

Minutes of the LTER Executive Board Meeting
October 4, 2007; Videoconference

1. Meeting called to order at 2:30 by Chair Phil Robertson; members present: Peter Groffman, Morgan Grove, Don Henshaw, Sarah Hobbie, Sally Holbrook, Chuck Hopkinson, Sherri Johnson, Steve Pennings, Dan Reed, Bob Waide; absent: Berry Lyons.

2. Minutes for Sept 20, 2007, meeting approved by consent.

3. Request for action from the Publications Committee

Publications Committee (PC) chair Alan Knapp would like guidelines for vetting potential volumes for the Oxford LTER series (email of Sept 14, 2007). OUP has proposed including in the series two books that do not fit the current suite of titles – one by an LTER scientist (using LTER data) to illustrate a general topic, and the other an ILTER site volume. The PC doesn't feel qualified under existing policy to make the publication decision; apparently we lack clear publication guidelines, which the PC has offered to draft. After considerable discussion by the EB the consensus is to ask the publications committee to review the intent of the series (referring to past CC minutes and the OUP contract), to consider whether current categories are sufficient (site, synthesis, methods), and to draft criteria for making series decisions. These new criteria may need to be added to the bylaws as part of the Publications Committee charge. The resulting recommendations will be considered for official adoption by the EB when received. Robertson will contact Alan.

4. Decadal Plan next steps

Robertson reported that the Network's decadal plan was submitted to NSF on October 1, with copies to EB, SC, NAB, the scientific task force for planning and its advisory board, and the writing team. The EB needs to decide when and how to make the plan publicly available. After discussion, the decision was made to limit distribution to LTER investigators until NSF has had a chance to read and consider the document, at least through the NSF Advisory Committee meetings later this month. After that point the plan should be posted for public access. Robertson will distribute to the all_lter email list now, then Waide will make publicly available on our web site towards the end of the month.

At NSF's invitation we will be presenting the plan to the cross-directorate Advisory Committee for Environmental Research and Education (AC-ERE) and the AC for the Biology directorate (AC-BIO) on October 18. Plans for further discussion at NSF will be made after Oct 18. Related activities now planned include Terry Chapin's seminar at NSF on Oct 29 (hosted by Henry Gholz) and our minisymposium on Feb 28. Individual trips later this fall (e.g. Robertson, Waide, and Scott Collins) will help to keep the plan in front of NSF staff and administrators.

The next network-level step will be to formulate research planning workshops as described in the plan and decided at one of the recent EB meetings. This will be a topic for the November EB meeting. Potential for an ESA Millennium Conference also discussed. Robertson will send a message to the LTER group to see if we can find leaders for a Millennium Conference.

5. Draft MOU with NAm Phenology Network

Waide reported on discussions with the North American Phenology Network, who would like LTER participants. A memorandum of understanding is under discussion; Bob will circulate the draft for further EB discussion at our next meeting. The MOU will describe the responsibilities of each partner in general terms, but will not commit sites to participation.

6. ChemDB Proposal

Julia Jones, Sherri Johnson, and Don Henshaw, representing the Ecotrends biogeochemistry workgroup from the Portland EC meeting, submitted a proposal for the design of a biogeochemical data harvester similar to ClimDB and HydroDB. The group has received a \$25,000 commitment from the Forest Service and now requests a \$25,000 match from the Network for preliminary design and programming costs. Discussion elicited general support for this activity, but the formation of new NIS module should not be undertaken without study. Discussion also noted that matching funds not now available in budget. Proposal will be sent to NISAC for their consideration and recommendation to the EC.

7. Potential SC meeting in Moorea

The 2011 SC meeting will be hosted by MCR. Bob needs to know now whether the EB would like to hold this meeting on-site vs. at the home-institution (Scripps) in order to budget appropriately. Distance would probably add another \$50,000 to cost of SC meeting. Discussion focused on value of getting network scientists to all sites, and noted the precedence for CC meetings at other remote sites such as BNZ and ARC. General agreement is that we should pursue with NSF funding for a Moorea meeting.

8. International Committee response to letter

The US LTER International Committee has now responded formally to the EB's January 23, 2007, letter that identified 5 issues needing attention: the needs to 1) broaden LTER site participation; 2) the identify contacts/resources at NSF; 3) summarize ILTER research and education opportunities in a written document; 4) set specific goals for the committee; and 5) implement the leadership and member rotation plan. Response in each target area was discussed, including deficiencies related to . Robertson will convey remaining concerns to US ILTER Committee co-chairs Patrick Bourgeron and Steve Hamburg, who now also serve on the ILTER governing board. There was also a discussion of asking Gholz and Li directly for support for international activities in the US LTER.

9. 2008 Supplements – input for NSF

NSF has requested input on Network-level priorities for 2008 supplements. Two potential priorities are cross-site workshops based on the decadal plan's thematic areas (currently have \$65,000 of LNO budget allocated towards this) and continued EcoTrends support. Before making a recommendation on EcoTrends support we need more information on the long-term plans of the group, including plans (and timeline) for migration to Network management. Robertson will follow-up with Deb Peters and Henry.

10. NISAC

Discussion of NISAC proposal to implement data auditing at sites was discussed. Concerns were raised in particular about how sites can be expected to pay for this activity if implemented without additional funding. Clarification from NISAC members present that their impression is that NISAC is not suggesting mandatory auditing but rather suggesting a best-practice procedure. Robertson or Waide will ask NISAC to clarify its position here with respect to costs and obligations of auditing. The EB also clarified its intent to ask NISAC to formulate an implementation plan for the CI strategic plan. Robertson or Waide will also convey this intent to NISAC.

11. Other

- a. Next meetings:
 - i. November 1, 12:30-3:00 ET
 - ii. December 13 2:30-5:00 ET
- b. future agenda items
 - i. Videoconferencing services for multi-site training (Grove)

ii. Urban long-term research sites – USFS (Grove)

12. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.