

University of New Mexico

## UNM Digital Repository

---

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Long Term Ecological Research (LTER)

---

10-1995

### **Coordinating Committee Meeting, Cedar Creek LTER Site, Minnesota, October, 1995**

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter\\_reports](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter_reports)

---

#### **Recommended Citation**

Long Term Ecological Research Network. "Coordinating Committee Meeting, Cedar Creek LTER Site, Minnesota, October, 1995." (1995). [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter\\_reports/81](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter_reports/81)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Long Term Ecological Research Network by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [disc@unm.edu](mailto:disc@unm.edu).

From: Stephanie Martin <[smartin@lternet.edu](mailto:smartin@lternet.edu)>  
To: [pi@lternet.edu](mailto:pi@lternet.edu), [net@lternet.edu](mailto:net@lternet.edu), [students@lternet.edu](mailto:students@lternet.edu)  
Subject: 10/95 LTER Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes  
Date: Wed, 1 Nov 1995 16:25:13 -0800 (PST)

M I N U T E S  
LTER Coordinating Committee Meeting  
Cedar Creek Natural History Area LTER site  
Bethel, Minnesota  
(Held in conjunction with Biodiversity Symposium)

October 20-22, 1995

SITE PARTICIPANTS: Shelly Arnott (NTL), Carl Bowser (NTL), Ingrid Burke (CPR), Dave Coleman (CWT), Tim Fahey (HBR), Janet Fischer (NET), David Poster (HFR), Kay Gross (KBS), David Hartnett (KNZ), Bruce Hayden (VCR), Anne Hershey (ARC), John Hobbie (ARC), Laura Huerneke (JRN), Glenn Juday (BNZ), Alan Knapp (KNZ), Johannes Knops (CDR), Jack Lattin (AND), Jean Lodge (LUQ), John Magnuson (NTL), Daniel Milchunas (CPR), Bruce Milne (SEV), Glenn Motzkin (HFR), John Porter (VCR), Phil Robertson (KBS), Tim Seastedt (NWT), Raymond Smith (PAL), Sarah Spaulding (MCM), Fred Swanson (AND), Dave Tilman (CDR), Maria Vernet (PAL), Les Viereck (BNZ), Jim Vose (CWT), Robert Waide (LUQ), Robert Wharton (MCM), Dave Wedin (CDR)

NETWORK OFFICE: Caroline Bledsoe (NET), Jerry Franklin (NET/AND), Jim Gosz (NET/SEV), Stephanie Martin (NET), Rudolf Nottrott (NET), John Vande Castle (NET)

NSF: Scott Collins

-----  
LTER BUDGET REDUCTION

Chair Jim Gosz called the meeting to order and displayed a matrix showing site budget categories affected by the recent \$20,000 annual LTER budget reduction (It was noted that, for some sites, this amounted to \$40,000.) He asked sites to provide later in the meeting information about what area(s) they had cut or transferred in dealing with level funding. The categories supplied were:

Principal Investigator salaries	Equipment
Post-doc	Students
Technician	Science Program
Subcontracts	Materials and Supplies

During discussion, it was suggested that before the results were presented to NSF the PI, Post-doc, Students and Technician categories be collapsed into a single "Personnel" category and that the Subcontracts be incorporated into the Science Program category. The PIs in Co-hort I agreed to meet with Scott Collins to discuss related impacts as they prepare their next site proposals.

NSF REPORT (Scott Collins)

Present budget situation: LTER Program Officer Scott Collins noted that there would be a decrease in the research budget for LTER, but that

Clinton would likely veto the appropriations bill presently under consideration. Nevertheless, a 20% drop is expected in the overall NSF budget over the next 10 years. NSF will be operating on a contingency budget. They would have approval to spend 75% of the previous year's budget until the '96 budget is approved by Congress, at which time they would be allowed to spend the appropriated amount. For LTER, that would amount to \$560,000 per site. Collins noted that he shared the sites' concern about their flat budgets. An additional problem this year is that the Partnerships for Enhancing Expertise in Taxonomy (PEET) used LTER budget funds last year. The \$10.8 million allotted for the LTER Program covers site budgets, but doesn't cover the REU program or cross-site supplements. However, if extra funds appear at the end of the year, they may be applied to LTER once out-year commitments are met.

Other funding opportunities: There will likely be around \$1.6 million (\$200,000 max/proposal) for cross-site proposals. (Last year 10 out of 42 projects proposed were funded.) These funds may be used for REU, ROA or high school programs if there is not enough for a cross-site competition.

NASA MODUS Proposal: In order to avoid losing NASA funds for work recently proposed in the MODUS proposal submitted to NASA, NSF has recommended that LTER sites document how much extant LTER research would be used for the effort. This would be to meet NASA's request that NSF co-fund the research, since NSF does not have matching funds. The MODUS group (Diane Wickland) needs to be informed how much sites are already doing that is relevant to the collaboration. John Vande Castle, Bruce Milne and Indy Burke agreed to meet to identify site efforts in this area in order to develop a briefing for NASA and to identify what the sites would be able to do under reduced funding.

Site Visits: Collins noted that NSF views site visit reports as very significant evaluations, and that DEB is bringing LTER site records into line with other large projects. It is now policy for formal reports to be on file; however, reports are recommendations only. Funding will not be cut as a result of a site visit, which is an opportunity to address reviewers' recommendations, a "wake-up" call. The site visits are meant to help sites improve, and maintain excitement and research quality. Sites can be put on probation following an adverse site review. It is expected that improvement will be demonstrated in the next proposal submitted to NSF for continuation of the site's LTER research program. If that proposal is not recommended for funding, NSF may then recommend that funding stop for that site. If cut-off is recommended, contingencies will be made to provide for wind-down money. NSF is trying to be more sensitive to how the Program is viewed from the outside. Large programs like LTER are vulnerable to attack, and a strong peer review process is critical to their defense.

Discussion: Gosz noted that the new site visit approach almost appeared to be impromptu. He asked if prior discussion of such changes would be possible in future, and whether NSF could generate a related policy document. Collins said that the problem was the \*past\* lack of documented policy, and that there is now no written management plan. Noting that there may have been very logical reasons for past management approaches, Jerry Franklin proposed that a dialog between NSF and the Coordinating Committee take place to at least air the issues. Caroline Bledsoe pointed out that there had been a written management plan developed at NSF 6 to 7 years ago. She agreed to try to locate a copy for Scott Collins. In general discussion it was suggested that site review teams be provided with past review reports. However, these would have to be provided by sites themselves, due to NSF's confidentiality rule. Scott Collins agreed to supply the new written policy to the CC.

**PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE** (Bruce Hayden, Chair)

Bruce Hayden provided a summary of the process the PC used in inviting proposals from major publishers for several LTER series. Major publishers attending the August 1994 ESA meeting were invited to attend a special LTER session at which LTER needs were described and proposals invited. The need for site- and network-level syntheses, electronic as well as print products, inclusion of color, and affordable distribution to students were emphasized.

Four proposals were received--Oxford, Springer-Verlag, Elsevier, and St. Lucie (Boca Raton, FL). The Committee reviewed them for these attributes: general design and overall plan, cost of production and sale price, quality control, production speed and capabilities, marketing capabilities and past successes, experience in producing publication series, and technical and editorial assistance capacity. The Committee unanimously agreed that Oxford provided the best opportunity for LTER, but that the Network should leave the option open to work with Springer on international projects. Site representatives were encouraged to review the proposals and be prepared to vote their preference later in the meeting. Later in the meeting, a hand vote showed full concurrence that the Committee should pursue securing a contract with Oxford University Press. PIs were urged to provide ideas for the contract negotiation.

**TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE** (Carl Bowser, Chair)

Carl Bowser reported that the new Technology Committee had been assembled with a goal of providing a range of expertise in membership. Other members are: Linda Blum (DNA), Bruce Hayden (Climate), Jordan Hastings (Data Management), John Vande Castle (Remote Sensing), and Scott Collins (NSF). Following an assessment of current and emerging technologies relevant to long-term ecological research, the Committee will prepare recommendations and publish a report. Bowser provided an outline of the report contents, which included a summary of recommendations, prior support, current needs and developments, full recommendations, and technological applications and appendices (lists of past supplements and site technological needs). Also considered would be how to obtain funding for centralized resources (modelling/large-scale computing and analytical instrumentation) and the possibility of buying into existing developments (e.g., USGS and San Diego Supercomputing Center, etc.) and new developments like NEXRAD (ground-based radar which provides regional analysis of precipitation, intensity, patchiness). In discussion, it was suggested that seeking breakthrough technologies be made part of the LTER mission, and that that the Climate Committee get involved to debate the research issues.

Site reps were asked to take two questions back to their sites for further discussion: (1 What support have you had in the past that advanced your science? and (2 What technologies are important to pursue? Resulting information will be solicited from the sites via e-mail communication.

**DATA MANAGERS COMMITTEE/NETWORK INFORMATION SYSTEM** (John Porter)

John Porter (VCR) reported that the Data Managers group has been actively developing a strategic vision for data management for the Network, a structure for Data Manager organization, and an LTER-wide information system. Following workshops to address specific aspects, the Committee

hopes to have the system design completed in one year. Support for the effort may be obtained through a combination of Network Office and site budgets, but proposals to other sources are also being considered.

General discussion: Concerns expressed included (1 intersite working groups engaged in comparisons should be critical players in the development of any Network-wide information system, and should be leading and including data managers; 2) the Network might want to focus on the core dataset catalog development instead of allocating more effort in this area at the site level; and 3) systematists and quality control elements should be built in, as well as links to LTER biodiversity and climate communities. James Gosz noted that NSF is placing increasing emphasis on information management. Past NSF guidance suggested that an appropriate commitment would be one quarter of the budget for information management.

#### NETWORK OFFICE PROPOSAL

James Gosz reviewed the function of the Network Office, noting that it responds to and mediates between the network of sites and NSF, facilitating activities identified by both. As decided at the May 1995 LTER/CC meeting at VCR, the Executive Committee and Chair have been developing the Network Office proposal to meet a January 15, 1996 deadline. The first draft was substantially reorganized and revised during the EC meeting the day before. A working draft will be completed in the next 30 days, so early input from the CC is critical. To facilitate CC input, the draft will be posted online and sites will be notified re access and comment provision.

The revised Network Office proposal draft takes into account the flat funding scenario (besides the 10% cut from the present funding level--\$900K/year, about \$37K is lost annually to inflation). Facilitation of the science agenda set by the EC and CC now leads the budget justification and determines how activities and service to the sites will be implemented. Proposal logistics will be developed once the NSF competition announcement is out. In an effort to obtain CC affirmation of the direction the EC is taking on the proposal and to determine where to cut the existing budget, site representatives were asked to rate proposed enhancements and outreach efforts in the new outline on a 1 to 5 scale, 5 representing the most favored.

#### ENHANCEMENTS (75% effort)

Regionalization	Data Management
Cross-Site Research/Synthesis	Electronic Communication
Standardization	Committee Meetings
Education	Technology Development

#### OUTREACH (25% effort)

International	Institutional
Publications	Electronic Communication
Interagency	NSF Liaison

Results tallied later in the meeting: 1) under Enhancements, the highest-rated activities were cross-site research/synthesis, data management and electronic communication; 2) under Outreach, publications and NSF liaison were highest and international was the lowest-rated. Others fell in the mid-range.

Meetings: The use of new technologies is proposed to cut meeting and travel costs. A recent test of video teleconferencing software at the

Network Office (an initial investment of \$2,000 to \$3,000/site) demonstrated its potential for smaller EC and CC business meetings. This tool would result in fewer meetings requiring travel.

In addition, the model presented by the present meeting--i.e., combining a science workshop with a business meeting--was discussed. (A later request for a hand vote showed full support for using this model for designated future CC meetings.) During discussion it was suggested that in evaluating topics for future workshop/meetings, the CC should ask the same questions asked through the peer review process: (1 How will this topic contribute to building significant infrastructure, and (2 How will it advance the science?

**Education:** In the area of education, activities proposed include development of training courses at centers (both NSF centers and LTER sites), and support of the Graduate Student Committee (travel, awards, multi-site field courses, intersite exchanges, REU student exchanges). In discussion, additional suggestions for student support included workshop participation and building students into Synthesis Center proposals. Representatives were also asked to consider whether graduate students should be allowed a vote on the CC. After further discussion, this proposal was voted down.

**Technology:** Among new technologies proposed for exploration, testing and possible (not mandatory) implementation at the sites were: 1) Thematic Mapper, AVHRR, SPOT; 2) SAR acquisitions; 3) Hyper-Spectral Imager (HSI); 4) Sun Photometer validation; 5) MODIS, Mission to Earth; and 6) Aircraft Imagery--free to LTER if Network incurs responsibility to interpret. Jim Gosz reminded representatives that NSF wants to develop centers of excellence at LTER sites, but that not all sites need to develop all technologies. John Magnuson noted that in situ remote sensing in water has been a neglected area.

Proposed areas of technology training in collaboration with NSF centers (e.g., San Diego Supercomputing Center) included: 1) ecological data management; 2) visual modeling; 3) analytical-predictive modeling; 4) massive data acquisition (e.g., NEXRAD); 5) mass data storage systems; and 6) climate simulation. PIs were urged to interact with NSF centers, which are "under the gun" to demonstrate their utility to the larger community. He noted that they are willing to write joint proposals and are eager to work with LTER.

Other interactions/collaborations proposed include: the Santa Fe Institute (student courses, workshops, Complex Modeling Systems training); the Center for Microbial Ecology (workshop training, sabbaticals, equipment use, post-docs); the new Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis; and the Lee Hood Center (cellular/molecular biology techniques). Modes of collaboration might include funding for sabbaticals, a full-time position for LTER activities with joint support by the Network Office, equipment use, etc.

**Publications:** Jim Gosz presented a list of proposed publications activities and invited PIs to provide input to the EC on whether to produce an annual report in place of two newsletters per year, as proposed in the previous cooperative agreement. Support is proposed in this budget for site series (with publisher), synthesis series (with publisher), an annual report or two newsletters annually, informal reports (e.g., El Nino and LIDET reports), and formal reports (Stream catalog, ILTER report, site directory). Input sought includes consideration of whether the Network Office should be continue publishing "grey literature"--depending upon distribution, each costs \$500-600. One suggestion was that these

could be put online, not printed. After additional discussion, it was agreed that the EC should decide what investment to place in publication areas after seeking the recommendations of the Publications Committee.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Jim Gosz noted that the Executive Committee, in collaboration with NSF, had been developing an advisory board as recommended by the 10-year review to facilitate strategic planning and broader participation in decisionmaking. The Executive Committee may seek a Board review of the Network Office proposal. Most individuals (listed below) identified have already expressed interest in serving:

Paul Risser, Chair, President, Univ. of Miami of Ohio  
Ann Bartuska, U.S. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.  
William O. Heal, United Kingdom  
Leonard Krishtalka, Director, Univ. of Kansas Natural History Museum  
Jane Lubchenco, Oregon State Univ., AAAS President-Elect  
Pam Matson, U.C. Berkeley, National Academy of Sciences member  
William Murdoch, Interim Director, Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis, U.C. Santa Barbara  
Ron Pulliam, Director, National Biological Service, Washington, D.C.  
Robert Robbins, Vice President for Information Technology, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington

#### DATA MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW AT CEDAR CREEK

Cedar Creek Data Manager Clarence Lehman provided an overview of Cedar Creek computer facilities. The primary server, a large Sun, resides at the University of Minnesota campus, with another Sun at the research site connected via phone link. CDR field personnel gather data directly from machine to database with palmtop computers, direct reading scales, ammonium nitrate analyzers and N,C and H elemental analysers. For storage and analysis, flat ASCII master files are maintained; data conversion filters are used for transfer to other formats. System backup involves biweekly off-site tape dumps with standard UNIX software. A duplicate system is maintained at the field site using a MIRIM (mirror) system. PERM1 records are used for ultimate backup and very long-term storage. Since tape is a volatile media and CD-ROM technology changes so rapidly, the site has chosen to use printed data in scannable form using error correction with the goal of producing a reliable, computer-readable document. There are check codes on each line of data, and a check code for the whole data file. At the front of each document is an English description of how to compute codes and the program.

Participants were led on field trips to the oak savannah and grassland (biodiversity) experimental areas.

#### WORKSHOPS

X-ROOTS: Caroline Bledsoe provided a summary of progress of the X-ROOTS synthesis activity funded in the last NSF cross-site competition. The central idea is to move the data through a series of steps, beginning with a survey of available data. She noted that there were unexpected challenges in reviewing the relevant literature and in obtaining information on data formats and methods. (Others involved: Harvey Chinn/UC Davis, Rudolf Nottrott/NET, Jordan Hastings/MCM.) Raw data is very difficult to obtain and, in some cases, publications do not include

information on variances. In addition, existing software tools must be modified, adding to the time and cost of the effort. She appealed to sites for assistance, due to the limited salary support. Help is needed from site data managers with data access and information technology support. Products include future related synthesis workshops--Agriculture (1995), Grass (1996), Forest (1997)--and both print and online publications, and a relational database with linked tables.

**Soil Methods Standardization Workshop:** Phil Robertson reported that the Soil workshop, with \$12,000 support from the Network Office budget, is tentatively scheduled for March 27-29, 1996 at the Sevilleta field station. The idea for the workshop grew out of the general frustration that soil methods are not uniform across sites, hampering cross-site work. The goal will be to recommend a single procedural measurement method (physical, chemical, biological properties) and two to three recommended alternative methods in a 12- to 15-chapter book.

The organizing committee, which will also act as the editorial board, identified lead authors, who will identify co-authors. A first draft is expected to be completed prior to March. NET support will cover non-LTER participant expenses and local expenses for LTER site participants, with six to eight experts and one LTER participant per site--about 30 total. There are no specific plans as yet for a follow-up cross-site comparison. In discussion, it was noted that biological properties will be emphasized and that the resulting book will be published, perhaps formally, as an easy-to-use LTER standard methods book. A supplemental proposal may be submitted to NSF for publication costs.

**LTER-LMER Workshop:** At the recommendation of NSF, LTER Chair Jim Gosz has asked Bruce Hayden and John Magnuson to organize a workshop to explore possible ways to more closely associate with the related Land-Margin Ecosystem Research (LMER) Program, funded through DEB and Biological Oceanography. Participants will be invited from within and outside both communities and NSF. Present LMER sites: Chesapeake Bay, Columbia River, Georgia Rivers (newest), and Plum Island Sound. Observable similarities between the two programs: the organic documents are similar, both build on processes and problems over the long-term, both are inter- and multi-disciplinary in nature, and LMER and LTER scientists are highly similar. One key difference: funding blocks terminate for LMER. There has been more vigorous effort for a merger from DEB than BIO Ocean, so a compromise approach may be needed. LTER PIs were referred to John Hobbie, who is LMER Coordinating Committee Chair, for answers to specific questions about LMER. Names of potential workshop participants should be forwarded to Bruce Hayden or John Magnuson.

The workshop will be an analysis and discovery effort which will result in a white paper with recommendations to NSF. A merger could mean the addition of 4 to 5 additional sites to the LTER Network. Some of the questions to be addressed: Assuming a merger occurs, should there be two classes of LTER sites? What would be the best approach to a merger--Allow for a "catch-up" period for the LMER sites? In the brief discussion that followed, it was suggested that a representative from the Prince William Sound, AK research group be invited to participate. As the workshop is developed, more information will be provided.

**LIDET Activity:** Jim Gosz reported that another LIDET workshop is scheduled for April 1996 which is expected to generate papers. The LIDET activity is intended to generate group science. A sample copy of the report "Meeting the Challenge of Long-Term, Broad-Scale Experiments,"



which describes the research process utilized by the LIDET team, was circulated. Copies will be available from the Network Office in a couple of weeks. Participants wishing copies were asked to note name and quantity on a sign-up sheet.

#### WORKSHOP PROPOSALS POLICY

Jim Gosz reported that the EC had developed a criteria for workshop proposals supported by the Network Office grant. There is \$25,000 for workshops for 1996 and the EC is looking for creative new ideas. The criteria are:

- \* Must be a consortium proposal from at least three sites
- \* Must include a title and justification and 3 pp. description
- \* All sites should be informed for possible participation
- \* A data survey should be completed prior to submitting proposal
- \* Products should be identified.
- \* Proposals should be presented at LTER/CC meetings
- \* Final decision to fund is the LTER/EC's

Since the LTER/CC won't meet again until April, which would be too late to plan for 1996 workshops, ideas will be solicited via e-mail for 1996. Deadline for submission to both the EC and CC is December 15. Proposals for 1997 workshops will be presented at the spring '96 LTER/CC meeting. Workshops that have been "waiting in the wings" would have to meet the new criteria. The workshop criteria were later endorsed by the CC.

#### SYNTHESIS CENTER PROPOSALS

PIs were urged to use workshops as preparation or pre-work for Synthesis Center proposals. Now is the time to develop proposals before the Center gets oversubscribed. No integrated LTER efforts are under way so far. Both individual and group, national and international (lead must be U.S.) proposals are entertained and the format is flexible. Some ideas already being explored: Jerry Franklin/structural legacies and their role in ecosystem recovery (particularly wood and coral systems); Laura Huerneke (JRN)/nitrogen fertilization; Glenn Juday (BNZ)/biological consequences of global change. Areas of emphasis the first two years: Spatiotemporal Dynamics and Ecosystem Management or other highly innovative and synthetic proposals. Target date for receipt of 1996 proposals is December 31, 1995. More information is available online at URL <http://www.ceas.ucsb.edu>. Kay Gross, who is on the review board, invited PIs to contact her to explore proposal ideas.

#### KNIGHT & NIEMAN FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

David Foster reported that with a go-ahead from the EC he had been meeting with the Knight and Nieman (MIT and Harvard) science writing fellowship programs to develop a one-day forum involving LTER scientists and approximately 15 invited established journalists. The two programs would organize journalist participation and LTER the scientist participation. The forum would be thematically organized and participants would break into informal groups. While it would be expected to lead to some initial activity, more important, it would likely generate a longer-term opportunity with real benefit to the LTER community. Such a forum could be incorporated with October 1996 CC meeting at Harvard Forest and the timing could be significant, as the Environmental Journalism Society meets nearby next year and their meeting includes a field trip to the site. An

optional trip to Hubbard Brook might be added. Following discussion, the CC enthusiastically endorsed the proposal.

#### SYNTHESIS COMMITTEE

Jim Gosz solicited PIs to serve as Synthesis Committee chair(s). He noted that help was needed for this increasingly important committee to help set the agenda for next year and work with the Publication Committee. When no volunteers came forward, he asked representatives present to go back to their sites and identify possible nominees by e-mail. In the interim, Gosz will serve as chair and Caroline Bledsoe and Bruce Milne volunteered to meet with him on urgent issues. In discussion, it was suggested that at least two Synthesis Committee members have close links to the Synthesis Center. Names suggested included Kay Gross, Diana Freckman, and Monica Turner.

#### LTER COHORT PRE-PROPOSAL REVIEW

Jim Gosz reported for Indy Burke that some sites would like to have reviews prepared by other LTER sites prior to renewal proposal submission. Should this be done in a more organized fashion? It was noted that LTER has lost sites due to proposals which did not review well: should LTER develop a more proactive approach? It was decided that the sites would continue to use an informal process for obtaining reviews of their proposals by sending them to appropriate PIs. No organized effort was recommended for handling the entire cohort of proposals that will be submitted in 1996.

#### 1-800 # STATUS

John Vande Castle reported that, while some sites who had been heavy users of the Network Office 1-800# had secured their own or found other local solutions, present use by the sites was still over-budget. Costs are down from a high of \$2,800 to 1,500 per month. The Network Office will send out notices to sites that are still using the NET number heavily. The question of whether to eliminate the modem pool and substitute commercial providers was considered, but the cost is low and not a key factor.

Rudolf Nottrott showed a screen capture slide of the videoconferencing software under consideration for use by the EC and CC. It is possible to scale windows showing the different participant connections so that multiple "talking heads" are visible simultaneously. There is a slight time delay in sound and image movement, but not to the extent so that it would interfere with communication. Jim Gosz reiterated that this would be a very cost-effective replacement for traditional meetings, as after the initial software costs, transmission time in most cases would be free.

#### GRADUATE STUDENT COMMITTEE

Janet Fischer (NTL), who with Reed Perkins (AND) is the new co-chair of the LTER Graduate Student Committee, reported that interest in doing cross-site work is growing among students working at LTER sites as a result of the Student Intersite Travel Awards supported by the Network Office grant. She pointed to descriptions in the current issue of the \*Network News\* of student intersite work supported by the first competition. The EC decides which proposals to fund. Information on past awards and upcoming competitions are posted online at the Network

Office. Five proposals were submitted in response to the October 1995 competition. Fischer proposed that the CC consider providing the same opportunity in 1996. A motion was offered and seconded to use 1996 NET funds in the amount of \$4,500 (approximately 3 awards) for intersite travel. The motion carried by a hand vote.

#### INTERNATIONAL LTER

Jim Gosz reported that international outreach, leading participation in the ILTER Network is expected to be included in the NSF RFP for the Network Office. Activities are likely to include scientists exchanges, student exchanges, collaborative proposals. Support for these efforts is also available from International Programs and other sources of funding, such as the Inter-American Institute (data management), the European Community, Soros (Russia), and other U.S. agencies. Gosz reported that several meetings, which are already funded or have a high probability of receiving funding, are planned for Mexico, Spain/Portugal/Morroco, Poland and Slovakia, Japan, Costa Rica, Chile, Taiwan, South Africa, China, and Canada. LTER participants for some meetings and exchanges still need to be identified (especially right away for the Spain/Portugal/Morroco trip, which will be split into coastal and interior site visits).

Discussion: Concerns were expressed about scientist-to-scientist international exchanges working at cross purposes to network efforts and about some people within countries being frozen out of the process by other individuals and organizations within those countries. Gosz noted that ILTER doesn't organize in-country efforts, but does present the U.S. LTER model and assists them in organizing themselves. International Programs seeks to develop bilateral relationships where both sides put money on the table.

#### UPCOMING CC MEETINGS

1996: April 24-26, Konza Prairie  
October (tba), Harvard Forest

1997: Proposals to host the 1997 meetings were entertained and H.J. Andrews, Central Plains, and Kellogg volunteered. Niwot offered to co-host with CPR. After discussion, it was decided that Stephanie would add a history of where past CC meetings had been held to the NET WWW home page. Other sites interested in hosting a 1997 CC meeting should e-mail Jim Gosz. A decision will be made at the April 1996 meeting.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

New Journal: David Tilman reported that he will be editing a new ESA journal, \*Ecological Issues\*. Three years of funding have been secured from the Pew Foundation, including funds to hire a science writer to convert science articles to lay language. The target audience will be policymakers and senior agency personnel, and links will be established with public education media. He solicited ideas for topics, noting that the journal wouldn't be officially announced for another three months in the \*ESA Bulletin.\* Format: 12- to 16-page free-standing articles, 3-4/year, that provide a summary of what is known about a scientific issue and address the related unanswered questions. Arrangements have already been made to use the Nature Conservancy's photograph collection.

Management of Public Lands: Jerry Franklin provided information about the shifts in the national debate over how public lands should be managed. A new war has begun with the changes in Congress over the disposition of public lands. The real agenda is to promote the sale of public land and give management authority to states and counties. A plausible case can be made that agencies don't manage well and, unfortunately, the environmental and conservation biology communities have helped to create this view by focusing on single-use percentage and reserve-based arguments. The new war, he said, will hinge on whether we value public lands. There is now active animosity in Congress for the type of science LTER does. Some of the rank and file are well-informed and thoughtful, but those in control view scientists as the enemy. Being identified with problem solution is no longer a real benefit, and we are seeing reversals of 30-year processes. Those of us who do value this public resource need to educate children and the general public, to get information out in digestible, credible forms, in high-profile venues. We need to get personally involved in developing positive messages.

Respectfully submitted 11/1/95 by Stephanie Martin  
Approved by J. Gosz, LTER Chair