

LTER Executive Committee Meeting - Washington DC January 11, 1996

Current budget scenarios from UNM and UW were distributed and logistical information taken care of, including the need to compress the meeting agenda to one day due to the weather.

Discussion started with plans for an ILTER workshop in Puerto Rico for March. The workshop would be in conjunction with the dedication of the "El Portal" Facility there. The agenda would be developed between the LUQ LTER and the LTER Network Office. The effort would be worked so as to be complementary with the planned ILTER meeting and workshop in Costa Rica that will focus on data management within ILTER. An effort will be made to promote ILTER research at these meetings without giving the impression that LTER is dictating how the work should be done.

The EXEC voted unanimously to fund the LTER/NASA workshop proposal. Information on this workshop, to coordinate and focus on method standardization within the recently funded NASA cross-site proposal. That left about \$10,000 in the LTER Network Office workshop budget. Stemming from earlier discussions, Bob Waide made a motion that if other funding from NCAS was successful, this workshop funding could be used for a LTER biodiversity workshop, to come up with products. This amount would be used for this biodiversity work, including a producing a summary of the species lists, and biodiversity information. After discussion on specific products that would result from the work, the LTER/EXEC voted unanimously to use the remaining workshop funds. These funds would be for both workshop and workshop support activities.

Jim Gosz reviewed the call for proposals for the LTER Network Office (NET) competition. Since the successful competition would be a cooperative agreement, it was understood that the actual work done could be changed once the cooperative agreement was negotiated. The current status of the proposal - what parts were complete, sections from the technology committee, and data management groups that were in the works. The data management effort of the NET would be significant, and there was discussion that this work be well supported.

Details of the budget options were presented by Jim and discussed by the EXEC. A point by Bob Waide and David Foster suggested that items in the proposal should be tied to ongoing and planned work of LTER. The requirements of the NSF RFP must be covered, but tasks mentioned in the proposal can be tied to specific activities and people within the Network. Most of this work stems from previous consensus of the LTER CC such as biodiversity and synthesis work, and should be pointed out. A long discussion period followed on general activities that need to be included. Specific items such as inclusion of the San Diego Super Computer Center activities. The work that would be undertaken would be for archival and procession of massive data. The need to frame this work within the scientific efforts of LTER was made a point. The LTER EXEC concluded that this work would be better to start in year 2, using other participant support funds, and perhaps funds from SDSC for workshop activities in year 1. This would help define the scientific support the collaboration would provide.

The LTER EXEC decided to preserve salary for the LTER Chair in all years of the proposal. Specific items in the publications activities were discussed with modifications to some items, including the need for some shift to electronic category. A proposed "consultant" category to stimulate synthesis activities and support data management work was discussed. The EXEC pointed out that the specific tasks of the consultants must be defined in the proposal to avoid ambiguities in the proposal. After discussion, it was decided to not have a consultant category, but transfer the funds to participant support. Equipment costs at UW were seen as unrealistic in the proposed flat-line budget. The LTER/EXEC decided to rework the equipment budget to keep the technology current.

Wording of the proposal was discussed, with specific recommendations to Specific items for the proposal to be added by the Seattle Office are: net traffic, use of Internet, www access, number of people in their personell directory, number of email addresses - etc.