

LTER Executive Board Meeting Notes

July 31, 2018

11 am EDT/12 noon CDT/1 pm MDT/2 pm PDT/3 pm AKDT

- Executive Board Google Drive:
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B3xT0TaiQmt0TkQxOVNhMGh0Tk?usp=sharing>
- Executive Board Zoom Link:
 - <https://ucsb.zoom.us/j/706470284> or
 - Telephone: US: +1 646 876 9923 or +1 669 900 6833 (Meeting ID: 706 470 284)

Attending:

Name	Present	Absent
Peter Groffman (chair)	x	
Diane McKnight (chair-elect)	x	
Ken Dunton (BLE)	x	
Sally Holbrook (MCR)	x	
Michelle Mack (BNZ)	x	
Oscar Schofield (PAL)		x
Eric Seabloom (CDR)	x	
Emily Stanley (NTL)	x	
Katie Suding (NWT)	x	
Jess Zimmerman (LUQ)	x	
Kari O'Connell (EOC-rep)	x	
Dan Bahauddin (IMC-rep)	x	
Frank Davis (NCO)	x	
Marty Downs (NCO)	x	
Corinna Gries (EDI)	x	

Agenda and Notes

Approve Notes from prior Executive Board Meeting.

Agenda:

- Approve May EB minutes (attached)
- General All Scientists' Meeting updates (15 min)
 - Meeting information: <https://lternet.edu/lter-scientists-meeting-2018/>
 - Workshop schedule: <https://2018lterallscientistsmeeting.sched.com/>
- All Scientists' Meeting PI meeting agenda (15 min)
 - Discussion draft, attached
- How should we approach a conversation with NSF on renewals (25 minutes)

- Letter from Dan Childers, attached
- Inquiry from ADVANCEGeo folks about whether we would like to participate.
 - See general info on the project, here: <https://serc.carleton.edu/advancegeo/index.html>
 - Request letter of support from Becky Irwin for a USDA's AFRI Research Coordination Network for a national native bee monitoring plan.

Notes:

Minutes from May Executive Board and Science Council Meeting: Update the year, but otherwise approved.

ASM updates:

- 337 registrants. Additional 56 spots held for those from NSF/EDI/NCO funding.
- Too many people opting for singles, so have nearly maxed out Asilomar -- seeking additional rooming options.
- 8-90 minutes sessions (11 concurrent workshops)
- 230 posters in 2 separate sessions (before requesting site posters).

PI Meeting agenda

Morning:

- Short updates
- Big chunk of time to talk about 40 year review. Peter and Frank are talking with Dan Thornhill, NSF-GEO Program Officer, about how much time they need
- Synthesis working groups - updates. Quick overview of what they have done. What have they been doing, what have they produced, etc.
- What's the role of the science council? This would be the discussion that people asked for in Madison. It's important to strengthen the sense of accountability to the Science Council.
- We also need some specific direction about how we want to spend our time at the science council.

Afternoon:

- NSF management of LTER program
 - Lost 4 sites in the last 10 years and there has been a big turnover in program officers.
 - Does NSF have specific goals for reducing (or changing) the size, structure, goals, etc. of the program?
 - Why and how do sites get on probation? Off probation?
 - Current group seems to want to interact with us smoothly, but they have some constraints about how they are supposed to communicate with investigators.
 - This is a place where the NCO could try to be more of an emissary. We need to frame the questions in a tight and coherent way and try to get some specific feedback from NSF.
 - Or should a site PI or someone from the Executive Board lead that discussion?
 - The Chair of the Executive Board has a conflict of interest as a PI on a terminated site.

- The incoming Chair (Diane McKnight) can't interact directly with NSF Program Officers until a year after she has left NSF.
- What if we nominated a small group of well-ranked PI's to make the case?
- Do we even want to engage in a discussion about this?
- NSF has been receptive to discussions that help them clarify what their goals are and what may be going right or wrong.
- Advocating for sites is not in the NCO's portfolio, but we could take on the role of liaison. Letting NSF know that the sites/Pis are confused and need some clarification.
- With the sites that have fallen off in the last 4 years -- are they falling off for cause?
- We don't know what kinds of things are correctable? and which are fatal?
- I've spent a lot of time with these reviews and I remain puzzled as to why these sites are terminated.
- It's unclear what goes wrong that means that you're done.
- We all understand that there has to be a way to end sites. I just have a very unclear idea about why these particular sites are terminated.
- Can we get NSF to speak to this issue? Ill will happens with a lack of information.
- It's possible that the answer might be that they just don't have enough money.
- They said look at the NSF response to the 30 year review and read between the lines. There's no money.
- It's possible that the program is too big and the only way they can run a robust program is by losing sites.
- Are we now competing with each other, but they may not want to tell us that.
- There's also competition at higher levels for program support. The NSF Director has an emphasis on cross-directorate activities. There's pressure for DEB and BIO to show that they are good players across directorates.
- \$30M for big ideas is coming from somewhere...
- We might want to allow them to prepare ahead of time. Someone could go to NSF and say, these are the actual questions. That might help us get some better clarity about these.

ADVANCEGeo: Inquiry from ADVANCEGeo folks about whether we would like to participate.

- See general info on the project, here:
<https://serc.carleton.edu/advancegeo/index.html>
- Conclusion: Definitely interested in collaborating

Bee monitoring Network:

- Request letter of support from Becky Irwin for a USDA's AFRI Research Coordination Network for a national native bee monitoring plan.
- Yes interested in collaborating