

Minutes of the Executive Board Videoconference
October 31, 2006
2:00-5:00 pm EDT

Participants

John Magnuson, Chair
Scott Collins
Peter Groffman
Morgan Grove
Don Henshaw
Charles Hopkinson
Sherri Johnson
Mark Ohman
Deb Peters
Dan Reed
Bob Waide

Executive Board Members Not Present:

Berry Lyons

Welcome and introductions

Approval of minutes from ASM EB meeting on September 20, 2006

The minutes were approved 7-0.

NEON meeting (Peters)

Peters discussed the NEON response meeting to be held in Las Cruces, Nov. 29-30, 2006. This is an open meeting to anyone interested in developing responses to the NEON RFI due Jan. 5, 2007 that are related to the connectivity framework sent out in the email. The email invitation sent to all lead LTER PIs can be widely distributed. Current co-sponsors are the Consortium for Regional Ecological Observatories (COREO), the Jornada Basin LTER, and New Mexico State University. COREO will be funding 2 representatives from each NEON climate domain to attend the meeting, and is providing food for all attendees. COREO will also have a short business meeting at the end of the response meeting to decide if they want to endorse these ideas to NEON. Peters asked if the LTER also wants to cosponsor the meeting.

Abbreviated version

Discussion centered on the representation of LTER at this meeting, and the possibility of cosponsoring the meeting with COREO, NMSU, and the Jornada Basin LTER. Disadvantages to cosponsoring are outweighed by the advantages in that LTER sites will

be widely represented at this meeting, and not all LTER sites feel appropriately represented by COREO.

Motion by Peters: **The LTER will cosponsor the NEON Response meeting to be held Nov. 29-30, 2006 in Las Cruces, NM, and LTER sites are encouraged to send at least one representative to this meeting.** Seconded by Groffman. 6-0 in favor.

Science Task Force Advisory Committee and NSF briefing

Collins and Magnuson provided an update on the Science Task Force Advisory Committee Meeting (STFAC) in Washington DC on Oct 25-26 2006 and the briefings to NSF program officers. The STFAC voiced very strong support for the Planning Grant effort, but made several suggestions for improving the process. We are awaiting their report. Among those briefed at NSF, the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences seemed most eager to cooperate and indicated that they would consider providing funding in the 2009 budget.

Action item: Follow up with Tom Baerwald.

Action item: Follow up with Henry Gholz regarding possible synthesis funding from 2007-2008 supplement funds.

The working group on Environmental Observing Networks was also supportive.

Henry Gholz suggested that additional briefings were needed for the Office of International Science and Engineering, offices related to computer sciences and cyberinfrastructure, Education and Human Resources, Geosciences beyond Polar programs, and Math and Physical Sciences. Potential dates for such briefings were discussed, with November 16-17 being the best option. The key people to contact are Peter McCartney, Kevin Thompson, Chris Grier, Frances Li, Enriqueta Barrera, and Rody Batiza.

National Phenological Network (Waide)

Waide provided an overview of recent discussions with the organizers of the National Phenological Network (NPN) and requested authorization to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding with the NPN on behalf of the LTER Network. After a discussion of pros and cons, the EB authorized the development of such an MOU, which will be submitted to the EB for final approval.

LTER Network Office Survey (Groffman and Hopkinson)

Groffman and Hopkinson led a brief discussion on progress towards revision of the Annual Survey. This agenda item will be revisited in the December videoconference.

Review of LTER ad hoc and standing committees (Magnuson)

The person listed is responsible for drafting our letter to the committee chair.

Publications (Peters)

Graduate Students (Collins)

Scientific Initiatives (Waide)

Waide indicated that the Committee on Scientific Initiatives (CoSI) was inactive and that the duties of the committee had largely been subsumed by the Science Council. With that in mind, there was no reason for CoSI to continue to exist. The EB concurred. Since Waide is the chair of this committee, the preparation of a letter is not necessary.

Social Science (Reed)

International (Grove)

Climate (Hopkinson)

The climate committee is a standing committee composed of a representative from each site. The committee serves or has served three purposes:

1. Maintains standard protocols for the collection and storage of climate data at each site
2. Organizes climate research across the network office
3. Provides climate related information or advice to the SB and EB.

The Climate committee has served the LTER network extremely well. It's most valuable contributions have been in establishing the climate data collection and archival standards across the network and in promoting two climate syntheses – the CLIVAR and CVER programs. The climate committee has also provided invaluable assistance in developing the ClimDB database. ClimDB is becoming the model for establishing the HydroDB database.

The chair, D. Goodin, plans to resign. A new chair needs to be selected and elected. B. Kloeppel has agreed to become the new chair, but this needs to be voted upon by the committee at large.

Goodin suggests that the committee needs to establish new initiatives. Goodin recommends that the committee be continued but with a new structure, one that includes all site reps as well as an executive committee.

The EB began considering several options for the climate committee:

1. Terminate, assigning the important climate data collection standards responsibility to another committee. This responsibility should not be assigned to the IM committee, which is already overburdened with network responsibilities.

2. Remain an active committee even if only to provide advice to the SC or EB when requested
3. Merge with a hydrology group to become a combined clim/hydro committee
4. Merge with other “technology” committees, such as GIS, remote sensing, technology.

If the Climate Committee does survive the EB’s evaluation it needs to submit a proposal to the EB outlining its structure, method of selecting that structure and goals for the next several years.

The EB agreed to continue discussions of the climate committee after first discussing the other “technology” committees, including GIS, remote sensing and technology.

- i. Education (Lyons)
- ii. Information Managers (Johnson)
- iii. NISAC (Reed)
- iv. Technology (Henshaw)

Next Meeting place, time, and agenda items.

Magnuson suggested dates towards the end of November for the next videoconference. The LNO will look for acceptable dates.

Motion to adjourn

There was a motion to adjourn, which was passed by voice vote.