

WICCI Science Council Meeting

Monday, May 4, 2009
DNR Science Operations Center
12:00 PM

ATTENDANCE

Members

- Dick Lathrop (Co-Chair)
- John Magnuson (Co-Chair)
- Sharon Dunwoody (arrived at 12:50)
- Bud Harris (via telephone)
- George Kraft
- Chris Kucharik
- John Kutzbach
- Philip Moy (via Live Meeting)
- Ken Potter
- Dan Vimont (arrived at 12:10)
- Bill Walker
- Darrell Zastrow (arrived at 12:10)

Staff and Guests

- Tim Asplund
- Tom Bernthal
- Alison Coulson
- Kevin Gibbons
- Jennifer Hauxwell
- Jim Hurley
- Pete Nowak
- Erin O'Brien
- Steve Pomplun
- David Webb

ABSENT MEMBERS

- Sandra McLellan
- Jonathan Patz

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

- Kevin Gibbons will send a specific e-mail with a link to the member resources page.
- Alison Coulson will send members the procedures and links necessary for uploading their presentations.
- John Magnuson will forward Erin O'Brien, Tom Bernthal, and the Science Council the article in *Nature* that analyzes the effects of climate change on wetland restoration and establishment.
- Pete Nowak will develop a draft of the process for vetting working group products.

MINUTES

[12:00] Meeting called to order by Dick Lathrop.

Introductions and Approval of Minutes

Everyone introduced themselves to the guests.

Dick Lathrop noted that there are a few changes to the minutes. He proposed that in the future, the Outreach and Operations Unit should submit the preliminary draft minutes to the chairs of the Science Council within two weeks after the meeting. The chairs would edit the minutes within a week and then the Outreach and Operations Unit would send the draft minutes out to the entire group to be approved by all Science Council members at the next meeting.

The minutes with revisions were passed unanimously.

Review of Action Items

Steve Pomplun and John Magnuson are working on the climate change fact sheet. He said that he will send out an e-mail to Science Council members asking them what questions are being asked at the presentations they have been giving.

Action Item: Kevin Gibbons will send a specific e-mail with a link to the member resources page.

Alison Coulson said that she is in the process of compiling the presentations that people have been giving.

Action Item: Alison Coulson will send members the procedures and links necessary for uploading their presentations.

Addressing Water Resources and Wetlands

Erin O'Brien discussed the work of the Wisconsin Wetlands Association, a nonprofit organizations that focuses on science and advocacy for Wisconsin's wetlands.

Tom Bernthal discussed the mapping of current and former wetlands that could potentially be restored towards identifying where restoration work and funding should be allocated. They have data from different parts of the state and are working on decision support tools.

John Magnuson asked whether their organizations have taken historical data on the wetlands and if they have analyzed their data in regards to climate. Both Erin O'Brien and Tom Bernthal said that they have not been able to gather that data. John Magnuson said that there is an article in *Nature* that contains wetland analyses in the Dakota's and Minnesota.

Action Item: John Magnuson will forward Erin O'Brien, Tom Bernthal, and the Science Council the article in Nature that analyzes the effects of climate change on wetland restoration and establishment.

Jim Hurley introduced himself and discussed the coverage of WICCI's current water-related working groups and how a Water Resources Working Group could pull together information as a facilitation and synthesis group, rather than focusing on a specific issue like stormwater or wetlands, because water is such a broad issue. The group could identify potential research and gaps, find potential grants, supply maps or data, etc.

Tim Asplund said that the group could also serve to assess the research needs of WICCI. He explained that the Water Resources Institute receives federal funding and works closely with USGS. He also sees it as bringing the work of other groups together and identifying gaps.

Ken Potter noted that he liked Tim Asplund's and Jim Hurley's ideas and that hydrology is a local issue. He said that he thinks it would be a good idea to get people from around the state to identify all the landscapes of interest, consider how the climate may change, and identify which areas are the best candidates for the mapping of watersheds and allocation of resources.

Dick Lathrop asked how the Wetlands Working Group would fit in. Should it be under the Water Resources Working Group? Erin O'Brien said that she would like to see how the climate is changing and to understand how the climate changes will affect wetland resilience.

George Kraft noted that trying to fit many people under the umbrella of "water" may be a bad idea because it is such a broad topic. He said that UW-Extension and other groups have tried to do that in the past but with little success.

John Magnuson said that he does not think that the Water Resources Working Group should serve a coordinating role because the topics do not seem to fit well under a hierarchy. He thinks that the Water Resources Working Group could serve the purpose of pulling together what we know and presenting that to others.

Darrell Zastrow said he thinks that working groups should begin if there is interest and momentum in starting new groups but that we should also consider what is administratively feasible to manage. Pete Nowak said that he thinks that groups should be able to start when enough people are willing to take on a new group.

Bud Harris said that he advocates for a geographic focus. He said that a lot of data is being gathered on the Green Bay basin and noted that the mapping of the wetland is what is missing to put into the SWAT model, and he encourages the group to focus on specific places such as Green Bay. Ken Potter suggested that the group be called a Hydrologic Process group that would focus on surface to groundwater modeling, and the other specific topic groups could send that group data and interact with them.

Jim Hurley said that people from USGS are very interested in working with WICCI. Tim Asplund said that many people are considering projects that analyze entire water basins to take the whole watershed into account when developing management designs. He noted that funding from different agencies would be more likely to fund such an approach. He

said that the Water Resources or Hydrologic Process Working Group could identify where these sites could be.

George Kraft said that he thinks that since there are champions of the working group that they should be encouraged to start the group. He said that there are two different models for the Water Resources and Hydrologic Process Working Groups. There is the potential to interact with other groups and identify gaps or to focus on the specific issues that Ken Potter mentioned.

John Magnuson said that he thinks that the people who are proposing the working groups should decide what kind of group that they would like to champion.

Chris Kucharik noted that while he likes the ideas that are being put forth, the role that is being proposed for the group does not seem to fit the description of a working group. Dan Vimont agreed and said that a facilitation group seems to serve the facilitation purpose that the Science Council is supposed to serve. Ken Potter agreed and reiterated that a Hydrologic Process Working Group would address specific topics and take advantage of opportunities to research low-hanging fruit because many working groups need information on hydrologic processes.

Dick Lathrop and Pete Nowak discussed the charters of the working groups and said that the people at the table should look at those to see how working groups are developing.

Dan Vimont and Chris Kucharik noted that they agree with Ken Potter that there is a need for a Hydrologic Process Working Group, but the proposed working group is different from that need. Jim Hurley and Tim Asplund agreed and said that this working group could come out of the Water Resources gap analysis.

Bill Walker said that there are three working groups being proposed. In the past, working groups have addressed topics and areas that are vulnerable to climate change. He said that he likes that one group being proposed is stressing resiliency, and another is trying to serve a facilitation role. He said that he believes that these are novel ideas and should be encouraged.

The Science Council encouraged the guests to develop working group charters for consideration.

Science Council Vetting of Working Group Products

Pete Nowak and Steve Pomplun opened the floor for discussion of how to review products from the working groups.

Sharon Dunwoody said that they could model the system of the National Academy of Sciences and present committee work to outside parties.

John Magnuson said that there are different products that should be vetted. Charters, white papers, and working papers should be vetted differently and should probably not be reviewed by the scientific community. He said that there could be internal review of different products.

The working paper from the Green Bay Working Group was considered as an example. The Science Council discussed it during a meeting. Dan Vimont noted that it may be best to have papers posted online and for people to submit comments there. Ken Potter said that a peer review process is important for these products and white papers.

Pete Nowak summarized the ideas presented, noting that the ability of WICCI members to post papers online is important. He said that outreach products are also important to answer questions of people around the state who do not know if the climate is changing and question the validity of the science. John Kutzbach said that the Science Council could ask 2-3 people who could review papers that are relevant to their backgrounds and expertise.

John Magnuson says that the Science Council should not serve the role as a formal reviewer of research papers, and that these papers should go through the peer-review process through journals.

Darrell Zastrow said that working groups and scientists who bring forward papers could propose potential reviewers who could take part in the review process. David Webb agreed and said that the products of these groups are meant to change management and be disseminated and implemented. He said that other people in the DNR have agreed and said that they will help disseminate the products of the group.

Bill Walker said that as soon as you put the WICCI name on the paper, the name represents an endorsement and that there should be a review process so that these products reflect the position of WICCI and do not communicate the wrong message. Steve Pomplun agreed and said that there should be media campaigns behind products WICCI being released.

Members differentiated products that are academic articles and white papers, the latter may be endorsed, and the former is submitted for traditional peer review. Dan Vimont and others noted that there should be a formal review process outlined.

Action Item: Pete Nowak will develop a draft of the process for vetting working group products.

Process and Criteria for Rotating Co-Chairs

Pete Nowak presented the document that outlines the proposed by laws of WICCI, including the processes for selecting and rotating co-chairs, as well as criteria and expectations of members. Members discussed proposed changes to the language.

The discussion focused on the criteria for selecting co-chairs and getting representation from agencies and organizations involved. Instead of leaving the language vague, participants agreed unanimously that the Science Council Co-Chairs would be drawn specifically from DNR and the UW-System with the caveat that this specification could be changed in the future if Science Council members so choose.

Here are highlights of the changes that they accepted regarding the co-chair positions:

- 1) The WICCI Science Council shall be lead by two co-chairs who have an equal voice in all matters relating to WICCI.
- 2) These co-chairs shall be selected from active members of the WICCI Science Council.
- 3) Each co-chair may serve no more than two consecutive terms of three years each. At the end of a second term, a co-chair may continue to serve on the Science Council, and would be eligible to serve as co-chair again after three years if still a member of the Science Council.
- 4) The three-year terms of the co-chairs shall be staggered with approximately 18 months overlap in their respective terms to the extent feasible. Procedures for voting for a co-chair nominee or nominees will be determined each time by the Science Council as appropriate.

Updates from Working Groups

Central Sands

George Kraft disseminated information about the Central Sands Hydrology Working Group. He discussed the unique nature of the landscape hydrology of the Central Sands region and said that the working group would address how this would be affected by climate change.

John Magnuson noted that the presence of many high-capacity wells near the headwaters of the river will have serious impacts on the coldwater trout streams. Dan Vimont noted that there may be a 20-30% increase in winter precipitation, but he does not know how that may affect groundwater.

Climate

Dan Vimont said that the Climate Working Group has been attending many meetings, including the Wildlife Working Group. These meetings have been productive. He said that these requests have consumed a lot of their time and asked that people interested in people from the Climate Working Group coming to speak then they should go through Pete Nowak in the Outreach and Operations Unit.

Dan Vimont noted that the downscaling of the models is done, and they are now working on analysis, including extreme events. He noted that they are not comfortable with making these data completely public because of how people may misuse them.

John Magnuson noted that in addition to asking each working group to list the top five variables that are most important to them that they should also request access to climate data from the Climate Working Group. Dan Vimont said that it would be best for the climate scientists to be in communication with the working groups so that they could present the data to them in an organized manner.

Dan Vimont said that he could possibly present the data on the June 8 Science Council meeting.

Future Agenda Items

- Climate Working Group presentation of recent findings

[2:19] Short break before the meeting went into executive session to discuss and vote on the nominations of new Science Council members.

Science Council Nominations

During the executive session Science Council members nominated seven new members:

- 1) Lewis Gilbert
- 2) Signe Holtz
- 3) Barry Johnson
- 4) Jim LaGro
- 5) Pat Leavenworth
- 6) David Liebl
- 7) Kristen Malecki

UPCOMING MEETING DATES

- Monday, June 8
- Monday, July 20

APPENDIX

Meeting Agenda – May 4, 2009

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 12:00 | 1 – Welcome and Announcements |
| 12:05 | 2 – Approval of Minutes from the April 6 Meeting |
| 12:10 | 3 – Progress on Action Items from Previous Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Steve Pomplun will draft a fact sheet on the changing climate to discuss with John Magnuson.• John Maguson and Pete Nowak will send a memo to all working group chairs asking them to send out a ranked list of climate variables important to their groups to the climate working group.• Alison Coulson will talk with Tim Asplund about involving social scientists into the Water Resources Working Group.• Pete Nowak will work on a draft of the Advisory Committee agenda and will prepare to discuss the content of the meeting on May 4.• Kevin Gibbons will send out the link to the member resources page to Science Council members and working group chairs.• Alison Coulson will send an e-mail to the Science Council and working group chairs requesting that they send information about talks they have given and will be giving, as well as requesting copies of their presentations.• Bud Harris will work with Pete Nowak and Steve Pomplun to e-mail the Climate Working Group to request that one of the members attend the conference the Green Bay Working Group has been planning for the summer.• Kevin Gibbons will forward Philip Moy the copies of other working group charters.• Pete Nowak will work on and distribute a new draft of the Policy for Election of WICCI Co-Chairs.• Kevin Gibbons will send out an online calendar poll to Science Council members to schedule two meetings for the summer.• Pete Nowak will draft language that will discuss how Science Council members can rotate in and out and minimum attendance requirements can be established. |
| 12:20 | 4 – Discussion on Forming Working Group(s) Covering Water Resources and Wetlands |
| 1:10 | 5 – Discussion of How the Science Council Should Vet Products from the Working Groups |
| 1:25 | 6 – Approval of the Wording for the Process for the Rotation of Chairs and Discussion of Membership Terms |
| 1:50 | 7 – Updates from Working Groups |
| 2:00 | 8 – Request for Agenda Items for June 8 Meeting |
| 2:05 | 9 – Break |
| 2:15 | 10 – Closed Session on Vetting Nominations for Science Council Membership |
| 3:00 | 11 – Adjourn |