

Here are some notes from the meeting of the Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) network Executive Board (EB) that took place on January 13, 2015.

**Attending:** Anne Giblin, Evelyn Gaiser, Sherri Johnson, Charlie Driscoll, Margaret O'Brien, Mark Ohman, Deb Peters, Emma Rosi-Marshall, Gus Shaver, Mary Spivey, Bob Waide

**Items discussed:**

1. Approval of minutes from December meeting. Ohman moved, Johnson second.
2. Planning for the May Science Council (SC) meeting:
  - The Science Council will be meeting at Harvard Forest on Wednesday and Thursday, May 13 and 14. The Executive Board will meet on Tuesday, May 12. There will be ad hoc and site lead PI meetings on Friday, May 15.
  - A proposal to NSF for network office transition funding that will fund the meeting is almost submitted; have budgeted 30K for this meeting. This will be enough to fund one representative from each site plus another couple of people needed for the science theme. We should be able to allow people to participate virtually. Also, sites are welcome to send extra representatives using their own funds.
  - The science topic for the meeting is inorganic nutrients. Emma Rosi-Marshall, Nancy Grimm, Phil Robertson and Sherri Johnson are organizing. They will send some guidance to the site representatives similar to the template of slides that was sent around last year.
3. EB participation in UNM proposal for LTER National Office. Please review rfp at [http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2015/nsf15535/nsf15535.htm?WT.mc\\_id=USNSF\\_25&WT.mc\\_ev=click](http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2015/nsf15535/nsf15535.htm?WT.mc_id=USNSF_25&WT.mc_ev=click)
  - Bob Waide raised the question of if the EB or SC should provide input to the UNM proposal, noting that the EB has played a major role in past proposals. The consensus of the discussion was that any group should be free to contact the EB during the proposal process. Bob will convene a conference call or prepare some written questions that will give the EB an opportunity to have input into the UNM proposal.
  - There are documents that might be useful to groups preparing the proposal:
    - There is a report entitled "An LTER Network Vision for the Next Generation LTER Network Office" that was prepared by Phil Robertson and Emery Boose back in 2013. We should make this available to anyone who asks or maybe post this somewhere.
    - There is interest in seeing the "McKnight Committee" report that was submitted to NSF. Groffman is working with Saran Twombly to make this available.
4. LTER-SESYNC-SPE concept paper:
  - John Kramer (SESYNC), Kathy Fallon Lambert (Science Policy Exchange) and Groffman have prepared a concept paper about developing an "LTER-SESYNC-SPE Collaboration to Promote Learning and Leading at the Science-Policy Interface." The paper makes the case there is a need and opportunity to leverage research from LTER sites in ways that increase its use in decision making.
  - The collaboration would begin with a focused workshop hosted by SESYNC in spring 2015 (perhaps May or June) to 1) establish a core group of LTER leaders who would invest time in one or more questions of interest, 2) develop a set of policy relevant research questions that the LTER network or subset of the network would agree to work on and 3) focus on the

need to build capacity within the LTER network to develop "transdisciplinary" approaches to this type of research and to support integrated working groups that combine stakeholder engagement, synthesis, and decision-relevant distillation and strategic outreach and communication. The workshop should also focus on practical issues of how this work could be funded and sustained.

- There was general agreement that this was a worthy effort that should be pursued.

#### 5. SESYNC postdoc

- Proposals to be on the registry for LTER synthesis proposals are due on February 2. We need to publicize this; <http://www.sesync.org/opportunities/sesync-lter-synthesis-postdoctoral-fellowships>

#### 6. Goals for March EB meeting

- The EB will meet on Wednesday, March 4 (0830-1700), the mini-symposium will be in the morning on Thursday, March 5 and the EB will meet again on the afternoon of the 5<sup>th</sup> until 1700.
- Saran Twombly is trying to arrange for a broadcast/streaming set up.
- Groffman is arranging meetings with program officers at various times. We need to be prepared for these meetings with specific questions and more importantly with relevant and exciting research highlights. Once we have the list of people we will be meeting with, Groffman will organize people to take the lead in the different discussions.
- We should use this time as an opportunity to continue discussion of issues that came up during our meeting with the NSF LTER team on November 10. However, some of the people that led those discussions will not be present with us in March. Groffman will compile and distribute materials that were prepared for the November meeting. Waide will send around past agendas.
- Some topics that we should consider:
  - Probation –Giblin could lead?
  - Network issues –discuss amongst ourselves and with NSF. Peters or Groffman could lead?
  - Leadership transitions.
  - Changing review criteria and institutional memory.
  - Questions/topics for discussion with NSF folks:
    - Launch of new marine sites. NSF is soliciting opinions; ASLO, ASM
    - General discussion of new sites. Target an arid site or general competition?
    - General report from Saran (and Management Team)
    - Broader perceptions of LTER within NSF and elsewhere
    - NEON and Macrosystems Biology. What can LTER do to help NEON succeed?
    - How else can LTER help NSF?
  - Bylaws changes:
    - LNO changes
      - Executive director chosen by Science Council.
      - Compensation for the chair.
  - Report and recommendation from the Publications committee (Alan Knapp).

- Data RFP – report from IM gathering exercise. Do we need a forceful statement of just what we need, what are the key issues?

#### 7. Relationships between LTER scientists and NSF

- When LTER scientists make negative comments about NSF, NEON and other specific programs that fund our research it creates problems for program officers that run these programs. It is important to remember that these program officers need to advocate for our programs within NSF and more broadly within the government. These efforts are hindered by negative and unconstructive comments.

#### 8. LNO transition

- Proposals for funds for SC and ASM meetings have been submitted.
- For IM, the goal is to make sure that the NIS continues to run and that data can be added and accessed. No development, training or outreach.