

LTERR Coordinating Committee - 4/25/01

I. Plum Island CC Meeting - Hopkinson

A. sched

- 1) Wed Sept. 19, Exec fly in
- 2) Sept 20 EXEC
- 3) 21 - full day science symposium
- 4) 22 AM business meeting
 - a) PM field trip to Plum Island
- 5) Sun 23 - Departures

B. Meet at New England Conference Center - UNH

- 1) fly into Manchester NH or Boston
- 2) room for 48 classroom style or 160 theater style

C.

D. Land-water linkages science theme

- 1) water and material transports
 - a) combination of in-house and external speakers
- 2) aim to summarize state of knowledge of watershed biogeochemistry
 - a) NOT CASE STUDIES
 - b) major advances
 - c) current understandings
 - d) obstacles and opportunities
- 3) 12 30-minute presentations
 - a) preliminary list of 13 presented
 - b) watershed hydrology - David Post or Julia Jones
 - 1> what have been major advances?
 - 2> modeling evapotranspiration
 - c) material inputs - Bob Howarth
 - d) Process level studies - Phil Robertson or someone from KBS
 - e) Riparian Processing - need speaker
 - f) Hyporheic and stream processing
 - 1> Dahlm or Findley speakers
 - g) Catchment studies - McDowell
 - h) whole catchment - Driscoll, Likens
 - i) whole catchment urbanization - CAP, BES, PIE
 - j) whole catchment human impacts - Smithsonian - Jordan or Correll
 - k) groundwater dominated systems - NTL
 - 1> differences from surface water systems
 - l) watershed biogeochemical modeling - Jack Cosby
 - 1> scaling up to larger systems
 - m) land margin biogeochemistry - Joe Vallino or Childers
 - n) continental scale - Charlie Vosmary (SP?)
- 4) products
 - a) special journal issue
 - 1> biogeochemistry or ecosystems
 - b) bioscience-type review article
 - 1> what is the state of the art in our knowledge

E. discussion

- 1) does it bring in GEO as we discussed last night?
 - a) yes, these are folks who have done work
- 2) most of folks are LTER folks
 - a) do you want 1/2 speakers are non LTER
 - b) 4 of these are non LTER
 - c) mostly previous have been 100% in house
 - 1> hard to do comprehensive review paper with just LTER
- 3) biotic processes at stream interfaces - covich, pringle
 - a) possibly in-stream processing or riparian processing
- 4) Margret Palmer would be good to be involved - she is in EPA Watersheds program
- 5) can information managers and Hydro-DB participate?
 - a) don't see database coming out of this symposium, but this is

opportunity to interact on hydro db

II. Science Themes

A. 2002 - invasive species

- 1) causes and consequences of species change
- 2) biogeochemical changes
 - a) not focused on biodiversity per se
- 3) comments
 - a) is it too broad?
 - b) could focus on invasions and extinctions - narrow somewhat
 - c) two different types of activities
 - 1> ANPP - collection of database and use of database
 - 2> conceptual synthesis that does not require database
 - b> e.g. Plum Island
 - 3> what model is this?
 - b> want to use ANPP as example - creating new synthesis

B. 2003 -

C. 2004 - Extreme events and ecosystem dynamics

- 1) approved by CC
- 2) multigenerational return frequencies
- 3) invasions, extinctions, floods, droughts, fire, hurricanes, paleo
- 4) database - return intervals of extreme events

III. New <http://intranet.lternet.edu> site for internal LTER documentation

A. focus on internal notes etc.

B. information needed by LTER folks

- 1) business end of LTER program vs public end

C. questions

- 1) can we use this for site-type internal documents?
 - a) possibly
 - b) can also help sites set up...

IV. NSF - Gholz

A. happy to be here.... starting to recognize more faces!

B. finally got budgets down to program level

- 1) good year for LTER
- 2) all core funding was approved, including programming for increases in renewals
 - a) 14.6M DEB
 - b) 3 M from GEO and OPP
- 3) need to work with other divisions on programmed increases

C. Supplements (venture funds)

- 1) increased by 10% (all programs were)
- 2) all were funded for this year

D. Site reviews

- 1) BES and CAP done
- 2) KBS next week
- 3) working on how new sites will fit into rotation

E. LTER/LTEB COV

- 1) we appreciate Coleman role in leading committee

F. Reviews - 20 year review

- 1) still planned for this year
- 2) search on for replacement Chair after Frank Harris pulled out due to overcommitments
- 3) Kristalka has agreed to co-chair, so searching for co-chair (possibly Harris???)

G. Annual reports on Fastlane

- 1) sent recent email
- 2) COV had concerns on reporting
- 3) underreporting of achievements is a problem
- 4) will start rejecting them if they are not complete!

H. NEON

- 1) not in 2002 budget
- 2) but there are efforts on Hill to increase funding beyond

budget

- a) if get more, could do NEON
- 3) Gosz - MRE account has been private pot for astronomy and physics and they have been lobbying to keep it that way!
 - a) biologists have not done counter-lobbying
- 4) Robertson had argued that NRI should get more from NSF, but land grant institutions don't like that
- I. Programmatic leadership at NSF for LTER
 - 1) rotators vs permanent
 - 2) fluid situation
 - 3) Gholz starts working on Ecosystems this fall
 - 4) points
 - a) I don't make those decisions
 - b) the program is solid
 - c) I recognize issues about how site review tie into renewal phase if have different managers
- J. questions
 - 1) were concerned that draft 20-year review panel had no ecosystem scientists on it. Has that been addressed?
 - a) lots of lists have been put forward
 - b) many of them declined
 - c) need to maintain external validity by having outsiders
 - d) won't be resolved until chairmanship is settled....
 - e) can't shed much light on this
 - 2) LTER Network involved in series of projects that involve Kristalka - does this create COI?
 - a) he is on bio-AC, well connected with biology at NSF
 - b) issue will be how this is viewed
 - c) it is out of program officers control - comes from front office
 - 1> not firm COI rules
 - 2> they are aware of his interactions
 - 3) would it cause problems if we submitted joint proposal during 20 year review?
 - a) probably
 - b) Kristalka needs to discuss with Mary Clutter
- V. NSF Science Series on LTER research
 - A. need to work out format with NSF people
 - B. huge list of possible topics - including cross-directorate
 - C. EXEC will take lead on trying to create format and work with NSF on times
 - 1) tag people for presentations
 - 2) perhaps a spring series rather than single brownbag
 - 3) shooting for the first one in February
 - D. discussion
 - 1) old OPP director did not know anything about ecology (was astrophysist)
 - a) need to aim low in terms of expectations of ecological expertise for folks outside bio.
 - 2) are all sites ready to participate?
 - a) depends on topics... site could be topics
 - 1> different matter for specific topics
 - 3) Gholz
 - a) need more discussion
 - b) format will be important
 - c) from NSF standpoint, hard to get people for more than a few hours
 - 1> 5 people max for each one of these
 - 4) since done on annual basis, could use results from fall science meeting and site vignettes...
 - a) should include introductory "this is LTER " segment defining program scope
 - b) this would be a good theme to start with

- E. APPROVED - use Land-water Linkages Science Topic as basis for first effort
- VI. LTER COV Report - Coleman
 - A. edifying and exhausting experience
 - B. large group - most not from LTER
 - C. real education to go back and look at huge files!
 - D. LTER specific questions
 - E. 12 page summary
 - 1) people, ideas and tools
 - 2) urged more regular cross-site competitions
 - 3) venture fund well used
 - a) SLTER
 - b) INT
 - c) etc.
 - F. overall things are on track, but can be improved
 - G. major achievements
 - 1) scientific discovery
 - H. got into nuts and bolts, in 23 page report that is awaiting sign-off
 - I. top marks for urban sites on sociological work
 - 1) other augmented sites are behind urban sites
 - J. meeting with Mary Clutter
 - 1) she was very positive (even proposed more money!)
 - K. recommendations
 - 1) hard time getting through all the stuff from annual reports
 - a) minorities, personnel
 - b) need to get fast-lane stuff well filled out
 - 2) greater equity in funding
 - a) need to get past historically imposed inequities
 - 3) greater outreach across directorates
 - a) increased funding
 - 4) increase synthesis
 - a) LTER-based sabbaticals?
 - 5) comments on more support for
 - a) SLTER
 - 6) ways to expand minority involvement and teamwork
 - 7) use supplementists to attract young scientists to bridge gaps to human dimensions
 - a) SBE support?
 - L. LTREBS - an unsung hero
 - 1) now up to \$60K per year....
 - 2) for dollars spent, they are doing important service
 - M. intersite studies, synthesis volume series lauded
 - 1) BNZ example
 - N. tools and new technologies
 - 1) please put these in reports
 - O. questions
 - 1) got impression that augmented sites are being held constant waiting for other sites to catch up?
 - a) opening can of worms as to whether augmentations were experiment or first step on bringing up entire network
 - b) not sure whether they will be increased
 - c) plan is to increase augmented sites by same amount
 - d) Clutter would like to increase disparity.... can be done either through increases or decreases
 - 2) lots of suggestions on improvements - what were 3 or 4 major thing LTER needs to do?
 - a) encourage and help develop outreach
 - 1> we have VERY high visibility
 - 2> K-12 at 15K per year with thousands of kids coming through
 - 3> could have funding increased
 - b) ecological informatics
 - 1> commercial groups do it on 40% of budget, but we only spend

10%

- 2> we are about to be overwhelmed in this area
- 3) Program management at NSF?
 - a) we recommended permanent and rotator to collaborate on LTER management
 - 1> historically have just had one person
 - 2> hard to get names formally attached to programs
- 4) cohort increases
 - a) \$120K increase
- 5) 20-year review is looking forward, COV looks backward
- 6) equity issues
 - a) last tier has 8 years on fixed budget
 - 1> we feel your pain
 - b) hard to do internally without attracting unwanted attention
- 7) front office is tremendously supportive of LTER
- 8) we have been blessed to be part of LTER - money gripes aside

VII. National Advisory Board

A. paragraphs from draft report

- 1) setting priorities - always first recommendation
- 2) network structure
 - a) how many sites are optimal, how to pick new based on science objectives
 - b) discussion
 - 1> do we want to work with GEO on more funding.... get some mixed signals
 - 2> we will discuss goals
- 3) increasing responsibilities
 - a) beware of mission creep and overloading
- 4) ILTER
 - a) needs to advance US science goals
- 5) partnerships
 - a) need to be worth costs
- 6) regionalization
 - a) satellite sites for LTERs
 - 1> (different flavor than past regionalization....)
 - b) goes back to IBP and Risser Report
- 7) Cross-site activities
 - a) question driven
 - b) central can facilitate, not drive
- 8) Metrics
 - a) need to go beyond pubs
 - b) worked on in LUQ, but we need to pick up again
- 9) New Methods
 - a) virtual field trips for outreach
 - b) do things more efficiently
- 10) be prepared to ask the questions that should be asked, not those that might be asked
 - a) ?????

B. discussion

- 1) what they see as outreach is very different than what we see
 - a) they did not capture full range of outreach activities
- 2) our ability to say NO to some groups is very limited!

VIII. NSF presentation by EXEC in Feb. 2001

- A. LTER program has evolved
- B. 1980s long-term research decade
- C. 1990s large-scale research decade
 - 1) list gets longer
 - 2) synthesis important
- D. LTER White Paper - priority setting
- E. Central organizing sentence = The central organizing intellectual aim
- F. Mission
 - 1) Understanding

- 2) Synthesis
- 3) Information Dissemination
- 4) Legacies
- 5) Training
- 6) Outreach
- G. Burke Figure
- H. 2000s Synthesis Decade
- I. Goals - what we will use for setting priorities
 - 1) maintain integrity of core measurements at sites
 - 2) increase pace of synthesis
 - 3) increase experimental and comparative cross-site research
 - 4) facilitate/increase multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary research
 - 5) extend use of LTER knowledge in education, policy making, management and public understanding
- J. Recent Synthesis Activities/Products
 - 1) BioScience articles
 - 2) new NWT volume
 - 3) 17 cross site activities post ASM
- K. setting priorities
- L. survey results priority list
 - 1) data, not something we will change
- M. goals for the next 10 years
 - 1) what we need is discussion of how we might go about achieving these goals
 - 2) think through strategies for accomplishing
- N. Discussion
 - 1) I've been told that there is directory of education at NSF that does not get enough proposals - why can't we get money from them?
 - a) Scott - we have tried. They are NOT short of proposals. 53M budget increase, 200M initiative in EHR so they are NOT flush with cash
 - 1> need education coordinator at NET
 - 2) is this on www?
 - a) it will be once they are approved by CC
 - 3) common theme - we need to be competitive in competitions in other directorates before we can get money from other directorates
 - 4) COV found other directorates were interested in competitive proposals from LTER sites.... that is way they prefer
 - 5) social science research community needs to want it if they are going to fund it...
 - a) hard to do interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary
 - 6) would be helpful to NSF DEB to know about money from other directorates sites have received
 - 7) at CAP was asked to submit supplements to GEO and EHR
 - a) however we have lost contact with the people who might be able to sheppard these through
 - b) could we send to DEB requests for supplements from other directorates aimed at specific projects
 - c) all our remote sensing is done by geologists
 - d) NSF response - not a good idea to send supplement requests unless it is pre-arranged
 - 1> previously these funds had come from directors opportunity funds, not program budgets
 - 2> not a good sales pitch to say "you can buy into something that is already great" - want to do new things that they want...
 - 3> shifts in personnel within NSF have made it difficult to sustain interests
- IX. Charge for working groups
 - A. plan for flat funding

- B. what should be done to implement the goals
 - 1) by individual sites
 - 2) by the network
 - 3) by the network office
- X. Increase pace of synthesis - working group
 - A. members
 - 1) Marilyn Walker
 - 2) Steward Picket
 - 3) John O'Brien
 - 4) Steve Carpenter
 - 5) Bob Waide
 - 6) John Porter
 - B. discussion of extreme events topic
 - 1) want whole distribution for disturbances
 - a) issues of stationarity
 - 2) driving events
 - a) response that condition sensitivity to events of a given time
 - b) thresholds where same agent drives qualitatively different disturbances
 - c) need to understand what that space is
 - 3) to incorporate understanding of variability need to know the space
 - a) but hard to understand that space
 - 1> have been some efforts
 - 2> want to go from guesses to numbers
 - 4) can tie into 2004 meeting - use as milestone
 - 5) could be extreme along several axes
 - 6) disturbance vs extreme events
 - 7) don't know what our fire regimes are at BNZ....
 - 8) key issue is predictability
 - a) winter is extreme event, but very predictable
 - C. science Themes
 - 1) could have network office fund NCEAS type working group leading into science theme
 - 2) follow up after meeting is critical
 - a) incorporate post-doc or graduate student salary into it
 - b) want to go beyond conceptual synthesis
 - c) could go out for new money to do this
 - 3) models for CC themes
 - a) could be used to start effort
 - b) or to wrap one up
 - 4) problem: we are loosey goosey on picking topics
 - a) need more rigorous process for choosing science themes
 - 5) increase up front planning for CC science meetings
 - a) cheap to do
 - b) 5 or 6 people
 - 6) science theme meeting should be at the MIDPOINT of the process
 - 7) don't want summary, want new understanding
 - 8) NCEAS working group is a logical product for a science theme
 - 9) link post-doc with science theme
 - D. what about non-CC synthesis efforts
 - 1) time is key issue
 - 2) get better at synthesis as you get older, but by then their time is cut to ribbons by other commitments
 - a) post docs have time but not perspective
 - 3) need way to hire senior scientists as post-docs
 - 4) could do exchanges between sites to bring people together
 - 5) working group model has done well
 - 6) post doc could be almost anywhere - provide continuity
 - 7) often we tell people what we have done, but it would be good to hear what we SHOULD have done

- E. Synthesis volumes
 - 1) doing well
 - 2) on pace
 - 3) but some (unnamed) are more summary than synthesis
 - 4) how can we help sites that are having trouble getting things together?
- F. Databases
 - 1) Bledsoe experience pulling together climate data
 - a) very hard to do
 - b) lead to ClimDB (but took a long time to do it)
 - 2) also issue of having data collected in ways that facilitate synthesis
 - 3) we do well on archival, but less well
 - 4) databases structured by dates
 - 5) need scientific collaboration with domain experts on developing value-added databases
 - 6) one-shots vs dynamic databases
 - 7) good science question should set priorities
 - a) theme driven vs question driven science topics
 - 8) some databases are of GENERAL use -help answer MANY questions
 - 9) can't build these big things without having a place for them to go
 - a) different than site based databases
 - b) need to be out front
 - 10) how can we get needed scientist and IM involvement in value-added database
 - 11) what are the high priority databases?
 - 12) we all have time series data - need to have standard ways to analyze it
 - a) grad student time series analysis workshop was VERY popular
 - b) methodological training focusing on ecological needs would be valuable
 - 1> e.g.
 - b> time series
 - b> photointerpretation
 - c) would also support site syntheses
- G. "Comparison Groups" 4 to 17 short term working groups per year
 - 1) some focused more geographically than on synthesis questions
 - 2) one or two shot meetings
 - 3) NET has funds for these
 - 4) example 17 groups from All Sci. Meeting
 - 5) examples
 - a) example East Asia LIDET project
 - b) LIDET followup
 - c) soil organic matter and invertibrates
 - d) network analysis to look at trophic webs
 - 6) regular competition would allow for more ahead of time planning
 - 7) Need to focus on important questions
 - a) groups can help identify
- H. committee on scientific initiatives
 - 1) help develop ideas on how we can go beyond what we can do now
 - 2) examples of things that would have been missed without LTER...
 - a) eg. took 23 years for Toolik warming to be statistically significant
- I. need some centralization in synthesis activities
 - 1) build on experience
- J.

- A. are 5 goals sufficient?
- B. increase interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research
 - 1) see powerpoint presentation for details
 - 2) discussion
 - a) take exception to first point
 - 1> don't want to place all disciplines on equal footing - scientifically inappropriate given that sites have different perspectives
 - 2> need to be OPEN to disciplines
 - b) I interpreted differently - don't want to have one discipline as servant of another
 - c) if take approach "DEB pays 80% of bills" it is hard to be open
 - d) need equal ENGAGEMENT
 - e) can't be "Long Term Science Program" - need perspective that has some disciplinary elements
 - f) we are open to interaction, different perspectives, but not all on equal footing - need to have framework that is narrower than all of science
 - 3) as LTER goes through 20 year review, and wants more directorate support, need to have idea about where we want to go in future - and humans are keystone species of the world
 - a) how can different disciplines come together to understand ecosystem dynamics
 - 4) prefer to say in more positive way
 - a) formulation of questions
 - 1> LTER is not like academic department, it is question driven enterprise
 - 2> need to come up with exciting interdisciplinary questions
 - 5) don't want to paper over this
 - a) want both views respected - that is hard since we each believe we know the answer
 - b) LTER questions have been posed by ecologists - but social scientists are now working within system
 - 1> so we feel at the short end
 - 6) being positive is important
 - 7) is this general to other scientific disciplines?
 - a) IT needs to be research endeavour
 - b) also GEO
 - c) hydrologic sciences
 - 1> what we need is often not state of the art hydrology...
 - 8) don't you often have important questions where one discipline might be in a service role?
 - a) you need to have at least SOME questions that are cutting edge in each discipline
 - 9) there are no unimportant disciplines....
 - 10) missing something here... work at ARC LTER I do, if stood alone would not be cutting edge. But when provided with context from other LTER research, it BECOMES cutting edge
 - a) other disciplines are less familiar with collaborative work
 - 11) perspective matters - can't take attitude that all information are equal - LTER allows multiple perspectives on the same datasets
 - 12) there are a number of positive ways to do things
 - 13) core areas
 - a) are core areas constraining us?
 - 1> no, since we ignore them :)
 - 2> we stretch boundaries of core areas
 - b) need to deal with disturbance core area
 - 1> in old days dealt with human interactions as disturbance - offensive to social scientists
 - c) problem - most sites receive no funds for social sciences

- d) 5 core areas help assure broad focus within a site to make it possible for us to have network-wide comparisons
 - 1> if take that approach then criteria is broad research perspective - lots of different things it can contribute to network
 - e) that is point I wanted to make..... most sites have built in breadth
 - 1> never designed for equal treatment at all sites
 - f) when LTER was established no one knew what it would become, core areas were designed that it would be at least this...
- C. Maintenance of quality of science and integrity of core measurements at sites
- 1) aim of core measurements
 - a) increase knowledge of systems
 - b) intercomparability between sites
 - 2) identify core measurements at each site and plan for their evolution
 - 3) continually add to basic descriptive database and basic understanding of system
 - a) usually measurement made through time with new measurements added and old ones continued
 - b) could do measurements for short time periods, but for lots of different KINDS of measurements -> leads to synthesis
 - 1> alternative way of building core of measurements
 - 4) continual improvements to data access and integration
 - a) to make data accessible, not enough to just collect it
 - b) need use and involvement of scientists
 - 5) stay on cutting edge of technology
 - a) make more efficient
 - 6) fresh perspectives, expertise, collaborations and comparisons
 - a) related to 2 above
 - b) bring in people for short term to fill gaps
 - 1> e.g. need insect person on Tundra
 - 7) legacies/archives
 - a) datasets as things handed on to next generation of scientists
 - 1> again, need scientist involved in data collection and QA/QC
 - 8) training/education/outreach
 - a) other potential users can help evaluate utility of data
 - b) bring on next generation
 - 9) discussion
 - a) is it a useful strategy to look at Network and Network Office perspectives?
 - 1> this was pretty site specific
 - b) are quality of science and integrity of core measurements the same thing?
 - 1> no, but they overlap heavily
 - 2> we focused more on data
 - c) one of the risks of long term research on minimal budgets is intellectual stagnation - need to have a way to refresh
 - 1> one way is to always make sure you can add new things and people
 - d) important to recognize that one direction we could follow on core measurements could lead to stagnation
 - 1> need balancing act
 - e) there are things that could be done by network to help
 - f) network and network office can play role
 - 1> standards for data collection ???
 - 2> minimum standard installations
- D. Synthesis group
- 1) see powerpoint
 - 2) discussion

- a) like Post-Doc - takes resources but really glue for group
 - b) good process for developing CC Science Themes
- E. Cross Site
- 1) initiated by
 - a) "interested leader"
 - b) funding
 - c) existing datasets
 - 2) limits
 - a) lack of interested leaders
 - b) funding limited
 - c) data sets across sites are incomplete across sites
inconsistent in content or not in same units
 - 3) priorities
 - a) assess character of current cross site studies (XSS)
 - 1> mean number of sites
 - 2> cost per site
 - 4) NSF "Influence"
 - a) timing of XSS to follow all site meetings
 - b) continue "reward" for site participation in XSS
 - c) supplements specifically designed for XSS
 - 5) Site level
 - a) promote regionalization
 - b) use standard methods for data collection
 - c) develop LEADERS for XSS
 - 6) Network Level
 - a) agree on common measures and units
 - b) develop centers of expertise w/in LTER Network for measures
not taken at all appropriate sites and coordinate sampling &
analysis
 - 1> wave net, send grasshoppers captured to Colorado State for
analysis
 - c) use CC meeting to plan explicit XSS with standard
experiments & measures
 - 7) Network Office
 - a) XS training workshops for consistent sampling (uses center
of expertise model)
 - b) provide personnel for XS data analysis (postdoc, staff)
 - c) co-fund sabbaticals for XS analyses
 - d) fund XS "calibration" studies to get various measures into
comparable units for XS analyses
 - 8) comments
 - a) applies to ILTER as well as LTER - broader than network
 - b) has there been any works with LTREBS in cross site
comparisons?
 - 1> not as systematic effort
- F. Outreach
- 1) see Patty Sprott's WORD file
 - 2) discussion
 - a) Schoolyard LTERS - getting teachers to LTER meetings
 - b) some groups in lists not identified - policy makers
 - 1> perhaps EPA
 - c) OBFS has core program for congressional aides
 - 1> more direct route
 - d) could extend cross site to students
 - 1> would be BIG carrot for excellence!
 - e) how can we replace activities - support for some period of
time and then move on....
 - 1> need to think about how we can "sunset" some activities
 - 2> may be able to continue with other support
 - 3> don't see how we can maintain support for these in long run
- XII. CC approvals
- A. Mission - move to adopt the 6 elements
- 1) do we need to get it down to 5

- a) Pickett: if it is more than 3 it doesn't matter if it is 5 or 6
- 2) PASSED with minor modifications
- B. Goals - move to adopt
 - 1) are these in order of priority?
 - a) no, but they are bound to be perceived this way
 - 2) these are not ALL we are going to do... these are areas where we want to focus on - priority goals
 - 3) do we have metrics for assessing these goals?
 - 4) increase the pace seems to be more detailed than others - has specifics
 - a) far-reachingness of synthesis more than increasing rate
 - b) increase breadth of synthesis activities.....
 - c) action: eliminated specifics and reworded
 - 5) will need to flesh out with explanatory paragraphs following
 - 6) PASSED unanimously
- C. next steps
 - 1) white paper with new mission, goals
 - a) writeups from working groups

□

LTER CC Meeting - Spring - April 24, 2001

- I. Agenda - Gosz
 - A. Reports
 - B. science themes
 - 1) want to involve datatask in science topics
 - 2) also standards development
 - C. "Its all really interesting" - Nancy Grimm
- II. Executive Committee Election
 - A. Tim Kratz and Indy Burke rotating off
 - B. Nancy Grimm and Alan Knapp elected
- III. Committee Reports
 - A. Publications Report
 - 1) new Niwot book
 - 2) discussions relative to Oxford
 - a) advertisement is issue
 - 1> want to have Oxford (UK) web site linked to Oxford (US)
 - b> our books not advertised in Europe
 - 2> want better efforts on advertising
 - 3> Kirk Jenson will be at ESA and may be able to meet with EXEC
 - 3) questions
 - a) did you negotiate copies for sites?
 - 1> no, we just get 30 copies and have those committed
 - 2> can do one-time non-profit buy
 - 3> KNZ did get a box.... but not in contract
 - 4) action item - Publications committee will negotiate with Oxford on site copies
 - a) also need to include NSF
 - B. Social Science Committee
 - 1) both Phoenix and Baltimore went through site review
 - a) issue of ecological core areas came up
 - b) want social science core areas to be included in future reviews for relevant sites
 - 1> have they been voted on by LTER CC?
 - b> no
 - b> had workshop of sites from LTER Network and other sites
 - a: tried to identify existing ecological core areas and corresponding social science core areas
 - b: white paper was circulated to social scientists at LTER sites and lead PIs
 - c: has been revised and posted on LTER WWW site
 - d: submitted to Natural Resources as paper
 - 2> Question for NSF - what do you need to have as core area?
 - b> science questions differ to some degree between sites
 - b> covered under quantity and quality of science in review process
 - b> do not want one template for all sites, even those with different missions
 - 3> concerned about questions like
 - b> why aren't you doing more in nutrient cycling?
 - b> why aren't you doing more on tracking human demographics?
 - b> want to make sure both are on the agenda
 - 4> This is not issue for CC. NSF sets criteria for judging sites, not CC.
 - b> should not change mid-review cycle
 - 5> disagree - should be reviewed relative to proposal you wrote, but we want these on the radar screen for all sites
 - 6> in creating social science committee view emerged that the network would benefit, if everyone participated in social science research. want to be able to go to NSF to help promote SS research
 - b> also could bring in geoscience and climate (these are not core areas)

- 7> want to go to the next level
 - b> need more funds
 - b> can't do it out of current funding.....
- 8> at the end of year, after 9 site reviews, will be able to know more at NSF-end....

C. Graduate Student Committee

- 1) Jennifer Edmonds and Rob Doe co-chairs
- 2) have list of site representatives - but many had graduated
- 3) need to know new site representatives
 - a) and keep list updated
- 4) can't get money to bring graduate students together, so WWW and list-serves are way we need to go
- 5) Karen Wilson at NTL has organized symposium at ESA
 - a) integrating social and natural sciences
 - b) good venue for interacting across sites
 - c) report has WWW site for low cost accommodations for students

D. Climate Committee

- 1) book in progress for Oxford (contract signed)
- 2) Doug Goodin new chair
- 3) need to acknowledge Greenland role in past

E. Technology Committee

- 1) summary recommendations
 - a) 9 items recommended
- 2) read WWW page to think about priority issues

F. Data Management

- 1) report late due to abbreviated meeting at CC

IV. Fall CC Theme

- A. Plum Island
- B. Land-Water Linkages
- C. 20-23 SEPTEMBER

V. SLTER Report - Monica Elser

- A. Monica runs K-12 program at CAP
- B. powerpoint presentation handout
- C. history of LTER Education Committee
 - 1) Charge - Jan 1998
 - 2) committee - 1997
 - a) Oct. 1998 Biosphere - 13 sites
 - b) Nov. 1999 Kellogg - 13 sites (not all same)
 - c) mission statement
 - 3) SLTER sub-committee 2000
 - a) Feb 2000 AAAS poster
 - b) Aug 2000 LTER All-Sci. workshops
 - c) Dec 2000 SDSC meeting
 - d) Mar 2001 poster

D. goals (from report)

- 1) things we think any SLTER can accomplish

E. SLTER activities

- 1) schoolyard experiments
- 2) classroom visits
- 3) field trips
- 4) Teacher workshops
 - a) many teachers have never worked with scientists before
- 5) on-line resources
 - a) WWW data - both ways
- 6) curriculum
- 7) linking with other programs
 - a) eg teachers in antarctica
- 8) general outreach activities

F. Putting together template for recording information on what sites do

- 1) cross-site online survey
 - a) 9 sites responded
 - b) 40-50 PIs and staff

- c) 40 LTER undergraduates
- d) >100 teachers
- e) >2000 students
- 2) funding
 - a) supplements
 - b) local, GK-12, USDA
- 3) www page
 - a) shooting for multimedia technology
- G. SLTER Project: Biome module
 - 1) teachers page
 - 2) kids page
 - 3) want data in graph forms
- H. Feedback on SLTER
 - 1) teachers and kids love us. We change lots of lives
 - 2) scientists and grad students enjoy working with kids
- I. SLTER future
 - 1) continue coordination with subcommittee
 - 2) pursue funding opportunities
 - 3) promote partnerships
 - a) scientist-educators-information managers
 - b) national partnerships (NSTA, SDSC/NPACI, TEA)
- J. comments
 - 1) data from questionnaire will be useful for 20-year review - but need more sites
 - a) want CC to set filling out survey as priority
 - 2) what is relation of SLTER to rest of education committee?
 - a) don't know what rest of committee is doing
 - b) SLTER focus is on K-12
- VI. Upcoming CC Meetings
 - A. Spring 2002 Sevilleta
 - B. Fall 2002 NWT
 - 1) need to put in early Sept.
 - 2) bring sleeping bag and own towel
 - 3) could be hosted in Boulder with hour drive to NWT
 - 4) tentative science theme - Biotic Change
 - a) at ecosystem and regional scales rather than species change per se
 - b) want both causes and consequences of biological change from biogeochemical perspective
 - c) discussion
 - 1> want some examples
 - b> changes in N cycling
 - b> critters are doing things to N cycle...
 - b> thrust is at regional level
 - C. spring 2003 KBS
 - D. fall 2003 BNZ
 - 1) more in summer? - no in September....
 - a) if that late, hard to combine with trip to Toolik
 - b) Shaver will work with Terry
 - c) would require rental of bus
 - 1> in new NET grant, could budget
 - E. spring 2004 -
 - 1) FCE
 - F. fall 2004 -
 - 1) VCR
 - G. questions
 - 1) All-Sci Meetings?
 - a) needs to be separate from ESA, but have people also attend other national meetings that year
 - b) could be 2003-2004
 - 2) idea that geosciences at NSF ought to buy into LTER...
 - a) hydrology etc. aren't core areas, but we all do them
 - b) could try to have science theme at BES on geosciences and

CC0104A

- LTER
- 1> invite critical GEO folks
 - c) could do at BNZ
 - d) prior to ESA workshop on geoscience ecology linkages... LTER well represented
 - e) could also be done with seminar series at NSF
 - f) AGU now has biogeosciences
 - 1> catalyzed interactions between geo. and bio.
 - g) we are already doing this stuff
 - h) GEO does pay some on new coastal LTERS
 - 1> GEO AD met with EXEC at NSF in Feb.
 - i) there are opportunities for interacting with GEO
- 3) looking at possible themes - from ALL-SCI followup topics in newsletter


□

CAP Meeting
List of Attendees

Blair	John	KNZ	3
Carpenter	Steve	NTL	
Childers	Dan	FCE	
Coleman	Dave	CWT	
Doust	Robert		
Driscoll	Charles	HBR	M
Fountain	Andrew	MCM	
Gosz	Jim	SEV	
Gragson	Ted	CWT	
Grove	Morgan	BES	
Harmon	Mark	HJA	✓
Hopkinson	Chuck	PIE	
Kelly	Eugene	SGS	
Kratz	Tim	NTL	3
O'Brien	John	ARC	
O'Keefe	John	HBR	3
Parmenter	Bob	SEV	3
Pennings	Steve	GCE	
Peters	Debra	JRN	
Pickett	Steward	BES	
Porter	John	VCR	
Reed	Dan		✓
Robertson	Phil		
Seastedt	Timothy	SGS	
Shaver	Guts	ARC	✓
Sprett	Patty	Network	
Vernet	Maria	PAL	
Waide	Robert	Network	
Walker	Marilyn	BZN	
Zimmerma	Jess	LUQ	3

TWIN PALMS



HOTEL 

Tel: 480.967.9431
Fax: 480.968.1877

225 East Apache Blvd.
Tempe, Arizona 85281

@ ASU

Grimm - IIII IIII IIII I - (16)

Knapp - IIII IIII II (12)

Chapin - IIII IIII - (8)

Driscoll - IIII - (4)

Priscu - II - (2)

Total voted - 21 sites