

LTER Executive Committee and Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes

4/20/94-4/23/94 Washington D.C.

Notes by John Vande Castle (JVC), LTER Network Office

LTER Executive Committee Meeting 4/21/94

Jerry Franklin, Fred Swanson, Judy Meyer, Tim Seastedt, John Hobbie, Caroline Bledsoe and John Vande Castle.

The first agenda item was discussion of the LTER 2000 Document, and goals for LTER in the next decade. For example, in the future, expansion of intersite comparison needs to be emphasized. Look at regionalization in the future will include inter-regional comparisons. A Focus on more general items of comparative research, regionalization, site history etc. should be considered, rather than specific (pet) projects. Individual scientific projects should not be excluded, but would be in addition to the general outline. The RFP for new proposals should include this. John Hobbie suggested the initial text be expanded by October 1994. This document will be open for modification at the fall CWT-LTER/CC meeting with the ultimate goal for publication in a journal like BioScience. The CWT meeting could be a place for teams to put together specific items. This activity would also act as a "record keeping" and documentation of the history of LTER.

Items for the agenda:

NSF report to the CC group

Time for the CC to discuss the NSF meeting

LTER 2000 research document

Election of new LTER EXEC members

Development of NASA/Sun Photometer interaction

Regionalization report by Hayden

Judy Needs a head count for CWT-CC October 19-21 Wed, Thursday Friday

Discussion of Governance: Chair, location of Network Office etc. (major item)

Discussion of all the new RFP's that were, are or will be out for future funding

Fred Swanson suggested that there be discussion of the formation of a group or committee that tracks the interaction between LTER and other agencies, for example between LTER and NASA, USGS, etc. There needs to be interaction from the sites, as well as a more organized effort from within LTER for these types of interactions. There needs to be information flow to and through the network office. Within the LTER Network, there should be specific liaisons to each the various agencies. If an executive director is included at the Network office, this person could see that these interactions were working.

The first afternoon session of the LTER/CC is devoted to interaction with NSF.

This would be followed by discussion with NSF, and then follow this with discussion within

the CC, after NSF representatives leave.

The CWT/CC meeting will be science oriented, but will include reports from committee groups, intersite projects, what augmented sites have proposed, and also "intersite" bytes.

The rest of the meeting as devoted towards finalizing the final agenda for the LTER/CC meeting beginning in the afternoon.

Agenda
LTER/CC Meeting, April 22-24, 1994

4/22/94

2-5pm Meeting with NSF officers:

- (a) Report from NSF
- (b) Interaction with NSF on current NSF Initiatives (supplements, FP's etc.)
- (c) Interaction with NSF on production of on-line datasets (e.g. Genomic Model, etc.)

5-6 LTER CC discussion of NSF actions/intentions

7p Dinner @ D'Angelo Restaurant

4/23/94

8-10 Governance Issues

- (a) New Process--coop agreement for Network Office (not grant)
- (b) Chair--criteria and selection
- (c) Executive Committee--role and expansion
- (d) LTER/CC Representatives--permanent or rotating
- (e) Executive Director--criteria and selection
- (f) Location of LTER Network Office
- (g) Expanded Committee Structure
 - (1) Publications
 - (2) Programs and Workshops
 - (3) Others
 - (4) Representation at LTER/CC meetings?

10:30-12 Report on Proposal/supplement preparation activities by sites (60 min)

LTER Responsibilities & expectations re on-line datasets (30 min)

12-1:30p Lunch

1:30-3:30 Governance (cont.)

3:30-4:00 Break

**4-5:30p LTER Science Agenda Document/Article (60 min) Hobbie
All Scientists Meeting Discussion (30 min) Review/Future**

6:30p Dinner @ Rio Grande Cafe

4/24/94

8-10 Governance (closure)

Science Document (decision on action steps)

10-10:30 Demo @ coffee break: Mosaic Home Pages (LTER, FLED, etc.) (Nottrott)

10:30-12:30 Election of new LTER Exec Members

**Meeting Schedule (a) Coweeta/Fall 1994 (Meyer: Agenda for mtg. incl.
Science Agenda, Committee Reports, Augmentation Reports, Cross-Site
Proposals)**

Regionalization Document (Hayden)

NASA Collaboration (Vande Castle)

International Activities (Franklin)

Network of Networks and All-Site Bibliography (Bledsoe)

LMER Report (Hobbie)

Vote of Appreciation (For the excellent organizational work of Adrienne Whitener)

LTER COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Attending:

Mary Clutter, Tom Callahan, James Gosz, Bob Wharton, David Tilman, Charles Driscol, David Foster, Robin Ross, Josh Schimel, John Hobbie, John Magnuson, Fred Swanson, Judy Meyer, Tim Seastedt, Kay Gross, William Schlesinger, Jerry Franklin, John Vande Castle, Bruce Hayden, Robert Waide, Cheryl Dybas, Roger Hanson, Indy Burke, Alan Knapp, Bruce Milne. (NSF representatives present from 2:00 to 5:00)

Friday - April 22 2:00-6:00

The LTER Coordinating Committee (CC) meeting commenced with information from the National Science Foundation and discussion with the LTER/CC

Tom Callahan initiated discussion by pointing out that the LTER Network Office grant is up for renewal on Feb 1 1995. Along with the planned changes in LTER The could potentially be a cooperative agreement between LTER and NSF. This would be in the form of submission of a formal proposal, followed by an document with agreement on what the Network Office will do and what NSF will do. Part of this would be a site review. Tom suggested a site review of the Network Office just prior to the LTER Network Data Managers meeting - September 22-24. JVC and Jerry should see how the Leehood STC and other cooperative agreements at the University of Washington have been arranged for background on how best to implement a cooperative agreement.

Current Special Competitions: Cross-site syntheses, regionalization and internationalization, and LTER site augmentation. Eleven sites indicated that they would be submitting augmentation proposals. Kay Gross asked about what will be included in the augmentation, in the form of increased support for existing site work. Tom indicated that these type of outside activities need to be part of the augmentation. The augmentations will be in the form of supplemental funding to existing LTER grants.

There were 30 cross site proposals planned for submission as indicated by show of hands by the CC members.

LTER Project reviews will include : MCM, BNZ, ARC, KBS, HBR, and NWT. Tom suggested that the the LTER Network use its resources to facilitate the review process and for other sites to help the sites under review. Tom requested names of people suitable for panel review of the augmentation and cross-site proposals. There was some discussion that add-hoc review should be included and that reviewers need background information on what the history of the activity has been.

Mary Clutter discussed the importance of the new international LTER efforts. Many countries are looking to the United States for leadership in these efforts. Jerry mentioned plans to get some type of congressional briefing regarding LTER activities. For example a retreat or "tour" of VCR would be possible. This could be done during a recess period. Mary suggested that LTER could sponsor a congressional visit. This could include a visit to the Arctic or Antarctic sites. Mary also suggested there be a presentation to the National Science Board - for FY95.

Jim Gosz discussed the importance of increased visibility for future and increased funding. New activities regarding interaction with K-12 education. As part of this, two pre-proposals were circulated for student and teacher interaction with LTER sites. These were submitted to ascertain initial interests for these activities. Kay Gross and Josh Schimel pointed out the time commitment involved in this type of activity by site personnel. The "Proposal A" was viewed best since it involved a teacher/student team, having the teacher manage the education and permit the teacher to spread the experience back to other students.

Jim mentioned that in the president's current budget plans, funding for NSF was enhanced for global change, and high performance computing and communication. Total R+D funding is planned as essentially flat, but there would be some shift of defense R+D funding to other groups, including NSF (also NASA, EPA etc.). Funding for LTER sites is proceeding along agreed forms of first providing funding for sites to better do existing and expanded research, to enhance sites to Center level funding, and last to add more sites as funding comes available. Supplemental funding was discussed as positive for all sites who submitted, within some limitations. Soil Conservation Service interaction, where the SCS has come and performed a soil characterization was also seen very positive, and continued interaction was encouraged

Tom suggested there be an on-line calendar of upcoming events related to LTER activities be established (by the Network Office). The calendar should be sent out on a regular and frequent basis via Email to PI@LTERnet.edu. This calendar of the LTER Bulletin and Newsletter is good, but not quite frequent enough. Tom also suggested that 3 key NSF people be included in the PI@LTERnet.edu Email group.

NSF is also interested in any information they can use as examples ongoing research, that would be interesting to other groups. Part of this request is for a current need of information on technology transfer. Information from the sites and Network Office can be sent to NSF at: CDybas@nsf.gov. Cheryl will send information such as press releases, etc. to PI@lternet.edu

Jim Gosz pointed out that sites must realize that data from the site research be made available on line. There was much discussion on how to get this information together. Jim Gosz pointed out that the CC had made a quantum leap in now deciding to getting data made more available. The discussion centered on having the Network Office act as a lead on organizing this activity and have it as a point of activity for the LTER Data

management group. Although this initial discussion indicated that the mechanism would not be difficult, later realization of the need for proper documentation and perhaps hierarchical access restrictions suggested this activity proceed with caution (see notes on later discussion).

An invited speaker by NSF, Dennis Helso of USGS - National Water Quality Assessment (NWQA) presented a short briefing regarding NWQA activities. Funding for the program was started in 1991, more sites added in 1994. The activities of the program are staggered every 3 years. By stretching the sampling period of the entire network to 3 years NWQA is able to cover 3 times the area of an annual sampling program. The research is focused in part on nutrient/contaminant loading to watersheds. There is also a need to use reference sites for comparison - thus a potential linkage for LTER activities.

Jerry gave background on the International LTER networking activities. The report from the initial meeting last September in Estes Park is in final publication stages by the Nework Office. A follow-up meeting in Rothemstadt is planned following the August 1994 INTECOL meeting in the UK. As part of this, an assessment of the electronic networking capabilities will be made by members of the LTER Connectivity Committee. Tom indicated that proposals for international collaborations, for instance to NSF-INT would have a good chance for funding.

The late afternoon session included general discussion regarding the information NSF provided as well as other concerns at the sites:

John Hobbie brought up the issue of the equity of the sites. NSF should be reminded that all the sites should be given the opportunity, thus the need for continued funding opportunities next year. Josh Schimel discussed the need to recognize the need for proper funding to cover LTER research as mentioned in the 10 year review document. David Tilman suggested that LTER as a network should push to spread LTER like funds out to the other ecological research groups. This is important regarding non-LTER funding, and LTER being seen as a money-rich program. Indy Burke pointed out the importance of ad-hoc reviews for proper review, as well as the perception of the review process for LTER funding. Judy Meyer bought up the issue of cross-site funding, and its importance, especially to outside groups not currently associated with LTER. Robert Warton pointed out that the Antarctic sites have not been able to compete for supplemental funds, and OPP needs to coordinate so that these two sites do not fall behind. Robin Ross pointed out that funds have been hard to find even for data management activities by the Antarctic sites. She indicated that these sites might be able to acquire funds by submitting cross-site proposals. David Foster pointed out the importance of making sure the reviewers have the proper background, thus the need for proper ad-hoc reviewers. Charles Driscoll pointed out the timing issue regarding the RFP's - It would be better if the RFP's were better coordinated and had better timing. William Schlesinger agreed with what NSF had presented, and was encouraged. Kay Gross pointed out the importance to include funding for people to do the work. Equipment by itself cannot be funded.

Alan Knapp was also pleased with what NSF had presented, and thought the information presented by NSF was positive. Robert Waide said that information regarding the result of

student funding needs to be transmitted by NSF more rapidly. Supplemental funding seems to have gotten more competitive. Information of what should be included in the proposals regarding augmentation needs to be more clear. He also said that on-line data was another back-door activity, not originally present in grant conditions by NSF. Tim Seastedt pointed out individual items that can be brought up to needed levels. Also that the importance of PR to the public and press, such as that emphasized by NSF representatives. John Magnuson pointed out the importance of the support and interaction that NSF gives to the LTER program. Reviewers need have a very broad background, and not be narrowly focused to be able to assess all the activities of site augmentation proposals. He also mentioned that late REU funding can be held until the following year since timing of the funding for this might not be in sync with the needs for offers to students. Bruce Milne discussed the proliferation of opportunities does cause some problem on the perception of clear goals of the LTER site program. He suggested that some thought be made to optimize the activity of the Network. Not all sites should be doing the exact same activities. Specialists to handle "outside" activities should be brought in as part of the research, rather than having existing researchers change activities because of the demands of the LTER program.

Saturday, April 23 1994

LTER Future Governance Discussion:

Background for the day's discussions was based on the document produced from the LTER Executive Committee meeting which was distributed to each site PI prior to the meeting. The updated LTER Governance document, as modified by these discussions will be distributed to LTER principal investigators by the Network Office.

Jerry Franklin discussed the procedures with NSF for future operation of the LTER Network Office, with a change to a cooperative agreement for tasks performed by the Network Office.

Jerry polled the CC for reactions:

All sites agreed with the plan for future operations. Kay Gross mentioned that this allows more accounting for activities by NSF on the operations. John Magnuson asked how the cooperative agreement would be judged, and Jerry said that the current views of what are produced will continue. Jerry mentioned the importance of realizing the scale of the program that LTER is moving towards, with the Network Office providing the infrastructure for a program approaching \$20M. David Tilman brought up the issue of knowing what was in the proposal, and was assured that a review of what was to be submitted by to NSF be a part of the fall CC meeting in CWT. The CC indicated a consensus, and further polling site representatives was not needed.

Discussion of future Chair of LTER opened with mention of what was included in the background information generated prior to, and resulting from the previous LTER Executive meeting. The function of the LTER Chair was discussed, and included the duties

as head of the Exec, CC, and leader of initiatives of the Network etc. The personal goals and satisfaction, as well as what motivates people to act as chair was also discussed. Jerry mentioned that this was one of the reasons the EXEC wanted this as a position that didn't require a full time position, and would have the executive director of the Network office and perhaps other help, such as a post-doc would be included in the Network Office. Bruce Hayden pointed out that it be quite flexible to suit whatever was needed for the best person for the position. William Schlesinger suggested that an "outside" person be added to the committee, to provide a wider perspective to the selection, and that the person selected should be committed to, and not overcommitted to other projects. Jerry said that a person from the 10 Year review committee or others that were suggested would be included. Judy Meyer raised the issue that a site PI might not ALSO be the LTER Chair. Discussion suggested that the Chair should probably not also act as a site PI. David Foster asked about the view that support for the Network Office and Chair include research activities, and discussion mentioned that research needs to be a part of the activities. The procedure to select a chair was discussed including if this should be fully advertised. The selection was decided to not limit the selection to an LTER PI, but allow for any outside person familiar with the operation of LTER. The credentials of the person or persons selected will be circulated. The CC agreed unanimously that the selection should proceed as planned with selection at the fall CC meeting. The vote will be by secret ballot.

Expansion of the LTER Executive committee was discussed as a method to have wider involvement of the site PI's in operations, with the EXEC acting to perform much of the initial work. It was decided to increase the EXEC members to 5 people, and to have the Chair act as non-voting member. Jerry mentioned that the structure of the LTER/CC is proposed to allow for both closed and more open meetings. It was recommended that there be a primary contact, but it be open to flexibility. The importance of continuity was discussed, as well as the need that the CC representative be able to speak for the site. This is especially important for the "limited" meetings. It was agreed that there be a regular site representative with a commitment for a three year period with the recognition that this be flexible for sites who are able to represent the site in a team framework.

Discussion of the Executive director of the Network Office: The individual will need to reside wherever the Network Office is located. The person needs to be committed to the position as a career, as a science advocate. The selection of this person will be determined primarily with interaction of the new chair, and selection proceed once the chair is selected. The concept of having an Executive director who will interact directly with the Chair was accepted by the CC.

A lot of discussion centered around operations of the Network Office activities. Better involvement of the CC in the cooperative agreement

The location of the network office followed discussion of information in the EXEC document. The need to be flexible was important, that the Office remain in Seattle for the near future, with review as needed, on a 1 to 2 year basis, as other changes in structure of LTER occur.

The CC agreed that the Office remain for the near future.

LTER Committee discussion included expansion of committee structure to cover issues within LTER. Specific recommendations were made for a committee to manage issues of syntheses and common measurements be included. Indy Burke suggested that the committees be science based. Charles Driscol emphasized the need for a common measurement approach. It was suggested that the "program" committee be altered to a "Syntheses" committee, with an initial charge is to develop a MMP (minimum measurement program). Key Gross asked that the MMP be linked to the science program. The diversity of the individual programs needs to be included. Discussion suggested that this should include 7 people, with initial membership by Charles Driscol, Bob Wharton, Kay Gross, and Josh Schimel. The financial needs of these groups will need to be included, and their activities in the Nework Office cooperative agreement.

Discussion of All Scientists meeting activities emphasized the support for and need for Assilimar was suggested as a location for September of 1996. The next meeting will be needed for Assilimar for 1000 people. JVC will check that this will be appropriate, available and can handle 1000 people.

LTER Science Agenda.

Discussion was based on the Long-Term Research Agenda document which built on the original LTER 2000 program initially submitted to NSF. The science agenda was formulated by John Hobie who will coordinate the activity, for five areas of focus, and initial document compiled for September 15. A plan for publication will proceed as an article in BioScience, perhaps part of a special issue.

Discussion of regionalization activity by Bruce Hayden, in producing an electronic document. Currently there are five sites that have the on-line document ready, and part of the "Mosaic", World Wide Web. The document includes color imagery which is difficult and expensive to publish in other forms. Discussion about concerns included what each of the sites considers in regional research, and the fact that this is something under construction. The implications and significance were noted for future work and information access, potential for a hard-copy run and even to congressional briefings.

Kay Gross lead discussion of acquisition, reconstruction and access of long-term datasets. Included in this is the ability to include information to document past datasets. The initiative is to access and archive important long-term datasets, especially of "orphaned" or "at risk" datasets. The ESA committee working on this activity will be submitting a report by the Snowbird ESA meeting.

JVC gave a background on the LTER/NASA interaction regarding Landsat data acquisition and sun photometer work.

There was much concern about the NASA interaction involving Warren Cohen, and knowing what the status of the landscape assessment program is. Concern centered around the lack of information and what the status of the proposal is. The committee suggested

that Warren provide information to the LTER/CC within the next ten days as to what was bееing doing and the status of this proposal.

Jerry provided background on the International LTER Networking meeting held at Estes Park. NSF has provided funding for assessment of electronic networking connections, database assessment and to demonstrate potentials for network activities. Kay Gross suggested that a letter of support for Jerry be included by sites that are representing LTER activites. The international networking activity will continue with the upcomming meeting in the UK.

Caroline Bledsoe gave background on the new LTER bibliographic database that is now online on the LTERnet data server, accessable by gopher and mosaic server, which has been developed.

John Hobbie gave background on the status of the LMER program. The is now a competition for renewal and new sites. There were 17 proposals including 4 of the 5 exisiting sites, with about 7 to be funded.

Judy suggested that information Network-wide information be compiled on overhead rates etc that have been negotiated. JVC will compile the material, compiling one list of institutions involved, and a second, but not linked list of the rates that was negotiated. This information will be distributed with a letter from Jerry to the site PI group for information. The information will not be made for general distribution.

Discussion of the distributing information on the organizational structure of the sites was suggested to be collected. It was decided to make this a key point of the VCR meeting in a year.

The CC discussed extensively the need to put LTER data on-line. Bruce Hayden proposed that a model be devolped by the data management group to put on-line a complete metadata structure and data itself as well as atrribution (who did it). This motion was voted unanomous. Jerry also got a committment from the entire CC to get one single dataset online by the end of the year after much discussion.

The final vote for two new EXEC members and Kay Gross and Bruce Hayden were elected by majority votes. There was a short roundtable for the sites to exchange information on the basic elements of site augmentation proposals that they were planning to submit.

Rudolf Nottrott gave a brief presentation of the on-line Mosaic information server of the LTER Network including its capabilites of LTER bibliographic searches (from work of Caroline Bledsoe and Harvey Chin), access to on-line site information, as well as display of the LTER electronic volumes, such as the LTER Regionalization document under preperation by Bruce Hayen.

The LTER/CC meeting was adjourned late in the day on Saturday, completing the agenda.

