NutNet business meeting, 11 August 2010

1. Education & outreach – Please let HQ (Elizabeth, Eric, Lydia) know if there are active education efforts or other outreach at your site, including K-12, undergraduate or graduate students, or community ed (e.g. tours) at your site. Have you developed any courses or do you use NutNet in your teaching?

We decided that a questionnaire will be sent out annually so that HQ can maintain a list of this type of information for e.g. future network funding. You will receive this soon.

2. Please let HQ know if you are working on a sub-group paper.

Single or few-site papers are encouraged, but it will be helpful for everyone to be aware of other papers/projects, not just for including authors, but also so others can be aware of activities for coordination and sharing protocols.

This has been included in the annual questionnaire.

3. How do we have a planned phase-down (or out) for sites that can no longer sample every year (or at all)?
    There should be a priority list of what can be dropped off- an order of effort
    1. Most important to maintain is the treatments, even if you can't sample them – leaves the possibility for others to sample
    2. Cover
    3. Light
    4. Biomass (unsorted)
    5. Biomass sorted to functional groups

Other options:
    If you are not sampling annually, sample biannually on even year of treatment (so TREATMENT year 2)
    Recruit others to take over lead at the site
    Talk to HQ – may be able to help find other solutions that fit specific needs

*For sites that must phase out, entirely (e.g. land sold) – be sure to GPS the center point of each plot (rectified if possible) for future analyses.

4. Should we continue to bring in new sites?

General consensus – Yes.

It's always good to add in observational plots – as long as they follow the standard NutNet methods.

What is the cost to coming in late?
        The late site would not be on the "opt out" papers that predated the new site.
        There may be some value to local investigators of adding experimental studies (e.g. comparison with the rest of the network, data access).

5. How should we manage woody encroachment into grassland plots? The original premise was to let the plots go, but management would maintain the character of the sites. Conclusion: keep standard local management going, that maintains the site as a grassland. Be sure this is added in the meta analysis (including if the debris is left on the plot – e.g. cut and remove or cut and leave).