

Education and Outreach Subcommittee Minutes  
Fall Meeting – Zoom Virtual Meeting  
November 5, 2020

Co-Chair: Catherine Collins  
Co-chair: Chris Rogers  
Secretary: Katie Blaydes

**Action Items**

- (2.a.ii) Have a draft of the Governance Document ready to present to the Executive Committee at the Spring 2021 Meeting.
  - (2.d.ii) Send an email to our group of volunteers for the Education and Outreach team and set up monthly meetings starting in January 2021.
  - (2.e.iii) Set up a meeting with David Gay and others for a final review of the Hg in Rain Brochure.
  - (2.g.v.1) Set up a schedule of reminders for monthly social media pushes.
  - (3.c & d) Announce winners from student papers and posters on social media. Ask for feedback on the evaluation process from the judges.
  - (4.a.ii.1.w) Check in with Bob on the UW DOI process for documents.
  - (4.a.ii.1.ee) Identify a few people to help write up an SOP or guidelines for review of NADP documents.
  - (4.a.ii.1.oo) Write up the disclaimer language to go on NADP reports. Identify a core group of EOS members to help with this.
  - (4.a.ii.2) CLAD is looking to start a webinar series in January. Help them with outreach.
  - (5.a.i.10) Meet with David G. to identify the point people for social media.
1. Spring Meeting minutes were approved via an online survey on 7/2/2020. A link to the minutes can be found at <http://nadp.slh.wisc.edu/committees/minutes.aspx>
    - a. Catherine noted that the new minutes approval process has been implemented and that it has been a good change. David Gay agreed and said it has been helpful for the PO.
  2. Old Business
    - a. Governance Document
      - i. There is a draft in progress. Edits were made to reflect the change in the subcommittee name from EROS to EOS as well as updating the mission of EOS.
      - ii. Currently working on incorporating MELD, now that it is an official science committee, into the document. The MELD committee will review the changes and we should have a draft to present to the Executive committee at the Spring 2021 Meeting.
    - b. Wikipedia Page
      - i. The page is up and running and in the last 90 days it has had around 160 views.
      - ii. At the last meeting we implemented a new protocol to review the page twice a year, in the Spring and in the Fall. EOS has completed its first review. There were two broken links that were fixed and content was added by a user (Mike Bell) that linked our content to the Critical Load Wiki page.
      - iii. Catherine asked that others go and take a look at the page and make edits where needed or add links to content pertaining to their science committee.
    - c. Foundation Letter
      - i. It is on the NADP website.

- ii. One of our goals was to reach out to folks with a formal letter asking for donations, but due to Covid the EOS leadership team decided it would be best to put this item on hold.
  - iii. Once the Covid situation stabilizes a little more we plan to pick this back up and direct our focus on the recipients of this letter.
- d. Education and Outreach
  - i. We have a team of volunteers.
  - ii. Catherine will be sending out an email soon to our team to start working on the learning modules. Looking to start it up after the first of the year and continue with monthly meetings.
- e. Mercury in the Rain Brochure
  - i. We identified an Ad Hoc committee for the review.
  - ii. The latest version of the brochure went out to the Ad Hoc committee about a month ago. Colleen, Rick, and Colin from MELD along with Kristi Morris, Doug Burns, Mark Olson, David Schmeltz, and Beth Boyer will be reviewing the document and providing their comments.
  - iii. We're looking to have the document returned by November 19<sup>th</sup> and then we'll go back to David Gay, the original author, and work through the revision and address the comments.
  - iv. Chris opened it up for any general comments or feedback from the MELD committee or volunteers on the Ad Hoc committee. He asked David Gay if he had received any feedback from any of the reviewers.
    - 1. David stated that he had not, other than Mark Olson saying he thinks it's ready to go. David's happy to address whatever is needed.
    - 2. Chris noted that they still have a couple of weeks to review it and then we'll get back together and go over it. He commented that it looks good and thinks we should have it done by the spring.
    - 3. Kristi Morris added that this was not an agenda item in MELD and this would be something that they tackled after the meeting.
- f. AMoN Brochure
  - i. We were looking to update the 2017 maps, but otherwise it's complete.
  - ii. Chris asked Bob Larson if there are any plans to update the brochure or if we could remove this from our action items.
    - 1. David Gay replied saying that he and Mark O. talked about it this morning and agreed that the only thing it needed is updating the maps and that's an easy update.
    - 2. Bob replied saying the first map is done and the second one he'll have to create because he'll have to combine two different maps. He will get it to us.
- g. Social Media
  - i. Katie gave an update on NADP's social media use.
  - ii. We currently have accounts on Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn.
  - iii. Guidelines for posts:
    - 1. Photo, video, or presentation
    - 2. Web link
    - 3. 1 paragraph (2-4 sentences) and/or 144 characters
    - 4. Screen shot of a post in other media
  - iv. Approval Process

1. Posts for monthly release – send to EOS for review and EOS will forward it onto the PO.
2. Posts for immediate release – send to the contacts at the PO.
- v. The monthly social media push out plan was shown with the edits incorporated from the previous meeting. The plan will be sent out to the committee chairs shortly following this week’s meeting.
  1. Committee chairs will be sent a reminder 5-6 weeks prior to their scheduled month for content and will be asked to send it back 2 weeks before we want it posted.
- vi. Katie shared how you can spread the word about NADP by giving updates on the amount of followers on each of the social media accounts.
  1. Facebook has 273 followers, Twitter 134 followers, and LinkedIn has 28 members.
  2. Katie emphasized the way to gain visibility and have a social media presence is to like and share the posts, otherwise the only people seeing the posts are those who are already affiliated with NADP.
- vii. A social media post from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was shared. In the post the park was celebrating the TN11 site turning 40 and highlighted the NADP program. The pictures shown were of a Brook trout, their native species of trout which is sensitive to acidic streams and Air Resource Specialist Jim Renfro. They also listed the NADP webpage for additional information.
  1. These are the type of posts we like to see!
  2. Katie stated that another way to gain visibility is to tag other environmental pages in our posts.
  3. Share, share, share!
- h. Web Page
  - i. UW-Madison is leading the efforts on this in converting the webpage into a mobile friendly design and EOS is here to help.
3. Fall 2020 Science Symposium Student Papers and Posters
  - a. A panel of judges evaluated 9 papers and 10 posters.
  - b. There were a couple of glitches due to the symposium being held virtually, so the judges are still working on the evaluations, but they should be completed by next week.
  - c. The winners will be announced on social media.
  - d. Judges will be convened for feedback on the evaluation process.
4. Committee Updates
  - a. CLAD – Mike Bell
    - i. He commented that it’s really great to see where EOS is going with outreach.
    - ii. They have 2 main reports that they want to figure out what the process is for publishing and making them official.
      1. The first is critical load exceedance summaries, which is a reoccurring document. Similar to the TDep maps where it’s using newest TDep information to show where exceedances of critical loads are that are in the National Critical Load database. Mike asked with something like this, where it’s reoccurring, does it need to go through an internal review process or can it be passed through and posted online? What is the standard process?
        - a. Catherine replied, EOS would be willing to help. We would not get into technical content, but we would make sure it’s readable

- and understandable to the public. We would then pass it along to the PO for posting on the webpage.
- b. Mike: does it need to be signed off on by the PO once that initial review is completed? We're trying to figure out the process as we are developing these things. Do we need to send it to you (EOS) or do we send it directly to the PO?
  - c. Catherine: it will probably depend on what the item is. If we wanted to send it concurrently we could probably do that to speed up the process a little bit. Just like the brochures, it goes through us and then to the PO, so we've had interaction with both of them. We don't have to make it super formal.
  - d. Chris R: What would you like us to provide Mike? What would be helpful?
  - e. Mike: we feel this is an already edited and scientifically accurate document. We want to make sure that we are following the expected submission and posting structure. Do we send it to Bob and he puts it on the website or does EOS want to make sure they are involved in the process of what we are calling an NADP document?
  - f. Chris R: I agree that it probably depends on what the document is. I've had more experience with the TDep maps and I don't think those ever ran through EROS or EOS. For something like this, that's an actual product that a science committee is putting together I don't know that it needs to go through EOS. If you're putting together more of a fact sheet, brochure, or something that has more of a forward facing view to it then I think that is a place where EOS can help and be involved with the overall theming and look of it. I'm happy to participate and be a part of the review process, but I want it to be a productive process, not one that's going to slow it down.
  - g. Mike: this is something that was approved and (A) it was published in 2017 and (B) it was previously approved by the Executive Committee. So it sounds like if all we're doing is updating data like TDep is, and it has gone through our internal review and it seems fine, we should be able to send it off.
  - h. Several people agreed.
  - i. Greg W. wanted to clarify Mike's question. Is EOS a technical review committee, like a clearing house, to make sure that things are scientifically robust in order for them to go onto the NADP website? I think that the answer is no and I think that's what you were asking.
  - j. Mike: pretty much. Within the park service we have our natural resource reports and there's a technical editor for those where we have to send it to them. They sign off on it and give it a natural resource report number and then it goes online. If it had to go through EOS, in terms of keeping track of everything being produced, then it makes complete sense to me because we are a government organization and it has 15 checks for everything

- we do. For me it's weird not having that because I'm so use to it.
- k. Greg W: so in the past and then again for this report are you saying that you've had Executive Committee review to make sure that it's up to standard and ready to be posted on the website?
  - l. Mike: no. I think the first time it was just getting approval to make this report, as in using TDep to assess critical loads because it was a new thing we were doing. Since that was approved, there is a current one on the website and we just need to make updates.
  - m. Greg W: this may be something we need to talk about in some committee, maybe this one, about do we have a formal process for review of NADP related reports that are not an agency report, such as a natural resources report or USGS scientific investigations report? One that is truly an NADP report, do we have a review process for that? I'm not sure that we do. I just wanted to clarify that that was your question.
  - n. Chris R: I think that's a really good idea Greg. Others agreed.
  - o. Catherine: I think we've hit on two different things with this discussion. (1) If it's a forward facing outreach type of product then EOS will be using its expertise. (2) If it's more of a scientific review then we will need to convene other scientists and groups to review the content. EOS can be involved, but dependent on the type of document will determine our level of involvement.
  - p. Mike: so this brings me to my second point. This is in regards to that natural resource kind of report or more of an analytical report. The CLAD workgroup has been developing this report on critical loads within the Bridger-Teton National Forest. We were wondering if NADP is the appropriate place to try and publish this or if we should be going through one of the federal agencies? This is something that has been done as a joint effort across all federal agencies that we felt it would be better as a how to use critical loads report being associated with CLAD versus being associated with the agency. One of the things that goes with this question if the answer is yes, is can NADP provide DOI numbers for our report so that they are more easily citable through UW-Madison?
  - q. David G: I think that we likely can, but I'm not updated on the system here. I can find out for you.
  - r. Chris R: I know Bob has been working on that with data products. We can figure that out.
  - s. Mike: do we want to have those type of reports as NADP products or should we be pushing those somewhere else? This is very different than the general public facing things, this is more of a scientific report that isn't necessarily written for the public space.

- t. Kristi M: originally Chris and I were both thinking that if it's NADP work centric that EOS would provide the review and there would be a checks and balances system that way. I've always had the question with the TDep fact sheet and it's very similar in what you're going to be doing Mike. Should EOS be a check mark to go through or are we concerned about creating another level of bureaucracy? So do we have that conversation here or do we have that conversation in Exec? What's the way to move forward on that question?
- u. Bob L: I have a question for David. Is there any type of review process within the WSLH that we need to go through?
- v. David G: I don't think so, but I honestly don't know for sure.
- w. Bob L: I think they've been more hands off than the IL State Water Survey was. David agreed. As far as DOI's go, I'll have to talk to the UW DOI person again. About a year and a half ago they were making a change where they were going to publish DOI's themselves, but they didn't have pricing and we were unsure what our level of need would be. I'll touch base with her again next week.
- x. Greg W: so Kristi's question is what is our process for information providing quality assurance? I think it's pretty standard practice in a journal to have two technical reviews. So if you have the document reviewed by two people who were not authors on the report and that could be, or perhaps should be someone within NADP. That way you're sure that the NADP data is being used in the right context and that we're not saying anything that would be counter to our standard practices in NADP. Maybe we should have one of those reviewers be an NADP person.
- y. Mike: do you mean a PO person or just someone who attends NADP meetings?
- z. Greg W: I think someone who is familiar with the program and is active in the program. So if you have two technical reviews then you can tell the Executive Committee that yes, it has been reviewed and we think it's up to standard and we are going to give it to EOS. I think this would be sufficient.
- aa. Kristi M: when you say give it to EOS, does EOS then give it a round of review or they're just passing it through?
- bb. Greg W: that's a good question. I'm assuming if we're going to be putting something on the web and we're now going to have something that's going to face the public then EOS should at least know about it. At least be the entity that facilitates working with Bob or working with DoIT to get it distributed.
- cc. Chris R: I would suggest Greg, that it go to EOS and then by EOS approving it, it would go to Exec. Not the other way around. I don't think you want Exec being the clearing house for this.
- dd. Greg W: no, I'm not saying Executive Committee should have to approve it. If something is going to go online and you're going

- to report it in some subcommittee or science committee, right? So the minutes from those committees eventually go to Executive committee where they're accepted. I'm not saying you have to come to Exec and say I have this report and it's ready to go, can I send this? I'm saying if you have a report that's been reviewed and it's ready to be published on the NADP website, then that's where EOS can be a clearing house.
- ee. Catherine: Greg would it be a good idea to get a couple of people together to draft a policy or process on how to do certain things? Such as this is the level of review that we would do for a fact sheet or brochure and then this is what it would be for a technical paper. We could draft some kind of guidance and figure out who the appropriate people are and how much review needs to happen at each step and stage. That way we would have something we could follow.
  - ff. Mike: we have done an internal review on the document with outside authors who have been part of the meeting and CLAD, but not helping writing the report. That part is done. I can write up a little summary of the main reviews and responses. I can do a response in how we modified the report to fit that information and I can submit that. I'd be happy to sit in on this group and talk through how we do things in the Park Service and it would be good to hear how the USGS does things.
  - gg. Greg W. noted that the USGS review process is lengthy and we don't want to go that route. If we can just document that this has been looked at. Basically we're asking NADP to be a publisher and we're putting scientific literature out that needs some seal of approval. By virtue of it being on the NADP website, we're saying that this has the NADP seal of approval. When I published stuff at Illinois it had to go through the whole USGS process. Any report that has had agency level review, I don't think needs any further review. The agency is standing behind that report. So if we're now going to say NADP approved it then we should have some kind of review process so we can stand behind this literature. Especially if we want to give it DOIs so that it can be citable.
  - hh. Kristi M: I wonder if there is a distinction between posting an agency document to the NADP website vs a document that has the NADP emblem on it. We're talking about a process that isn't broken and I don't want to overdo it either. Thinking back to the TDep whiter paper, we just worked with Bob to get stuff online.
  - ii. John W: the TDep white paper went through the entire EPA ORD review process. It had the technical reviews that Greg is mentioning and full agency reviews. Once those reviews were done we gave the PO an opportunity to look at it, made sure the disclaimers were appropriate for all parties and then it went right to Bob and it was posted.

- jj. Kristi M: I think that's appropriate. I don't want to create a whole bunch of steps in between that process.
- kk. Several people agreed.
- ll. Camille D: it would help if we had guidelines that just state that. So if there is someone newer to NADP then there's a written procedure to follow. It won't always be Bob posting to our website. Eventually it might be a student or an associate chemist posting these documents and it would be good to have guidelines to follow. That way they would know for sure, yes I can post this or no there's a step missing here and reach out to the appropriate contacts. Even if we have to keep it as simple as possible then at least there is something to refer too and then that way we have a starting point.
- mm. Kristi M: now that the way this EOS committee is structured and that all of these groups are coming to EOS reporting on the things that they are working on, there should be no surprises. That's something we want to avoid as well and with this new structure there should not be any.
- nn. Catherine: so there are two things we should address. (1) If there are multiple agencies that are a part of the paper then making sure all of the agencies involved have had a chance to review the document. (2) In between the Fall and Spring meetings have a check-in with our committee chairs, maybe a quarterly meeting, just to see if there is anything in the works that we need to do.
- oo. Donna S: I do want to point out that the version of the TDep report that is on the website does not give any indication that it's a cleared EPA report, where on the EPA side it does have an official EPA report number. So there is a distinction there. In the case of an agency report that does kind of make it a grey area of what it is that you want to post. If you're going to say that it's been cleared by the agency then maybe it should be the version that is the actual report rather than a version that just has the EPA logo on it and I don't know how you want to handle that. The other thing I would recommend this group do, like John was saying, is we had a disclaimer that fit everyone's needs. This group may also want to come up with the disclaimer language that needs to be a part of reports that go on the website.
- pp. Greg W: I would suggest for the benefit of EOS and this meeting that you do have a core group of people that come together and discuss this and come up with a process. Hopefully one that is simple and stream-lined, but one where we're covered. I propose we table this, but Mike brings up a really good thoughts and questions.
- qq. Donna S: if any report, even if it's not considered an EPA report, if it has an EPA author probably like USGS it's still going to have to go through clearance. You can't make it public and have an

EPA author on it and not have it go through the EPA clearance process.

- rr. Greg W: right. I think anything like that should be sufficient review. It should be no problem. If you put your emblem on it then it's your report. NADP is just distributing it. Whereas, if the only logo on it is the NADP logo, then it's an NADP report.
- ss. Donna S: what I'm saying is it could have the NADP logo and be an NADP report, but if it has an EPA co-author or an ORD co-author on it, it's still going to have to go through our clearance process. Even though it's not an EPA publication it doesn't matter.
- tt. Greg W: right, exactly. Same thing with the USGS. So I think we're covered there. We can say this has EPA co-authors or USGS co-authors and it can't go anywhere unless it's been reviewed so we're good. I think what Mike was asking is a little bit different. We're producing this thing and it's an NADP report, but it's not a park service report. It's got co-authorship from a lot of different agencies. I think if the agencies have reviewed it then we are covered. I think it's just those grey areas that we need to figure out the next steps.
- uu. Mike: it's going to go through all of those review processes so it will come in sound. Do we want to do bigger outside citations, templates of structure, or does that matter? Can we be just more general with this?
- vv. Greg W: I would suggest we not be reformatting anything to some sort of standard NADP style. That just creates a lot of work.
- ww. Mike: no, I just want to make sure I'm following the correct protocols.
- xx. Greg W: I don't think that it's time well spent to try and reformat everything into an NADP format.
- yy. Mike: based on what the other committees are doing, I don't foresee this being a regular enough process that this would be necessary.
- zz. David G: a simple alternative there would be if you want similarity to put a NADP cover sheet on it with the logo and DOI if that's appropriate. Greg agreed.
- aaa. Mike: I'll put all of this together and send it onto EOS to keep you informed.

- 2. CLAD is hoping to start a webinar series in January and it will go monthly for 7 months. They're working on the final schedule right now and speakers. EOS could help get the word out.
  - a. Catherine: we'll ask you for the content to push out, but we can certainly help you with the outreach.

b. TDep – Kristi Morris

- i. We have identified Nathaniel Javid to help us with the formatting of the TDep white paper fact sheet for managers. Our goal is to get that done by the end of the year.



- iii. Reminder: our listserv addresses are going away and it will be replaced by Google Groups. That will be happening next week. There will be a final email that is sent from the current listserv saying that you'll be receiving one from Google Groups announcing the new group. That email will be followed shortly by another one from Google Groups saying welcome.
  - g. QAAG – Camille Danielson
    - i. The main thing they are working on is the data quality objective (DQO) meeting that they are going to have in January. There's a group working on NADP citing criteria. I don't know of any needs that we have for your committee at this point.
    - ii. We have posted recently our quality assurance reports, our joint quality assurance plans for the laboratories, and our table of contents for all of our SOPs. Not sure if this is something that external people would be interested in or if there is any desire to communicate that out.
      - 1. Greg W. commented that he didn't think there needed to be anymore review of those documents.
      - 2. Chris R. said that he thinks anything can be a post, so send us your QA graphs.
      - 3. Greg commented that he thinks these reports demonstrate that quality is important to us and we're staying on top of things.
  - h. CityDep – Greg Wetherbee
    - i. I can't think of anything to have EOS help us with right now.
    - ii. We're working on an NSF research coordination networks grant proposal that is two pages and is going to go out to program managers within NSF to get their feedback. From there they take their feedback and write the proposal and then it gets submitted to NSF. The grant is to try to bring different networks together within cities to talk about ways for collaboration for air quality monitoring in atmospheric deposition. We're also trying to weave in a human health aspect to it, which is where AMSC will come in. If we're fortunate enough to get the grant then maybe we'll want to make a big deal out of it. However, this is a ways down the road.
    - iii. On another note: CityDep has never been granted official status by the Executive Committee nor are we asking for it. This means in the Governance Document we should not probably be mentioned. It currently has a home within TDep.
      - 1. Catherine responded that she would take a look at the Governance Document and see if CityDep is mentioned. If it is she will remove it.
  - i. Catherine opened the floor for any other comments or questions.
    - i. David Gay had a suggestion for EOS. You might recommend to all of these sites, subcommittees, and committees that one person be assigned the task of being on the lookout for material that can be used for social media and then send it along to EOS.
      - 1. Catherine: we do have two people assigned from each committee already, so maybe one of them could be the social media reviewer.
    - ii. Winston Luke commented an additional item from the NOS update. There have been discussions in both QAAG and NOS about evaluating siting criteria for the wet dep sites and the impacts of those violations of criteria on data quality. Tim Sharac is leading that effort with a lot of input from Mark Olson and others.

- iii. Andy Johnson mentioned that in the Governance Document he thought there was a section that mentioned Ad Hoc groups that CityDep could potentially fall under.
  - 1. Catherine: I don't think Ad Hoc groups are specifically named.
  - 2. Kristi M. confirmed that the Ad Hoc groups are all lumped together and once you come out of being an Ad Hoc group then you get official status.
- iv. Chris Rogers had a question for Bob. What is the plan for getting instructions out for using the new Google Groups? Are you going to provide those to the chairs and secretaries?
  - 1. Bob responded saying, right now it looks like people will not be able to subscribe and unsubscribe themselves. They'll have to put requests in to the PO. Next week when we send out the last and initial emails, there will be instructions on how to use them and we will follow up with the chairs/officers.

## 5. New Business

### a. Highlighting publications – Chris Rogers

- i. We need to use low hanging fruit for social media. One idea that we had talked about was the use of Google Scholar to get notifications when publications have been listed using NADP data. We should put those on social media. If David G. agrees for someone to get these notifications from Google Scholar, then someone at the PO office can pop these links in when they are notified. We could have 300 posts we could make a year that would just be related to publications.
  - 1. David agreed that there are some great papers that come out that would make for good posts. He noted that the PO use to highlight them in the newsletter in the past.
  - 2. Camille D. suggested not posting every one if there are hundreds, but maybe one per month.
  - 3. Mike B: it's really easy to schedule tweets. Some programs will once a month find 5 papers and schedule one to come out a week. It would take 10 minutes to find those and then you can let it be for a little while. It would be an alternative to searching all of the time.
  - 4. Chris R. agreed that maybe doing a couple of publication posts a month is a good idea. He emphasized that he thinks we are currently not putting up any content that is incentivizing people to want to share our stuff or participate in social media. Anything we can do to drive the content and generate interest is important. He wants to make this more of an automated system rather than it having to go through a review process.
  - 5. David G. commented that someone at the PO could do this. He said he could find someone within the PO or at the labs that is younger that could do this pretty easily.
  - 6. Greg W. suggested someone even younger such as a student. Possibly engage a marketing student. They could then target groups, like ones in California, to send out mercury information from MDN data. In order to target these groups, you'll need someone technical.

7. David G. agreed that the more information we push out the better and if we can find new places to push it out, even better.
  8. Margaret Johnson volunteered.
  9. Bob L. commented that during Mark Olson's talk he mentioned the PO is hiring a part time person and they are supposed to be dedicated to outreach.
  10. Chris R: Catherine, Katie and I will get together with David G. soon and identify these people so that we have names and can move forward with the social media plan.
- b. Anything else? – Catherine Collins
- i. Winston L. commented in terms of content on the social media sites, NOAA has a “postcards from the field” that they do. Maybe we should have a more concerted effort to have site operators send in photos.
    1. Catherine agreed that this is a great idea.
    2. Richard T. said he's been having site operators send him photos especially sites with wildfires nearby or the sites impacted by the recent hurricanes. He mentioned there is a plan to get those out.
    3. David G. suggested we could push these out under the guise of weird places we look at rainfall chemistry. Or cool places.
    4. Camille D. suggested you could have a site of the month. Others agreed this would be a good idea. David G. commented that we occasionally use to do this in the newsletter where we would interview site operators.
    5. Chris R. commented it would be great if site operators would go on social media and post a picture of their site and then tag us. Basically cut the PO out of it. Ideally if we can get to that point then we've actually gotten somewhere.
    6. Catherine said it would be a good idea to give site operators some bullet points of what they could talk about in their post.
    7. Richard T. suggested that we could revive the sampling selfie. He thought the Park Service did that a couple of years ago.
    8. Mike B. commented that this is something people enjoy and it's an easy post. He suggested we could get some TikToks of sampling.
  - ii. Catherine asked if there was anything else. Hearing nothing she made a motion to adjourn. Camille D. moved and Andy J. seconded.

**Participant List**

Greg Beachley  
 Mike Bell  
 Katie Benedict  
 Katie Blaydes  
 Amanda Cole  
 Catherine Collins  
 Christa Dahman  
 Camille Danielson  
 Nichole Davis  
 Cari Furiness

Gilberto Fuentes García  
David Gay  
Dana Grabowski  
Jim Hermanson  
John Jansen  
Nathaniel Javid  
Andy Johnson  
Margaret Johnson  
Maria Jones  
Muge Kafadar  
Bob Larson  
Winston Luke  
Jason Lynch  
Amy Mager  
Mike McHale  
Kristi Morris  
Jason O'Brien  
John Offenburg  
Mark Olson  
Eric Prestbo  
Melissa Puchalski  
Donna Schwede  
Rodolfo Sosa  
Richard Tanabe  
John Walker  
Greg Wetherbee  
Chris Worley  
Kenny Yan