

MINUTES
PINEMAP Executive Committee Meeting
March 6, 2014

Meeting recording link: <http://ufifas.adobeconnect.com/p5hu0nqd1u0/>

Attendees

Jessica Ireland	Lisa Samuelson
Tim Martin	Steve McNulty
Mike Kane	Tom Byram
Martha Monroe	Rod Will
Gary Peter	Randy Wynne
Eric Taylor	Wendy-Lin Bartels
Ross Whetten	

PINEMAP SYNTHESIS ACTIVITIES (Tim Martin)

- Since the last annual meeting, we have been working on integrative activities that need to happen in order to achieve our outcomes and to do the kind of cross-region, cross-institution, cross-discipline work necessary.
- There are unique challenges associated with this kind of work:
 - Data availability
 - Authorship
 - Motivating collaboration and cooperation
 - Timing
- Data availability is going to be a challenge for the foreseeable future
 - Bottlenecks in collection, processing, error checking of field data
 - Complexities associated with regionwide simulation modeling
 - Just saying “get it all into TerraC quarterly” is probably not a viable solution
 - Need to address what the timing should be and how to in the end have data in TerraC, but in the interim, have data available internally
 - How do we prioritize what data gets submitted when?
 - Synthesis planning at annual meeting is central (during second day of annual meeting)
 - What is critical path for each outcome and sub-outcome?
 - How do we assure compliance once we set priorities?
 - Conversation may allow re-focusing on how best to achieve our long-term responsibility to archive project data
- Authorship in synthesis activities
 - Addressed in PINEMAP operating principles and guidelines (attribution of credit, fairness, foster environment of intellectual stimulation)
 - Discussions regarding authorship should occur early in the collaboration process.
 - When in doubt about whether to offer authorship, participants should err on the side of inclusion.
 - To avoid duplication of effort and enhance potential for collaboration, it is critical that anticipated analyses and publications be posted on the PINEMAP “Planned Analyses and Publications” spreadsheet on Intranet site.

- This spreadsheet is not being used, but is important. We are open to other methods for tracking this.
 - Graduate student projects: continued communication is key to ensure students get pubs they need without hindering progress of other synthesis activities—can't wait until graduate student pubs are complete to do synthesis activities, need to be open about what different levels are, timing, etc.
- Other synthesis issues:
 - How to motivate participants who are being pulled many ways?
 - How to assure there's something in this for everyone?
 - How to help everyone "keep their eye on the prize" of outcomes?
 - Allowing time: This is **Big Science**, we all need to be realistic about expectations and how fast things can be done.
- What's next: Discussion of best practices at annual meeting
- Input from EC: How best to address this at annual meeting:
 - Ross Whetten: An overview PowerPoint could be a kick off presentation followed by small group discussions focused on specific outcomes, think about ways to contribute to a specific integrative activity—specific datasets, specific outcomes. Easy to get lost in the big picture—individual students and researchers may not feel they have a stake unless they focus on something immediately relevant to them.
 - Rod Will: Get volunteers to discuss some of the actual cases that have cropped up; give concrete examples of issues we are dealing with, get input and advice of ways to handle issues. Use this as a jumping off point for further discussion
 - Tim: Good idea, we could give talk as a series of case studies, and then go into small groups.
 - Lisa would be happy to provide some examples.

2014 ANNUAL MEETING SCIENCE PRESENTATIONS (Tim Martin)

- First day (Wednesday), stakeholder engagement:
 - Morning:
 - Present survey results on science priorities
 - Feedback and validation
 - PINEMAP science talks focused on identified priorities
 - Poster overview session
 - Afternoon:
 - Present survey results on tech transfer preferences
 - Present tech transfer plans
 - Feedback
 - Stakeholder panel
- Preliminary outline for science presentations:
 - Climate scenarios and projection datasets: these are central to everything we are doing and are also state of the art
 - Management scenarios: central to assessing alternatives, need to run these by the folks who are actually planning and doing management

- Initial regional modeling runs comparing current and future climate: what kind of outputs, what they are telling us in regards to the future, strengths and weaknesses of models
 - Growth and yield
 - WaSSI
 - 3-PG
 - Timber supply
- PINEMAP tools
 - DSS
 - Seed deployment
 - Risk assessment
- The modeling runs will be a challenge. This is a more integrative effort; as we move forward, there needs to be more cross talk among people working on different model runs. This is a peek into the future of how things are going to have to work as PINEMAP moves forward—increasing communication is important
- The annual report and the annual meeting are serving as vehicles for moving us forward; pushing us to be integrative.
- We will be recording audio and PPT from these talks to use as modules for stakeholders and also for other PINEMAP activities.
- Martha: science coming out of PINEMAP on attitudes, perceptions, and how to talk about this stuff—could present on this also.

Jessica: administrative items: All year 4 subaward modification paperwork has been fully processed; thank you for your efforts in turning that paperwork around so quickly.

Tim: working my way through the annual report. This is a huge effort. Each article has been through technical and readability review. Once that process is through, will go back to authors. The report is moving along and is an impressive document that shows more synthesis than last year.

Next EC Meeting: Thursday, April 3, 2014, 9:30-10:30 a.m. EDT