

AASC Conference Call – Minutes
Tuesday June 18, 2013, 1:00p EDT

On call: Maggie Benoit, Heidi Houston, Susan Schwartz, Brandon Schmandt, Gabi Laske, Steve McNutt (*all AASC*); Donna Blackman, Rodey Batiza, Jenn Wade (*all NSF*), Juli Morgan (*GeoPRISMS*), Doug Toomey (*CIET*)

Not on call: Jeff Freymueller (*AASC*), Ramon Arrowsmith (*EarthScope*)

1) Report on EarthScope meeting activities (Benoit)

The EarthScope National Meeting included a half-hour plenary discussion plus a 50 minute breakout session devoted to the Amphibious Array and its future. It was a substantial amount of time to update community on the status of the array, to highlight initial science, and to encourage people to start thinking about what the array could do next within NSF budgetary constraints.

At the Plenary session, we heard from:

- Abers – experiment overview
- Wade – NSF perspective and outlook
- William Wilcock – OBS operations overview
- Benoit – led final discussion of future

At the breakout, short presentations were given by:

- Weisen Shen – ambient noise tomography across the ridge
- Yang Shen – imaging crust and upper mantle
- Julie Elliot – talked broadly about GPS in the Pacific Northwest
- Abers – OBS noise and receiver function recovery
- Wade – NSF comments
- Benoit and Wilcock moderated additional discussion.

Clearly some work has begun with AA data, although it is in early stages. Several of these presentations and discussions highlighted the future of the array (along with discussions with OCE personnel before the workshop). Although NSF is concerned about making a future long-term commitment to an experiment as large and long-running as Cascadia, they are open to ideas from the community for strategies to use the amphibious array (onshore coordinated with offshore). Much discussion centered around a possible upcoming workshop to garner community input, discussed below.

2) Fall activities: OBS planning meeting (October) and AGU sessions (Toomey, Schwartz)

OBSIP is coordinating a workshop in the LA area on October 21-22, convened by Monica Kohler, Harm van Avendonk, Doug Wiens, and John Nabelek, to discuss OBS science. The day before, CIET will hold their annual meeting, the last part of which may be open and include presentations of people using CI data. One goal is to get feedback on data quality. Also, CIET wants to learn enough to include snippets of science being done in their Year 4 proposal, derived from this meeting, with information on who is using the data. A proposal has been encouraged shortly after the workshop. CIET will advertise this opportunity broadly, along with a web site for announcing what people are doing.

Hooft, Allen, Trehu, and Schwartz are convening a fall AGU special session on Initial Results of Cascadia Initiative.

ACTION ITEM: To help them seed this, Benoit & Abers will circulate a list of who participated in the EarthScope National Meeting Cascadia discussions [*NOTE: The requested list is above in these minutes*]

3) Update on CIET activities this summer (Toomey)

There will be 6 cruises this summer, 3 recovery and 3 deployment. Five use the Oceanus, and one (trawl-resistant seismometer recovery) use the Atlantis-2 with Argo/Jason to aid recovery. The first just finished, recovering WHOI instruments, and the second is out right now. The WHOI recovery had weather issues off Cape Mendocino, but recovered all focused-study sites, with 2 instruments not recovered. It was known at deployment that the two instruments had bad acoustic transponders, they probably recorded OK but the release mechanism could not be activated. CIET still wants to recover them, they likely have a year of data, and do so this year while clock is working & can reuse for Year 3. May try to do via Atlantis cruise, and are seeking extra ship-time day to do so.

CIET is starting an outreach program, using the A2 cruise, which has possibility of visual real-time feeds. A reporter will be on board for a cruise, and Discovery channel contacts developing. From the Apply To Sail announcement, CIET received over 50 applicants from all over, many not from Oceanographic institutions. In the end they average 3 students per cruise.

The Year 3 plan remains as originally planned after the 2010 workshop. The focused array will reoccupy Grays Harbor, with more sites and more instruments, and the deep-water array will return north. Priority will be given to sites that did NOT recover well in Year 1.

Data delivery still seems slow to be released. Issues include leap seconds, APG clocks, etc. There needs to be shorter time until metadata are available, from all Instrument Centers. Hopefully there will be a smoother Year 2. CIET sends out a plea to find out who is using data, and what are they doing?

A GeoPRISMS newsletter article is being written, and photos/text are being solicited.

4) NSF suggestions/ideas for a 2014 meeting to discuss the future (Blackman, Wade, Abers)

NSF wants to keep ability to support amphibious array facilities, but the 4-year Cascadia budget commitment is big. It is unclear that NSF would want to immediately roll into something like Cascadia again. They are looking for alternatives, and will consider: scenarios where only a portion used, either single transect, or 1-year deployments, or other options including possible short-term interim use of the instruments to other projects. As long as EarthScope is a program (i.e. through 2018) then EAR's constraint is that the on-land part must be tied to stated EarthScope goals and regions of interest.

As a result, there was a sentiment that some kind of planning and science target identification meeting should happen, at an appropriate time. Late 2014 seems appropriate, it gives perhaps enough time to analyze Year 1-2 data and a quick look at Year 3. NSF is not yet in a position to specify details of how exactly such a meeting should be managed etc.; 2013 budgets still do not exist, never mind 2014. (A note on budgets: MGG sees a 7% cut to science, 5% cut to facilities including OBSIP base costs.)

Discussion: It seems important to keep a land component to optimize use of the shallow-water instruments. There was some sentiment that the purview should be broader than GeoPRISMS science plan. It is not clear the extent to which NSF might break up the facility. There was some discussion about the benefits of a community facility, in which a broad community participates in planning how it is deployed, vs. PI-driven designs where data are made open in a timely manner. Some parallel onshore-offshore experiments could be useful models to compare (eg, McNutt mentioned a Sicily project; others exist as well). Everybody agreed that the program would benefit from rapid communication about who is doing what work on current data, to test whether this concept works. It was suggested that AASC might be a useful vehicle for leading the proposed workshop, something NSF will ponder. AASC has built-in coordination with EarthScope, GeoPRISMS, and OBSIP.
ACTION ITEM: Follow up between AASC and NSF about how such a workshop would be run, and by whom.

5) Future of AASC what is its role? What are reporting processes to / from? (Abers)

This item was only briefly discussed. There is still a problem with direct reporting to/from AASC. There needs to be a more regularized reporting from AASC to both the EarthScope and GeoPRISMS steering committees, perhaps by the chair. Also, for AASC to be useful, there should be a reasonable rate of reporting *by* the facility operators (IRIS, UNAVCO, CIET) *to* AASC – this has somewhat happened informally until now, but perhaps it should be regularized. There is also uncertainty about AASC's role and charge.

ACTION ITEM: NEED FROM CHAIRS OF EarthScope Steering Committee and GeoPRISMS Steering and Oversight Committee - put regular reporting from AASC on agendas. Keep AASC alerted to dates of SC meetings.