

WICCI Science Council Meeting

Monday, March 9, 2009
DNR Science Operations Center
12:00 PM

ATTENDANCE

Members

- Dick Lathrop (Co-Chair)
- John Magnuson (Co-Chair)
- Bud Harris
- George Kraft
- Chris Kucharik
- Ken Potter
- Bill Walker
- Sandra McLellan (LiveMeeting)
- Philip Moy (LiveMeeting)

Nonmembers

- Alison Coulson
- Kevin Gibbons
- Lewis Gilbert
- David Liebl
- David Lorenz
- Michael Notaro
- Pete Nowak
- Steve Pomplun
- Jack Sullivan
- Steve Vavrus
- David Webb

ABSENT MEMBERS

- Sharon Dunwoody
- John Kutzbach
- Jonathan Patz
- Dan Vimont
- Darrell Zastrow

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

- Kevin Gibbons will contact working groups who have not submitted charters.
- Chris Kucharik will supply a table of the available variables that they can investigate, and Kevin Gibbons will circulate that to the working group heads who have not submitted their requests.
- All working groups will send requests of data needs to the Climate Working Group.

- Jack Sullivan will give an update on the engagement with the DNR Water Division and what are the opportunities.
- Kevin Gibbons will send the WICCI logo to Michael Notaro and the rest of the Science Council.
- Outreach and Operations Unit will send an e-mail to the working groups detailing how they can support the working groups, what information they would like, and what images and slides they can provide.
- Pete Nowak will forward a new draft of the proposal for the nomination of new members to the Science Council.
- Members should pose suggestions to bring in Advisory Committee members to the next meeting, but unless they are posed, people will not actively seek them out.
- Kevin Gibbons will set up a closed access on the WICCI site to disperse documents and drafts internally.

MINUTES

[12:02] Meeting called to order by Dick Lathrop.

Introductions and Approval of Minutes

People at the table introduced themselves to the guests Michael Notaro, David Lorenz, and Steve Vavrus who were visiting as representatives of the Climate Working Group. They were also welcomed to the table.

Suggestions were made to the minutes to be edited.

Minutes were approved with corrections to names and other items.

Action Item Review

Dick Lathrop reviewed the action items asking people to report.

David Hart has not been receiving e-mails from the Science Council listserv. Philip Moy has not seen a charter from David Hart.

Action Item: Kevin Gibbons will contact working groups who have not submitted charters.

Working Group Updates

Dick Lathrop asked for updates from the working groups.

Pete Nowak noted that they website is of direct importance to WICCI and communications. He noted that working groups should submit as much information as possible so that more support and funding can be acquired for WICCI.

Dick Lathrop noted that the Wildlife Working Group website looks good and shows impressive progress since December.

Stormwater

David Liebl gave the update of his working group through the Stormwater Working Group website (wicci.wisc.edu/workinggroups/stormwater). He and Ken Potter gave an update of the talks that they have been attending and putting on throughout the state. They are also working on a Sea Grant proposal.

Green Bay

Bud Harris noted that there is not a lot of content on the website, but he is working on content and should have things to add to the Future Plans/Roadmap section.

He said that the next step for the risk assessment is to follow up on nutrient loading in Green Bay. He and his colleagues have developed a proposal and submitted it to the EPA. They plan to address phosphorus using the SWAT model. They are going to focus on quantifying the risk and coming up with solutions that are the most cost effective. Much of the money will be going towards modeling and some will be spent on climate. Ken Potter and people from the Stormwater Working Group will be involved with the program as well.

Bud Harris said that he and Vicky Harris have been invited to a Nature Conservancy workshop on the "ecological integrity" of Green Bay. They are now conducting a similar workshop in Chicago for the entire Great Lakes region. The report of the strategies will be out soon, and he is interested in figuring out how the report from the workshop will link to efforts at the local scale. He plans to contact the Nature Conservancy and work with them closely this summer to discuss these issues and how they overlap with the risk assessment that they have conducted.

Climate

Steve Vavrus said that he has been working on some proposals. One of which is a Center for Disease Control (CDC) proposal with Sandra McLellan and Jonathan Patz. The Climate Working Group is also scheduled to meet with members of the Operations and Outreach Unit to talk about the website in three days.

Pete Nowak, Chris Kucharik, and others noted that the Climate Working Group webpage will be quite different because they are different than other working groups.

David Liebl brought up that data needs may be an important section for the Climate Working Group page.

David Lorenz noted that he has downscaled the precipitation of Wisconsin and brought results to the workshop that he passed around. He is going over the models and working over the extreme events to figure out if the models are using the data correctly. He is making sure that the downscaled models do not have any biases.

He says that there will be outputs on precipitation, maximum temperature, and minimum temperature. He said there will also be the possibility of calculating extreme events occurrences since they are using daily output data. These can be used to project daily outputs for extreme events as well.

When asked about humidity, evaporation, wind speeds, and other variables, he said that his group could use that data, so the Climate Working Group just needs funding. Solar

radiation would be difficult for them to do because there are fewer measuring stations. Bud Harris mentioned that daily solar radiation is important for the SWAT model.

Pete Nowak noted that there are important elements of data needs (time scales, geographical, etc.) that the working groups should send to the Climate Working Group so that they know which variables are important. Chris Kucharik noted that they are putting together the data, but to get more precision would require more funding and time.

Pete Nowak said that the Climate Working Group should have a data needs section on the website so that other groups know what the group needs and so that Outreach can use this information to help acquire funding. Dick Lathrop responded that the other working groups are in contact with the Climate Working Group and are providing their data needs. Steve Vavrus said that working groups are contacting them, but he would like to have compiled requests for data so that they know what working groups are asking for and whether there are commonalities.

John Magnuson said that it may be best for the Climate Working Group to make a list of which variables the Climate Working Group is able to investigate and which they aren't with timelines of the two. With this information working groups know what is possible and can request certain data that are most useful to them.

Bill Walker noted that it may be a two-step process: (1) the working groups figure out what their data needs are and (2) figure out which they would really like to investigate.

Michael Notaro and Steve Vavrus noted that there are many variables that people should sort through. Pete Nowak noted that the variables are not the only important part, but also the precision and the resolution. In the end they resolved to ask the members of the Climate Working Group to return.

Action Item: Chris Kucharik will supply a table of the available variables that they can investigate, and Kevin Gibbons will circulate that to the working group heads who have not submitted their requests.

Action Item: All working groups will send requests of data needs to the Climate Working Group.

Water Resources

Dick Lathrop noted that they have started to form the organization of a Water Resources Working Group, but they are not quite sure how it would turn out. George Kraft said that he is not sure how the working group would look and whether the topic is too broad.

Ken Potter noted that the Stormwater Working Group can deal with event-driven problems, so things like groundwater could be interesting to investigate. He said that the Stormwater Working Group can also deal with wind and wave issues.

John Magnuson noted that if there is a leader, such as Tim Asplund, they could start to develop a subset of issues that do not overlap too much with Coastal Hazards and

Stormwater. They could even tackle an issue such as future lake levels. Dick Lathrop noted that they will continue to have a brainstorming session.

David Liebl noted that a GAP analysis may be a good idea to identify gaps in the coverage of the working groups.

Jack Sullivan noted that one third of the DNR is the Water Division, and very few people there are working on climate change. He thinks that there is a great opportunity to push on that part of the agency to get some involvement in the water issues. He suggested that people from WICCI engage with the Water Division soon.

Action Item: Jack Sullivan will give an update on the engagement with the DNR Water Division and what are the opportunities.

Dick Lathrop noted that he, Tim, and Jim Hurley will meet soon to talk about these issues.

Natural Areas

John Magnuson noted that there are many natural areas across the state of the DNR, UW-System, federal government, etc. and that these areas are important and interconnected. He and Dick Lathrop have met with others to brainstorm the possible group. Bud Harris noted that the Nature Conservancy should be part of the discussion, and other people suggested the other universities in the UW-System.

Land Use

Dick Lathrop noted that Jim LaGro of the Urban and Regional Planning Department has contacted him regarding WICCI's developments and has expressed interest in getting involved and starting a Land Use Working Group.

Steve Vavrus asked whether or not there would be a Tourism Working Group, and one has yet to be formed. John Magnuson noted that the head of the Birkebeiner was at the Advisory Committee Meeting, and he thinks Winter Tourism would be an interesting group.

WICCI Seminar Series

Michael Notaro said that there have been two presentations so far, and there have been 50-100 people at each presentation. He thinks that there has been good attendance and interest so far and noted that recordings of the talks will be available online. He is looking forward to having a larger audience across the state.

Pete Nowak thanked Michael Notaro for his leadership and getting the Seminar Series going. He said that an annual report and this seminar series may be something that they may want to repeat this in the future.

Action Item: Kevin Gibbons will send the WICCI logo to Michael Notaro and the rest of the Science Council.

WICCI Communication

Steve Pomplun noted that WICCI needs to improve its communications. He said that it is difficult to have effective communications because of the complexity of the organization. He said that he did not know about the Stormwater Working Group's presentations, and he would like to put that into communications, the annual report, funding proposals, etc. He said that he can make the logo available, as well as images and slides that anyone from WICCI can use. He would like a better process of two-way communications to get updates on what they have been doing. Should he send them regular e-mails asking what they are doing?

Ken Potter noted that if people want to promote these issues, then they should tell them ahead of time. Otherwise they can let them know through other means. Dick Lathrop noted that there should be "FYI" messages that the chairs should let Outreach know that they are conducting events.

Steve Pomplun said that he would like for the website to serve as a portal of events, so there need to be more updates. He would like to have this information for the website and for other groups. John Magnuson noted that when people talk about "communication," it is not about controlling the other groups, filtering, or sorting. He said that the people at the table are giving many talks and that they would like to have these posted on the WICCI website.

Action Item: Outreach and Operations Unit will send an e-mail to the working groups detailing how they can support the working groups, what information they would like, and what images and slides they can provide.

John Magnuson noted that the seminar series and other things are perfect to broaden our impact to college students and other audiences.

Jack Sullivan noted that the Coldwater Fisheries Working Group gave a good update that he was a part of, but there was limited explicit connection with WICCI, even though they are connected.

Filling Science Council Vacancies

Dick Lathrop opened the discussion and said that two members who specialize in wildlife have left the Science Council.

Pete Nowak read over the handout that he prepared on the proposed process for criteria and processes for nomination. People would first refer to the criteria and nominate people through the Co-Chairs. He said the Co-Chairs can put those nominees up for vote at the Science Council meeting.

Motion: George Kraft motioned that the criteria and processes proposed by Pete Nowak should be approved. The motion was seconded by John Magnuson and discussion began.

John Magnuson noted that they should add the criteria of geographic location of people around the state, as well as gender and institutional affiliation (USGS, DATCP, etc.). Dick

Lathrop that there should be balance in the people who are nominated so that there is diversity.

Pete Nowak made some edits to the proposal. Bill Walker noted two issues: (1) how does the process start and (2) what do "balance" and "diversity" mean (those are vague terms).

Lewis Gilbert noted that the mechanisms open nominations at any time, effectively not setting a cap on the number of members. Bill Walker noted that there is nothing compelling the nomination of members at different times. Lewis Gilbert noted that the way it is structured now makes sure that the Science Council regularly considers the composition of its membership and whether there are slots that need to be filled at different times.

John Magnuson noted that he thinks it would be a good idea to have an annual or semi-annual consideration of the membership to compare different candidates. Pete Nowak noted that getting the membership to be above 15 would require extra support. Lewis Gilbert suggested noting that the membership of the Science Council should be considered at least once a year. Pete and Lewis noted that setting a concrete number seems like a bad idea. Pete Nowak said that he thinks there should be specific times of the year in which the composition of the membership should be considered. John Magnuson asked whether there should be specific criteria and processes specified for when nominees are brought to the table. He would like the discussion to be, "What areas do we need to go into?" Pete Nowak said that the leadership of the Co-Chairs should give guidance to recommend how many people should be accepted and what the makeup of the group should be.

Lewis Gilbert suggested conducting the evaluation annually around the time of the production of the annual report to have the annual membership review period. Dick Lathrop agreed with that proposal and noted that it would also be a good opportunity for Co-Chairs to contact members who have not been able to attend many meetings to figure out whether they will be able to be active members of the Science Council. John Magnuson asked whether or not there should be regular rotation of members and/or Co-Chairs. Pete Nowak noted that it is Outreach's job to call to attention any people on the Science Council who are not able to attend the Science Council meetings and pose possible replacements.

Lewis Gilbert noted that the motion should be visited first and then revisit the idea of terms and rollover.

Action Item: Pete Nowak will forward a new draft of the proposal for the nomination of new members to the Science Council.

Dick Lathrop noted that the Co-Chairs would review the applications but allow the Science Council to review and finally vote. John Magnuson noted that reviews in the future should be conducted in a closed session.

Pete Nowak read over his edits to the proposal. Members discussed whether or not it would be best to have the Co-Chairs trim the list of the best possible candidates or if it would be best to just bring the full list. Pete Nowak noted that the Co-Chairs should "vet" the list to eliminate members who would have no chance of being voted onto the Science

Council. Basically saying that the Co-Chairs would err on the side of bringing more names to the Science Council. Ken Potter noted that all the possible names should be mentioned at the table to give due respect to the people who nominated the people. Dick Lathrop said that it may be best to just bring the whole list. John Magnuson said that the Co-Chairs could bring the list with their recommendations, rather than vetting them per se. This process would then open up the process for debates.

The motion was called to question and was approved unanimously.

[2:00] 5 min break

Advisory Committee Invitee

[2:05] Dick Lathrop opened the floor to suggestions on who to bring to the meeting and how to nominate them.

Steve Pomplun said that Agriculture was a group in high demand, as were economics, land use, and tourism. He would like the group to decide whom should be invited to the April meeting. He thinks it is clear for some sectors whom should be invited, but it is less clear for others. Pete Nowak said that he has met with Gary Radloff to talk about important representatives for possibilities of members to take control of the Agriculture Working Group.

John Magnuson noted that having members from the Advisory Committee attend the Science Council meeting is an important step. He thinks there may be some usefulness in bringing someone from the Advisory Committee meeting as the Agriculture Working Group is being formed. Pete Nowak noted that he wants input from the Science Council, but he may not need additional input from the Advisory Committee. John Magnuson said that maybe it would be useful to have people to come in from tourism, land use, or other sectors.

Pete Nowak said that there are many things that the Science Council could focus on, but he is concerned with economic and commerce impacts. He said that ultimately people were concerned with economic impacts of the state. John Magnuson noted that he would like to insert an economic perspective into the working groups. He wonders if it would be best to have an economics working group or to have people enter into the different working groups.

Bud Harris noted that there is no social scientist on the Green Bay Working Group, and he knows there are regional differences in the way commerce works in different areas and sectors of the state.

Chris Kucharik said that he would like a chance to talk more with Pete Nowak and their other colleagues before involving many other people.

John Magnuson noted that he put the agenda item on the agenda because he was very interested in what was happening at the Advisory Committee meeting and would like other Science Council members to interact with other stakeholders because it was very

informative. He sees it as important to have a listening session and for people to hear what people in these areas are thinking about.

Bud Harris said that he thinks that cross fertilization is important, and he noted that it has reshaped the thinking of the Science Council and that it should. Bud Harris said that he expects that there would be substance in the meeting to begin with, so that we should be ready. Chris Kucharik noted that the Science Council should bring a presentation of the issues to incite the discussion.

Bill Walker thinks that it will be interesting to bring people in to hear about their interest groups and their concerns. He and others noted that there is not strong understanding of climate change on the Advisory Committee, but the members are good at talking about their groups and their interests.

Dick Lathrop asked the other members of the Science Council how the people of the Advisory Committee should be engaged. Steve Pomplun said that he would like members of the Science Council to make presentations to their organizations. He would also like to bring in people from the Advisory Committee here to the Science Council. He would like the Science Council to ask them, "What do you need to know?" That way they could figure out what issues are important to them and how they can be helped.

Pete Nowak noted that through his experience with the Wisconsin Buffer Initiative is that the scientists and the citizen working groups had difficulty talking about the issues that were involved. Citizens had to learn that science takes time. Scientists had to learn that the models and methods that they were using were not taking into account local interests, so they had to incorporate those priorities. He hopes that the Science Council will attend the Advisory Committee meetings and that Advisory Committee members will attend Science Council meetings and start to interact more with members. He thinks that the Advisory Committee will need more time to establish its identity more and better understand the issues. He thinks the Science Council should attend the next Advisory Committee meeting on September 24 and wait to ask Advisory Committee members to attend afterwards.

Action Item: Members should pose suggestions to bring in Advisory Committee members to the next meeting, but unless they are posed, people will not actively seek them out.

John Magnuson posed that people should come to the meeting and that there should be a committee to work on a strategy for involving members in the future.

Website Communications

Kevin Gibbons described the progress of development of the website. He and Alison Coulson have been gathering content and photos for posting on the web and asked for more from the working groups. The only groups that have not submitted content are Coastal Communities, Green Bay, Human Health, and Climate. The Climate Working Group and the Operations and Outreach Unit had set a date to meet later in the week to discuss how their page should look.

Bud Harris noted that he would need edits made to content that he could send out. Kevin Gibbons and Steve Pomplun said that there would be no problem with that.

Action Item: Kevin Gibbons will set up a closed access on the WICCI site to disperse documents and drafts internally.

Alison Coulson talked about the collaborative software that she, Avery Dorland, Karin Fassnacht, and Kevin Gibbons have been looking over that would let members work on draft documents and posts collaboratively.

David Liebl suggested that the login link should be small at the bottom of the page so that it is not large for everyone to see.

Presentation

Dick Lathrop reviewed the PowerPoint presentation that he worked on with Alison Coulson. He highlighted the images and discussed them in detail.

Steve Vavrus noted that the city of Milwaukee has a "Heat Wave Action Plan" and that would be a great cover slide.

John Magnuson posed to the Science Council that they should check whether the information that is being displayed is useful and accurate, such as whether the Karner Blue Butterfly is in danger of becoming extinct.

Jack Sullivan noted that the Coldwater Fisheries Working Group is going to have a meeting soon and will be able to come to the Science Council soon to report on progress.

John Magnuson posed that people should come to the meeting and that there should be a committee to work on a strategy for involving members in the future.

George Kraft asked members if they could forward him conceptual models of how climate, landscape, agriculture, and hydrology interact with one another.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Central Sands Hydrology

[3:05] Meeting adjourned.

UPCOMING MEETING DATES

- Monday, April 6
- Monday, May 4

APPENDIX

Meeting Agenda

- 12:00 | 1 – Welcome and Announcements
- 12:10 | 2 – Approval of Minutes from the February 9 Meeting
- 12:15 | 3 – Progress on Action Items from Previous Meeting
- **David Hart** will draft a Coastal Hazards Working Group Charter and e-mail it to the Science Council before the next meeting.
 - **Kevin Gibbons** will send out working group contact information to the Science Council.
 - **All working groups** will submit charters to Dick Lathrop, John Magnuson, and Kevin Gibbons.
 - **Dick Lathrop** Science Council members and working groups will forward photos and other images to Dick Lathrop and Alison Coulson so that they can create a “roadshow” PowerPoint presentation.
 - **Kevin Gibbons** will get Lewis Gilbert’s and Dan Vimont’s presentations from the Advisory Committee and send them to the Science Council.
 - **Dick Lathrop, John Magnuson, and the Outreach and Operations Unit** will identify what information they would like from the working groups and request that information specifically.
 - **Operations and Outreach Unit** will research funding opportunities for WICCI as a whole and the working groups.
 - **Dan Vimont** will send a proposal to Lewis Gilbert to establish a pot of money that the Climate Working Group could use for data requests.
 - **Pete Nowak** will organize an investigative committee to consider an Agriculture Working Group involving Chris Kucharik, Bill Walker, and others.
 - **Steve Pomplun** will draft a note of appreciation to send to Sarah Shapiro-Hurley.
 - **Pete Nowak** will contact the Science Council asking for criteria towards developing criteria for nominating new Science Council members. They will compile the information that is gained from those communications.
 - **Pete Nowak** will contact the Science Council asking for criteria towards developing criteria for nominating new Science Council members. They will compile the information that is gained from those communications.
 - **Pete Nowak** will invite Mike, Steve, and Dave from CCR to the next Science Council Meeting.
- 12:25 | 4 – Updates from Working Groups

- 1:00 5 – Discussion of WICCI Seminar Series
- 1:20 6 – Discussion of Filling Science Council Vacancies. Discussion of the Membership of Science Council and the Inclusion of Underrepresented Expertise
 - What criteria need to be taken into account?
 - How should invitees be nominated and approved?
 - What considerations of the Science Council makeup need to be addressed?
- 1:55 7 – Short Break
- 2:00 8 – Discussion of Inviting Advisory Committee Members to present points of view and issues (Agriculture??). Perhaps one presentation area per Science Council meeting?
 - What issue are members interested in discussing?
 - Who should be invited?
 - How should that person be engaged in the meeting?
- 2:30 9 – Progress Report on Website and Communications
- 2:55 10 – Agenda Items for April 6 Science Council Meeting
- 3:00 11 – Adjourn