

University of New Mexico

## UNM Digital Repository

---

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Long Term Ecological Research (LTER)

---

8-1-2000

### Coordinating Committee Meeting, Snowbird, August, 2000

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, Snowbird, August, 2000." (2000). [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter\\_reports/66](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter_reports/66)

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).

**Coordinating Committee Meeting  
August 3, 2000  
Snowbird**

1. Status of BioScience articles from John Hobbie. Goal to publicize accomplishments of LTER with one author from each site.
2. Discussion of preparations for 20-year review – Discussion included the issue of what needed to be prepared to present to 20-Year Review Team. Several themes were suggested, including biodiversity, NPP, regionalization, and cross-site research. We discussed the goal of refreshing the intellectual aims of LTER as part of our preparation. We also discussed coupling our preparations to the BioScience articles.

Suggestions about major questions to be addressed included:

- natural climate variability and response
- disturbance and ecological response
  - droughts, floods, land use change, invasions
- forecasting ecological change from variability in space and time
- forecasting ecosystem change from scaling and process studies
- human and ecological legacies
  - past land use
  - past ecosystems
- biodiversity and ecosystem function

Discussion of preparation of white paper – The consensus was that it should focus on scientific priorities and it should integrate the existing vision statements. The document should include a discussion of the mechanism for setting priorities. This mechanism should include Network and network Office priorities, as the review is of both. A review of the Risser Report and our success in achieving its recommendations would be valuable. The document Should reflect the fact that we have accommodated mission creep over the years through priority setting, not the addition of new money.

Scott Collins arrived and fielded questions about the 20-Year Review process. 3>

Planned schedule – A draft of the white paper will be developed beginning with a fall meeting of the Exec and Scientific Initiatives Committees. The draft will be reviewed at a January meeting of the lead Principal Investigators and then presented to the NAB at the February 2001 Exec meeting. The Exec will revise the document for the April 2001 CC meeting in Phoenix.

**There was a motion to adopt this schedule which was passed unanimously.**

3. The review of the Network Office was received today. The review calls for prioritization of activities in the Network Office, but that will require prioritization by the

Network first. The CC needs to establish a mechanism for sites to provide input to future reviews of the Network Office. A discussion of this point was pu off until a future meeting.

4. Following up on ASM activities, the CC decided to solicits request for support for post-ASM working groups to be funded by the Network Office. Proposals will be sent to the Network Office and evaluated by the Executive Committee. There is about \$180K in the Network Office budget for these activities. The focus should be on working groups that aim to produce real products. We should investigate the possibility of co-funding these activities with NCEAS. We should also consider working with other groups (AIBS, ESA) for future meetings.

What can we do to have another ASM in 3 years? Collins indicated that the next ASM should be 6 months separate from ESA and at another venue.

5. Several other items were discussed

- Thanks to organizers and NET Staff
- Meeting reimbursements
- Communication issues, particularly poor response to queries
- Cross-site competition – these funds come from venture funds in directorates, but these are not available every year. This time there were only 36 proposals, which raises the question of whether this competition is worth it with such a small number of submissions. It might be a good idea to have the next competition the next All-Scientists Meeting. There also needs to be an effort to get SBE involved in cross-site studies.
- OCE may be interested in buying into LTER - may be interested in setting up own network.
- There was a meeting with agency represenatatives to discuss the development of network of networks idea. We are working on a more formal planning effort.
- Dave Greenland has stepped down as Climate Chair. Doug Goodin with replace him.

Coordinating Committee Meeting - 8/3/2000

I. Misc discussion

- A. Hobbie working on bioscience paper
  - 1) themes are questions more than methods
  - 2) outline available
- B. new Bioscience Editor interested in LTER

II. 20-year review

- A. chairperson selected
  - B. need names of 6 international people for review committee
  - C. what do we want to present beyond site science
  - D. refresh the intellectual aims of LTER (Shaver)
  - E. Themes
    - 1) biodiversity
    - 2) NPP
    - 3) regionalization
    - 4) cross-site research
      - a) National
      - b) International
    - 5) will need people to work on these topics
      - a) could couple to Hobbie bioscience paper
        - 1> same material sliced differently
        - 2> focus on large questions
          - p> not topics themes or tools
        - 3> is social science in the list
          - p> social science is a method and is part of all questions
        - 4> goal to publicize accomplishments of LTER with one author from each site
          - p> organizers
            - a: Hobbie
            - b: Seastadt
            - c: Grimm
            - d: .....
          - p> major questions to be addressed
            - a: natural climate variability and response (Greenland?)
            - b: disturbance and ecological response
              - 1: droughts, floods, land use change, invasions
            - c: forecasting ecological change from variability in space
  - 6) discussion
    - a) preparation will include CC input
    - b) meeting in Jan for social science starts - white paper available
- F. Shaver draft white paper
  - 1) focus on scientific priorities

and

time

1: lots of human dimensions

2: empirically based/statistical forecasts

d: forecasting ecosystem change from scaling and process studies

e: human and ecological legacies (Foster)

1: past land use

2: past ecosystems

f: biodiversity and ecosystem function (Tilman)

1: role of biodiversity in maintaining system function

p> don't want to confuse cross site research (tool, no question)

- 2) discussion
  - a) but many things we do are not explicitly listed
  - b) I like focus on scientific priorities.....
  - c) already have some vision documents, do we throw them away?
  - d) they should be integrated
  - e) they will also want to know HOW WE SET priorities as well as what priorities are....
    - 1> I agree that that will be important for review

G. Prioritization Process

- 1) Network Activities
- 2) Network Office Activities
- 3) discussion
  - a) clarification - this review is of entire LTER Network, not just NET office... Yes
    - 1> want to have good mix of site and cross-site/network successes
    - 2> will need to go beyond site level
    - 3> committee chair given relatively free hand in past
  - b) also good to go back and look at Risser report to see what we have done (and not)
  - c) we tend to have accomodated mission creep through priority setting, not acquisition of new money
    - 1> need to make it clear that that occurs and that we deal with it
- 4) Scott Collins arrives - questions to Scott about 20 year review process
  - a) want to be like 10 year review. Get reviewers to all sites.
  - b) focus on entire network and NSF management of it
  - c) how long? it will take a while....
  - d) loose reins on committee
  - e) you can help NSF by giving questions
  - f) also like lists of US an International folks who might be good
  - g) chair has been contacted
  - h) idea would be 2001
  - i) is it likely to occur before summer
    - 1> unlikely before summer to get team organized
  - j) anything to help educate Henry?
    - 1> want to let him know what he is getting into
    - 2> site visits help
      - p> 9 scheduled for next year
  - k) last review functioned independent of NSF after it was organized
    - 1> NSF steps back
  - l) document will have major impact (similar to Risser)
    - 1> issue of more for sites or more sites
- 5) Planned schedule
  - a) Fall EXEC and SCI Init. committee
    - 1> develop strawdog document
      - p> Hobbie outline
      - p> Shaver whitepaper
      - p> discussion
        - a: don't need to focus on Hobbie stuff since it is focusing on past successes rather than future priorities
        - b: still good to have!
    - 2> pass to CC

- b) Jan. Lead PI Meeting ? yes
  - 1> work on strawdog documents
  - 2> lead PIs only will be reimbursed
- c) Feb 2001
  - 1> EXEC with NAB in DC
  - 2> revise strawdog document
- d) April 2001 CC meeting (Phoenix)
  - 1> final review and plans for 20 years
  - 2> April 25-29 is landscape ecology conference in Phoenix
- e) need to have act in order, beyond things in document
- f) motion on this schedule
  - 1> carried unanimously
  - 2> will work on schedule for January lead PI meeting via email
  - 3> also need to figure out when NAB can meet ASAP
    - b> and coordinate with NSF
    - b> remind Scott as soon as he gets back
  - 4> need to tie down April meeting as well
    - b> should it be in conjunction with LE meeting? yes if

feasible

- 6) Needed for report back to NAB
  - a) how we prioritize...
  - b) NET Office site review - received today
    - 1> same issues for NAB
  - c) Lead PI meeting will need to work on
    - 1> EXEC will need to work on first
- 7) Network Office Site review document
  - a) prioritization of activities in the NET Office
    - 1> but need to prioritize needs of network
  - b) mechanism for sites to provide input to future reviews of NET Office
    - 1> CC will need to discuss at some point

### III. ASM Followup

- A. NET budget can be used for planning
- B. requests will come sooner than next CC meeting
- C. how do you want us to prioritize them?
  - 1) use Hobbie document and list to evaluate
    - a) EXEC will need to make decisions
      - 1> also may need to coordinate overlapping requests
      - 2> send to Waide
    - b) do you want feedback on decisions?
  - 2) deadline or incremental?
    - a) until we run out of money....
    - b) will request feedback from CC on things that merit further support
      - 1> willing to solicit proposals
  - 3) what level support?
    - a) we can support planning meetings
    - b) have about \$180K total
      - 1> goes quickly with 23 site meetings
      - 2> suggest focus on real working groups
  - 4) 6 or so people for 3 or 4 days?
    - a) yes, could also be multiple meetings
    - b) Collins - very important that these be products
    - c) can we cofund with NCEAS
      - 1> Collins - Yes
  - 5) last CC meeting got permission to fund individual scientists to work on synthesis

- a) may try to cofund some of these with NCEAS
- 6) steps
  - a) send email to talk about availability
  - b) receive requests
  - c) EXEC will evaluate
    - 1> but will need to know what is coming.....
    - 2> will wait to accumulate a few
- 7) perhaps better to have a deadline?
  - a) END OF OCTOBER
  - b) deadline for NCEAS proposals
  - c) Waide will discuss with Richmon so could be earlier than Oct.

IV. Thanks to ORGANIZERS! and NET Staff

V. reimbursements

- A. if paid own airfare, need to fill out form and send receipts
- B. if used NET travel will send per diem. Hook on WWW site at \$88 per day. Maximum of 4 days authorized.
  - 1) name SSN and home address on WWW

VI. communication issues

- A. still need to get past 50% responses to queries
- B. some folks not in LTER database.... so they don't get message. Esp. problem for graduate students
- C. next review may involve site responses to NET requests

VII. What can we do to have another ASM in 3 years

A. Collins

- 1) next one will be 6 months separate from ESA
  - a) so more folks will stay for ESA since it will be time for another meeting
  - b) at another venue

VIII. Other Discussion

A. What about intersite competition?

- 1) needed venture funds for this year
  - a) but that is not every-year thing
  - b) have roughly 3 year cycle since sharing with other clusters
- 2) 36 proposals to panel
  - a) can apply to do cross site in any part of NSF at any time....
  - b) disappointed by small number of proposals - hard to deal with admin.
    - 1> they say "is it worth our time and effort" for such a small number
  - c) panel meets 24-25 August with immediate awards following
- 3) next go round might be good to have after next All-Sci Meeting

B. next ASM

- 1) would like to work with other group (AIBS, ESA) on organizing future ASM meetings

C. how can we work constructively to get SBE involved in cross site?

- 1) workshops etc. help
- 2) there is community out there willing to push, but have to work hard

D. was hard to get enough social scientists here...

- 1) perhaps need to have mutual benefits

E. OCE may be interested in buying into LTER - may be interested in setting up own network

F. Meeting with agency reps. Working on more formal planning

effort

1) working on ASPI ecological society proposal

a) well thought of by agencies

2) very positive meeting here...

G. Dave Greenland stepped down as Climate Chair. Doug Gooding is new CLIMATE chair

H. for next ASM want to learn on the lessons we learned here

1) perhaps article for NET News

2) will need feedback

a) perhaps Bruce Peterson - he has some ideas

□