one operational hammer and the leg-related logging requests. Although the Biosphere Pilot Project is considered a very high priority, it was not included in the ranking as it was unclear as to either the status of requested inquiries into the possible lease of a containerized facility, or the actual cost of building one. All the other items would unlikely be funded in FY'99.

Consensus 98-1-2

OPCOM recommends to SCICOM the following prioritization for the use of any additional SOE funds that become available in FY'99:

OPCOM Recommended Prioritization of ODP SOE Options for FY 1999

1.	GLT - Leg 185	\$ 87K
2.	1 Operational Hammer	\$157K
3.	WST - Leg 184	\$ 19K
4.	WST - Leg 183	\$ 19K
5.	VSP - Leg 186	\$ 45K
6.	ARI - Legs 183, 185, 186	\$ 30-40K each

Other Big Ticket Items:

DML	\$450K
Microbiology lab	\$200K
1 Operational Hammer	\$157K

Other Items (in no particular order):

Borehole Stability Project	\$ 16K
CORESEIS	\$ 27K
Gas Chromatograph	\$ 55K
XRD	\$150K (\$60K - used)
Data Migration	\$???

The following items were deferred pending further information:

Mirror Web Sites	\$ 50K per site
SSDB Computer Tech	\$ 72K

(Note: SCICOM/OPCOM made some changes to this priority list at their joint meeting the following day).

G. Proposals Under Consideration for FY'00**1. Logistical/Operational Issues (J. Baldauf)**

Baldauf said that TAMU had gone through all the proposals under consideration for FY'00 and had not detected any major operational risks.

Proposal 482 - Wilkes Land:

Sites:	5
Water depths:	487-3712 m
Penetrations:	500-1000 mbsf
Estimated time:	40.3 days (35.6 drilling, 4.8 logging)
Weather window:	January-February (ice constraints)
Jurisdiction:	Antarctic Treaty
Hardware costs:	\$105,127

Comments/Constraints:

- Operations will require an ice support vessel
- 3 sites (WCSH-1A, -2A, -3A) in 785, 637, 487 m water respectively) (shallow water guidelines apply)
- Requires weather and ice monitoring

Proposal 489 - Ross Sea:

Sites: 8 (4 primary)
Water depths: 510-1000 m
Penetrations: 650-1000 mbsf
Estimated time: 50.2 days (44 drilling, 6.2 logging)
Weather window: January-February (ice constraints)
Jurisdiction: Antarctic Treaty
Hardware costs: \$326,172

Comments/Constraints:

- Operations will require an ice support vessel
- Primary sites are in <600 m water
- Requires weather and ice monitoring
- Hardware costs include 3 reentry cones with casing
- Will require an extended leg to accommodate ~17 day transit

Proposal 485 - Southern Gateway:

Sites: 8 (5 primary)
Water depths: 1460-4055 m
Penetrations: 500-880 mbsf
Estimated time: 50.7 days (44.6 drilling, 6.1 logging)
Weather window: December - May
Jurisdiction: Australia
Hardware costs: \$130,399

Comments/Constraints:

- FFF may be required to achieve depth objectives

Proposal 479 - Eastern Manus Basin:

Sites: 4 (1 permanent installation)
Water depths: 1655-2139 m
Penetrations: 300-700 mbsf
Estimated time: 46.8 days (39.9 drilling, 6.9 logging)
Weather window: Anytime
Jurisdiction: Papua, New Guinea
Hardware costs: \$406,299

Comments/Constraints:

- High temperature tools required
- H₂S safety precautions required
- Cost includes 2 HRGB - 1 will be recovered
- Cost and time estimates do not include CORK deployment.

An Australian firm has acquired the mining rights to the PacManus site. They are aware of ODP interest in the site and have said that they will permit ODP to drill. It was agreed that a critical review of the status of high temperature tools for a potential leg at PacManus is needed.

Gieskes noted that DMP had discussed high temperature tools for TAG. He asked whether such consideration fell under the purview of the SSEPs or SCIMP. Humphris said that science is the business of the SSEPs, and the usefulness and status of the tools the responsibility of SCIMP. SCIMP can provide a reality check on the scientific vision by determining whether the measurements that the SSEPs would like to do can be done with the tools proposed. Natland noted that some items would have to fall out, given the tight budget situation and the fact that there will be the need for high-priced specialty tools. Consequently, the SSEPS will do some of the required prioritization in terms of the science and the applicability of the tools would be reviewed by SCIMP.

Action Item 98-1-6A

OPCOM requests the LDEO-BRG conduct a critical review of the status of high temperature tools for a potential leg in the Manus Basin based on Proposal 479, the Pacmanus felsic-hosted hydrothermal system. In their review, LDEO-BRG should consider input from the SSEPs on the types of measurements that are desirable.

Proposal 500 - Long-Term Seafloor Observatory:

Sites: 1 (reentry)
 Water depths: 4500 m
 Penetrations: 500 mbsf
 Estimated time: 30.5 days (28.5 drilling, 2.5 logging)
 Weather window: Anytime
 Jurisdiction: International waters
 Hardware costs: \$161,765

Comments/Constraints:

- None

Proposal 490 - Prydz Bay:

Sites: 5
 Water depths: 600-3100 m
 Penetrations: 400-1500 mbsf
 Estimated time: 45.6 days (40.6 drilling, 5 logging)
 Weather window: January-February (ice constraints)
 Jurisdiction: Antarctic Treaty
 Hardware costs: \$127,105

Comments/Constraints:

- Operations will require an ice support vessel
- Site PBS-1 is positioned in 600 m water (shallow water guidelines apply)
- Requires weather and ice monitoring
- Will require an extended leg (transit estimated to be 20 days)

Proposal 445 - Nankai:

Sites: 4 (2 LWD), (2 reentry)
 Water depths: 4685-5200 m
 Penetrations: 800-1200 mbsf
 Estimated time: 65.5 days (56.2 drilling, 9.3 logging)
 Weather window: March-June (typhoon season, July-October)
 Jurisdiction: Japan
 Hardware costs: \$428,650 (w/o LWD)

Comments/Constraints:

- Strategy (1 or 2 leg) not well defined
- Clarity is required concerning requirements (legacy holes, CORKs, packers)
- Kuroshio Current problematic during Leg 131; resulted in VIT cable loss, pipe vibration and loss of WSTP tool
- Status of 3rd party "LAST" tool unknown
- Operation time with transit ~69 days
- Cost considerations needs refinement after operational strategy determined.

There will be a meeting required with proponents and ODP-TAMU engineers to define operations (May/June 98).

Information on the current has been provided by the proponents. The current will require special operational considerations, and may require through the pipe video/sonar.

Research into the Kuroshio Current has shown the following:

- Strength - 2-5 nm/hr currents may be encountered at both ENT and WNT sites
- Width - ~100 km
- Variability - tow major modes (meander/non-meander) varies over decades
- Mode during Leg 131 - meander (~4 nm/hr at Site 808)
- Present mode - non-meander (>2 nm/hr may occur at all sites)
- Variability with depth - drift buoy data (over a limited time period) shows 0.4-1.3 m/sec (~0.8-2.5 nm/hr). Current meter data (near WNT sites) show ~ 2 nm/hr at 700 m, and ~1 nm/hr at a depth of 1500 m. It appears to reverse direction between 1500 and 3000 m. At 4600 m, it is ~ 1.4 nm/hr
- Forecasting - practicality needs to be evaluated. It may be able to determine the major mode, but it is unclear whether it will be possible to determine/predict local currents at specific sites.

TAMU does not object to having the leg scheduled, but needs to know (1) the strategy and priorities before scheduling, (2) what to do to minimize the problem of the current during drilling. Humphris reminded OPCOM that the proposal was a two-leg proposal. The SSEPs have not said that they will support a two-leg program; consequently the proponents have had difficulty in determining the priorities for a single leg of drilling. The cost of logging tools for Nankai would be \$450-500K, depending on the final suite of LWD tools selected. G. Moore has indicated that, should Nankai be scheduled in August, Japanese colleagues may be willing to contribute financially to the cost of the logging program for the leg.

Action Item 98-1-7A

The JOIDES Office will request that the Nankai proponents work with the SSEPs, ODP/TAMU, and LDEO-BRG to clearly define their overall drilling and logging strategy prior to the August SCICOM Meeting. Note: Confusion is connected to whether the SSEPs support a one or two leg program, and which experiments (packers and CORKs) and logging programs will be carried out.

Proposal 486 - Paleogene Equatorial Pacific:

Sites: 11 (Leg 1), 11 (Leg 2)
 Water depths: 4230-5400 m
 Penetrations: 60-440 mbsf
 Estimated time: 43 days on site (1 leg)
 Weather window: Anytime
 Jurisdiction: International
 Hardware costs: \$78,360

Comments/Constraints:

- Cost estimates are based on proposed sites for Leg 1
- MDCB required for penetration of potential chert layers.

Proposal 450 - Taiwan Arc:

Sites: 7 (4 primary - 2 cased reentry sites)
 Water depths: 1252-4460 m
 Penetrations: 400-1300 mbsf
 Estimated time: 46.6 days (with logging)
 Weather window: Feb-May, Oct-Nov (typhoon season July-Oct); monsoons (Nov-Feb)
 Jurisdiction: Taiwan, Philippines
 Hardware costs: \$554,000

Comments/Constraints:

- Reentry cones may be required at 3 sites -- this is included in cost estimate
- no CORKs have been identified as being required
- Kuroshio Current could influence operations
- Potentially short (<12 hr) transit from sites.

Proposal 448 - Ontong-Java:

Sites: 12 (4 primary - assumes 2 reentry sites)
 Water depths: 1600-4500 m
 Penetrations: 150-2380 mbsf
 Estimated time: 46 days (40 drilling, 6 logging)
 Weather window: Anytime
 Jurisdiction: Federal States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea
 Hardware costs: \$193,000

Comments/Constraints:

- Operational strategy unclear (102 legs) requires better definition (i.e. number of sites, casing requirements, logging)
- Greater than 80 days required to complete current proposal
- Cost assumes 2 reentry sites with routine logging

A prioritized set of sites is expected based on the results of two recent site survey cruises.

Proposal 431 - W. Pacific Network:

Sites: 2 (2 reentry)
 Water depths: 5700-5715 m
 Penetrations: 400-470 mbsf
 Estimated time: 22 days
 Weather window: WP-1A (March-June), WP-2A (May-September)
 Jurisdiction: International
 Hardware costs: \$240,000

Comments/Constraints:

- None

Proposal 451 - Tonga:

Sites: 6 (1 reentry)
 Water depths: 319-4727 m
 Penetrations: 551-752 mbsf
 Estimated time: 46.5 days
 Weather window: May-December (constrained by cyclones (Jan-April))
 Jurisdiction: Tonga
 Hardware costs: \$90,000

Comments/Constraints:

- Time estimates assume reentry for Site 06B
- Site TF-3 is positioned in 315 m of water -- subject to heave limit of 2 m.

2. Logging Issues (M. Reagan)

Reagan explained that the logging program for each proposal was presented to the SSEPs, who made their recommendations regarding each item, and then the LDEO/BRG liaison commented. The recommended operations for proposals under consideration for FY'00 are as follows:

- "Environment" legs - WST, GHMT
 Wilkes, Southern Gateway, Prydz Bay, NARM, Ross Sea, Weddell Sea
- "Interior" legs - ARI, VSP, GLT, BHTV
 PacManus, H2O, Ontong-Java, Taiwan Arc, Tonga, ION, Shatsky
- Other
 Nankai - VSP, LWD (ADN, RAB, MWD)

The cost for tools for environmental legs is ~\$70-100K. The highest logging budgetary item is LWD (~\$450K per leg).

3. Major Budget Items

These were presented as part of reports under G.1 and G.2.

H. Panel Reports and Action Items

1. Site Survey Panel (S. Srivastava)

Srivastava reported that SSP has three new US members to increase its complement to 16. Over the past few months, much effort has gone into helping the proponents of Leg 184 prepare for SSP and PPSP. Most recently, two proponents attended the SSP meeting in Berlin. All the required data are expected to be processed in time for the PPSP meeting in May. Tamaki, who is the SCICOM/OPCOM liaison to SSP, said that he was very impressed by the data set that was presented to the SSP by the East Asian Monsoon proponents.

Srivastava reviewed how the panel approaches its mandate, and summarized the legs and proposals that were considered by the panel. The site survey readiness of proposal and legs considered is in the SSP minutes. He noted that the proponents of Leg 188/Proposal 490 (Prydz Bay) did not submit any data for consideration by SSP in February. The site survey cruise for Leg 183 is almost over and the required data are expected.

The majority of proposals under consideration are either ready or very close to being ready (i.e. 2A or better). Each WP site (Proposal 431) is ranked differently. The data submitted for Proposal 479 (Pacmanus) is not adequate, and there was concern about the number of holes that require the use of a HRGB. There was confusion about the sites in Proposal 504 (Newfoundland Basin); the proposed deep hole needs to be better documented. There are some major problem with Wilkes Land (482); consequently, it is ranked 3A. Although there are a lot of data for Ross Sea (489), there is still some confusion. To address the problems, SSP has requested that the Ross Sea proponents come to the Databank to compile the data. Wilkes Land (482), Ross Sea (489), and Southern Gateways (485) have potential problems with safety, and have been flagged for PPSP.

Srivastava also put forward a request from the Data Bank that the winter submission deadline be moved from 1 January to 1 February, since the holiday season makes the former impractical. This would cause no problems for the SSP meetings.

Consensus 98-1-3

OPCOM accepts the SSP recommendation that the winter deadline for submission of data to the Data Bank be changed from January 1 to February 1.

Srivastava raised SSP's concern regarding the role of SSP liaisons to the SSEPs. They are concerned that SSP input is not being carefully considered by the SSEPs. Although they are to judge the science, some issues relating to site survey information might be important in their considerations.

Action Item 98-1-8A

The SCICOM Chair will communicate with the SSEPs Chairs prior to the May meeting in order to clarify the role of the SSP liaisons as conveyors of important site survey information on proposals.

In terms of Panel membership, Srivastava requested extending the membership terms of Mike Enaschescu (industry member) and Roger Flood (US) to ensure corporate memory. Three individuals have been nominated by SSP members for consideration as next panel Chair, and all are willing to serve. This will be a decision for SCICOM. The liaisons from SSP to the next meetings of ISSEP and ESSEP are Bob Whitmarsh and Al Hine, respectively.

2. Pollution Prevention and Safety Panel (M. Ball)

Ball reported that safety reviews are complete for drilling scheduled through 1998 (Leg 182 (Australian Bight). All but 2 of the Leg 183 sites (Kerguelen Plateau) have also been reviewed. Legs 184 (East Asian Monsoon) and Leg 188 (Prydz Bay) have been previewed. PPSP intends to review 184 through 186 at the May 21-22 meeting in Salt Lake City. Legs 187 and 188 will be reviewed at the November meeting. Previews of proposals 450 (Taiwan arc-continent collision), 482 (Wilkes Land margin), 485 (Southern Gateways Australia-Antarctica), and 489 (Ross Sea, Antarctica) are tentatively planned for the November 1998 meeting. PPSP in good shape and will stay that way if SCICOM/OPCOM can schedule through 2000 at the August meeting.

3. Scientific Measurements Panel (J. Gieskes)

Gieskes presented the recommendations of the SCIMP (Appendix 2).

SCIMP Recommendation 98-1 (to eliminate the six month deferral period for sampling the Permanent Archive) was made at the suggestion of the ODP Curator, John Firth. The six month deferral period prior to sampling the permanent archive was originally intended to permit advertising, and to see if the flood gates would open. They did not.

Consensus 98-1-4

OPCOM accepts SCIMP Recommendation 98-1 that the 6-month deferral period prior to sampling the Permanent Archive (PA) no longer be required. Implementation of the PA sampling should be overseen by the ODP Curator on a core-by-core basis, and the approval of the CAB for requests to sample the PA will be required in each case.

SCIMP Recommendation 98-2 concerned the need for a timely summary on actions taken on SCIMP Motions and Recommendations. OPCOM discussed the matter and agreed that, now that Minutes and Motions from both OPCOM and SCICOM are available on the web site, this was a non-issue. Janecek, who will assume the Chair of SCIMP in June, agreed to that this mechanism would satisfy the intent of their recommendation.

SCIMP Recommendation 98-3 requested that ODP-TAMU develop an integrated sampling, data, and publications policy through collaboration between the ODP Publications Office and the CAB. A number of issues need to be addressed in an integrated policy including definition and tracking of "non-performers", obligations of scientists to publish, how to disseminate ODP data, etc. Although there have been only a small number of non-performers, the publications department has expended a lot of energy pursuing the matter. The issue was brought to the attention of SCIMP by Ann Klaus (TAMU), who is keen to have the "policing" of non-performers removed from TAMU Publications.

C. Moore inquired why, if scientists are being encouraged to publish in the outside literature, an Editorial Review Board needs to be set up prior to the leg. He added that there is a policy in place, and implementation of this policy is a management issue. Gieskes explained that the recommendation calls for a review of the current policy and development of a new policy by April 1998. Humphris agreed that an integrated sampling, data, and publications policy was a good idea. She added that SCIMP should define what that Policy should be - not ODP-TAMU. SCIMP should rewrite the policy by taking the current policy and weaving in what they have proposed (Page 3, Appendix 9). The new policy would be submitted to OPCOM/SCICOM for review and approval. Farrell suggested that defining the obligations of the scientists on the ship should be a corner stone of this policy. Humphris said that within the policy, it should be clear who will do "policing" of non-performers. Currently, JOIDES writes letters to non-performers, and a copy goes to the appropriate national committee. Carter said that there is critical distinction between identifying non-performers and the national committees' need to act. Piasias said one option was to withhold samples from non-performers in the future.

Action Item 98-1-9A

OPCOM requests that SCIMP develop an integrated policy for sampling, data, and publications in collaboration with the ODP Publications Office and the CAB. This will include revision of the section of the ODP Publications Policy that addresses the issue of "non-performance" and which defines the obligations of the scientists participating on ODP Legs.

SCIMP Recommendation 98-4 recommends adequate training of shipboard scientists in the use of Applecore and the JANUS paleo-application by a trained specialist either before or during drilling legs. ODP-TAMU strongly supports this, and measures to address this are being implemented.

SCIMP Recommendation 98-5 supported sequential drilling and logging of sections of a drill hole when potential degradation of the hole might jeopardize the success of subsequent logging operations. At the SCIMP meeting, the LDEO/BRG liaison suggested that in some cases, instead of carrying out all the logging when the hole was finished, it was advisable to drill a section of a hole, log, then drill again. This is because holes collapse due to degradation before logging is accomplished in some cases. Fox commented that this practice is in fact followed now, and there have been a number of legs in which this has been carried out. Moore said that this should be a recommendation to Co-Chiefs. Reagan pointed out that the SCIMP recommendation is similar to one that LDEO-BRG routinely makes to scientists.

Consensus 98-1-5

OPCOM notes SCIMP Recommendation 98-5 regarding the importance of sequential drilling and logging of sections of a drillhole, and encourages Co-Chiefs to consider this in their cruise planning and operations.

SCIMP Recommendation 96-6 requested SCIMP input to operational plans involving third party tools and experiments. Ellins explained that the ancillary program letter (APL) for seismic experiments on Leg 179 was at the root of this recommendation. She reviewed the passage of this APL through the JOIDES Advisory Structure, starting with SCICOM and OPCOM consideration in August 1997. Gieskes, Chair of SCIMP, was at the August OPCOM meeting. SCIMP was then asked to approve the use of the WHOI VSP tool for Leg 179. Reagan observed that the role of SCIMP with respect to logging has changed, and that they are no longer asked to comment on the logging plans for each leg. Gieskes commented that a segment of SCIMP felt that should be retained as a responsibility. Humphris commented that SCIMP could comment on the usefulness of a tool(s) to address specific scientific objectives, and that would be appropriate. She recommended that LDEO-BRG present proposed logging plans to SCIMP for their comment at meetings.

Action Item 98-1-10A

The LDEO/BRG liaison to SCIMP will present a summary of the proposed logging plans of highly regarded proposals to SCIMP for their comment.

SCIMP Recommendation 98-7 urged acceptance of the recommendations made by the Micropaleontological Reference Center regarding the distribution of slides to various investigators. There is concern that the reference collections are used, and that if there is non-activity, consideration should be given to the relocation of that reference collection. Since OPCOM had only just received the report, it was decided to postpone a decision until there was time to read the report.

Action Item 98-1-11A

The SCICOM/OPCOM Chair will communicate with OPCOM members regarding acceptance of the of the recommendations made by the MRC (Micropaleontological Reference Center).

Note: This was finally approved by consensus by e-mail.

Consensus by E-Mail 98-1-6

OPCOM accepts the recommendations made by the Micropaleontological Reference Center Lead Curator regarding the distribution of slides to various paleontological investigators.

SCIMP has determined that \$215K is a reasonable estimate of the cost of a microbiology facility. This price could be less because a lot of the required equipment is already on board the ship. The cost of renting a van is essentially the same as buying one (usually less than \$30,000). This is less expensive than the cost of a second ship and two days of ship time - a scenario that has been proposed by the Deep Biosphere PPG.

There are strict rules for radioisotope work on UNOLS ships which is carried out in an isolation lab (page 11, Appendix 2 and SCIMP Minutes). The use of radioisotopes should not be allowed in the normal shipboard labs, but could be restricted to a containerized lab. The UNOLS rules could be extended to the drill ship, and a protocol for conducting this type of work worked out in conjunction with the Radiation Safety Office at TAMU. A subset of the Deep Biosphere PPG recently visited TAMU where they met with Bill Mills and Brad Julson.

At the recent SCIMP meeting, Sanny Saito reported that a Japanese group is planning to study drilling contamination problems in sampling the deep biosphere. Gieskes recommended that SCIMP send a liaison to the PPG and that when there is a membership change on SCIMP, a microbiologist should be selected.

Action Item 98-1-12A

SCIMP will identify a liaison to the Deep Biosphere PPG.

Action Item 98-1-13A

The SCICOM Chair will inform the national committees of the need for an individual with microbiology expertise to serve on SCIMP when next there is a membership change on the panel.

Natland (liaison to SCIMP) said that he could not comment on what SCIMP had recommended. There has not yet been any feedback to OPCOM or SCICOM from the PPG, so the strategies or plan under consideration by the PPG were not clear. Gieskes agreed, and commented that SCIMP panel members were only able to give very broad advice at this time. Humphris pointed out that the decision to embark upon a phased approach was taken by SCICOM at the August 1997 meeting not only because of the recommendation from the renewal review, but also because SCICOM wants a proof-of-concept before building an expensive facility. She reminded the panel that the Deep Biosphere PPG represents a new group of scientists without much experience on the drill ship. They have had one full meeting, followed by a meeting of a sub-group of the PPG with engineers and lab officers at TAMU to design a phased approach. Fox pointed out that the PPG has moved from a vision to an identifiable set of experiments that will take the vision forward in a phased manner. McKenzie will report to SCICOM on the PPG. Nils Holm was recommended as the SCICOM liaison to the Biosphere PPG to replace McKenzie, who will rotate off the panel after this meeting.

Appendix 2 contains a summary table of maintenance and replacement costs (pages 15-18) provided by Jay Miller that had been requested by SCICOM for budgetary planning purposes. SCIMP determined that the total cost to keep all the equipment running is \$150K.

As requested by SCICOM in response to EXCOM Motion 98-1-8, SCIMP reviewed and prioritized all activities and services under its purview. SCIMP approached this from the point

of review of cost savings. Potential actions to achieve cost savings were classified from the most to least drastic.

- Most drastic - ship cores home (unacceptable to science community)
- Moderately drastic - lay-up of listed equipment (major repercussions that would negatively affect the community).
- Less drastic scenario - cut down on some of the services on the ship; lay-up less equipment; disallow replacement of selected items (constitutes only a minor savings)

SCIMP was of the opinion that equipment lay-ups are not effective, and the savings are trivial compared to budget cuts that may be required in the future. Scenarios for cost savings related to publications and information services are on pages 23-24 of Appendix 2. The major areas identified for cost savings in logging services include elimination of the large diameter tools (negative impact on innovation) and cessation of LWD/LWC.

SCIMP considered the potential for cost savings in connection with the idea of not archiving cores forever since, with time after a leg, sampling requests diminish. If cores cease to be archived in perpetuity and older archive cores are eliminated (i.e. donated to museums), the remaining cores could be consolidated in fewer core repositories - a new core curation system with potential savings.

A summary of the impact of the proposed SCIMP actions/scenarios on the LRP is on page 26 of Appendix 2. Cutting any high-priced item results in a major impact on achievement of the Long Range Plan, so this needs to be viewed in concert with a prioritization of the science objectives. SCIMP queried whether cuts in engineering should be considered by JOIDES, and whether there ought to be further cuts at ODP-TAMU.

Humphris summarized that TAMU has provided the capital replacement plan and, in terms of the EXCOM motion, SCIMP has provided information on cost cutting. Humphris added that now SCIMP needs to advise SCICOM on what ODP should provide as basic services.

Gieskes reported that SCIMP did not want to discuss replacement of US members at the SCIMP meeting. The panel felt that it was not appropriate for non-US panel members to provide input to this process when the US has no input to the selection of members by other countries. Humphris said that she understood his concern. She clarified that membership in all cases, including the US, is determined by the National Committees. However, Panels can provide input concerning their needs with respect to expertise or specialty to National Committees of all ODP Members through the SCICOM Chair who communicates with the National Committees on panel membership issues.

In a discussion of data archiving, Natland noted that the TAMU Data Librarian accepts EXCEL spread sheets. Piasis said that this was okay, as long as a separate file directory in ASCII was also submitted for archiving. Only ASCII files are archival; nothing else!

4. Technical and Engineering Development Committee (S. Humphris)

Humphris reported that Skinner was unable to make the meeting as the airport in the UK was closed due to fog, so Howard Shatto ran the November meeting. Humphris reported that it had two foci:

1. A review of potential engineering projects to meet the Long Range Plan (LRP) requirements (e.g. hard rock coring options, shallow water coring systems, MWCS, etc.)
2. A proposal from JAMSTEC for Joint Development of Technology focused on:
 - improvements to coring systems
 - development of long-term monitoring systems (tethered vehicle for installation, access, and recovery of monitoring equipment).

On the latter item, TEDCOM passed the following consensus:

TEDCOM Consensus 97-2-1:

TEDCOM fully supports the exchange of information and assistance in the joint development of technology between JAMSTEC/OD-21 and ODP-TAMU to the extent that this can be done within the constraints of budget and available personnel.

TEDCOM also recognized that projects falling within the coring systems initiative would be the most appropriate for joint development, and recommended that ODP-TAMU follow up on possible collaborative projects.

There were also several recommendations by ODP-TAMU regarding improving interactions with TEDCOM:

- One TEDCOM meeting/year prior to August SCICOM/OPCOM meetings to review overall strategy for, status of on-going, and proposed new, development projects.
- Appointment of a TEDCOM representative to interact with the TAMU Project Manager for key development projects.
- Bimonthly reports on development projects to be sent by e-mail to TEDCOM.

There was no resolution on this issue, although post-meeting communication with the Chair suggests continuation of the two meetings/year schedule. Humphris reported that she will be meeting with Skinner in the next two months to discuss some of these issues.

5. OPCOM Discussion of Major Action Items from Panels

All items were dealt with during reports of each Panel Chair.

6. Summary of Any Items that Need to be Sent to SCICOM

All items were dealt with during reports of each Panel Chair.

I. Drydock Projects

1. Update on Status of Dry-Dock (J. Baldauf)

This was postponed until the TAMU report in the joint OPCOM/SCICOM meeting.

2. Options for the downhole Measurements Lab (J. Baldauf)

Baldauf displayed a schematic showing the existing DML and the model for the expanded downhole measurement lab (Appendix 3). The cost estimates for the expansion of the downhole lab are a year old and are as follows:

- | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| • Laboratory without A/C | \$400K | |
| • AC/Ducting | \$310K | (includes improving the AC throughout the entire lab stack) |
| • Stairway Access | \$ 30K | |
| • Elevator Extension | \$ 35K | |
| • Additional Office Space | \$ 50K | |

If the roof of the lab stack is selected for the placement of a van for the microbiology lab, it would need to be strengthened at a cost of \$15K.

Action Item 98-1-14A

OPCOM requests that ODP-TAMU include the plans for the expansion of the DML in the bid packages to go out to dry -dock vendors, with some caveat, so that it would be possible to fund this project in the event that sufficient cost-savings become available.

3. Dry-Dock Plans for the Downhole Measurements Lab (M. Reagan)

Reagan reported that some of the data acquisition capabilities for logging tool experiments in the DML will be enhanced. There will be an upgrade of the MAXIS system and the Schlumberger acquisition system will be switched to a modular PC-based system, which will be easier to maintain and will allow use of the latest generation tools. In addition, modifications will be made to the existing DML to optimize utilization of space. This expenditure is an X-based item in LDEO's FY'99 budget. All of the plans have been discussed with Leon Holloway (TAMU) and the SEDCO representatives.

4. Identification of Space for Containerized Microbiology Lab (J. Baldauf)

In August 1997, SCICOM passed a motion requesting that a space be identified for the placement of a containerized microbiology lab. This could be on the roof of the lab stack, or in the present location of the Core-Tech Lab. In addition, it requested SCIMP to identify space where some initial microbiological work might be done. SCIMP considered the Second-Look Lab and the Micropaleo Lab as potential initial laboratory space. On hard rock legs, the Micropaleo Lab would be suitable, but would become too crowded on soft rock legs. Baldauf has also determined that WHOI has a van that could be available in FY'98 for outfitting for microbiological work.

J. On-Going Implementation Projects

1. SCIMP Recommendations on Future Oversight of JANUS (J. Gieskes)

This was postponed until the joint OPCOM/SCICOM discussion the following day on the transition from the implementation phase with advice from the JANUS Steering Committee to oversight by SCIMP.

2. Publications-Status (J. Baldauf)

Publications was postponed until the ODP-TAMU report at the joint OPCOM/SCICOM meeting.

K. Other Items

Humphris asked for any other items; none were brought up.

Humphris reminded that OPCOM would continue the next day in joint session with SCICOM and that she would present the Action and Consensus Items from this meeting to SCICOM.

Humphris pointed out that this is the last meeting for Joris Geiskes as the Chair of SCIMP. She expressed the thanks of OPCOM for his many, many years of dedicated service to ODP, and commented that she was sure he would be back in some capacity to serve ODP again.

L. Next Meeting

The next meeting of OPCOM will be in Durham, UK on August 21-22, 1998.

Operations Committee (OPCOM) Meeting

17 March 1998

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 a) Structure of guidehorn before and after damage
 b) Number of Paleo Entries in the JANUS Database
- Appendix 2 SCIMP Notes for the OPCOM Meeting
- Appendix 3 Schematic of the Proposed Expansion of the Downhole Measurements Lab