Coweeta LTER 2011 Winter Meeting Minutes
February 8-9, 2011

Tuesday Feb. 8

Following the presentations, Ted posed the following questions to prompt discussion from the group:

1) What are thoughts about the presentations?
- Still looks a bit like several individual studies – we still need to improve on integrating the different aspects of the project.
- However, some projects look very well integrated (synoptic – streams, salamanders, leaf litter bags, chemistry, land use)

2) What were the highlights from the presentations?
- Salamander work was strong and seemed to stand out
- Water-related ecosystem service (from wildlife to water quantity) was also strong.
- We've done an admirable job of having large spatial scale study, incorporating new models (occupancy modeling), and figuring out new protocols (e.g., leaf litter bags to sample *Tallaperla*, snails, crayfish, salamanders)

3) What do we need to do to prepare for the mid-term review?
Next immediate steps
- We need to go through the topics and grade ourselves on how we are doing – which objectives have we met and where have we dropped the ball. And if we have dropped the ball, why, and how are we going to pick that ball back up or do we just leave it on the ground.
Report to reviewers
- Review team will have the proposal in front of them. Need to send agenda to them ahead of time with presentations grouped together to help reviewer make linkages between the different research parts.
- Should write a report for the reviewers beforehand.
- We should also point out areas where additional spin-off research occurred (e.g. pollen from bog cores)
- Need to make sure we link past research to the current work
- Need to show how we leveraged NSF funding to spin-off additional research
- Do we want to show educational/outreach component? Yes – but probably as a poster and/or as part of the report we give them up front.
Presentations
- Need someone to take the lead on telling the story of major parts of the research (stream synoptic stuff; intensive hillslope plots);
- Need to have 5-6 speakers max (one for each major theme); get the best storytellers
- Keep presentations at high level, but with all the background detail left off unless they ask; broader themes can get lost with the specifics
- At the presentation, have an introductory thematic talk to introduce themes and show links of all themes.
- Key contributions of Coweeta should be included – need to show how past work has informed what we are doing today
- It might be good to have a conceptual diagram showing major contributions to major issues (e.g. clear cutting controversy led to NEPA which led to WS 7 clearcut study)

Site visits
- Where would be a good place to take the reviewers to show them the science:
  - Lower gap plots
  - One catchment at Coweeta to talk about modeling
  - One location on the intensive hillslope plots, ideally a developed area (e.g., Watauga or new development at Bates)
- At one stream site, we could have a PI from each group describe what research took place (socioeconomic and stream chemistry and land use and fish surveys, etc.)
- We can't illustrate changing climate, but can show range of development; need to find good examples of each land use type
- Will website be up by review? Yes. COGENT will be down, but data catalog will be up so that GIS data can be uploaded

Other
- Bradford suggested that PIs come up with 'integrative' questions, then task groups of students to undertake the research during the summer
- This summer graduate students will present as well in the form of posters

Wednesday Feb. 9
Following the four morning presentations, we continued a group discussion regarding the mid-term review.

What will the midterm review involve?
- There will be 5 reviewers; 3 are non-LTER and 2 are LTER-related
- 1 of the reviewers will be an Information Manager
- We can provide a list of possible reviewers for NSF to consider
- The Information Manager will look at both our website and the intranet
- The review will take part on June 28 and 29; it can begin as early as we like on the 28th, but will only go until 1pm on June 29
- At 1pm, the reviewers will gather and write their report. At 4:30 they will give their report, so folks should plan on staying until 6pm
- Graduate students, undergraduate students, cooperators, administrative support staff, and PIs should all plan to attend
- They will also look at the in-kind support that the home institution supplies

Closing the loop
- It was agreed that we still need to work at closing the loop between the social and the biotic/physical parts of the project
- We need to show that the work we are doing is fully integrated
- We also need to show that we are doing credible science that is regionally relevant
- Band suggested using something like the ISSE diagram to illustrate how we are closing the loop

Engaging the public
- In terms of communicating with the public, success should be measured by delivering credible science effectively. However, we can't necessarily measure success by changing local attitudes and policies (e.g., provide science that shows the benefits of riparian buffers, but this may not translate into more riparian buffers or additional regulations)
- As scientists, our job is to inform policy and attitudes, but not try to influence

- We are already helping to inform conservation by providing insights on how to effectively and efficiently monitor headwater streams using leaf litter bags with local conservation organizations and state agencies
- Pringle mentioned that we have the Hazard Sites, Synoptic Sites, and SVAP. We are working with LTWA to develop SVAP for volunteers. The Hazard Sites could be used as demonstration sites.
- It is important that we have a narrative in delivering our science to the public.

Research themes on web
- John Chamblee presented the research themes on the web that selected PIs will need to fill out; this is based on work from the Georgia Coastal Ecosystems (GCE)
- In reviewing the themes, Leigh pointed at that there was nothing for geomorphology and that there needed to be something for the geology of the southern Appalachians, perhaps under Regional Characterization
- Should population biology be elevated to its own theme? No – it was decided it should be included as a sub-theme under Biodiversity
- John emphasized the importance of getting the correct themes because these themes are part of a relational database and would be very difficult to change in the future
- How do we organize research under the 5 core areas? It was suggested that perhaps research should be organized around the 5 core areas.
- There is no real history on how the 5 core areas came into existence and they don't really reflect the type of research we are doing now.
- Research and data sets will be "tagged" with the particular core area they represent, which should hopefully satisfy NSF
- We should know what the core research areas are and should be able to link our current research to these core areas if asked.
- Jason made a table in Excel showing the research themes in our proposal and their associated questions/hypotheses that we said we would tackle. It was decided that time would be better served if this table was sent to PIs to fill-out.

Homework for PIs
1) PIs need to fill-out the table Jason created to show where their research fits based on the original proposal and associated addendums.
2) The major research themes need to be completed by a select group of PIs who are familiar with the research in these areas (we never identified these folks)

<u>Attendance</u>

Participant Name	Affiliation	Description
Charles Seabrook	Independent Journalist	Journalist
Scott Pearson	Mars Hill College	PI
Jason Love	UGA	Site Manager
John Maerz	UGA	PI
John Chamblee	UGA	Information Manager
Andy Laviner	UGA	Tech
Carol Harper	UGA	Tech
Rhett Jackson	UGA	PI
Sheila Gregory	UGA	Tech
Ted Gragson	UGA	PI
Jeff Hepinstall-Cymerman	UGA	PI
Jackie Mohan	UGA	PI
Helen Fosgate	UGA	Editor
Katie Bower	UGA	Tech
David Leigh	UGA	PI
Cathy Pringle	UGA	PI
Cara Sipprelle	UGA	Tech
Don Nelson	UGA	PI
Larry Band	UNC at Chapel Hill	PI
Craig Depken	UNC at Charlotte	PI
Jen Fraterrigo	University of Illinois	PI
Paul Bolstad	University of Minnesota	PI
Steven Brantley	University of Minnesota	Post-doc
Monica Turner	University of Wisconsin	PI
Barry Clinton	USFS	PI
Kitty Elliott	USFS	PI
Jennifer Knoepp	USFS	PI
Wayne Swank	USFS	PI
Joe Davis	USFS	Tech
Neal Muldoon	USFS	Tech
Chelcy Ford	USFS	PI
Stephanie Laseter	USFS	Tech
Kimberly Novick	USFS	Post-doc
Jack Webster	Virginia Tech	PI
Fred Benfield	Virginia Tech	PI
Jeb Barrett	Virginia Tech	PI
Robert Warren	Yale	Post-doc
Mark Bradford	Yale	PI