

LTER Executive Board Meeting Notes

September 24, 2018

- **Executive Board Google Drive:**
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B3xT0TaiQmt0TkQxOVNhMGh0Tkk?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
David Foster	x	

Agenda and Notes

Notes from prior Executive Board Meetings (June, July, August) approved.

- **Review All Scientists' Meeting PI meeting agenda**
- **Nominate and approve 40-year Self-Assessment Committee**

Many potential committee members were discussed. Considerations included seeking a balance of career stages, biomes, and scientific approaches. The NCO and EDI were invited as ex officio members.

Ultimately, the following members were invited and agreed to serve:

- David Foster (HFR, terrestrial, senior)
- Jen Lau (KBS, terrestrial, mid-career)
- Deron Burkepille (MCR, marine, mid-career)
- Mike Gooseff (MCM, Antarctic, mid-career)
- Jim McClelland (BLE, marine, mid-career)
- Sarah Hobbie (CDR, terrestrial, mid-career)
- Peter Groffman (EB)

- **How can we keep the All Scientists' Meeting discussion productive?**

Some options for discussion points:

- Provide a history of the 10, 20 and 30 year reviews, structured around Oscar's and Peter's summary.
 - Historical perspective is critical.
 - Frame for the committee some of the different visions for LTER that have emerged through time -- in large part in response to NSF.
 - We were challenged, many times, to come up with visions and new agendas -- sketching some of those out would underscore the positive elements of LTER.
- Discuss NSF's management of the program.
 - Should we give up trying to get more information and focus instead on making our case?
 - Framing what has people nervous upfront -- we respect that there are constraints that limit your answers to these questions, but these are the things we are concerned about, is there a way for these to get communicated to the committee?
- Prepare for the discussion with the program officers in the afternoon. Generate some strong, compelling topics.
 - What are the grand challenges we can address?
 - This is a program that produces information that no other program can.
 - Fundamental questions where doing a short-term study would have given you the wrong result (i.e. long time series where the effects were wildly different than what would have been perceived at 3 years).
 - Would like to send a note to all the members of the Science Council asking them to come prepared to discuss what we have done a great job on in the last 10 years.