

LTER/EXEC Phone Conference Meeting Notes of 3/15/95 - John Vande Castle

Item 1 - Workshops

NET Office Budget has \$20,000 for both funded and unfunded workshops. - how to spend this - item in VCR EXEC Committee session. Full funding vs handling onsite costs vs handling just logistics for workshops. For meetings not local to Seattle, it helps if the remote sites help with local logistics.

The LTER/EXEC could make suggestions for workshop priorities. Some money needs to be reserved for a planned meeting/workshop with the LEE Hood Technology Center at UW.

Item 2 - ILTER

ILTER work - Some new Funding added to the LTER Network Office to support New Eastern Europe ILTER work, Jerry should Email Mike Allen saying NET will do this.

Item 3 - EMAP -

EPA/EMAP reorganization will include a focus on site based work. Need a Workshop between May and August for about 40 with people. A substantial (\$25M or \$0.5M/site). EPA will probably do the evaluation of sites, and arrange funding, but in any event these will be formulated at the workshop. Questions on this include does LTER want to join in - how - should LTER proceed aggressively. It seems that EPA is taking some of the previous recommendations, and could be an opportunity as long this is advantageous to LTER - LTER needs to pay attention to how much additional work. Bruce Hayden suggested treating this as a cross-site effort, to include the entire network. Kay Gross suggested that LTREB sites also be considered as part of this. This again depends on exactly EPA is asking. The EXEC agreed to have an EPA representative for a briefing at the VCR LTER/CC meeting. It was also suggested that this information get out to the sites for comment (EMAIL) before the VCR LTER/CC meeting. John Hobbie will get review information (8 copies plus NET) of the EPA review in the next few days. Jim Gosz will get some general info out to the the LTER/CC. The datamanagers should also be included at the outset rather than tacked on at the end.

Other issues:

The LTER/EXEC discussed LTER Email groups and suggested that general Email groups be as well defined as possible For instance, email sent to NSF (name@nsf.gov) become part of the permanent record since that email is logged and archived - and subject to FOI. As a solution to get out information, users would be encouraged to CC: other groups (such as NSF@LTERnet.edu - (NSF staff associated with LTER work at NSF).

Travel for student research that was discussed at the previous LTER/CC meeting was not able to be included in the revised budget - money for this would have to come from the participant support category of other meetings. Options were discussed such as sites kicking in funds and perhaps NET supporting travel etc. Jim and Caroline will work on possibilities here.

end of notes.