

ILTER Executive Board Meeting Notes

November 13, 2019

[Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android](#)

Additional ways of connecting:

Dial: +1 408 638 0968 (US Toll) or +1 646 558 8656 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 706 470 284

International numbers available:

<https://ucsb.zoom.us/join/706470284>

The LTER Executive Board meets monthly. Agendas and minutes for current members are available on the [team google drive](#).

See the [Executive Board Committee page](#) for current membership and approved minutes of past meetings.

Attending:

Name	Present	Absent	Minutes approved
Diane McKnight (chair)	x		
Ken Dunton (BLE)	x		
Nick Haddad (KBS)	x		
Jesse Nippert (KNZ)	x		
Oscar Schofield (PAL)		traveling (China)	
Heidi Sosik (NES)	x		
Emily Stanley (NTL)	x		
Katie Suding (NWT)	x		
Jonathan Thompson (HFR)			
Jess Zimmerman (LUQ)	x		
Annette Brickley(EOC-rep)	x		
Dan Bahauddin (IMC-rep)	x		
Frank Davis (NCO)		@ ESA governing board	
Marty Downs (NCO)	x		
Corinna Gries (EDI)	x		

November discussion topics

Informational Updates:

- proposals submitted
 - AISL: Public Engagement with Science @ LTERs (Sarah Garlick, Kari O'Connell, Julie Doll, Kathy Fallon Lambert, John Besley)
 - DRK-12: LTER Schoolyard Book series (Jill Haukos)
 - NCEAS is submitting a CZ Hub proposal, aligned with LTER Network Office

- Information Managers are planning to meet at ESA 2020
- [Decadal Review document](#) submitted October 5, 2019
- Communications Committee is producing a 2020 calendar. Each site will get ~20 copies. let us know if you want
- After discussion with NSF Public Affairs and Working group, there are no plans for a Spring 2020 NSF symposium

Primary discussion:

LTER All Scientists' Meeting - we will need to identify a location soon. All the options have pros/cons. The LNO would like some feedback from the Executive Board on what they see as the primary values of the meeting so that we can set priorities in negotiations.

Some assumptions going in:

- We don't want the meeting to be smaller than ~600 (average of 20 people per site, which seemed like a lot, but we easily hit that last year)
- We don't want to be rattling around in a big convention center hotel
- We don't want to meet over the summer (Gordon Conference-type venues would be a good option, but we've avoided that because of field work).

Scenario 1 (think Asilomar):

Relatively small (~700), all-inclusive venue

Pros: Friendly, relaxed, highly interactive, all-hours meeting

Cons: expensive, often shared rooms, little ability to expand the tent any further, small meeting rooms, travel is challenging

Scenario 2 (think Estes Park):

Pretty much as large as we want, but sprawling and mixed with other guests

Pros: Friendly, relaxed, interactive, all-hours meeting, relatively inexpensive

Cons: Lousy food, no access to alcohol, barely adequate technology and facilities

Scenario 3 (think Flagstaff/Albuquerque/ Providence/Madison/Boise):

Flexible size, single meeting venue, but scattered hotels and meals (mostly)

Pros: Flexibility -- can increase size of meeting to accommodate a broader cross-section of participants; depending on the city, lodging and meals can be much more affordable

Cons: much less self-contained, participants harder to identify and engage, accidental encounters will be harder to engineer.

Discussion:

- *Have we considered a cruise ship? The Association of Tropical Biology considered it, but ultimately decided against it.*
- *Liked the setting at Asilomar. Things like having to have lunch shifts seems like a minor issue.*
- *But the crowding at Asilomar was a big issue for some. Also, it's not centrally located, so travel for those from the midwest is more complicated and expensive.*

- *How many people are excluded by the smaller size? Few from inside the network. Really don't know how many are excluded from outside the network - probably not more than 100, given that they have to pay their own way.*
- *Are we looking for a place that we occupy by ourselves? That's the central question. How important is that?*
- *The Network did meet in Seattle once. It was expensive and seemed to dilute the impact of the meeting. Consensus is that we are not interested in diluting the LTER-centric meeting with too many additional participants.*

Executive Board Priorities:

- *Community feeling is important*
- *700 people is a good size*
- *All other things being equal, a central location would be an asset*

Data Citizenship checklist (Jess/Corinna)

Context: A paper recently came out, including Sevilleta data in a metaanalysis, that placed Sevilleta in the Sonoran Desert. Jenn Rudgers (SEV PI) reached out to Jess Zimmerman (LUQ PI) to discuss the idea of a data checklist, such as that posted on the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) website: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/PRISMAStatement/Checklist>.

- *Neither NSF nor journals will allow that ... we can't require any obstacle to data download, including even a page acknowledging that a user has read the data policy..*
- *There has been some discussion of writing a BioScience paper, which would examine the benefits and risks of data sharing and potentially provide tools and guidelines to mitigate the risks.*
- *Part of being a good data citizen is contacting the dataset authors to get more information about the context.*
- *Maybe at the next Science Council meeting we could have a workshop to discuss the topic, develop examples, and start writing it up.*
- *It's also important to emphasize a robust review process. Are LTER scientists being asked to be reviewers? Are editors actively choosing not to ask LTER folks?*
- *Sevilleta was a meta analysis. Luquillo case was not.*
- *A data license and a data policy are different. The license cannot contain any restrictions. So we can't have a requirement for a checklist (or any other impediment to download).*
- *Data policy is different - we can have the policy that we want, but we can't require any intervening step.*
- *BioScience article could provide a tool or checklist box to facilitate the conversation between the data analyzers and the PIs.*
- *Next steps: Include this topic as a breakout at the Science Council Meeting.*

Additional Topics:

NEON MOU initial conversation (Marty)

Context: NEON (Hank Loescher) approached the Network Office to discuss setting up a Memorandum of Understanding between LTER and NEON. The LNO will engage in the conversation and be sure to include representative(s) of the Executive Board. It's not yet clear whether an MoU is necessary or the correct vehicle for the proposed activities.

- *The conversation should include at least one active PI.*
- *Relocatable sites shouldn't be sitting in a parking lot while LTER could make good use of them. Maybe that's an item that would require an MoU.*
- *LTER executive board may have LTER-centric goals and we should schedule a follow up discussion.*
- *LTER is not a legal entity that could sign an MoU. It would have to be with UCSB.*

Hold until January: 2020 Science Council format (and priorities)

Decisions and Tasks:

- Priorities for pursuing All Scientists Meeting locations are set. Marty Downs will investigate locations with these in mind.
- Data citizenship paper will be a topic for Science Council discussion
- Goals for a NEON/LTER MoU will be a topic for additional Executive Board discussion (February?)

Running List of future discussion topics:

- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) plans (December)
- Science Council priorities (January)
- NEON/LTER MoU (February?)
- Broader long term research community (lter)
- PI webinars "community of practice" - Diane will check in
- Investigator-IM integration
- Education strategic planning
- 40th anniversary activities
- NSF symposium - waiting on Cheryl (or other advice from NSF)
- Should we reconsider an external advisory council?