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Ames's Proposal for Lab Triggers Battle at NASA

Andrew Lawler

Just east of California’s sprawling Silicon Valley sits Moffett Field, home to NASA’s Ames Research Center. The 800-hectare former Navy base also includes an airfield, abandoned wind tunnels, and plenty of open space, the last a rare and valuable commodity in this booming region. Ames officials would like to trade the use of part of that land for a new building largely dedicated to NASA's nascent astrobiology program, the core of which is a 2-year-old virtual institute based at Ames (Science, 20 March 1998, p. 1840). Although some scientists applaud the idea, stiff opposition from other researchers and from officials at NASA headquarters could well sink it.

The fracas began last year, when Ames managers decided to cash in on their prime real estate and their proximity to a rich supply of intellectual capital. “We want to create a research park with university, government, and industry partners,” says Bill Berry, Ames deputy director. “And we can make land available to our partners to further NASA’s research agenda.” Ames officials envision a 32-hectare site with a 10,000-square-meter lab, primarily dedicated to astrobiology. Built by the potential partners, it would cost NASA about $15 million to outfit and another $15 million a year to operate. NASA Administrator Dan Goldin is intrigued by the idea, which Ames officials say has attracted the attention of local companies.

It has also drawn criticism. Some researchers and officials at NASA headquarters argue that a brick-and-mortar project defeats the purpose of a virtual institute, and that a building would divert money from science. “There’s no compelling reason to do this,” says David Black, director of Houston’s Lunar and Planetary Institute. Adds one NASA manager: “This is not an obvious slam dunk, so why do it?”

Faced with such conflicting views, NASA appointed an 11-person panel last fall to conduct an independent review of the proposed facility. Although its report is not due until September, NASA last month asked the chair, Stanford geologist Donald Lowe, for a preliminary summary to inform its planning for the 2002 budget cycle. The 10-page document, obtained by Science, says that the facility could be used to design and test astrobiological experiments; to simulate the environments of other planets, comets, or asteroids; and to provide computational capability for everything from understanding planetary formation to the self-assembly of living systems. “I think it’s a pretty good idea,” says panelist David Deamer, a biophysicist at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

At the same time, the document warns that start-up and operating funds should not come out of the hide of other NASA science programs.

The Lowe panel’s findings rattled opponents of the new lab. According to NASA sources, Anne Kinney, the NASA headquarters official who leads the parent Origins program, wanted the Astrobiology Task Force—a group of a dozen outside researchers—to consider the findings. On 9 June, just 3 days after Lowe submitted his preliminary report, the researchers discussed the document in a teleconference; the next day they submitted a letter to Kinney. In it, task force chair Charles Beichman, an astronomer at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California, opines that the three research areas outlined by the Lowe panel are not compelling enough to warrant a new facility. “We do not agree that it is necessary to establish a national laboratory,” the letter states.

Task force members say it wasn't a close call. “To spend $15 million a year on this when researchers are struggling along with $50,000 grants is not a good balance,” one member explains. Black also casts
doubt on some of the plans themselves. The idea of creating an environmental simulation facility, for example, “is nuts. ... You can’t simulate the gravity on a comet,” he says.

Next week the battleground shifts to Washington, D.C., when Beichman briefs NASA’s space science advisory committee. Lowe is out of the country and will not attend the meeting, although another panel member might speak on his behalf. That arrangement infuriates the lab’s supporters, who feel that NASA headquarters has ears only for the critics. Last week Ames’s director, Henry MacDonald, wrote to Ed Weiler, NASA space science chief, to complain about how the Lowe report has been handled.

But lab supporters may be fighting a losing battle. The head of the astrobiology institute, Nobel Prize-winning biologist Baruch Blumberg, has refused to take sides in the disagreement and did not return calls seeking comment. His silence, along with a lack of support from Weiler and the advisory committee, could doom any land-for-space deal.