



## LTER Site Characteristics

This table summarizes and compares information between sites including:

- Number of Principal Investigators (PI) at each site
- Number of institutions represented by each PI
- Average dollar amount per PI
- Number of Graduate students at each site, etc.

See "*LTER Site Profile Categories*" below, for detailed explanations of table entries.

SITE	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Andrews	17	17.6	3	29	46	50	40	25	3.5	40
Arctic	17	30	9	51.5	5	8	5	10	3.6	11
Baltimore	21	33	14	28.8	15	70	13	15	0.6	20
Bonanza	29	25	8	40	26	89	29	14	5.7	41
Central Arizona-Phoenix	40	30	3	0	33	100	34	15	1.5	20
Cedar Creek	9	35	9	9	34	94	15	71	1.3	17
Coweeta	28	18	8	26	27	80	52	30	2.7	30
Florida Coastal Everglades	7	64.5	3	0	15	90	16	9	9.2	19
Georgia Coastal Ecosystems	15	42	4	26	4.5	16			1.1	15
Harvard Forest	19	37	5	26	27	80	15	81	8	62
Hubbard Brook	14	50	9	23	10	30	10	30	3.5	15
Jornada	13	24.2	8	25	40	67	15	8	1.95	15
Kellogg	31	10	3	0	5	70	13	12	2	45
Konza	19	24	5	20	15	80	24	30	3.2	44
Luquillo	23	22.3	12	10	33	8	13	45	2.7	12
McMurdo	8	60	8	20	5	0	16	9	0.5	28
Niwot	15	15	4	26	40	95	25	12	2.2	10
North Temperate Lakes	18	21	4	-15	10	98	37	23	1.9	28
Palmer	11	44	6	26	15	0	9	8	0.3	14
Plum Island	12	37	6	54	3	80	10	10	2.8	15
Santa Barbara Coastal	9	52	1	16	3	95	13	10	0.9	23
Sevilleta	20	10	14	0	5	90	7	20	2.5	150
Shortgrass Steppe	11	15	3	15	21	79	15	35	3	15
Virginia	21	12	6	23	53	30	20	13	1.2	19
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>29.5</b>

KEY to COLUMNS

A = Number of principal investigators (PIs)  
B = Average \$ per PI (x1000)  
C = Number of institutions  
D = Effective overhead rate (%)  
E = Percent of budget spent on infrastructure  
F = Percent of budget spent in the local economy  
G = Graduate students  
H = Undergraduate students  
I = LTER leveraged resources  
J = Non-PI scientists at the site

---

**LTER Site Profile Categories:**

**Number of PIs.** This is the number of investigators who are engaged in the work of the site and participate in governance of the LTER program at the site. This might be the list of PIs on the current proposal plus new additions and minus people who have moved on. Note that there is also a category for other scientists: "non-PI scientists at site."

**Average \$ per PI (x1000).** This is the number of dollars that an average PI who gets such an allocation has at his disposal. Typically, these funds may be spent on PI stipend, student support, specialized equipment or technical staff support. It should be noted that only a fraction of PIs at a site get such allocations.

**Number of Institutions.** This is the number of institutions (colleges, universities, museums, etc.) represented by the site PIs.

**Effective Overhead Rate (%).** This is the negotiated overhead rate for the current award less the matching resources provided by the lead institution (cash, field station support, staff, equipment, etc.)

**% of Budget Spent on Infrastructure.** LTER sites establish the facilities needed by the PIs to conduct research at their sites for the long-term. Sites build their research facility by supporting existing infrastructure and by adding to it in an incremental way each year. The capacity for research grows at LTER sites. This category quantifies infrastructure expenditures as a percent of the annual award.

**% of Budget Spent in the Local Economy.** Many LTER sites expend significant fractions of their award in the local community at their field stations and as such have direct impacts on local economies. The fraction of the budget spent at the field station reflects this impact of the research award. Some sites have field stations where there is not a local economy and others have their field station at or in the local community of their University and most of the award is spent locally.

**Graduate Students.** Graduate education and graduate students are both direct and indirect beneficiaries of LTER awards. The number of graduate students who benefit from LTER awards each year includes those who receive stipends from the awards and those who use the field station and equipment in support of their graduate research programs. This category includes both types of LTER student support.

**Undergraduate Students.** Undergraduate education and undergraduate students are also both direct and indirect beneficiaries of LTER awards. The number of undergraduate students who benefit from LTER awards each year include those who receive stipends from the LTER award, REU students, and those who use the field station and equipment in support of their undergraduate and graduate research programs.

**LTER Leveraged Resources.** Many sites use the LTER research awards and the LTER research facilities to leverage additional research support. These synergisms directly advance the LTER research program at the sites. The ratio of annual average leveraged research funds to the annual LTER award is a measure of the effectiveness research synergism.

**Non-PI Scientists at the Site.** This category includes all non-PI scientists who conduct their research at the LTER site and or who collaborate with LTER-PIs on site research.

---

**Notes:**

1. The table provides averages across all 24 LTER sites as a measure of the attributes of an average site.
2. Several sites have field stations that have finite capacities and have limits on the degree to which leveraging of award funds is possible. These sites are the Antarctic sites (McMurdo Dry Valleys and Palmer Station) and the Alaskan (Arctic Tundra site).

---

Data collected August 2001

*Assembled by the LTER Network Office  
under the direction of the LTER Coordinating Committee*

---

**[INTRANET](#) [www.lternet.edu](http://www.lternet.edu) [www.iltternet.edu](http://www.iltternet.edu) [schoolyard.lternet.edu](http://schoolyard.lternet.edu)**

---

- Copyright 2003 Long Term Ecological Research Network -

This material is based upon work supported by the [National Science Foundation](#) under Cooperative Agreement [#DEB-0236154](#). Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in the material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Please [contact us](#) with questions, comments, or for technical assistance regarding this web site.