

Minutes  
LTER Executive Board Agenda 22 October 2012  
10:00AM-12:00PM EDT  
Conference Call

Meeting called to order at 08:00 MDT by Chair Scott Collins; Members attending: Dan Childers, John Blair, Emery Boose, Nicole Kaplan, Karen McGlathery, Evelyn Gaiser, Bob Waide, Nancy Grimm (briefly), Mark Ohman, Mary Spivey, Emily Stanley  
Also attending: Saran Twombly, Matt Kane  
Not attending: Gus Shaver, Steve Hamilton

1. Report from NSF – Twombly and Kane

Alan Knapp gave a fabulous presentation at a NEON meeting last week on the complimentary nature of the LTER and NEON networks. It would be good to have him reprise this presentation during the afternoon following the 2013 mini-symposium.

Revised instructions to site visit teams will be issued shortly. These changes may alter site visit formats. The revisions will specific NSF's goals for site reviews. Specifically they will ask the team to evaluate progress based on the proposal and to identify any potential problems with research, IM, site management, etc. All site visit teams are in place for 2013! Names of members will be sent to the sites soon.

The outcomes of two ASM workshops, LNO future and LTER in 100 years, will appear in the LTER Newsletter. Any lengthier reports that are generated will be shared with NSF and the broader LTER community.

Good plans are in place for the 2013 mini-symposium. NSF recommends that the EB do something different in the afternoon following the symposium. It would help to have a more focused set of short presentations to the larger LTER management team at NSF. This should include the Knapp presentation, a Pasta presentation, update on site data management, updates on working group progress and outcomes. This session would be targeted to the supervisory admins within NSF. This is to bring them up to speed on the nitty gritty of what LTER is about and accomplishing. This would be limited to 1 hour total. This allows LTER to focus on what we want to highlight and provides plenty of time for open discussion and dialogue.

Matt Kane said that the ASM was a great meeting, but expressed concern that only 75 people attended the afternoon report-out session even though 200 people attended the evening event. Surprised that so few came to this session. Suggested we consider a way to make that report out session more productive. Meeting seemed long for lots of people. Should the meeting be shorter? But still, overall this is a great, cost-effective meeting at a nice venue.

2. Planning for Review of Synthesis Proposals – Collins and Waide

All CoI lists have been submitted. Estimate we can fund 15 working groups, 3

postdoc proposals, and maybe around 5 training workshops. We will struggle most with postdoc allocations to spread it as far as possible. Review teams will be assigned to evaluate proposals by category (synthesis, postdoc, training). The EB will send out review criteria to ASAP. If necessary, we will tap additional ad hoc reviewers for some proposals. The reviews will also include comments on the budget requested.

### 3. Final ARRA rebudgeting – Waide

LNO submitted a revised spending plan since the ASM, which has been approved by NSF. Some challenging conditions were attached to the plan. For example, new detailed information is needed on meeting attendance with sign-in sheets. The new conditions create some management challenges given how the money is spread around. All synthesis money needs to be spent out by end of August 2013. This means spent, invoiced and paid for. Most working groups overestimate their costs and try to use leftover funds for another meeting. That procedure will not work this time and will not be allowed. It is important for proposers and reviewers to really estimate costs accurately or perhaps the EB should slightly overshoot the number of proposals to be funded.

### 4. Compensation for IMC members – Collins, Waide and Boose

The EB discussed the proposal from IMExex for compensation for the co-Chairs who are putting in >20% of their time on this committee. Funds would go to the sites to pay back the sites for the IM time commitments to network level activities. This may be relevant to other committees but it is especially important for IM commitments. The request would be somewhat symbolic but a value equivalent to one-month salary would be appreciated. Need to find a way to get this moving. The EB felt that this was a reasonable request. In general it is expected that 10% effort at the Network level might be baseline for all LTER participants and compensation would be for levels significantly above that baseline.

### 5. Arctic LTER synthesis volume – Collins

Approved unanimously

### 6. Committees - Collins

#### Climate

Following the ASM, there was a proposal to either disband the Climate Committee (CC) or to redefine its mission. Many on the EB felt that disbanding the CC would be unfortunate at a time of significant emphasis on climate change. Julia Jones proposed a more activist and synthetic role for this committee to generate a more coordinated approach to analyzing the long-term climate records that are being built across the network. It is not clear at this time what resources would be needed to achieve a new climate synthesis? Such a synthesis could take many interesting and useful directions, for example, an analysis of extreme events across sites. The EB agreed that the CC needs a more interesting revised charge. It was recommended that the EB engage in further discussion with Julia Jones to determine if she would be willing to serve a chair or co-chair, and to ask what funding the CC might need to

engage in synthesis projects.

#### Remote Sensing

Mike Gooseff – EB approves nominating him as Chair. The EB concluded that this committee also might need to revise its charge.