

University of New Mexico

UNM Digital Repository

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Museums and Research Centers

4-28-1994

LTER Correspondence & Letters

Jerry F. Franklin
Chair of LTER Network

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



Part of the [Forest Sciences Commons](#), [Other Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Commons](#), [Other Geography Commons](#), and the [Physical and Environmental Geography Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Franklin, Jerry F.. "LTER Correspondence & Letters." (1994). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/lter_reports/178

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Museums and Research Centers 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.



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

April 28, 1994

David Greenland
University of Oregon
Department of Geography
Eugene, OR 97403-1251

Dear David:

I would like to invite you to attend the upcoming Coordinating Committee meeting to be held at the Coweeta LTER Site, October 19-21, in your role as Chair of the Climate Committee.

Please plan to arrive by the evening of October 19. A registration form is attached; Note that, due to the time of year, rooms must be confirmed with Beth O'Grady of the Coweeta site by June 1. The LTER Network Office will pay your travel, food and lodging expenses. Please let Adrienne Whitener in the Network Office know whether or not you plan to attend.

I look forward to seeing you there.

Regards,

Jerry F. Franklin
Chair, LTER Network



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

April 28, 1994

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

Dear Josh:

I would like to invite you to attend the upcoming Coordinating Committee meeting to be held at the Coweeta LTER Site, October 19-21, in your role as Chair of the Graduate Student Committee.

Please plan to arrive by the evening of October 19. A registration form is attached; Note that, due to the time of year, rooms must be confirmed with Beth O'Grady of the Coweeta site by June 1. The LTER Network Office will pay your travel, food and lodging expenses. Please let Adrienne Whitener in the Network Office know whether or not you plan to attend.

I look forward to seeing you there.

Regards,

Jerry F. Franklin
Chair, LTER Network



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

June 13, 1994

To: LTER Principal Investigators (Extended List)
Committee Chairs

From: Jerry Franklin, Chair, LTER/CC *JF*

Subject: Decisions on governance
and Identification of actions required

As you are all aware, some very significant decisions were taken at our LTER/CC meeting held on April 22-24, 1994, in Washington, DC. Although you have already received minutes from those meetings, I wanted to provide this reiteration of the decisions taken and subsequent actions that are required to implement those decisions. Several of action items require your immediate attention so that we can meet timelines associated with the fall meeting at Coweeta. "Adopted" means that the stated position was adopted by a majority vote (in most cases they were unanimous) of the full LTER/CC following discussion of the Executive Committee's recommendation. Many of the Executive Committee's recommendations were modified during the discussion into these final forms.

SELECTING FUTURE CHAIR OF THE LTER/CC

ADOPTED: The Chair of the LTER/CC should be a well-established senior scientist, recognized both internally and externally as a leader in ecological science. The Executive Committee, with the addition of one non-LTER ecological scientist, will operate as a search committee soliciting nominations, developing a short list, interviewing candidates, interacting with NSF, and providing the LTER/CC with a recommendation. Final selection will be by a secret ballot of the full LTER/CC. As a guide, the Executive Committee will seek candidates willing to commit to a half-time commitment for a 3-year period; however, a commitment of 1/4 time for 2 years will be required as a minimum.

ACTION: ALL PIS ARE IMMEDIATELY ASKED TO PROVIDE THE CURRENT CHAIR WITH NOMINATIONS FOR THE NEXT CHAIR OF THE LTER/CC. THE DEADLINE FOR NOMINATIONS IS JUNE 30, 1994. Some reality checks would be appropriate with regards to availability and suitability so as to keep avoid creating a large winnowing job for the Executive Committee. The LTER/CC believed the most appropriate candidates are to be found amongst existing and past PIs of LTER projects.

ACTION: Following receipt of nominations (beginning July 1) the Search Committee (Executive Committee, with the additional participation of Dr. Jane Lubchenco) will begin evaluating and contacting the list of potential nominees. The initial discussions amongst the Search Committee will occur via phone conference in mid-July. The ultimate objective is, of course, selection of a candidate for a vote by the full LTER/CC at Coweeta on October 20 and, if approved, assumption of the LTER/CC Chair in January of 1995.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LTER/CC

DECISION: The LTER/CC and Network Office must make better use of standing and ad-hoc committees to spread responsibility and participation in formulation and implementation of the LTER Network activities. Hence, the LTER/CC adopts the following as standing committees. Their regular committee meetings will be supported through the Network Office and their chairs will meet with and report to the LTER/CC at the annual large or open meeting.

Committee	Chair
Data Managers	James Brunt
Climate	David Greenland
Technology	David Foster (pro tem)
Publications	Bruce Hayden (pro tem)
Synthesis	Robert Wharton and Kay Gross (pro tem)
Graduate Student	Joshua Greenberg

ACTION: All Committee chairs have been invited to the Coweeta LTER/CC meeting. See below for specific actions regarding the Publications and Synthesis Committees.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

DECISION: A Publications Committee is established and will consist of at least 5 members, of which at least 2 will be LTER/CC representatives from the sites, and ex officio participation by the Network Office Publications Coordinator and other individuals as identified by the LTER/CC. Initial members of the Publications Committee are Hayden (chair pro tem), Foster, Seastedt, Hobbie, and (ex officio) Martin and Bledsoe. The initial charge to the Publications Committee is to provide recommendations to the full LTER/CC on: (1) A policy for LTER with regards to the publication network-level books and LTER book series, including objectives of such books/series and a process for development of publication proposals and for peer review of content and quality; (2) A policy on electronic publication of LTER documents and publications; (3) Advice and recommendations on continued development of the LTER bibliographic data base; and (4) Suggestions and advice on LTER/CC activities involving other media, such as video.

ACTION: HAYDEN (WITH ASSISTANCE FROM NETWORK OFFICE) TO ORGANIZE A PHONE CONFERENCE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP TO 1) IDENTIFY REMAINING MEMBERSHIP AND SELECT AND PERMANENT CHAIR AND 2) DEVELOP AN INITIAL WORK PLAN FOR THE COMMITTEE'S ACTIVITIES. THE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE IS TO REPORT TO THE LTER/CC ON ITS PROGRESS AT THE COWEETA MEETING.

SYNTHESIS COMMITTEE

DECISION: A Synthesis Committee is established and will consist of at least 7 representatives, including at least 2 of the regular LTER/CC site representatives, and additional ex officio representation from the Network Office. Initial members of the Synthesis Committee are Wharton and Gross (chairs pro tem), Driscoll, J. Schimel, M. Harmon and (ex officio) Franklin and Bledsoe. The initial charge to the Synthesis Committee is to provide: (1) Leadership in development of the network-level synthesis and cross-site activities;

(2) Specific recommendations to the LTER/CC and Chair for Network-sponsored synthesis activities, including topics for proto-workshops, full workshops, symposia, and other activities. An immediate charge to the Synthesis Committee is to begin (3) development of an LTER **MINIMAL MEASUREMENT PROGRAM (MMP)** to support synthesis and other network-level research activities, including appropriate QC/QA procedures.

ACTION: WHARTON AND GROSS (WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE NETWORK OFFICE) TO ORGANIZE A PHONE CONFERENCE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP TO 1) IDENTIFY REMAINING MEMBERSHIP AND SELECT A PERMANENT CHAIR, 2) ORGANIZE A PROGRAM OF WORK SPECIFICALLY INCLUDING 3) A PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE MMP PROGRAM BY THE TIME OF THE COWEETA LTER/CC MEETING.

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

DECISION: A Technology Committee is established and will consist of at least 7 representatives, including at least 2 of the regular LTER/CC representatives, and additional ex officio representation from the LTER Network Office. Initial members of the Technology Committee are Foster (Chair pro tem), Shugart, Brunt, and Mark McKenzie and (ex officio) Vande Castle. The initial charge to the Technology Committee is to provide leadership in identification and application of new technology and technological approaches in LTER. Included within this charge are providing: (1) continuing periodic assessments of technological needs and development, as typified by the earlier Shugart and Gosz committees; (2) recommendations on the continuing involvement of the LTER Network with existing technologies, including GPS, GIS, and remote images; and (3), in collaboration with the Data Management and Synthesis Committees, developing and updating protocols, such as the Minimum Standard Installation.

ACTION: FOSTER (WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE NETWORK OFFICE) TO ORGANIZE AND PHONE CONFERENCE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP TO 1) IDENTIFY THE REMAINING MEMBERSHIP AND SELECT A PERMANENT CHAIR AND 2) ORGANIZE A PROGRAM OF WORK BY THE TIME OF THE COWEETA LTER/CC MEETING.

c: J. Gosz
T. Callahan
Network Office Staff



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

April 28, 1994

James Brunt
University of New Mexico
Department of Biology
Castetter Hall
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1091

Dear Jim:

I would like to invite you to attend the upcoming Coordinating Committee meeting to be held at the Coweeta LTER Site, October 19-21, in your role as Chair of the Data Management Committee.

Please plan to arrive by the evening of October 19. A registration form is attached; Note that, due to the time of year, rooms must be confirmed with Beth O'Grady of Coweeta by June 1. The LTER Network Office will pay your travel, food and lodging expenses. Please let Adrienne Whitener in the Network Office know whether or not you plan to attend.

I look forward to seeing you there.

Regards,

Jerry F. Franklin
Chair, LTER Network



Marine Biological Laboratory

Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543 • (508) 548-3705

The Ecosystems Center

Memorandum

DATE: October 18, 1994
TO: LTER Coordinating Committee
FROM: John Hobbie *JH*
RE: BioScience MS on LTER

At the last meeting, we agreed to prepare a first draft of a manuscript for BioScience for the Coweeta meeting. There was very good response and I think we are off to a good start. Thanks to all participants. The eight sections were written separately, so naturally there was no general agreement on the amount of detail, on the goals of LTER, and the need for figures. The second draft should clear up these points.

The goal of the MS is to present the views of the LTER P.I.'s about the directions of the next decade of LTER. We will state the general scientific goals of LTER, state the approaches to be used, and illustrate how LTER is already making progress on the scientific goals and already using the approaches (at least in part). But we need to greatly increase the use of these approaches throughout LTER. We probably do not have to justify LTER's existence but can start right off saying here are the goals and approaches, here are some illustrative results.

My thoughts on the overall approach of the MS follow -- we should discuss these at the meeting.

1. We have to state the LTER goals in the Introduction Section and then all the section authors have to quote the same goals. There has been enough written about LTER and its goals that various authors have chosen a variety of goals. Fred Swanson points out that we now have a mixture of scientific topics (e.g., biodiversity) and approaches (e.g., modeling, regionalization). We should distinguish between topics and approaches and decide what to include here.
2. Should probably limit the number of references in each section to 5 or so. We are trying to highlight the LTER papers and the LTER examples. Some explanation is necessary at the start of each section but this is not a review article.
3. Should have at least two figures as examples for each section. These should be described in the text. Maps and color photos should be a part (as yet undetermined).
4. The examples should be drawn from all of the LTER's, not just your own. We will have to attempt to have all of the sites represented with a figure, somewhere.
5. The networking, coordinating committee, central office, e-mail, newsletters, data base, funds for comparative research, All Scientist meetings, NSF site visits, NSF panel reviews, etc., are not a part of the document because the emphasis is on results. They should receive recognition as the infrastructure that makes LTER work. How should we do this? Expand the Introduction?

The enclosed draft includes everything sent to me plus a revised Introduction section. A few comments are given (all caps) here and there. The references and figures are assembled at the end. We have to decide upon some deadlines for moving the manuscript along.

AW



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

To: LTER Principal Investigators

October 10, 1994

From: Jerry Franklin, Chair, LTER/CC *JF*

Subject: Nomination for next Chair LTER/CC
and Director LTER Network Office

As per our procedures adopted last spring, the Executive Committee has proceeded to solicit nominations and contact candidates for the next chair of the LTER Coordinating Committee; Jane Lubchenco was added to our group for this "search" process. During the process 15 individuals were nominated, all of them by scientists within LTER. Although LMER and LTREB PIs were contacted, no nominations were offered. Six of the nominees were from within our LTER ranks and three (Gosz, Hayden, and Magnuson) received more than one nomination.

Of the nominees, three indicated an interest in the Chair. Magnuson and Hayden both indicated a willingness to serve if we lacked an appropriate and willing candidate but, otherwise, preferred not to be considered for the Chair at this time because of pressing site responsibilities. Gosz indicated both an interest in the Chair and an ability to devote a significant amount of time to the job during the next several years, including a half-time commitment during 1995. A copy of his CV and a letter outlining his vision for the LTER Network is enclosed.

The Executive Committee has considered Dr. James Gosz' qualifications and is pleased to unanimously recommend him to the full LTER/CC as our candidate for Chair of the LTER/CC and Director of the LTER Network Program for 1995-1997.

We think that LTER is very fortunate to have someone with Dr. Gosz' experience, ability and dedication that is willing to take on the responsibilities of the Chair. Discussion and voting on the Chair will occur during the closed session of the LTER/CC on October 19.

Enclosures: Gosz CV
Gosz letter

cc: Lubchenco

From: "James R. Gosz" <jgosz@nsf.gov>
To: jerry@lternet.edu
Subject: here it is
Date: Tue, 04 Oct 94 10:47:23 EDT

The Role of the Chairperson
in the LTER Network Office

from Jim Gosz

Oct. 4, 1995

Jerry Franklin informed me that I would be nominated to follow him as the chair of the LTER Network Office; a high honor in my view. I am extremely excited about the future of LTER and welcome any opportunity to help it attain its full potential. I believe I have the energy, passion and contacts necessary to make a difference and would look forward to working with the entire LTER community to attain the goals that have been set. At this point, I have seen LTER as an outsider in the academic community, as a program officer in Ecosystem Studies when it funded LTER, as a P.I., as Division Director, and as an NSF representative on interagency committees that now sees LTER as a model for certain types of research. These positions have provided me with different perspectives that I believe can help in the role of chairman of the Network Office. I also believe I will leave NSF on a positive note and be able to maintain a special communication channel with the different Directorates of value to LTER. The following paragraphs address some questions and issues that Jerry posed for me. In a number of cases I am not sure I have the complete answer, or even the right answer; however, I will attempt to express my feelings on the issues. In all cases, I expect that LTER actions and directions will be developed by the entire community through the efforts of the Executive and Coordinating Committees. No single person directs the LTER program. The role of the Network Office (and its chair) should primarily be that of a catalyst, inside the LTER community, as well as with other organizations/institutions on behalf of LTER.

Please excuse the hurried, rambling nature of the response. This seems to be a unusually busy week at NSF.

Time Commitment over the next three years:

I plan to take a sabbatical when I return to New Mexico (in 72 days!) for the period January - December, 1995. This would allow me to spend 6 months (~1/2 time) working in the chairman position. I believe that amount of effort is essential to become familiar with the Network Office operation and personnel, get up to speed on the developments that are occurring in LTER and ILTER, and maximize the opportunities that I see developing in other agencies and institutions. I would plan to spend significant amounts of time at the Network Office; probably 2 week periods every other month during this first year. I anticipate that I will be able to spend at least 3 months (~1/4 time) per year in years 2

here it is

and 3. After the first year, the executive director will be in place and the day-to-day operation will be in her/his hands. The role of the chair will change somewhat but the need for effective communication will be even more important. I would like to experiment with a variety of communication techniques, ranging from standard phone conferences to telecommunication techniques. I also believe these procedures can be used more effectively throughout the LTER network.

Priorities for the chair, Network Office, LTER program:

Chair Role-

My generic view of the chair is one of stimulating the science and scientists in the LTER program through the mechanisms of the Exec. Committee, Coordinating Committee, the Cooperative Agreement with NSF and other potential agreements with other agencies. To repeat myself, the role should be catalytic in nature with major decisions being made primarily by the Exec. and Coordinating Committee procedures. The chair should actively seek ways to involve as many scientists (P.I. and non-P.I.) in the many activities as possible. Communication will be a crucial process in these activities, as it is in any organized activity. I believe the chair must work especially hard to develop effective methods for communicating with all aspects of the LTER effort; graduate students, PIs, Coordinating/Executive Committees, special committees. Those methods must also include mechanisms that identify when communication is not as effective as it should be. The Cooperative Agreement will represent new opportunities for LTER, as well as new responsibilities. The chair will be in an important position to make the best use of that instrument. Examples are: more direct access to NSF to express the needs of LTER; a better method of developing new initiatives, areas for supplemental funding; making NSF more sensitive to the issues of renewal procedures, peer review; working with the Biological Sciences Directorate to leverage resources within NSF; and with NSF to leverage resources from other agencies. Other responsibilities will include: being more responsive (and reactive) to varied needs of NSF in its own efforts to promote LTER/ILTER; increased visibility of the Office and LTER program and more frequent (i.e., annual) Network Office site reviews. This Cooperative Agreement will make the Network Office (and LTER program) function more like a Science and Technology Center (or network of centers). NSF will demand more accountability but also use the process to give greater visibility to the effort. That greater emphasis will allow better justification for increased funding. An important role for the chair will be to help develop the LTER's ability to sell itself through stimulating activities and products from the sites plus the special responsibilities of the Network Office. The new situation with the chair being at a different institution will be a significant challenge. The primary way to meet that challenge is to spend significant amounts of time in the process.

Chair's role in evaluating the impact of major new supplements on the network-

I'm not exactly sure what was intended with this point; however, I do think the chair has several obligations involving the attempts of NSF to augment site budgets to achieve Center-level activities. The chair, as primary negotiator of the Cooperative Agreement, is in a position to work with NSF to develop appropriate announcements for individual site

here it is

proposals. It was important to get the augmentation process started last year, but after a year's experience, LTER should take a progressive role in helping NSF develop the type of augmentation request that takes best advantage of LTER strengths and needs. The chair, interacting with Exec. and Coordinating Committees, will be in a prime position to provide that message through the normal interactions that will develop through the Cooperative Agreement. Another role for the chair and Network Office will be to help the sites with augmentation awards keep NSF and the broader community apprised of their progress. It is important for these first sites to promote this activity, demonstrate its value and keep the process going. I certainly have stressed to NSF officials that if the process is stopped and only a couple of sites have 2X budgets, the effort will have failed and will likely be more destructive than helpful. The chair needs to work very hard on this effort and the funded sites need to understand that their work is on the behalf of the entire network. The rest of the network also should understand that these sites were chosen first based on their proposals and to demonstrate that the effort will succeed, all sites need to be supportive and help where possible. The role of the chair can be to help develop that network-wide support.

Network Office Role-

The office is about to undergo a number of changes. Some turnover in staff is occurring presently and I assume there will be more. There are space changes planned and possibly new working relations developed among current and new staff. It will be important to work closely with Jerry (essentially as co-chairs) during the first year of transition. He will be important in keeping the office together and functional during this dynamic period. He has suggested that his preference is to be out of the national LTER Network Office activities by the end of 1995 and out of the ILTER Network Office activities by the end of 1996. This means the new chair, new Exec. Director and the New Network Office must be fully functional in one year. During this period we will have to continue the many excellent services performed by the Office, plus develop anticipated new ones that may result from the Cooperative Agreement and new opportunities. I anticipate new opportunities for promotion (e.g., videos, TV programs, special announcements), sessions to brief other agencies, societies and government on the values, scientific advancements, etc. from long-term research programs and dedicated research sites (multidisciplinary research platforms). It will be a very challenging year. I hope the entire LTER program will see this as "their" challenge, as well as one for the Network Office, and help in the process.

The role of research by the Network Office should be an agenda item for the Exec. and Coordinating Committees. The recent site review of the Network Office suggested that research was an appropriate activity for the Office; however, it should not be funded through the Cooperative Agreement. Office proposals for research should be submitted to appropriate programs, special competitions, etc., and compete with the rest of the world. I support that position. The LTER community should be involved in developing the types of research that is appropriate for the Network Office to pursue. I suspect that some prime areas would be in developing additional communication infrastructure (we do not have to depend on NSF for all Network Office capabilities), special funds to foster international connectivity, network-wide enhancements of computational abilities (we should be hitting up industry), and

here it is

others. The chair, executive director, and other senior staff should expect to develop proposals in these areas as time allows. There also should be proposals developed involving Network Office and LTER site co-PIs to take advantage of the expertise throughout the LTER program.

The Network Office may have some flexibility in sponsoring workshops identified as necessary by the LTER community. I hope that the Cooperative Agreement will include sufficient funds to allow some workshop development and avoid the necessary 6 month delay in getting a specific proposal funded when NSF realizes that workshops will need to occur. I believe that NSF feels the community is mature enough to allow them to develop necessary workshops with money set up for that in the Coop. Agreement. This would not preclude the LTER community from proposing other workshops through regular routes. I doubt there will be sufficient funds to do all that we would like to do.

The Cooperative Agreement will allow a much more interactive relationship between NSF and the Network Office. That means the Office may have to be more responsive to requests and more ready to react to opportunities identified by NSF and others, including LTER scientists. It will be important to develop the Office in such a way that it is not continuously overcommitted with work. It will be important to have some flexibility in staff time and a well organized schedule of work with clear priorities. In other words we will need to know who is able to drop what task and when if the situation is warranted. I suspect the chair and executive director will be the principals making those decisions.

The Network Office location seems to be generating a lot of discussion. There certainly are no plans to move it in the near term. It is critical that it be in Seattle during the next 1-2 years to facilitate the transition that the office will go through. Moving immediately would complicate the challenge immensely. There very serious negotiations going on at UW that will tell us a great deal about how that university views the importance of this program. It was not clear during the site review. The Cooperative Agreement will also make clear the status of LTER at the University of Washington. If the university does not treat the program in a way that NSF feels is appropriate, then NSF will develop pressure to move. Also, the LTER community must have a say in whether or not the Office should move. My plan would be to make this a serious agenda item and to develop a rigorous analysis of the pros and cons of a move. Some mention has been made of moving the Office to the Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis that will be located at U.C. Santa Barbara. I can identify both pros and cons (mostly cons right now) and would want the LTER community to take a serious look at the issues involved.

Role of non-LTER scientists and sites-

NSF has a very strong view that the LTER sites can function as research platforms; dedicated research sites with long-term funding. These research platforms allow more complete understanding of the dynamics in systems (long-term data) and multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary approaches (many individuals/disciplines working on similar time/space scales). These research platforms, or nodes of activity, develop a more comprehensive understanding of environmental factors and should be used

here it is

as reference points for other research in the region. Therefore, it seems clear that LTER should be supportive of comparisons with other, non-LTER sites and research efforts. The comparisons should increase the value of LTER sites by demonstrating the role of that reference node and other sites and scientists should gain value from the more complete understanding that LTER programs can provide to their independent studies. The research platform funding complements the traditional, unsolicited, investigator initiated funding making both better, if they work together. Seems like a win-win situation and worth promoting. I believe that the cross-site comparison and synthesis awards may be one of the most productive ways of demonstrating the value of LTER science. The chair, Exec. and Coordinating Committees could be very active in promoting this type of research, in NSF as well as with other agencies (e.g., NBS). We can develop workshops that actively involve non-LTER scientists and we can share data with them. LTER can play an important role in the health of the broader scientific community if it chooses to use its influence in that way (and in the process, improve its value).

Immediate Challenges, mid (3 year) and long term perspectives (10 years)-

The most immediate challenge is a smooth transition in the operation of the Network Office during a change in leadership, local conditions and interaction with NSF; maintaining the services and visibility of LTER during a very important period for the entire program while accomplishing any new requirements of the Cooperative Agreement. This transition will involve close attention by the past and new chair, hiring, training new staff, and keeping current staff from going crazy with all of the change. To complicate the issue, we need to start planning the next All Scientist meeting scheduled for 1996. There will be important roles and challenges for the entire LTER community in this transition phase. Once some Network Office stability has been achieved, the immediate challenges will change to promoting LTER visibility (nationally and internationally) and demonstrating the significance of this scientific approach using site science, cross-site comparisons, international comparisons, syntheses and the regional-scale approaches of the augmentation awards. We need to constantly reinforce NSF with evidence that it is on the right track. I intend develop a bimonthly reporting mechanism directly to Mary Clutter, Jim Edwards, other directorates, and the Division of Environmental Biology to make sure they know we are active and successful. That also means the Network Office must have effective communication with sites and P.I.s and be able to respond immediately when news worthy issues occur. The Office of Legislative and Public Affairs (e.g., Cheryl Dybas) is always eager for new findings that they can use to educate Congress, other agencies, etc. about the successful science being performed with NSF funding. We could set a goal of each site reporting a major scientific finding each year which would generate more than enough "science stories" to keep LTER in constant view. The work by Dave Tilman and the Hanta Virus stories were used MANY TIMES this past year and I know there are many more that could be used effectively if we accept that challenge.

Here are a few additional immediate challenges that we could work on. Many could extend to the mid and long term:

* work with NSF to promote the use (and increased funding) of LTER in programs of NBS, USGS, USFS, NASA. NSF can use the help of the LTER

here it is

community.

* work more effectively to develop the Network of Networks. This concept has been identified as very important in the interagency working groups that are developing guidelines for future federal funding.

* help NSF develop consistent review standards and materials that should be provided to reviewers/panels.

* develop a list of potential program officers that can be used by NSF that will benefit the LTER effort. Having a rotator manage the LTER program opens special opportunities for the network to have a say in future NSF management of LTER. We also should feel free to suggest potential Division Directors. We have to reduce the "us versus them" mentality that exists in certain circles. We should take a more active stance in instructing NSF how LTER can be managed and supplying individuals that can help in the process. The Division of Environmental Biology is dominated by academic scientists. We need to get our scientists in there.

* develop liaisons with other scientific societies to promote the "research platform" concept of LTER and encourage interactions with other research communities.

At the midterm period, we should be able to demonstrate what the Network Office should look like for the long term and where it should be located. A possible recommendation for a move could involve a significant challenge to both the Office and the LTER program. Hopefully, the midterm also should allow an evaluation of the success of 4-8 augmented LTER programs in terms of broadened disciplinary research base, regional scale activities, and extensions to other research sites and research programs. The challenge will be to demonstrate to NSF and the world that the 2X funding generates more than 2X the value in both scientific and practical terms. The network of sites should be able to demonstrate the value of its work from both a basic and applied perspective and the challenge will be to demonstrate the value of networking among sites vs independent contributions of the collection of sites. I view these as significant challenges, not that they cannot occur but that we need to challenge ourselves to make sure they happen in that short time period. I also believe that a significant challenge will involve making more of the core data sets available to the broader scientific community. The higher visibility caused by long-term commitments to sites, cross-site research, and augmentation awards make it critical that these successes are delivered as fast as possible. The increase in visibility should take many forms. We have not tapped the communication technology anywhere near what its potential will allow. We should be challenged to reach audiences from K through retirement by multimedia techniques. We have something important to "sell" and we should not be afraid to use the expertise available to sell it to the public, to Congress and to Government. A goal would be to have agencies, Congress, other scientific groups bombard LTER with requests for advice, scientific expertise, etc. If we want success, we should be willing to accept those additional responsibilities. We should not

here it is

depend on NSF to be able to sell LTER by itself. By the midterm, we also should demonstrate the magnitude of our activity in the international arena (ILTER). There is a finite capacity for LTER involvement internationally. Sites will be able to develop collaborations with a limited number of foreign sites and the Network Office will be limited in its ability to absorb the increasing demands of international communications, connectivity, etc. A challenge will be for the LTER program to identify limits to this activity and to help design mechanisms that can foster additional expansion. Perhaps the ILTER can evolve into a separate organization with a separate office and its own funding allowing LTER to participate simply as one of the many international programs modelled after LTER (self-replicating LTER).

The LTER 2000 document identifies many goals that should serve as long-term challenges. I do not think I can improve on the list (it is very ambitious) from a scientific perspective; however, accomplishing the goals will involve challenges for the Network Office and LTER network that make the current activities look like kindergarden. The long term goals will require at least an order of magnitude greater funding and level of activity. Those resources will have to come from other research arenas since the level of funding for federally supported science will remain flat for some time. That means we cannot simply argue for new money, we will be arguing for someone else's money, hopefully not other biological sciences. Meeting the challenges outlined previously will go a long way toward being successful in the long term.

My time has run out and I am sure this document will generate as many questions as answers. Perhaps that is the way it should be. I look forward to the opportunity to place these issues on the table for all of LTER to mull over, debate and modify as needed. I can only promise to work hard to make the scientific successes of the LTER network as visible and as rewarding as possible.