

## NADP Ecological Response and Outreach Subcommittee

### Fall Subcommittee Meeting

Madison, Wisconsin

October 14, 2008

Members present at meeting are listed in table at end of minutes.

Meeting was called to order by EROS chair Andy Johnson.

#### Administrative:

- 1) Approval of minutes from Spring EROS meeting (April 29-30, 2008) in Pensacola. Pam Padgett moved; Tom Butler seconded. Minutes approved.

#### Updates and Reports:

- 1) Updates on outreach efforts via letter/invitation to NRSP-3 scientists and to local NADP site operators and supervisors to encourage their attendance and participation in NADP meetings – (Andy Johnson).

Last year, Tom Butler sent out 41 letters to local site operators **in 6 states** around Colorado in advance of the Fall 2007 NADP Annual Meeting in Boulder. Nine site operators registered for the meeting.

This year, Andy sent out 38 letters to local site operators in 6 states around Wisconsin inviting their participation, and also to 31 NRSP-3 Appendix E scientists. Andy circulated a draft of a letter to a few committee members, including Ray Knighton, for approval, then sent it by email to NRSP-3 SAES scientists [Andy, did letters to site operators follow this same process? **Yes. A draft was sent to David G., Eric P. and Tom B. for review before being sent out**]. We aren't certain of the registered numbers for this year yet, but are guessing 4 Appendix E scientists.

- 2) Update on development of the two mercury 1-pager fact sheets; one being more “educationally” oriented, the other more specifically oriented towards the mercury speciation initiative – (Pam Padgett, Bob Brunette, and David Gay).

Pam Padgett reported that there has not been much movement on this issue by her, but now that the NADP Governance document is finalized it may be more likely. Two years ago, the purpose of the fact sheet was to solicit participation/provide information for the mercury dry deposition network. Is this still needed and should it be a priority?

David Gay indicated that the PO is using a 4-yr-old mercury brochure that deals just with wet deposition and MDN on the NADP website. If we would like to develop an outreach brochure, the PO has a graphic designer who can lay it out, so it is just matter of getting text to her. It was unclear what the aim and intent for the dry deposition initiative was going to be (research, network growth) when this was proposed, so it was difficult to develop text.

Eric Prestbo stated that there has been enough information developed about the mercury speciation initiative now, so it shouldn't be difficult to provide text that would fit well into a brochure – there is a poster in the symposium poster session that could be adapted.

The assumption is that it will be published by NADP, so that it would be useful to the NADP community. Eric will take the lead, will basically turn the poster presented at the meeting into a brochure, will turn it over to the PO for [?] graphics person, then will send it for review by the

committee. The aim is to finish it by the spring meeting. The target audience is policy people and funders – more technical scientists can get information in other ways.

Ray Knighton suggested that the brochure should include what the goals of the initiative are, and what its impacts will be. It would also be good to show how the data collected will feed into indicators.

Colleen Flanagan pointed out that the NPS has a 2-page brochure on mercury that summarizes their work on ecosystems indicators that might be useful.

- 3) Update on developing content for the NADP website describing the connections between climate change and deposition, based on the outline developed at the Spring 2008 meeting – (Pam Padgett and Frank McCormick).

This was an initiative to flesh out an outline for the connection between deposition and climate change. There has not been much effort on the initiative since the spring meeting – the outline was circulated and things added, but haven't gone further. The process has been hindered by the fact that the website updates have not been made by the PO yet, so can't see how it fits. Ray Knighton noted that a multi-pollutant assessment is coming out from NARSTO at the beginning of 2009; it could be good resource. We may also want to look at the list of deliverables of the Global Change Science program and see where NADP can contribute or is contributing.

- 4) Update on working with the Program Office/CAL to develop a “Kids Corner” page for the NADP website – (Frank McCormick).

Frank was not present at the meeting to give an update. Ray Knighton indicated that 4-H is developing a curriculum on air quality, and it might be good to coordinate with that effort. There is a national 4-H curriculum committee that approves development of any curriculum. Ray is the liaison for the 4-H curriculum on air quality for CSREES. The NADP PO has developed kids' activities; these efforts fall under outreach activities, which are encouraged by Univ. of Illinois. It's possible that the PO could work with 4-H. Ray will investigate – there are lots of competing issues, in part because 4-H has money to develop curricula; he's not sure if they will take things developed outside the committee and rubber stamp them.

#### New Business:

- 1) Vote on motion to recommend that the Executive Committee accept and approve the Program Office's recently revised forms and documents formalizing the sample archive request process – (Andy Johnson, David Gay, and/or Chris Lehmann). [Appendix A]

David Sherwell moved; Pam Padgett seconded. There was general discussion of the history of the sample archive requests and approval process. Chris Lehmann has developed cost estimates for the CAL to recover costs associated with processing NADP archive samples. There was general approval of the policy, with two exceptions: a) In the Procedures section, change “Recipient *should* provide copies of presentations...” to “Recipient *shall* provide copies of presentations...”; and b) In the same bullet, change “Recipients are *invited* to report their findings...” to “Recipients are *encouraged* to report their findings...”. Motion passed.

During the discussion, a separate issue came up, of the consistency between data use requirements for data downloaded on the NADP website and for data derived from NADP archived samples. This is relevant especially for reporting and assessing the impact of the program for sponsors. There was a previous effort to collect information on the use and users of data downloaded from the web – EROS has made recommendations for collecting statistics at the front end of downloading data. David Gay now does a web search to find published literature that uses NADP data, to collect the information for the annual SAES-422 Multistate Research

Activity Accomplishments Report. Several ideas emerged, such as to have a terms and conditions statement associated with data download, through a pop-up window or check box requirement indicating that the statement had been read and/or agreed to. Or to send reminder email to people who have downloaded data, asking if they've published using the data. We should revisit the topic of information gathered when data are downloaded.

Pam Padgett made a motion: Review the NADP data user information collected and the previous analysis of that information, and propose updates. Cari Furiness seconded. During discussion, Ray Knighton suggested that we be sure to address the issue of consistency in data usage. Motion passed.

- 2) Discussion on the Program Office's desire to have EROS help develop a policy they can follow on how to decide what topics and information should get put on the NADP website – (David Gay). [Appendix B]

This issue derived from a previous situation in which David Gay had negative reactions to publishing some information (Asian Soybean Rust, e.g.) on the website; some of the concern was the need to include context, not just maps. During discussion, it was determined that there are two categories of data products – mission-critical and relevant. Currently, there is a separate section of the new website that is for new initiatives.

Gary Lear made a motion: Have a separate, flexible "Special Projects" section of the NADP website for publishing relevant information that is not in the category of NADP-sanctioned data products, at the discretion of the Program Coordinator. Pam Padgett seconded. During discussion, it was asked who will decide what is posted on this section and it was proposed to be David Gay, with notification and some review by EROS. Ray Knighton suggested that the PO develop a report of what has been posted on the Special Projects section annually. Eric Prestbo asked what will be the burden on the PO to maintain this new section? David responded that he will gauge the effort required, and Andy will follow up with David about that. Motion passed.

Andy will continue as chair for another year, unless spring meeting brings someone else to the table. Meeting was adjourned.

EROS Meeting Attendees

Butler, Thomas	Cary Institute and Cornell University
Flanagan, Colleen	NPS
Furiness, Cari	North Carolina State University
Gay, David	NADP Program Office
Johnson, Andrew	ME DEP
Knighton, Raymond	USDA-CSREES
Lear, Gary	EPA
Padgett, Pamela	USDA-FS
Prestbo, Eric	Tekran
Risch, Martin	USGS

Sherwell, John	MD DNR
----------------	--------

## Appendix A

# Disposition of NADP/NTN and NADP/AIRMoN Archival Samples

Revised August 2008

### Background

All NADP/NTN and NADP/AIRMoN samples are sent for analysis to the Central Analytical Laboratory (CAL). NTN samples are collected weekly on Tuesdays and are sent unpreserved to the CAL in 1-liter polyethylene bottles. On arrival at the CAL, NTN samples are poured from the 1-liter bottles and are filtered. The 1-liter bottles are washed and reused. As volume permits, two filtered portions are saved in 60-mL polyethylene bottles. The first portion is used for chemical analysis and the second portion is stored in a cooler at ~4C. This second portion is sometimes analyzed to verify measurements of the first portion. The refrigerated portions of NTN samples are retained for five years after release of the final data. At the end of these retention periods, the CAL discards the samples or sends them to an approved requester or requesters. AIRMoN samples are collected daily when precipitation occurred since the last collection. AIRMoN samples are stored in new, triple-rinsed 250-mL bottles and are refrigerated to ~4C. Each week the accumulated AIRMoN samples are packed in an insulated carton with chill packs and are sent to the CAL. On arrival at the CAL, AIRMoN samples are left in the 250-mL bottles, which are stored in a cooler at ~4C. They are removed from storage only long enough to pour out portions for chemical analysis. AIRMoN samples are kept refrigerated and are retained for two years after release of the final data. At the end of these retention periods, the CAL discards the samples or sends them to an approved requester or requesters.

### Objectives

This policy establishes a set of procedures for reviewing and approving requests for use of archival NTN and AIRMoN samples. This policy seeks to:

- leverage the substantial investments already made in network samples and enhance the scientific value of the network by making archival samples available for additional measurements not currently made by the NADP
- ensure that the CAL retains a volume sufficient for all analyses and verification checks through the entire retention period (total disposition of archival samples is not permitted)
- ensure that the NADP retains sole authority to decide on archival sample disposition (no third-party dissemination is allowed)

### Definitions

**NADP/NTN: Archival NTN samples** are filtered portions of samples retained in 60-mL polyethylene bottles in a cooler (~4C) at the CAL. The volume of an archival sample depends on the volume that remains after the CAL has completed all analyses and verification checks of analytical measurements. Archival sample volumes may be up to 60 mL for samples with an initial volume of approximately 100 mL or greater. The **NTN retention period** is five years after the end of the calendar year (e.g., 2008 samples will be released in 2014).

**NADP/AIRMoN: Archival AIRMoN samples** are (unfiltered) portions of samples retained in 250-mL polyethylene bottles in a cooler (~4C) at the CAL. The volume of an archival sample depends on the volume that remains after the CAL has completed all analyses and verification checks of analytical 2

measurements. The **AIRMoN retention period** is two years after the end of the calendar year (e.g., 2008 samples will be released in 2010).

During the retention period, archival samples are termed **active archives**. At the end of the retention period, archival samples are termed **expired archives**.

#### Policies

- The NADP through its Executive Committee retains sole authority to decide on archival sample disposition. Third-party dissemination of archival samples is not allowed.
- Archival samples will be retained in entirety for CAL analyses and verification checks of analytical measurements for one year after the sample collection dates.
- After a year from the date of collection, portions of active archival samples may be sent to approved requesters, provided that no less than 30 mL is retained through the end of the retention period.
- Approved requesters will pay for all costs of materials, labor, and shipping charges associated with preparing and sending archival samples.
- Approval of requests for the disposition of archival samples will be contingent on satisfying all objectives stated above.

#### Procedures

- Requests for active or expired archival samples will be sent to the NADP Program Office. Requests should include the following information: (a) organization and individual requesting samples; (b) objectives of the investigation; (c) what will be measured and how the measurements will be used; (d) identifications of sites and dates of samples desired; (e) required minimum volume; and (f) specific instructions (“valid” samples only, specific packaging, compositing, etc.)
- Requests will be sent by the NADP Program Coordinator or his/her designee to the Chair of the NADP Executive Committee, the Chair of the Ecological Response and Outreach Subcommittee, and the CAL Director. These four people comprise an ad-hoc committee charged with evaluating the requests. The NADP Coordinator or his/her designee chairs this committee.
- As needed (approximately four times per year), a conference call or email will be initiated among the ad-hoc committee members and the requesters. During this conference, a plan will be developed for the disposition of expired archival samples or for providing portions or sub-samples of active archival samples older than one year from the date of collection. If mutual agreement on a plan cannot be reached, the ad-hoc committee will develop a plan following this call and defer decision to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee may vote on the plan, or defer decision to their next regular meeting.
- During the semi-annual Executive Committee meetings, the NADP Program Coordinator or his/her designee will report on archive samples distributed within the last 12 months.
- Approved plans will be implemented by the CAL Director.
- An individual requester or the Executive Committee may annul the plan and terminate the delivery of samples at any time.

- Ongoing requests spanning two or more years must be reconsidered and approved each year. When conflicting requests are received, the decision will be based on how best to leverage network investments and enhance the scientific value of the network. Such decisions are worked out to the mutual agreement and compromise of the requestors and CAL Director, or deferred to the Executive Committee.
- Recipients of archival samples will pay the costs of materials, labor, and shipping charges associated with preparing and sending these samples. The per-sample cost recovery is prepared each year by the CAL Director. The current list of charges is available upon request.
- Recipients may not distribute NADP samples to anyone else without NADP approval.
- Recipients should provide copies of presentations, papers, reports, and articles to the NADP Program Office. Recipients are invited to report their findings at the annual NADP Scientific Symposium, typically held in the fall.
- Recipients of archival samples agree to credit the NADP in all presentations, papers, reports, and articles based on data obtained from these samples. It is suggested that the following acknowledgement be used:

**“Archived precipitation samples were obtained from the National Atmospheric Deposition Program. The NADP is National Research Support Project-3: A Long-term Monitoring Program in Support of Research on the Effects of Atmospheric Chemical Deposition. More than 240 sponsors support the NADP, including State Agricultural Experiment Stations; universities; private companies and other non-governmental organizations; Canadian government agencies; state, local, and tribal government organizations; and federal agencies, including the US Department of Agriculture-Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (under agreement no. 2008-03331). Any findings or conclusions herein do not necessarily reflect the views of the US Department of Agriculture.”**

Approved by the NADP Executive Committee  
XXXX, 2008

19 August 2008

**To: NADP Executive Committee**

**From: Christopher Lehmann, CAL Director**

**Re: NADP Archive Sample Cost Recovery**

Here are the per-sample recovery charges to cover the materials and labor associated with preparing and shipping NADP archive samples. All shipping charges are to be paid by the recipient.

**Per-sample cost recovery**

- Incoming unfiltered sample (includes 60 mL bottle) - \$3/ea
- Incoming filtered sample (includes 60 mL bottle) - \$4/ea
- NADP sample filter (desiccated, in dish) - \$10/ea
- Active archive (split required, includes 60 mL bottle) - \$7.25/ea
- Expired archive (no split required, fewer than 250 samples) - \$2/ea
- Expired archive (no split required, more than 250 samples) - \$1/ea
- Expired archive (split required, includes bottle) - \$5.25

**Additional labor**

- Special processing (sub-sample, split, etc.) - \$2.25/sample
- Labor (special projects, sample compositing, etc.) - \$27.00/hr

**Supplies**

- Rinsed 60 mL bottle - \$1/ea (est. actual cost to CAL)
- Other supplies charged at est. actual cost to CAL

The charges will take effect for all requests received after August 1, 2008. These charges may be waived at my discretion under extenuating circumstances, or if fewer than 10 samples are requested (not requiring special handling) in any one calendar year.



## Appendix B

Andy,

I have a request for you and EROS. I would like you to develop a policy for putting information onto the NADP website.

At our Spring meeting, you may remember that the topic of putting up the Soybean Rust results on the web came up in my presentation. At that point, EROS wanted some say in what went up on the website. And we now have two other items for potential inclusion on the website.

What I would like is a policy that EROS wants the program office to follow when it comes to web display of more unusual topics. That policy may be asking permission for each display, or it may be a set of general rules. But if EROS has time this fall, I would like some direction on how you/EROS/Exec would like me to proceed. I have two examples right now that I would like to add to the web.

The issues that I would like to see on the web are the following:

1. Mercury concentrations in the air (Mercury Dry).  
More of this information is coming. Also, it is an initiative that NADP is considering, so it may have special status, but...
2. The National Mercury Monitoring Strategy.  
This is a multi agency, multi state strategy for monitoring mercury from the atmosphere to the fish, you might say. This clearly is not an NADP network, but MDN and MDN dry (will be) are a major part of this effort. And the web presence they are looking for is for planning and results documents. In my mind it will drive people to our site who are looking at the mercury "big picture". The following link will take you to a good example of the type of website that the National Mercury Monitoring Strategy group would like to have up and going, and housed here at the survey:  
<http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu/cladws/>

So again, what I think that EROS should consider for the program office is a web information policy; i.e. a general policy on how to put information on the web, or permission to add things as I determine appropriate, or restriction to pass everything through EROS; however decided.

As you know, I will be at the fall meeting and can address/discuss these topics in EROS specifically, if you wish. Thanks very much for considering this.

D

David A. Gay  
Research Scientist & Coordinator,  
National Atmospheric Deposition Program  
Illinois Water Survey  
University of Illinois  
(217)244-0462  
[dgay@uiuc.edu](mailto:dgay@uiuc.edu)