**Notes from meeting of the LTER Executive Board – May 17, 2016**

**Attending:** Frank Davis, Anne Giblin, Mike Goosef, Peter Groffman, Sally Holbrook, Sherri Johnson, Lou Kaplan, Steve Pennings, Dan Reed, Emma Rosi-Marshall, Roger Ruess, Scott Simon, Bob Waide

1. Approval of notes from last meeting on April 27, 2016.

1. Rotation of members of the Executive Board (EB):
   1. SEV, JRN, BES off
   2. MCR, BNZ, CDR on
   3. How important is it for the site principal investigator (PI) to be the rep on the EB? The by-laws say that it is the PI or a designee. We agree that we should keep this but emphasize the need for a person that is deeply involved with the site.
   4. The new LTER National Communications Office (LNCO) will keep track of the rotation schedule.
2. Request from publications committee:
   1. The committee is recommending including a book, “Martha’s Vineyard. The History, Ecology, and Conservation of a New England Landscape” by Foster et al. as part of the official LTER book series.
   2. The book is somewhat less LTER-centric than other LTER books, it is focused on Martha’s Vineyard with comparisons to Harvard Forest and other LTER sites in the northeast.
   3. The committee suggests, and the EB agrees that it is good for our sites to be placed into a broader context and heartily approved inclusion of this book in the series.
3. National Information Management Office (NIMO) update. Margaret O’Brien made a presentation (attached) and led the discussion:
   1. NIMO is now the Environmental Data Initiative (EDI), an information management (IM) effort that includes LTER and a variety of other research networks.
   2. While this is considered to be an exciting development and affirmation of the accomplishments of LTER IM over the last 30 years, it will be important to ensure that LTER site and network needs are met by the new structure.
   3. EDI is very much a three year experiment. We will need active dialog with NSF, other networks and with the LTER IM community to help this develop into a more permanent IM program. Questions for further discussion:
      1. How are LTER synthesis needs met?
      2. How are LTER databases maintained?
      3. How will the Community Advisory Board be constituted?
      4. What happens after three years?
         1. How will the “fee for service” model work?
         2. Will all NSF projects need data management and be willing to pay?
         3. Will we need to pay?
   4. There is a strong sense that we just have to move forward and see how the issues emerge and resolve. Probably, we should begin to consult with the other partners in the EDI.
4. Education committee update. Scott Simon made a presentation and led the discussion:
   1. *Scott/Kari*
5. NIMO/EDI and LNCO coordination. Mark Schildauer from NCEAS/LNCO joined for this discussion.
   1. Collaboration and communication between LNCO and LTER network office (LNO) at the University of New Mexico (UNM) has been very good. There has also been a lot of discussion with NIMO/EDI.
      1. LNCO has transitioned critical services from the LNO office; email, password, authentication, DNS, and Databases.
      2. There are some services still at LNO/UNM until it is figured out whether they should ultimately be at LNCO or EDI.
   2. There are some unresolved issues related to interactions between LNCO and NIMO/EDI:
      1. The request for proposals that led to the LNCO was clear that no IM was required, but coordination was assumed, and now we have lots of changes in the IM area. This creates uncertainty for the LNCO.
      2. The main focus of the LNCO is synthesis working groups, many of which will be tightly tied to LTER data. It is not clear how/who will support IM activities for these projects.

1. Synthesis working group proposals:
   1. Very happy with the quantity (24) and quality of the proposals.
   2. 22 of 24 were LTER plus other sites.
   3. Great range in data fluency among the proposals.
   4. Three proposals were funded:
      1. Stream Elemental Cycling: Global Patterns in Stream Energy and Nutrient Cycling -- PIs: Adam Wymore (LUQ) and Sujay Kaushal (BES)
      2. LTER Metacommunities:  A synthesis to identify how metacommunity dynamics mediate community responses to disturbance across the ecosystems represented in the LTER network -- PIs: Eric R. Sokol (MCM), Christopher M. Swan (BES), Nathan I. Wisnoski (AND)
      3. Communities-to-Ecosystems: Integrating plant community and ecosystem responses to chronic global change drivers: Toward an explanation of patterns and improved global predictions*--*PIs:  Kimberly J. La Pierre (KNZ/CDR/SGS), Meghan L. Avolio (KNZ), and Kevin R. Wilcox (KNZ/SGS)
2. Diversity committee. Emma Rosi-Marshall gave an update and led the discussion:
   1. Nidzgorski and Pickett lead the committee, Marty Downs from the LNCO is participating. This is currently an ad hoc committee.
   2. The committee would like us to consider three requests:
      1. Make this ad hoc committee a standing committee
      2. Recommend that each LTER site articulate a diversity statement and generate a diversity plan.
      3. The network should establish a diversity statement and plan to complement or reinforce the activities of the sites.
   3. The EB approved a motion that: A diversity committee should be established as a standing committee of the Network.  A formal and easily identified component of Network governance structure would help signal the commitment of the Network to enhancing diversity, provide a channel for communication concerning diversity within the Network, and curate and distribute information on diversity and diversification relevant to the LTER Network.
      1. We would like to charge the diversity committee to provide sites with specific examples and suggestions (best practices, e.g. advertising REU opportunities across the network) to facilitate diversity across the network. The committee could also provide examples of things that the sites are doing to promote diversity.
      2. We also recommend that the committee track activity of increasing diversity across the network.
3. Minisymposium revisioning. Sherri Johnson has led a subcommittee on this topic and led the discussion:
   1. The committee suggests that there are three options that we could consider:
      1. Option 1 - Very short, science focused talks highlighting LTER science achievements. Focus on NSF Directors and Program Officers.
      2. Option 1 - Present on highly topical issues and showing how LTER funds this work. NSF and Agency focused audience.
      3. Option 3 - Use Executive Board to communicate the LTER message to NSF.
   2. Here is a “sense of the board” on some other issues associated with the minisymposium:
      1. Do we LTER need to present science to NSF once a year? YES
      2. Does the EB need to go to Washington once a year? YES. Maybe not everyone needs to go.
      3. Do we need two meetings of the EB per year? Not necessarily.
4. Meet with NSF program officers Dave Garrison & Lou Kaplan
   1. New site competitions.
      1. Preproposals were very strong.
      2. 12 of > 50 coastal site preproposals were invited for a full proposal, 6 of 13 arid site preproposals invited for a full proposal.
      3. It is important that Geosciences and Polar Programs find out more about LTER so it is clear that LTER is not just a Biology Program.
   2. Changes in NSF LTER team:
      1. Saran will be on LTER team through August. Can we thank Saran for her hard work for LTER.
      2. Current NSF Working Group Team is Dave Garrison, Lou Kaplan, Peter McCartney, and John Schade. Will soon appoint a “point person” from among this group.
   3. Funding outlook:
      1. BIO funding will be flat.
      2. Hope to be able to preserve the cost of living increases and equipment supplements.
5. Items for discussion at future meetings:
   1. By-laws
   2. National Advisory Committee
   3. Mini-symposium
   4. EDI
   5. New site orientation
   6. Institution contributions
   7. Compensation for the chair
   8. ILTER
   9. An integrated supplement paln
   10. Diversity statements



