

Meeting Notes - LTER Executive Board

Meeting date: August 17, 2017

Approved: October 5, 2017

Attending:

Name	Present	Absent
Peter Groffman (chair)	x	
David Foster (HFR)	x	
Michael Gooseff (MCM)	x	
Sally Holbrook (MCR)	x	
Steve Pennings-GCE		x
Dan Reed (SBC)	x	
Michelle Mack/Roger Ruess (BNZ)		x
Eric Seabloom/Sarah Hobbie (CDR)		x
Katie Suding (NWT)	x	
Jess Zimmerman (LUQ)	x	
Kari O'Connell (EOC-rep)		x
Wade Sheldon (IMC-rep)	x	
Frank Davis (NCO)		x
Marty Downs (NCO)	x	
Corinna Gries (EDI)	x	

July Meeting Minutes, approved.

Current items

Discussion of LTER/NEON symposium (PG and FD)

- Peter Groffman reviewed the genesis of the April LTER-NEON workshop and several possible next steps, including:
 - a paper focused on “measurement synergies” between LTER and NEON is being written.
 - a workshop more focused on modeling is in the planning stages. NEON is taking the lead on this, the workshop is scheduled for late February in Boulder.);
 - a memorandum of understanding b/w LTER and NEON (discussion focused on what could be included; should it be a large umbrella or several smaller, focused projects)
 - Proposal for joint ESA symposium in 2018

- Several members of the Executive Board have LTER sites co-located with NEON sites and have very little sense of what is happening at their sites. All thought that some agreement would be a step in the right direction in terms of communication.
- The Executive Board voiced general support for a specific data sharing agreement -- focused on specific data streams, ideally around the needs of a particular synthesis working group that would need both LTER and NEON data to achieve their goals.
- Getting concrete experience with NEON's synthesis and Quality Assurance/Quality Control approach could be valuable. That's been a weak point in our data management approach in LTER.
- There were some concerns that an overly vague MOU would not deliver concrete results and would potentially jeopardize LTER's independence. Also, some noted that mainly terrestrial sites would stand to benefit.
- There is concern in the ecological community about what will happen to funding for project-based research if and when NEON operational funds need to come from the NSF Division of Biology budget. There is some uncertainty about just where the funds are coming from. The NEON Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (Groffman is a member) is working to clarify this and to facilitate communication with the ecological community.
 - It is worth noting some parallels with the Ocean Observatories Initiative (OOI) and concerns in that research community. The National Academy of Sciences ran an evaluation of OOI several years ago and made recommendations that supported finding a new balance between infrastructure and core research. That seems to have resolved any potential tension.

ASM content planning/committees, date change (MD)

- New date for All-Scientists' Meeting: September 30-October 4, 2018
- Volunteer planning committee: Frank Davis, Melany Fisk, Chris Swann, Katie Suding, [Jennifer Rehage](#), [Paul Julian](#), Rachel Morgan-Kiss, grad student, IM, Jill Haukos (KNZ), new site rep.
- Marty will reach out to new sites, education committee, grad committee
- Wade will discuss IM rep with IM Executive Committee

Nominating Committee for another chair

We need to nominate a new chair for the LTER Science Council. The last time, we had fairly senior people on the nominating committee, which helped encourage candidates. The committee was: Deb Peters, Alan Knapp, Emma Rosi-Marshall and Mark Ohman. Perhaps a mixture of people from this committee and a few new members?

Web site(s) update (MD)

There are several web site efforts in progress right now.

- An information management committee is working on updating im.lternet.edu (Brian Herndon chairing).
- A joint working group of information managers and outreach managers is working on a new set of web site guidelines for LTER sites (Mary Martin and Marty Downs chairing).
- The Network Communications Office is working with a web design firm on updating lternet.edu, drawing design inspiration from the new logo. There will be a prototype to share soon. Meanwhile, the NCO is considering a new feature - a database of experiments at each site, grouped in broad categories, such as nutrient additions, rainfall manipulations, disturbance simulations, etc.

Discussion:

- Not all the sites have experiments. We might want to include “natural” experiments or comparisons, but it might dilute the message.
- To gather information, it might be worthwhile to look at sessions from past All Scientist meetings.
- A lot of this information was compiled for the strategic plan and 30-year review.
- How will we handle cross site syntheses?
- Marty will move forward with collecting the data.

Revising our committee structure: New approach to consider (FD)

- Wait for Frank Davis to discuss at next meeting

NSF symposium planning, possible themes (MD):

NSF working group advised us at the science council meeting that Cheryl Dybas and Marty Downs would take the lead on NSF symposium planning. Marty would appreciate feedback on possible themes:

- Integrating human "disturbance" -- from science council (save for 2019)
- Focus on a synthesis working group (Metacomunities? Synchrony?, Biodiversity and productivity?).
- For reference, current working groups are here:
<https://lternet.edu/synthesis-working-groups-2016> and
<https://lternet.edu/working-groups-2017>
- LTER Futures (from 2016 Science Council) -- how to differentiate from recent "Scenarios" symposium?

Update from Environmental Data Initiative (Corinna Gries)

- The LTER and other information managers met at Environmental Science Information Partnership meeting (ESIP) and it went really well.
- EDI attended Ecological Society of America Meeting and had a booth where many people stopped. The data management workshop they held was scheduled for a late evening time slot, so attendance was disappointing.

Discussion:

- Has EDI heard any guidance from NSF on what the shape of a solicitation might be for 2019? No. The only thing EDI has heard is that the aligned end dates for EDI and NCO were deliberate.
- The same is true for the NCO. There has been no word on what NSF would like to see. Probably we should put our heads together and propose something that we think will work.
- It's difficult to get community buy-in for these endeavors with such a limited time-span. It would be good if NSF could see this as a long-term investment.

Information Management Committee Update:

There was a strong presence of the LTER Information Management community at ESIP. (The approximately 20 LTER IMs who attended made up almost 10% of the conference participants.) Information managers appreciated the multiple sources of funding (EDI and NCO) to attend the meeting.

Final logo, based on feedback from July meeting, will share to Network and begin integrating in materials:



Continuing items

- Nature of our network?
- Revisit org chart