**CNH Group Teleconference, October 30, 2015**

In attendance:

Kelly, Jen, Armen, Cayelan, Kathie, Amy, Mike S., Chris, Paul

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* Summary of Action Items \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Deposit 1-2 working papers illustrative of each of the models in Dropbox Folder
  + Who: Armen (Cycles/BiomeBGC), Kelly (Econ SDP), Chris (PIHM), Cayelan/Paul (GLM), Kevin (Hedonic), Mike S. (social science)
* Local lake catchment experts to identify lowest gauged point in catchment; email Chris with this information, and then he will lead delineations of the three watersheds.
  + Who: Paul (Mendota), Kathie (Sunapee), Amy/Lars (Oneida), Chris (watershed delineations)
  + Notes:
    - There was much discussion on what is the lowest point in the catchment; rather than using the standard limnological definition of the outflow of the lake, we are going to use the lowest gauged point downstream of the lake to capture groundwater flows. Note that this point could be substantially downstream of the lake’s outflow, depending on where the gauges are downriver.
    - Amy to use the Oneida watershed delineation developed as part of Syracuse city projects and long-term Oneida projects, not the delineation that was developed for the proposal
    - Including metadata for watershed delineations is crucial (TBD per forthcoming metadata policy/standards); once projections are shared we can all overlay other data layers on catchment delineation
    - Final catchment delineations from Chris to be saved as an immutable GIS file in the database that Corinna is setting up for project (via Kelly)
* Establish a metadata policy/standards
* Kelly, Cayelan, Kevin to draft first version of authorship policy taking into account discussion points (see below); to circulate for comments/discussion at next teleconference
* VT team to hold Feb. 10-13, 2016 for modeling meeting at Penn State (travel days on 10th and morning of 13th)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Meeting Minutes

* ODS
  1. 2 training modules
     1. Shorter version for those contributing text only
     2. More in-depth version for editors/administrators
     3. Visit organicdatascience.org for an overview of the site’s organization
* Rolling out project with lake associations
  1. Social scientists to visit LAs this year – surveys, documents, etc.
  2. Overview of LAs
     1. Kathie, Sunapee (lost connection)
        1. LSPA is very excited about project
        2. Have begun strategizing next steps for document analysis
     2. Paul, CLA
        1. CLA is constantly in fundraising mode
        2. Connect industry/citizens/academia/stakeholders
        3. Very enthusiastic and active, e.g. representatives show up to area events concerning water quality
        4. There is an association of lake associations in Wisconsin (led by Eric) based in Stevens Point that is interested in sharing data and engaging the LAs in Wisconsin with CNH project
        5. Discussion of forecasting project with CLA (they are using the minute resolution data from the Mendota buoy)
           1. CLA wants to forecast lake water quality to general public
           2. Use data from Mendota to forecast water quality, time series analysis of lake data coming off of buoy
           3. CLA takes prediction and displays on website
           4. Local TV piece on it coming soon (approx.. 5 minutes)
     3. Amy, OLA
        1. Formed in 1945
        2. Primary concern is the fishery ($12m dollar sport fishery); want to keep it as active sport fishery;
        3. 3000 members
        4. Newsletter comes out monthly/quarterly
        5. 3500 sq. km watershed; most active members in OLA are around the waterfront but want to expand the membership to homeowners in the watershed
        6. Annual meetings
* Revisiting watershed delineations
  1. All models depend on it; all models have different spatial footprint; hedonic (3 sq meter footprint); PIHM at smaller scale; need to decide on delineation sooner rather than later; coordinate with Pat (put together quick and dirty delineation, need to refine)
  2. Corinna going to be involved in setting up database of core datasets for project; these would be a fundamental data layer that would be unchanged throughout the project
  3. Delineations could be very different by discipline!
  4. Chris – needs lowest downstream point, not lake outflow, to define the catchment
     1. This modified watershed delineation will also help account for social/political/neighborhood boundaries that may be blurred around the lake.
  5. We need to record projection data in metadata files; with that information, people can then overlay other data layers
  6. General method involves putting a buffer around watershed to get data; lowest downstream point captures water quality going out of watershed; lakes tend to lose groundwater on their low end; how far downstream of lake outlet? What’s the lowest gauge? Serves as a control for the model; we need the local experts to define this.
  7. **Action item**
     1. Decide on the lowest point downriver of the lake outflow for each catchment (information from each local expert, Kathie, Paul, and Lars/Amy)
     2. Amy/Lars – will use the common delineation developed for long-term Oneida projects and Syracuse city projects that Amy has worked with- can touch base on lowest point downriver with Cayelan (Pat had many questions about the watershed last year when putting together a figure for the proposal)
     3. Action item – work with local experts to find lowest downstream point, then work with Chris to delineate catchment and sub-basins
     4. Chris – can work with everyone’s boundaries if we share projection information; will have buffers outside watershed for other maps that we can overlay; need to share the metadata; typically delineates sub-basins
  8. **Action item**
     1. Establish a metadata policy
* Dropbox model papers
  1. Everyone should rename their proposal Dropbox folders and repurpose for project; contents have already been reorganized
  2. Eventually materials will be linked in ODS
* Press release coming from VT
  1. Working on it now with Kelly’s college at VT
  2. Will distribute release for everyone else to modify and use at their institution
* Authorship policy
  1. Use Pat’s CSI guidelines as a starting point for the conversation
  2. Not making decisions today
  3. Guidelines for authorship; identify right off the bat how people can contribute to the project; are there other categories or items that we should be including in our policy?
  4. Discussion
     1. Paul – mixed feelings about approach; important to identify how people contribute, need general agreement of what is required to be a coauthor; hard to weight categories and decide who is involved given that every paper will be different; instead of using quantitative metrics, use the authorship policy as a tool to talk through each paper as it comes up; be careful about coming up with hard and fast rules that might be difficult to adapt in the future; proceed with caution, but good way to proceed
     2. Mike – policy puts onus on lead author, then person identified has to also identify their contribution
     3. Chris – make each manuscript a proposal on the ODS site, e.g. “I’d like to start this paper…” and let people opt to participate, plus stay informed; Every participant has to identify exactly what they will do to contribute to the paper and then meet those goals, as identified on the ODS website. This model has been successful in Chris/Paul’s current project (see for example the Age of Water site)
     4. Paul – not worried about freeriding; people are good about deciding when they should be involved; good to be up front as soon as possible
     5. Jen – other categories and we don’t know what they’re going to be; make it less of a checklist; try to be inclusive of many ways people can participate
     6. Armen – need to incorporate flexibility; can we try to create high-impact papers this coming year? We can all put together incremental papers; but we should allocate some time to developing these high-impact products that define what we’re doing as a broader group
     7. Cayelan – what papers bridge the gaps between models (social/natural)?; those are the papers that serve the CNH program and are likely to be the higher-impact project papers
     8. Cayelan – **action item** for the Steering Team is to put together draft of policy send out for feedback
* Amy joining VT team as project postdoctoral associate, starting February 1!
* INSPIRE workshop and trip to Penn State (Chris, Paul, VT team)
  1. Thurs/Friday would be the workshop in February; arrive Wed; leave Sat
  2. Group agreement that best date is **Feb 11-12**; hold a tentative date for the workshop