



ILTER

Long Term Ecological Research Network

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

Phone: (206) 543-4853
Fax: (206) 685-0790

April 11, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Attendees, LTER Coordinating Committee meeting at Luquillo, May 11-12
FR: Stephanie Martin, LTER Network Office, 206-543-6764 or "smartin@lternet.washington.edu"
RE: Travel, lodging, etc.

It looks like we're finally all set for the May LTER/CC meeting. Eric Hart at Global Express tells me you've all scheduled your flights, and I am putting together a list of arrival and departure times to facilitate airport pickups. We have also managed to rally from last week's setback. As I noted in my electronic mail message, the Rio Grande hotelier we had been dealing with backed out and we have had to go with an alternative plan. The Luquillo site has arranged for us to meet at the Institute of Tropical Forest's (ITF) Conference Room in San Juan and stay at the University of Puerto Rico Guest House in Rio Piedras. Transportation between the University and the Institute will be provided.

LODGING

Due to the limited capacity of the Guest House, lodging will be double occupancy. (See attached room list; notify me right away if you would like me to change your room assignment.) Room rates are very reasonable, \$20/night for doubles (\$10 each) and \$15/night for singles.

Payment must be made in cash, or with travelers checks or money orders. NO CREDIT CARDS OR PERSONAL CHECKS WILL BE ACCEPTED. You will be issued individual receipts. (Reminder: the Coordinating Committee grant pays food and lodging expenses for LTER/CC meetings for Executive Committee members and invited experts/presenters. Sites cover these costs for their meeting representatives.)

MEALS

Breakfast, lunch and coffee breaks on meeting days will be provided by CEER at a cost of \$15/day/person. (Payable to the Center for Energy & Environment Research (CEER) and, again, no credit cards please. Receipts will be provided.) The cost of lunch for the Saturday field trip will be \$5/person. Dinner on Wednesday will be at CEER's expense; all other dinners, which will be arranged at different locations, are at your expense. The cost for those arriving Tuesday and staying through Sunday will be \$50 for breakfasts and lunches; those arriving on Wednesday and staying through Sunday will be \$35 for breakfasts and lunches.

AIRPORT TRANSPORTATION/SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Group transport to and from the airport will be provided. The times of trips will be based on your flight schedules, but there will necessarily be limited runs. If you need to depart before the majority of the group on Sunday, let me know as soon as possible. We may be able to arrange additional trips to the airport Friday evening and Saturday, depending upon the demand and the availability of vehicles.

I will send you an agenda and arrival/departure list, and any last-minute details closer to the time of the meeting. In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to call me at 206-543-6764, or leave a message with Adrienne Whitener or the phone machine at 543-4853. Thanks for your patience!

Long Term Ecological Research Network

Network Office

College of Forest Resources AR-10

University of Washington

543-4853

Seattle, WA 98195

685-0790

Phone:(206)

Fax: (206)

April 25, 1990

TO: LTER site participants in LTER Coordinating Committee meeting, Luquillo, Puerto Rico, May 10-12, 1990

FR: Jerry Franklin, Chair, Coordinating Committee

RE: All-Scientists Meeting--Major Agenda Item

One of the major work activities at our LTER/CC meeting is developing the plan for the All-Scientists Meeting in Colorado, September 25-29. We have to develop and agree upon essentially all aspects of this meeting since it is only four months away! Items for consideration include the following:

1. Theme--the most important general item is the theme of the meeting. What do we want it to do for us as an LTER Network? One good prospect would be LTER accomplishments of the 80s and the directions they provide us for the 90s. We're thinking here about--
 - What are some of the major/synthetic products of the LTER Network (concepts, theories, relationships) during the 80s?
 - How do these relate to LTER directions/efforts in the 90s?

So, what I would like is for each of you to come with at least one idea of a major scientific accomplishment of the LTER Network during the 1980s. Not an individual study finding, but rather something on a larger scale.

2. Expenses--how are we going to utilize the \$60,000 that is allocated to the meeting in the CC budget? This will not even begin to cover all of the travel and lodging costs that would be incurred by 10 participants from each of the 17 sites. Last time we allocated money so as to provide the most help to the most distant sites. How many of the sites could drive to the session in Colorado? If the Seattle, Corvallis, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Kansas people, as well as those in Colorado and New Mexico could drive, it would save a lot in airfares. (Incidentally, there has been no decision to limit participation to 10 per site.)

3. Agenda--what do we want to accomplish at this meeting? I have a strong preference for developing some workshop-type sessions around intersite topics. Maybe some of the work that Dave Tilman or Phil Sollins has been doing, for example. I also would like to see a cross-section of LTER scientists attack some of the issues that we

have been struggling with and have left open-ended, such as protocols for data sharing between sites. What do you want to have happen at the meeting? What topics does your group want to see covered? What elements of the strategic plan do you think need to receive attention from a broad set of LTER participants.

Should we be having meetings of our standing committees and working groups at the All-Scientists Meeting? Data Management and Meteorology groups? GIS working group? Others?

4. Presentation--do we want some poster sessions for sites to present their work? Do we want plenary speakers, and, if so, who should they be?

5. Outside participants--who should we invite to attend our meeting from outside of the LTER network? Some of the Land Margin Project scientists? Representatives from the enlarged Long Term Research Network that we included in the Global Change Workshop?

We are going to have to be pretty efficient in San Juan in order to get all of these issues resolved in the two working days that we have. Please do some pre-work with your LTER group about their expectations for the All-Scientists Meeting before you get there.

c: C. Bledsoe, T. Callahan, LTER Network Office Staff

Date: February 27, 1990

To: LTER PI's and LMER PI's

From: Caroline Bledsoe, LTER Research Coordinator

Subject: Exploration of possible LTER-LMER collaborative activities and research projects

cc: NSF/GEO/Biooceans Group: Taylor, Altado

NSF/BSR/LTER Group: Werner, Edwards, Callahan, Schindler, Rodman, Bledsoe

In the LMER (Land Margin Ecosystem Research) program, there are now four coastal sites: a Chesapeake Bay ecosystem, a Massachusetts salt marsh ecosystem, a Tomalis Bay California ecosystem, and a Columbia River estuary ecosystem in Washington and Oregon.

These coastal ecosystems focus on land-ocean interactions, and represent ecosystem types which the LTER Network generally does not represent, with the notable exceptions of North Inlet and Virginia Coast Reserve sites. The LTER Executive Committee suggests that increased information exchange and contact between the 17-site LTER Network and the 4 LMER sites is desirable.

We have invited representatives from each of the 4 LMER sites to attend the May 1990 LTER Coordinating Committee meeting in Puerto Rico as observers. We hope that this meeting will provide reciprocal opportunities for the LMER and LTER representatives to learn about each others' sites and to consider ways to conduct cooperative research in the future.

The specific representatives from each LMER site are not yet identified, but, for your information, we list the PI's for each site and their addresses. Each LMER representative will give a brief orientation to their sites at the May LTER/CC meeting in Puerto Rico.

LMER Sites and Principal Investigators

- (1) PROTEUS (Processes of Recycling and Organic Transformations
and Exchanges between Uplands and the Sea)
Chesapeake Bay LMER
Dr. Michael Kemp, PI (301) 228-8200
Horn Point Environmental Lab
University of Maryland
P.O. Box 775, Cambridge MD 21613
mkemp (Omnet)
- (2) Waquoit Bay, Massachusetts LMER
Dr. Ivan Valiela, PI (508) 548-3705
Boston University Marine Program
Marine Biological Laboratory
Woods Hole MA 02543
ivaliela/mb1 (TELEMAIL)
- (3) BRIE LMER, Tomalis Bay, N. California coast
BRIE, Biogeochemical Reactions in Estuaries
Dr. Stephen Smith, Co-PI (808) 948-8693
Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology
University of Hawaii, Honolulu HI ... ~~984~~ 96844
s.smith.hawaii (OMNET)
stephens@uhccux.uhcc.hawaii.edu (Bitnet)
Dr. Tim Hollibaugh, Co-PI (415) 435-1717,
Tiburon Center for Enviromental Studies 459-4752
San Francisco State University
...
- (4) Columbia River and Estuary LMER
Dr. Charles A. Simstad, Co-PI (206) 543-7185,
Fisheries Research Institute WH-10 543-4650
University of Washington, Seattle WA 98195
81817@UWACDC (Bitnet)

Dr. David Jay, Co-Pi (206) 545-8045
Geophysics Program AK-50 543-8020
University of Washington, Seattle WA 98195
JAY on GPHYSF (DECnet)

#38 12-FEB-1990 08:50
From: IN%"cbledsoe@NOTE.NSF.GOV" "Caroline Bledsoe"
To: exec@lternet.washington.edu
CC:
Subj: Representatives from LMERS as Observers at LTER/CC mtg @ LUQ?

I would like to increase (begin?) interactions between the LTER Network and the 4 LMRE (Land Margin Ecosystem Research) projects. These 4 projects (last one just funded this year) are a salt marsh (Woods Hole), a Chesapeake Bay estuary, the Columbia River estuary in WA state, and Tomales Bay, CA.

These 4 projects were funded by BSR the first year, then funds come from GEO the second year, then back to BSR, etc. I believe the funding is for 5 years, with possible renewals. So these program are very similar to LTERs (both funded by NSF, both have relatively stable funding, both are long-term research oriented, both are site-based research). And, the LMERS are an excellent link of LTER to the marine. So, I want to strengthen the links.

I suggest we invite 4 reps from each one of the 4 LMERS sites to the May LTER/CC meeting at LUQ (the LTER/CC grant would have to pay for their travel, so this cost would have to be figured into the Year 3 budget request). And I suggest we have an item on the agenda to discuss how to expand contacts, research, communication, x-site projects between LMERS and LTER.

Since so much of the Global Change monies at NSF is going to GEO, LTER needs to strengthen it's arguments for its share of Global Change funds. (it seems really bizarre to me that ecology/ecosystems is not more central to Global Change research). And closer ties between LTER and LMERS certainly will bring LTER closer to marine/ocean sciences.

Your comments, gentlemen?

Please reply ASAP, as Jim Edwards and I are talking over this issue right now, and Jim is calling a meeting with GEO this week to discuss closer ties between LMERS and BSR programs.

Caroline

p.s. just to let you know how desirable the LMERS seem, GEO has offered to pay for them EVERY year! No thanks, BSR wants to keep its piece of that action!!!

get file from JF

LTFR side

APRIL 15, 1990

TO: PARTICIPANTS IN LTER COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING
^ IN PUERTO RICO, MAY 10-12, 1990

FROM: JERRY FRANKLIN, CHAIRMAN, COORDINATING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: ALL-SCIENTIST MEETING--MAJOR AGENDA ITEM

One of the major work activities at our LTER/CC meeting is going to be developing the plan for the all-scientist meeting in Colorado on September 25-29. We have to develop and agree upon essentially all aspects of this meeting since it is only 4 months away! Items for consideration include the following:

1. Expenses--how are we going to utilize the \$80,000 that is allocated to the meeting in the CC budget. This will not even begin to cover all of the travel and lodging costs that would be incurred by 10 participants from each of the 17 sites. Last time we allocated money so as to provide the most help to the most distant sites. How many of the sites could drive to the session in Colorado? If the Seattle, Corvallis, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kansas people, as well as those in Colorado and New Mexico could drive it would save a lot in air fares. (Incidentally, there has been no decision to limit participation to 10 per site).

2. Agenda--what do we want to accomplish at this meeting? I have a strong preference for developing some workshop-type sessions around intersite topics. Maybe some of the work that Dave Tilman or Phil Sollins has been doing, for example. I also would like to see a cross-section of LTER scientists attack some of the issues that we have been struggling with and have left open ended, such as protocols for data sharing between sites. What do you want to have happen at the meeting? What topics does your group want to see covered? What elements of the strategic plan do you think need to receive attention from a broad set of LTER participants.

Should we be having meetings of our standing committees and working groups at the all-scientist meeting? Data Management and Meteorology groups? GIS working group? Others?

3. Presentations--do we want some poster sessions for sites to present their work? Do we want plenary speakers and, if so, who should they be?

4. Outside participants--who should we invite to attend our meeting from outside of the LTER network? Some of the land margin project scientists? Representatives from the enlarged long-term research network that we included in the global change workshop?

We are going to have to be pretty efficient in San Juan in order to get all of these issues resolved in the two working days that we have. Please do some pre-work with your LTER group about their expectations for the all-scientist meeting before you get there.

cc. Bledsoe, Callahan, LTER Network Office staff

1. Theme -- The most important general item is the theme ~~to or are general goals~~ of the meeting. What do we want it to do focus as an LTR network? Caroline and I suggest One good prospect would be LTR accomplishments of the 80s and the directions they provide us for the 90s. We're thinking here about --

What are some of the major/synthetic products of the LTR network (findings (concepts, theories, relationships) during the 80s?

How do these relate to ~~our~~ LTR directions/efforts in the 90s?

So, what I would like is for each of you to come with ^{at least} ~~a major~~ ^{one} idea of a major scientific accomplishment of the LTR network during the 80s. Not ~~just~~ an individual study ~~finding~~ but, rather, something on ^{a larger} ~~the~~ scale. ~~of~~

Return to SM

Received via email 4/1190

From: Robert Waide, Luquillo
To: Caroline Bledsoe
Subj: RE: Prelim Planning for May Meeting - request for info
To: cbledsoe@note.nsf.gov, smartin@lternet.washington.edu

In response to your message of April 6:

1. A social hour will be possible on Wed evening. I am not sure if we can have it at the UPR Guest House but if not we will do it somewhere.

One possible problem is that some people will not arrive in PR until the evening because of the time change. It would help us to schedule these events if we had travel information as soon as its available.

2. We tentatively plan to have dinners at 1) a restaurant in the mountains (probably El Batey de Tonita), 2) a restaurant in town (to be selected), and 3) in Old San Juan, perhaps in small groups. We will provide transportation to all these dinners. Since option 1) requires a 45 minute drive, we would like to schedule it for a day when the business ends relatively early. Will there be such a day?
3. All of the meeting arrangements you mention are being handled by the Luquillo LEF. Stephanie will arrive a day early to check on arrangements.
4. There are no phone or FAX facilities at the lodgings, except for pay phones. The meeting will be held at the Institute of Tropical Forestry, where phone and FAX facilities are available. The numbers for ITF are 809/766-5335, 766-5336, and the FAX number is 809/250-6924.
5. Remember that at this time of year we are on the same time as New York.
6. The Executive Committee and staff will be transported to dinner on Tuesday and Wednesday.
7. The Executive Committee meeting will be at ITF
8. Information on the evening social will be forthcoming.
9. Coordinating Committee meeting will be in the ITF Conference Room, which is a 10 minute drive from the lodgings. We will arrange transportation.
10. We will leave for the field trip at 8:00 AM. A box lunch will be picked up along the way. Special dietary requirements should be communicated to Madelain. We will be back to the guest house by 6 PM, and probably will provide a variety of choices for dinner.

Received via email 4/11/90

From: Robert Waide
To: Stephanie Martin
Subj: Information for CC meeting; below find a blow-by-blow account of the CC meeting logistics.

Monday

We pick SMARTIN up at airport and take her to hotel

Tuesday

We arrange for pick up of Executive Committee and take them to the guest house. Dinner will be at Cafe Valencia (Spanish cuisine) near the campus, probably about 7 PM. We provide transportation.

Wednesday

We pick up Executive Committee and take them to ITF for meeting. Breakfast and lunch provided. During the day we pick up arriving CC participants and take them to guest house. At 5 PM we take Executive Committee back to Guest House. At 6 PM we pick everyone up and take them to the Metropol Restaurant for a social hour (6:30-7:30; cash bar) and dinner (Cuban cuisine). Return to Guest House by 10 PM.

Thursday

We pick up participants at Guest House at 7:30 and take them to ITF. Continental breakfast and hearty lunch will be provided. We will transport group back to hotel at 5 PM. At 6 PM, we will pick up group and drive 45 minutes into mountains for dinner at El Batey de Tonita. Return to Guest House by 10:30 PM.

Friday

Same schedule as Thursday, but for dinner we propose simply providing transportation into Old San Juan, where people can eat at the restaurant of their choice and sightsee. If the meeting ended a little early, we could run some early vans in for people who want to shop. We propose to organize a central pick-up at about 10 PM to return to the Guest House.

Saturday

Pick up group at 8 AM for field trip. Breakfast either in cafeteria or along way (this to be organized later). Visit El Verde and Bisley field sites, dwarf forest, perhaps landslide. Dinner at Los Chorritos restaurant (exotic dishes) on return. Back at Guest House by 9 PM.

Please let me know what other information you need. Be aware that I will be out of town from Wednesday until next Tuesday.

Regards,

Bob

Sunday

We provide transportation to airport.

Additional important points:

Cost of breakfast and dinner will be \$15/day/person.

Cost of lunch for field trip will be \$5

Dinner on Wednesday at our expense.

All other dinners at individual's expense.

Cost for people arriving Tuesday and staying through Sunday will be \$50 for breakfast and lunch, payable to CEER.

Cost for people arriving on Wednesday and staying through Sunday will be \$35 for breakfasts and lunch.

Please let me know if you have any problems.

By the way, if you can't get through by phone, try 767-0338 or 764-1779.

Bob



LTER

Long Term Ecological Research Network

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

Phone: (206) 543-4853
Fax: (206) 685-0790

May 24, 1990

Ariel Lugo
Institute of Tropical Forestry
Call Box 2500
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00928-2500

Dear Ariel:

On behalf of the LTER Network Office staff, the LTER Executive Committee, and the site representatives who attended the Coordinating Committee meeting in Puerto Rico last week, I'd like to thank you for the hospitality and the excellent organization of both the meeting and the field trip.

As I'm sure you've heard from several others already, we were treated exceptionally well by you and Bob and your family of researchers and staff. I regret I was called away and had to miss the opening day of the meeting but, from all signs on my arrival, things couldn't have gone much better. I think we succeeded in highlighting LTER's accomplishments, planning the upcoming All Scientists meeting, and making progress toward further defining research emphases in the area of global change.

The field trip was informative and well-organized and provided a unique opportunity to see the interesting independent and collaborative work underway at Luquillo, as well as the effects of Hurricane Hugo.

Again, thank you. This meeting will be a hard act to follow.

Sincerely,

Jerry F. Franklin
Chair, LTER Coordinating Committee
Bloedel Professor of Ecosystem Analysis

JF/sjm



LTER

Long Term Ecological Research Network

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

Phone: (206) 543-4853
Fax: (206) 685-0790

May 24, 1990

Robert Waide
Center for Energy and Environment Research
University of Puerto Rico
G.P.O. Box 3882
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Dear Bob:

On behalf of the LTER Network Office staff, the LTER Executive Committee, and the site representatives who attended the Coordinating Committee meeting in Puerto Rico last week, I'd like to thank you for the hospitality and the excellent organization of both the meeting and the field trip.

As I'm sure you've heard from several others already, we were treated exceptionally well by you and Ariel and your family of researchers and staff. I regret I was called away and had to miss the opening day of the meeting but, from all signs on my arrival, things couldn't have gone much better. I think we succeeded in highlighting LTER's accomplishments, planning the upcoming All Scientists meeting, and making progress toward further defining research emphases in the area of global change.

The field trip was informative and well-organized and provided a unique opportunity to see the interesting independent and collaborative work underway at Luquillo, as well as the effects of Hurricane Hugo.

Again, thank you. This meeting will be a hard act to follow.

Sincerely,

Jerry F. Franklin
Chair, LTER Coordinating Committee
Bloedel Professor of Ecosystem Analysis

JF/sjm



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Memorandum

Subject: National Ecological Research Program

TO: Members of The Association of Ecosystem Research Centers

Attached for your information is a copy of an EPA notice published in the Federal Register announcing a series of public meetings on the subject of a national ecological research program.

We hope appropriate representatives of your organization will be able to participate in these meetings.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rick A. Linthurst".

Rick A. Linthurst
Director of Modeling, Monitoring
Systems and Quality Assurance

Attachment

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

PUBLIC NOTICE OF THREE REGIONAL PUBLIC
MEETINGS TO DISCUSS THE DESIGN OF A NATIONAL
PROGRAM OF ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH, INCLUDING
POTENTIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL
ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

A. Background

In late 1988 the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) recommended that EPA provide Federal leadership in establishing an enlarged, better coordinated program of national ecological research. The SAB further recommended that an "institute" be established to implement such an expanded program.

EPA, following the guidelines of the SAB, has formulated a framework for a significantly expanded program of ecological research. The specific elements of the research program and the appropriate institutional arrangements to accomplish the program have not yet been determined.

B. Meetings

The EPA Office of Research and Development, in cooperation with selected EPA Regional offices, will conduct three public discussions of the proposed national program of ecological research and major institutional arrangement options for support of such a program at the following dates, times and locations:

Location: Chicago, Illinois

Site: Ramada Hotel O'Hare
6600 N. Mannheim Rd.
Rosemont, Illinois 60018

Date/Time: Tuesday, May 22, 1990
9:30 AM - 5:00 PM

Local Contact: Louis J. Blume
U.S. EPA Region V
230 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 886-2910

Location: Seattle, Washington

Site: Seattle Hilton Hotel
1200 6th Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

Date/Time: Wednesday, May 30, 1990
9:30 AM - 5:00 PM

Local Contact: Patricia Dooley
U.S. EPA - Region X
1200 6th Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 442-1295

Location: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Site: Holiday Inn Independence Mall
400 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Date/Time: Thursday, June 7, 1990
9:30 AM - 5:00 PM

Local Contact: Jayne Dahm
U.S. EPA Region III
Mail Code 3E541
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
(215) 597-7828

Individuals or organizational representatives planning to attend any of the meetings are requested to inform the listed local contact person 10 days prior to the designated date to assure that adequate space is available for all interested participants.

Substantial time will be provided for questions and answers and public comment. Written statements for the record will be

accepted and are preferred in order to assure full opportunity for all to participate. Written statements may also be submitted to the contact person within 14 days following each meeting for those not able to attend in person.

/s/

Erich W. Bretthauer
Assistant Administrator
for Research and Development



association of ecosystem research centers

MEMORANDUM

TO: All AERC Center Directors and
Representatives
All Corresponding Members

FROM: Fred Wagner **FW**

SUBJECT: Membership Input into AERC Position on
National Institutes of Environment

DATE: May 3, 1990

executive committee

President
Frederic H. Wagner
Ecology Center
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

Secretary
James R. Gosz
Department of Biology
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Treasurer
James F. Reynolds
Systems Ecology Research Group
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

John E. Hobbie
The Ecosystems Center
Marine Biological Laboratory
Woods Hole, MA 02543

Gene E. Likens
Institute of Ecosystem Studies
The New York Botanical Garden
Mary Flagler Cary Arboretum
Millbrook, NY 12545

David E. Reichle
Environmental Sciences Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

The purpose of this memo is to survey the views of the AERC membership on important events currently underway. Those views will then be used by the Board in its efforts to formulate an Association position on these matters. Exciting things are underway, and the Board wants the membership both to be kept informed on these matters and to participate in formulating Association policy on them.

The lead article in the last AERC Newsletter mentioned the several, concurrent initiatives underway to develop a major, national effort to research the big environmental problems. The National Institutes of Environment proposal is most comprehensive in terms of recommending priority research areas and advocating an institutional structure; and is farthest out in front by virtue of already reaching Congressional action. It is this initiative on which we would like your feedback so that we can formulate a firm AERC position and participate in the leadership role.

The entire effort has been led by two people-- Steve Hubbell at Princeton and Henry Howe at University of Illinois, Chicago--who sought corporate funding to convene a workshop in Washington on December 2. Around 30 people attended, roughly half and half natural and social scientists. I attended to represent AERC. The white paper that came out of the December workshop has gone through several iterations and has culminated in the attached proposal. Several

AERC Center Directors and Representatives
and Corresponding Members
May 3, 1990
Page 2

committees -- one of which I chaired on the Institute for Ecosystem Management -- have contributed more detailed verbiage toward a longer document that is now in preparation.

Meanwhile Hubbell and Howe have been working with Congressional staffers. In the House, Representatives Roe, Scheuer, and Saxton submitted an amendment to HR 3847 (bill proposing to raise EPA to cabinet status) which calls for the National Academy to conduct a feasibility study for an NIE. This amendment passed. In the Senate, Bill Bradley has submitted a similar amendment.

The move to an NAS study slows the hectic December-April pace and gives your Board a chance to dialogue with you, consider the possible benefits and costs of the proposed organization, and develop an AERC position that adequately represents the members' sentiments in the matter. What the Board is asking herewith is that you convene your scientists to discuss the issue, develop a group position, put that down in a brief (1-2 pages) position paper, and send it to me by June 1. The Board will then weigh these responses and develop an official AERC position which we hope will provide some leadership in the initiative. Hopefully, this will provide strong impetus for moving ecosystem science forward.

Whether or not valid, the following arguments are being made in favor of an NIE:

(1) Solution of the major environmental problems will require a massive increase of knowledge in both the natural and social sciences, and hence an immensely augmented national research program.

(2) A program of such magnitude will require the concerted efforts of the entire scientific community, including government, private industry, and academia.

(3) Such concert will require some organization, institution, or body which can articulate national environmental research priorities, and coordinate research efforts in such a way that government, industry, and academic programs are complementary and address the priorities.

(4) The research must be of high quality, and as the NSF model has firmly demonstrated, quality is most effectively assured by competitive awards and strict peer review.

(5) The political realities are that major new funding is most likely to be appropriated to new programs and concepts.

(6) Present agencies either (a) do not have a sufficiently broad charter to address the need, (b) have mission-oriented political constraints that could influence free expression of research results and policy implications, and/or (c) would be limited by (5) above:

(i) NSF has a clear and distinguished record in promoting quality science. But its valuable basic-science charter, while at times generating research with clear practical applications, does not have the applied orientation which the NIE advocates see as needed to address the major environmental problems.

(ii) EPA has a primarily regulatory role. While having an in-house research capability, it is not of a magnitude or orientation to meet the need envisaged by the NIE sponsors.

(iii) USDA, Interior, NASA, and DOE all have important roles to play, but have more focused missions than that conceived for NIE.

(7) There is a huge and needed pool of scientific personnel in academia, and except for NSF, the agencies have a varied record in fully tapping that capability, especially in a competitive, peer-reviewed format.

The arguments that have been posed in opposition to the NIE concept are:

(1) It adds another bureaucracy that will exacerbate the existing bureaucratic competition among the agencies for the funding pie and political influence.

(2) There is a risk that NIE would be established and its funding, rather than coming from new monies, would be developed by siphoning funds from the existing agencies and thereby hamper their valuable programs. This is an obvious source of unease to the agencies.

(3) In a more self-conscious vane, some observers fear that any individuals or organizations supporting the NIE initiative might incur the displeasure of the existing agencies because of the risk of (1) and (2) above, and thereby hamper any future

All AERC Center Director and Representatives
and Corresponding Members
May 3, 1990
Page 4

interactions with the agencies, whether or not the NIE became a reality.

(4) Much of our knowledge about ecosystems and about the effect of such perturbations as acid rain and eutrophication has come from NSF-sponsored research. The NSF system and the type of research it has funded is fine but NSF does not have enough funds (and it is not likely that they would receive a 10-15 fold increase in their ecological funding). The proposed NIE budget of \$0.5-1 billion is so large that there might be no justification for ecosystem studies at NSF and we might be trading a well-regarded, successful agency for one with no track record at all.

(5) One of the strengths of the U.S. system of funding research is the variety of sources. By concentrating all of the ecological funding in one place, the community would lose the diversity of sources and put too much power into one agency/institute.

Please note that several permutations are possible. (a) One is a new, separate, and independent agency patterned after the National Institutes of Health model. This is what is being sought by the leaders of the NIE movement. (b) An NIE could be formed and situated in a new Department of Environment alongside of a separate EPA newly situated in the Department. (c) NIE, or its equivalent, could go into EPA. That agency is advocating its own expanded environmental research program, possibly in a new division called an institute.

Given this background, the AERC Board now asks that you discuss this issue with your people and send us your preferences in the matter by June 1. We will then formulate a concerted AERC position.

A major objective of AERC is to advocate and assist in the development of an expanded national research effort on the big environmental problems. Hence, it was appropriate that we become involved in the NIE initiative. With the rapid unfolding of events in the past 4-5 months, I had to represent the organization as best I could, but without sufficient input from you members. I conveyed support of the organization for the concept, helped develop some of the printed matter, but informed the initiative's spokesmen that AERC would not at this point take a position on a specific organizational structure and affiliation. This was the position adopted by the AERC Board at its March 4 meeting in Boulder, Colorado.

AERC Center Directors and Representatives

AERC Center Directors and Representatives
and Corresponding Members

May 3, 1990

Page 5

But please note that these kinds of initiatives get generalized, and represent compromises between the detailed nuances of the participating individuals' positions. A camel gets designed, and you either support it or you don't. Not everyone's hump can be included.

So please send me your feedback. It is a matter of great potential significance to ecology and solution of our environmental problems. It is central to AERC's mission and the Board wants to represent the organization in whatever way will best serve the interests of our science and solution of the looming environmental difficulties.

FHW/sb

Enclosure