MC meeting  
September 22, 2015  
Jess, Whendee, Nick

* Jess is going to begin drafting a letter to Saran in response to her review with the intention of delivering it at the beginning of next year
  + Whendee is going to put together a table similar to Jess’ with examples from the proposal text that will serve as a counterargument to the negative comments
    - The proposal includes a definition of novel ecosystems
    - There is sufficient support to justify drought as the future research direction
    - (At the SEAC meeting, Mike mentioned that there was plenty of mentions of the historical data)
  + Nick agreed that a response should be sent in order to make it part of the record, but stressed that the tone should be kept friendly. Having the negative comments is helpful for knowing what areas the reviewers will be looking at closely in the future.
  + Agreement from all that the broader impacts section could have been more detailed, however the 25 page limit is somewhat of a hindrance
* The personnel assigned to the hypotheses were reviewed
  + 1a – Added Nick.
  + 1b – Added Nick and T. Heartsill-Scalley
  + 2a – Put Grizelle in lead.
  + 2b – Added Ramírez, Schowalter, Covich, Crowl
  + 3a – Put McDowell as lead
  + 3b – Put Ramírez in lead, added Ballantyne
  + 4 – Mike in lead – is that ok? Jess will add the remaining CTE researchers listed in the table
  + 5 – Lodge is currently listed as lead, but may not be interested in the role. Jess will ask her and, if she is not interested, will ask Cantrell
  + 7 – Added Waide
  + 8 – Put Waide in lead, added Uriarte
* Jess will speak with the lead for each section to make sure they are interested in being in the leadership role and then will speak with the other personnel listed to make sure they are listed in the right area.