

**Ecological Responses and Outreach subcommittee Notes**  
**Fall 2005 Meeting**  
**Jackson, Wyoming**

Submitted by: Megan Vogt

**In attendace:**

Pam Padgett, USFS  
Ray Knighton, CSREES-USDA  
Tonnie Maniero, NPS  
Greg Lawrence, USGS  
Gary Lear, EPA/CAMD  
Megan Vogt, Frontier Geosciences  
Richard Cline, USFS  
John Johnston, EPA/ORD  
John Sherwell, MD DNR  
Latoya Miller, EPA/R4  
Maggie Kerchner, NOAA/ARL  
Rich Grant, Purdue Univ.  
Ellen Porter, NPS  
John Ackermann, EPA/R4

**Old Business:**

- The name change from Effects to Ecological Responses and Outreach subcommittee (EROS) was approved in both the Joint Subcommittee and Executive Committee and was voted on in the Technical Committee meeting on Wednesday morning. It was approved.
- The mercury brochure is completed and ready for distribution. Much discussion centered on who should receive the mailer. One question is how to utilize the brochure as an outreach source.
- Network design is considered an ongoing process that all feel EROS should be involved with. The original network was based on regional trends, now there appears to be an interest for other uses. How do we determine what people are currently using the network for?

Three stages proposed for Ideal Network Design:

- 1.) Identify users' objectives
- 2.) Analyze the current networks to identify gaps
- 3.) Pinpoint key locations for future growth/primary protection

Alan Vanarsdale mentioned a potential fourth state being additional analytes.

## Network outline attached

### New business

- Rich Grant discussed the need for an orientation leaflet for newcomers to the meetings. These leaflets should explain how NADP works and how the subcommittees are organized. Each new member could pick up this info when they register. Maggie Kerchner believes this handout should include the structure of the meetings and how to become involved.
- There was also talk regarding the governance of the Executive Committee. Some questions raised included: who votes, voting motions through subcommittee and if adopting motions would be exclusive to the executive committee. This discussion stemmed from limiting the decision making of the Technical Committee, making it advisory at best. Pam Padgett brought up the point that the voting population should be vested and informed, pointing out subcommittees are more informed.
- A question raised was; if the technical committee doesn't have a vote, how does the Executive Committee get nominated? A possibility being that the nominations be done in subcommittee.
- Alan believes that the executive committee should have the power to make decisions, but Gary Lear pointed out that the Technical committee can overrule the Executive committee. (This was an issue that arose in Seattle with the vote to eliminate field chemistry.)
- Ray Knighton was curious how to get more participation in the scientific community. Pam noted that the Fall Meetings are a good recruiting tool; that was how both she and Greg became involved.
- Ray suggested that to get scientists involved there should be a clear pathway on how the technical side of NADP operates. Ray also stated that NADP should be utilizing data, EROS specifically, perhaps bringing a group of scientists together, producing research, proposals, etc. There is a need to stimulate or demonstrate the impact from the network, push the scientific community in a direction.
- Gary pointed out that the topics for the Fall Meeting are generally decided on in the spring meeting, not many scientists attend the spring meeting. Maybe the topics could come out of the subcommittees.
- Recruitment into the subcommittees and technical committee continues to be one of our primary outreach efforts.
- Please welcome EROS's new secretary: Megan Vogt.

Maggie Kerchner discussed the Norfolk Meeting:

- The discussions will revolve mainly around coastal and urban deposition issues; including mercury and ammonium. This will be tied to the huge undertaking of integrated Ocean Systems and coastal deposition.
- Alan suggested that perhaps another specialty symposium occur, there have been specialty symposiums in the past. Ray thinks a more selfish approach is in order, to help move the program forward.
- Closed with the Network Design still undecided. Alan stated towards the end that the EROS committee should be the voice for emerging issues.
- New people need to become engaged in the process and address this issue of Network Design. Please bring ideas and suggestions to the next meeting trying to answer: How do we document ideas and questions that the network can answer? What can we do to improve it?