

Coweeta All PI January 2005 Meeting

Summary

Purpose of the meeting was planning for the NSF site review. Consensus was reached on the most likely field sites to be used during the review along with what should be emphasized and who should present. Five critical concepts were identified that need to be clearly defined and understood by all to assist in communicating the integrative and regional nature of the Coweeta LTER research. Final site visit schedule and framework will be developed by Jim Vose, Brian Kloeppe and Ted Gragson by mid-January and circulated. There will be two practice runs with draft presentations and site visits on **Thursday March 24** and **Wednesday May 18**.

Attending

Paul Bolstad	Bob Ratajczak (for G.	Cathy Pringle
Mark Bradford	Grossman)	Ron Pulliam
Seong-Hoon Cho	Ron Hendrick	Barbara Reynolds
Barry Clinton	Mark Hunter	Mark Riedel
Dave Coleman	Brian Kloeppe	Mark Scott
Katherine Elliott	Jennifer Knoepp	Jim Vose
Chelcy Ford	David Leigh	Bruce Wallace
Ned Gardiner	David Newman	David Wear
Ted Gragson	Scott Pearson	Jack Webster

Overview

The purpose of the meeting was planning for the NSF site review. We discussed various documents and communications relevant to the upcoming NSF Site Review including the report by the external advisors (June 2004), an external review of the Information Management (November 2004), and the NSF guidelines for the review of Science and Information Management.

Information from H. Gholz

The Coweeta LTER Site Review will be held on June 28-29 (Tu/Wd), with the review team arriving the afternoon of June 27 (Mo). Other sites in the review pool this year:

- NTL: week of May 23
- KNZ: Jun 2-3
- SGS: from Jul 13-15
- AND: week of Jul 18-22
- PAL: start travel from the US on/around Nov. 5

NSF Site Review Teams will consist of five members

- 3 with no connection to LTER
- 2 from within LTER without a site conflict
- 1 member will be an IM/IT expert
- Team as a whole equipped to address review criteria consisting of
 - LTER Science Evaluation Guidelines
 - LTER IM Evaluation Guidelines
- Two types of briefing/background material are suggested for the Review Team

- an intranet or other protected site with information available online
- written material

The review take place over two days including the evening in between

- Review team members arrive afternoon/evening before review for an 8 PM closed briefing by NSF
- Team is ours starting as early as we like on Day 1 through 1 PM of Day 2
- No later than 1 PM of Day 2, team begins writing draft report
- Report-out will take place about 430 PM of Day 2 with an opportunity for response by PI and others
- Final adjournment about 6 PM on Day 2

The review team needs to get the information they need to prepare their report

- it may ask for revisions in the schedule
- plan to be flexible to the degree possible
- sites often use a half a day for field trips, but sometimes combine field tours and presentations
- consider how to include administrators

Draft Site Review Schedule

Based on the information provided by Henry Gholz and others, the following draft site schedule was prepared.

DAY 1

Two introductory presentations

- a. Vose – history of Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory research and collaboration with UGA
- b. Gragson – history of Coweeta LTER research and overview of 2002-08 research

Four field stops

1. Lt TN Park – Leigh, Gragson, Bolstad. Provides context for the integration of project elements; demonstrates the particular uniqueness of the project; helps with the apparent bias in the singular focus of research in the Coweeta basin.
2. GAP/Dendrochronology – Clark Lab to focus on the terrestrial-environmental gradient; Elliott Lab to focus on the dendrochronology-temporal gradient.
3. Litter Exclusion – Webster, Wallace? Focus on the history and legacy of aquatic research at Coweeta.
4. Hemlock Site – Hunter, Vose, etc. provides mechanistic integration of terrestrial and aquatic research within the Coweeta Basin.

Executive meeting of Science Advisory + NSF Site Review Team

IM Review

Poster Session – Site Review Team + Graduate Students over hearty hors d'oeuvres

DAY 2

Presentations: 4 Synthesis & 1 Futures to end by 1:00 pm

1. Bolstad – Socio-natural Categorization
2. Pearson/Pringle – Terrestrial-Aquatics
3. Clark – Forecasting
4. Kloeppe – Schoolyard, Outreach & Cross-Site Collaboration
5. Gragson/Vose – Future Directions

Working Groups

After these preliminaries, CDs with copies of all relevant documents including the presentations and site report from the June 2004 meeting were distributed and individuals formed into groups. The group objective was to identify ~3 field sites (the recommendation of the external advisors last year), how each site demonstrates a particular aspect of the overall Coweeta LTER research, and any logistical or conceptual considerations to show unity/integration in the research.

Highlights from the Groups

Organize the presentation at each field site around the Coweeta LTER research topics – socio-natural template, terrestrial-aquatic dynamics, forecasting. Each would be posed as a question then answered. In addition, the opportunity should be taken in traveling to each field site and once there to tie the activities at the site into the larger research issues. Presenters should see each field site as the reviewers are – *de novo* – but with the advantage of in-depth knowledge about the region and the ability to explain context and process.

On a related topic, rather than asking individuals to provide information and assembling a presentation based on what is received, outline the presentation to reflect the research and selectively solicit information to make the point. The point is to integrate, for example, terrestrial and aquatic presentations. Each presentation should demonstrate: integration; logical flow; and related themes or dimensions of the research.

The basis for integration will be everyone having clearly in mind the definition of concepts critical to the overall Coweeta LTER research. The most important concepts are:

- Regionalization
- Integration
- Disturbance
- Scaling
- Forecasting
- Socio-natural template

Following-up on comments by the site review this summer, Gragson will serve as “master of ceremony/moderator” for the site review making sure everyone stays on time; introducing speakers; placing them in the context of the overall research as necessary; etc.

A particular challenge is how we can demonstrate data and research legacies without having to describe the collection of each data point. While the reviewers will want to know about this legacy, describing the collection itself is time away from the more exciting aspects of the research. We could set up posters at each field site to reflect other activities there that are not

described and/or other research that might be of interest that we are not going to cover. In general, we pick the highlights of research at Coweeta for presentation and description from a comprehensive list. It would be appropriate to set up tents/awnings at each field site – it will rain. This way we can protect posters and keep visitors relatively dry. NSF states that site visits should not be a financial burden to sites, so the price of an awning should not be a problem.

As opportunities present themselves, it is appropriate at each field stop to point reviewers toward additional information/research carried out at the site or in the region by students who they can meet that evening in the poster session. *Every PI needs to tell their students to a) be at the site review this summer and b) prepare a poster on their research for the poster session.*

Field Site Details

Consensus was reached on three field sites and related information. As regards presentations, external advisors recommended three-to-four 5-minute presentations at each stop. The names below are individuals who can speak directly to the topics or have students that can. A final list of topics will match the a) three-to-four presentations and b) integration principles. The sites, likely presenters and topics are:

Little Tennessee River Site

Speakers: Pearson, Turner, Leigh, Gragson, Webster, Newman/Cho

Topics:

Landscape evolution / sediment record
Second home development
Human impact on fluvial systems
Fish and aquatic “surveys”
Stream restoration / Little Tennessee Watershed Association
LINX study, inter-site research
Forecasting
Mars Hill to Nancytown Gradient
Land use history - farming and logging impacts

Litter Exclusion / Hemlock

Speakers: Hunter, Wallace, Webster, Vose, Eggert

Topics:

Litter exclusion
Hemlock research will demonstrate responsiveness to regional events
Invasive species / disturbances
Linkages between terrestrial and aquatic systems
Importance of leveraged funding
Southern pine beetle impacts

Forest Gap Site

Speakers: Clark, Reynolds, Elliott, Pearson, Hendrick, Nina (Hendrick student)

Topics:

Forest gap experiment

Effects of human influence on arthropods and soil processes, simulation and impacts

Dendrochronology

Rhododendron

Gap impacts/fragmentation impacts on bird populations

Potential Reviewers

Henry Gholz requested that sites forward names of potential Site Review team members. He will take them under advisement. These individuals should not have a conflict with the site. The initial list includes:

- Todd Ackermann (Information Manager at Niwot)
- Ralph Alig (USFS Corvallis)
- Mike F. Allen (UC - Riverside)
- Nancy Bockstael (University of Maryland)
- Carol Couch (Georgia EPD)
- Bill Parton (CSU)
- Scott Collins (UNM)
- Tom Crow (USFS Landscape Ecology - Washington DC)
- Linda Deegen (Woods Hole - Toolik Lake)
- Bruce Hayden (University of Virginia)
- Dale Johnson (University of Nevada - Reno)
- Jean Lodge (USFS - Luquillo LTER)
- Diane McKnight (Arctic and Niwot LTER sites)
- Barbara Moorehouse (ASU - sociology/environmental center)
- Steve Pacala (Princeton)
- Steward Pickett (Institute of Environmental Studies)
- Bruce Schindler (Oregon State University)
- Fred Sklar (Florida redevelopment agency / FCE site)

Collaborators

If at all possible, we should invite important collaborators to participate in the NSF Site Review this summer. The list that emerged at the meeting includes:

- Al White and Sarah Butler
- Stephanie Madson
- Amy Rosemond
- Maury Valett
- Tim Burt
- Fred Worrall (England)

Drafting

A strong site review promoting Coweeta LTER and preparing us for a successful renewal cannot be achieved by last-minute preparations. Two dates were identified during spring when most people could return to Coweeta and bring with them draft presentations and/or participate in dry-

runs of the field site visits. The selected dates are: **Thursday March 24** and **Wednesday May 18**.

Other Items

Can we find a B&B large enough in Franklin to lodge the NSF site review team? The team is 5 plus one-two NSF observers, but there may be more. We should make reservations now – it will be high season.

The Coweeta webcam is operational and will soon be linked to the Coweeta website for easy access.

Sampling at Hazard Sites will take place this year.

Coweeta LTER Summer 2006 Meeting: BIG symposium. It will be 2 years since we presented research results so it will be “exciting” again to hear what everyone is doing. In addition, we will be ready to link our efforts back to the plan in our 2002-2008 proposal of holding a symposium in year 4 that feeds into the forecasting effort. For the All-PI Winter 2006 meeting – could we imagine how to carry out a data analysis, codification, etc. meeting?

Mark Bradford joined the Coweeta LTER as an investigator this year; Bruce Haines left the Coweeta LTER this year.

The Coweeta LTER brochure needs to be revised. A draft will be prepared this spring and circulated for comments.

Caution from Gholz to LTER: Congress cut NSF base funding and NSF is currently determining how it will absorb the cut. Final allocations to programs may not be known for months. Henry's advise to sites: A) There will be no supplemental funding in FY05 (except for Schoolyard) – if the funds normally set aside for supplements are available, their combined dollar amount is what is approximately needed by DEB to cover the base funding for LTER sites given DEB's increased burden of funding. B) Sites should also anticipate how to adjust to a 3-4% cut (although hopefully less or even 0%) in the FY05 core budget. If a cut happens, it will be across-the-board to all sites and Schoolyard would not be immune.