

IT'S BEEN A LONG TIME since we carried information about how to write for these columns, and the changing nature of the manuscripts being submitted for *Park Science* publication indicates a need to rebroadcast the objectives and guidelines.

First, the subject matter: *Park Science* is dedicated to the circulation throughout the National Park Service of information about scientific research that is recently completed, on-going, or perhaps merely contemplated, but which in all cases has important *management implications*. The question in the minds of all authors should be: "What does all this contribute to better management of the area (or the System)?"

Second, the length: Because *Park Science* is limited to 24 pages, four times a year, the editorial board has decreed that only in very exceptional cases shall any article run longer than six, or at most seven, double spaced, typed manuscript pages. When longer articles come in, the editor has to decide whether to send them back for cutting by the author, to cut them herself, or to turn them down. She would prefer to expand the publication to fit all the excellent material that comes in, but alas, this is not an option. (So much excellent material was "backed up" that *Park Science* received a first-ever permission to exceed its 24-page size – this issue only.)

Third, the "art": Photos are welcome, so long as they focus on the research. Pictures taken in the field, showing research process and/or findings, are especially welcome if they come in as glossy black and white photos. We can't use color, so anything that has to be "translated" is an added expense and can always be counted on to lose a lot in the translation. Tables should be clearly typed and checked. If you have graphs, they should be submitted as "PMT's." This set of initials stands for photomechanical transfer, and it consists of a high quality, glossy rendition of your graph, done with a commercial type printing camera. It saves your parting with precious originals and makes your article (and therefore, *Park Science*) look its very best. We like that.

Fourth, the editorial route: Presumably, no submissions will come to the *Park Science* editorial office without clearance by the Region and whatever park is mentioned. Seldom will the Regional Director need to see your copy, but no superintendent should open the pages of *Park Science* and have an article about his or her park come as a complete surprise (let alone a rude shock). We *don't* like that. Neither do the superintendents.

That about does it. We're delighted with the response from all over the System in terms of editorial submissions. Some Regions are responding with more material than others, but every one of you is sending in *something*, and the comments from readers convince us that this way of keeping a farflung field informed and "in touch" is a good idea that is working well.

One last caveat to the scientists: Remember, *Park Science* is not a journal. Gear your presentations to the general audience, and remember that superintendents and their resource management staffs, busy and beset, want to know – right up front – how this piece of research or information is going to help them manage *their* responsibilities. Keep writing for the journals. That's part of *your* professional responsibility. But remember that you owe it to your profession to communicate outside the ranks. *Park Science* is your vehicle.