

University of New Mexico

UNM Digital Repository

Long Term Ecological Research - Reports

Long Term Ecological Research (LTER)

4-1993

Coordinating Committee Meeting, Las Cruces, New Mexico, April, 1993

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter_reports



Long-Term Ecological Research Network

College of Forest Resources, AR-10
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

LTER Network Office

Ph: 206-543-4853

Fax: 206-685-0790

**LTER Coordinating Committee Meeting
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM
April 3, 1993**

MINUTES

Meeting Chair: Tim Seastedt (Niwot Ridge LTER; LTER Executive Committee)

List of participants attached.

Opening remarks were made by **James Gosz**, Division of Environmental Biology (DEB), National Science Foundation. Among other topics, Dr. Gosz discussed the reorganization of DEB into activity clusters designed to increase program and cross-funding interaction. He confirmed that the program offering supplements to existing DEB awards for outside scientists to conduct research on LTER sites is still viable, and will be more widely advertised in the near future. Other disciplines (eg genetics, behavioral biology, etc.) are beginning to develop programs to give supplements to people in their specialties to do work on LTER sites so that they can make use of long-term data. The estimated completion date for the LTER 10-Year Review report is June 1993.

LTER 2000 science vision document: **Fred Swanson** led a discussion about rapid development of a one-page LTER 2000 science agenda to supplement the infra-structure-oriented LTER 2000 document and to define a science vision for LTER. Dr. Swanson agreed to chair a lunch meeting during the Coord. Committee Meeting to put together a justification context for the document. The document will specifically address network-level science, what characterizes it, how it complements site-level science, etc. **Bruce Hayden** will draft the LTER 2000 science document and circulate it by email, first to the small working group, then to the Coordinating Committee.

Synthesis Volume: **Caroline Bledsoe** and **David Coleman** led a discussion about the Synthesis Volume under development. The following possibilities were discussed: possible publication as a special journal issue as opposed to a book; financing publication by way of a supplemental grant; and convening an editorial board for the publication. Suggestions were solicited for possible chapter titles, contributing authors, and editors.

All Scientists Meeting: The September, 1993 All Scientists Meeting will maintain much the same structure as the 1990 meeting, which seemed to meet the needs of most participants. Mornings will be structured, afternoons less structured, and evenings designed for the group to reconvene.

The 1993 All Scientists Meeting will increase emphasis on graduate student involvement. **Caroline Bledsoe** has put together a group of four grad students to plan that effort. **Grad student committee members are: Win Everham, LUQ; Janet Fischer, NTL; Anne Hartley, JRN; and Steve Wondzell, AND.** Each LTER site is strongly encouraged to bring at least 2 graduate students to the All Scientists Meeting. The graduate student committee goals for the All Sci Meeting are to: get more graduate students at the meeting; assist them in networking with each other without becoming isolated as a group; and to integrate them with researchers at sites other than their own. A long-term goal is to encourage cross-site comparison work in graduate student projects. All Scientists Meeting registration forms will contain space to indicate willingness to "mentor" individual or small groups of grad students.

Suggestions for VIP speakers and cross-site synthesis speakers can be made to the **Program Planning Committee: Caroline Bledsoe, NET; Bill Lauenroth, CPR; John Vande Castle, NET; Bob Waide, LUQ, and Bruce Hayden, VCR.**

The following responsibilities for the All Scientists Meeting have been assigned:

All Sci. Program Committee: morning presentations

Caroline Bledsoe: Speakers

Ken Bible (NET): workshop logistics

Adrienne Whitener (NET): Registrations

Rudolf Nottrott & Daniel Pommert: Communications

To be determined: Coordination of hosts for International Summit invitees

Network Office: PR/press coordination; invitations; information mailings; requests for abstracts, etc.

All Sci Graduate Student Committee: graduate student participation; poster coordination

International Summit: The Network Office is compiling a list of volunteers to host 30 or so International Summit participants throughout the entire All Scientists Meeting. There will also be space on the registration forms to indicate willingness to volunteer as hosts.

Responsibilities would be to interact with one to three foreign participants to ensure that they are full participants in the meeting, and that they know where to go for any problems.

Allocation of Network Office funds for site participation in All Scientists Meeting: The following allocation was unanimously agreed upon by the Coordinating Committee.

Network Office funds will support:

- A. meeting costs, meals and lodging (i.e. on-site costs) for 5 people per site at the double occupancy rate;

- B. all sites except the two Colorado sites will have 5 minimum estimate airfares paid by the Network Office. (Minimum estimate = 14-day advance purchase with Saturday stayover.)
- C. For sites wanting to drive or send some drivers and some flyers (like NTL): Network Office funds equivalent to unused airfares will be exchanged for the on-site costs at the meeting. The dollar amounts for will be based on airfare estimates to be obtained by the Network Office and discussed with the affected sites in the near future.

All costs covered by the Network Office will be paid either to the YMCA of the Rockies for on-site costs or to Global Express for air travel. This will eliminate the need for travel claim forms to be processed through the University of Washington.

Each site is encouraged to send at least 5 people in addition to the 5 Network Office-paid participants, and to include at least 2 graduate students in each site group. (The graduate students can be part of the group of 5 LTER Network Office-paid participants from each site if the PI so decides, but they will not be covered in addition to the 5.)

Presentation on State of the Environment Reporting, Canada: Potential collaborations and interactions between LTER and the Canadian long-term research organization are currently under discussion with NSF and Jerry Franklin. **J.D. Collinson**, Assistant Deputy Minister, State of the Environment Reporting, Environment Canada, explained that his agency is not a parallel to LTER. State of the Environment Reporting arose from the Canadian government's Green Plan. It is charged with producing a national report on the state of the environment every 5 years, and the government intends to establish ecological science centers in 15 ecozones to monitor ecosystem profiles.

LTER/NASA interactions: **John Vande Castle** gave an update on LTER/NASA-EOS collaborations. A meeting between LTER and NASA/MODIS scientists at Goddard Space Flight Center, March 22-24, was held as a follow-up to the previous meeting at Sevilleta. The goal of this meeting was to initiate specific recommendations from the SEV workshop. Notes from this meeting are to be sent to Principal Investigators at each site. From recommendations at this meeting, a supplemental proposal was submitted to NSF for an initial test of a few Sun Photometers for use in satellite data corrections. NASA committed funds for this activity if funded, and also promised to assist in calibration of the instruments and training in their use. Other activities such as planning for a workshop at the All Scientists meeting and overflight of AIRSAR and AVIRIS sensors for some sites this year were also discussed. NASA acquired Landsat TM data for 9 LTER sites during 1992, and has committed to acquisition of 26 scenes during 1993 based on input from the sites and documented in the SEV LTER/NASA workshop report.

McMurdo Dry Valley presentation: PI **Robert Wharton** introduced the newest LTER site with a description and slides about the area and research performed there. The site will be featured in an upcoming issue of the *LTER Network News*.

Data Management Group report: **James Brunt** discussed upcoming meetings; current data management focused working groups; the Data Managers' responses to LTER 2000 and the

ILTER 10-year review; standard data exchange format; and the LTER all-site bibliographic data base.

The Data Management Group is developing a 10-year plan for development of scientific information management in LTER. Objectives include training and education, communication facilitation, technology realization, and "mindset" (the "network" view). The 10-year plan will be expanded upon at the next Data Managers meeting in Madison and at the All Scientists meeting. There is a short description of the plan in the Proceedings of the 1992 LTER Data Management Workshop, available from the Network Office.

Dr. Brunt announced the symposium on Environmental Information Management and Analysis: ecosystem to global scales, held in Albuquerque, May 20-22.

ESA Committee on Long-Term Data Sets: Kay Gross has been asked by the Ecological Society of America (ESA) to look into the preservation and future of long-term data sets (not specifically LTER). There is currently no mechanism for the preservation and maintenance of long-term ecological data. To use LTER as an example, there has not been an effort to pull together long-term historical data at all sites. Other issues:

- increasing importance of long-term records
- the need to define data and take formats into consideration
- where to begin collecting
- data endangered by shifting budget priorities
- how to prioritize data to collect
- how to determine what to save and what not to save

A preliminary meeting was held in November to discuss finding, preserving, maintaining, accessing, archiving and curating of data and developing a catalog. If funded, this summer ESA will appoint a committee to identify critical issues and the focus, scope and scale of the catalog. The expected products would be a hard-copy catalog, approximately 2 years out, and, eventually, an on-line version.

US Geological Survey Grand Canyon project: Richard Marzolf, USGS, discussed a plan under development by the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a controlled flood experiment in the Colorado River below Lake Powell. The EIS will be available to the public this summer, and it will be decided on by Secretary of the Interior Babbitt by summer '94. The first flood experiment is scheduled for April of '95. Dr. Marzolf also discussed the Grand Canyon Protection Act now in congress. The Act has language in it about long-term research, and there may be some potential for interaction with LTER.

Biome Map discussion: Judy Meyer (LTER Exec) led the discussion about update of the LTER biome map for use in publications and as a quick, visual introduction to the LTER Network. Suggestions included considering Bailey's ecoregion map with separate input from the Antarctic Palmer Station site. The Coordinating Committee agreed to request that Stephanie Martin (LTER Network Office Publications Coordinator) consider the EER map and Bailey's ecoregion map and send the next version of the LTER biome map to sites by mail for comment.

Minimum Standard Installation discussion: Rudolf Nottrott (NET) pointed out that sites' reactions to MSI center around cost, and what direction to go in as a network. Tim Seastedt (LTER Exec) suggested that the LTER 2000 science document presents an opportunity for the sites to re-evaluate their needs. It was decided that Jerry Franklin (LTER Chair) and the Science and Technology Committee be asked if they would consider a re-evaluation of the MSI, and a call for volunteers to conduct it in conjunction with LTER 2000. CC members decided to recommend that NSF include two additional items on the list of what is appropriate for supplemental funding; these are (1) personnel support for operating and maintaining present MSI installations and (2) intersite research projects. Conclusion: Further discussion to be deferred until the Risser report on the LTER 10-year review and the scientific justification for LTER 2000 are available.

Dept. of Interior U.S. Biological Survey: Bruce Hayden led a discussion on the National Biological Survey (NBS) proposed by Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt. The discussion focused on how the NBS might interface with LTER, and how to position LTER so that when the time comes to establish a relationship, LTER will be ready. Current speculation is that individuals will be tapped from various agencies (National Park Service, USDA Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife, etc.) to form the NBS. Its mission will probably be along the lines of identifying trends and status of biological resource levels in the U.S. The proposal has some language in it similar to EMAP. It may include a grants program, but DOI will probably look primarily to using its own capabilities.

(Update: In May Jerry Franklin had an opportunity to discuss LTER with Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt, who plans to talk to James Gosz about collaboration and cooperation between LTER, ESA, and the proposed National Biological Survey.)

Summary of LTER Coordinating Committee CLOSED SESSION
April 3, 1993

Following is a summary of the final session of the Jornada CC meeting, edited from notes provided by session chair Bob Waide. **Please note: this session was closed to all but representatives of LTER sites, and this summary is being sent only to the extended PI list.**

1. **Bruce Hayden** noted that the **ecosystem panel** is having a hard time getting adequate numbers of proposal reviewers to respond. Bruce suggested that LTER scientists take this responsibility particularly seriously. If someone is unable to review a proposal, he or she should inform NSF and suggest another reviewer.

2. **John Hobbie** discussed his suggestion that LTER join LMER in proposing to **EMAP** a program of intensive monitoring of site characteristics that would (a) complement the EMAP measurements (e.g. time intensive oxygen measurements) in order to provide detailed variability and trend data, and (b) test various indicators of ecosystem status that are now or might be suitable for inclusion into EMAP. The consensus was that LTER should invite a representative from EMAP to the All Scientists meeting for a discussion. Jerry Franklin has been asked to delegate the responsibility for making this invitation.

3. There was brief discussion of the **LTER 10-year review** process, with general agreement that it was a necessary, albeit time consuming, task. General curiosity was expressed about the content of the review committee's report and the responses to questionnaires. It was decided that LTER should find out from Paul Risser whether the summary of responses will be made available to the sites. If not, then the sites should be urged to share their responses within the Network.

4. A discussion about **CC meeting improvement** resulted in the following suggestions for improvement: 1) handle informational items by e-mail, reserving face-to-face meetings primarily for action items; 2) include closed sessions in future CC meetings; 3) use telephone conferences to complement face-to-face meetings; 4) schedule more results-oriented science presentations; and 5) adopt a specific type of cross-site comparison as a theme, encouraging sites to send interested LTER co-PIs as their second site representative to participate in a mini-workshop on the selected topic.

5. **John Hobbie** was elected to the **Executive Committee**. Jerry Franklin's proposal to expand the number of elected members to four full members (instead of 3 members and an alternate) was accepted. The elected members of the Executive Committee are now **John Hobbie, Judy Meyer, Tim Seastedt, and Fred Swanson**.