The North American Carbon Program (NACP), sponsored by the U.S. National Science Foundation, convened an “all-scientist” meeting in November 2006 to advance a broad integration of climate change research across the United States, Canada, and Mexico. The meeting, held in Fort Collins, Colorado, was attended by some 150 scientists and revisited progress toward the full implementation of strategies that address the need for improved decision support.

Meeting participants noted that long-term continuity of research is essential. Long-term integrated observation systems are necessary to track and understand changes in the carbon cycle, with coordinated improvements in integrated modeling and data management infrastructure to support modeling and analysis. Identification of study regions that are critical for reducing uncertainties in the North American carbon balance and integrating biogeochemical science with the human dimensions of carbon management and decision support is important. NACP requires cross-disciplinary integration to evaluate the range of carbon sources and sinks in diverse regions of North America. Participants noted that long-term continuity of research is essential. Long-term integrated observation systems are necessary to track and understand changes in the carbon cycle, with coordinated improvements in integrated modeling and data management infrastructure to support modeling and analysis. Identification of study regions that are critical for reducing uncertainties in the North American carbon balance and integrating biogeochemical science with the human dimensions of carbon management and decision support is important. NACP requires cross-disciplinary integration to evaluate the range of carbon sources and sinks in diverse regions of North America.

Scientists who want to visit their congressional offices and feel obligated to offer perspective on the article “Natural radioactivity, earthquakes, and the biosphere,” by S. A. Pullinetti, which headlined the 15 May issue of Eos. 
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More than 20 scientists and engineers from around the United States convened in Washington, D.C., on 1-2 May 2007 to participate in the annual Science and Technology (SET) Congressional Visits Day (CVD). The AGU Office of Public Affairs frequently helps to arrange for members’ visits to their congressional delegations, but CVD is a unique event during which AGU members can team up with a larger group of scientists and engineers to promote federal funding of scientific research. The 40 Earth and space scientists invited by AGU, the American Geophysical Union, and the Joint Oceanographic Institutions started their day on 1 May at AGU headquarters by getting an overview of the budgets of several science agencies and learning how those budgets are set by the federal government and Congress. They also heard what to expect during their congressional visits, most of which would be conducted with staff rather than with members of Congress. In addition, they received hints on how to conduct themselves appropriately, and how to effectively and quickly get their messages across. At an afternoon briefing held for CVD participants at the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), there were presentations on the budgetary and technology funding situation and talks that highlighted current and technology priorities for the U.S. government.
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I feel obligated to offer perspective on the article “Natural radioactivity, earthquakes, and the biosphere,” by S. A. Pullinetti, which headlined the 15 May issue of Eos. Contrary to the confident statements therein, there is no scientific consensus in fact there is no consensus, in the scientific community about the causes of earthquakes, with the seismological community still agreeing that “an increased seismic tectonic activity is observed before earthquakes,” and an “earthquake preparation area...for large earthquakes.”
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The American Federation of Earthquake Prediction Organizations (AFTPO) established the first national standards for earthquake prediction in 1995. These standards require that an earthquake prediction statement be accurate and specific, with an accuracy level at least as stringent as the seismic wave duration for the area of interest. An example of such an area for U.S. earthquakes is the San Francisco Bay Area.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) is a nonprofit membership organization, and the Public Affairs Office of the AGU strives to provide a voice for Earth and space sciences in the context of diverse national goals, policies, and management opportunities in the United States and abroad. The AGU Office of Public Affairs frequently helps to arrange for members’ visits to their congressional delegations, but CVD is a unique event during which AGU members can team up with a larger group of scientists and engineers to promote federal funding of scientific research. The 40 Earth and space scientists invited by AGU, the American Geophysical Union, and the Joint Oceanographic Institutions started their day on 1 May at AGU headquarters by getting an overview of the budgets of several science agencies and learning how those budgets are set by the federal government and Congress. They also heard what to expect during their congressional visits, most of which would be conducted with staff rather than with members of Congress. In addition, they received hints on how to conduct themselves appropriately, and how to effectively and quickly get their messages across. At an afternoon briefing held for CVD participants at the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), there were presentations on the budgetary and technology funding situation and talks that highlighted current and technology priorities for the U.S. government.
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