

Lakeshore Nature Preserve Committee

Thursday Nov. 1, 2012

10:30AM-12:00PM

304 South Hall

APPROVED MINUTES

Present:

Mike Amato, Rachel Bower, Gary Brown, Dave Gardner, Rhonda James, Kelly Ignatoski, Donna Paulnock, Ken Raffa (CHAIR IN BILL BARKER'S ABSENCE), Phil Townsend

Also Present:

Cathie Bruner (Preserve), Ann Burgess (Friends), Glenda Denniston (Friends), Kennedy Gilchrist (Friends), Adam Gundlach (Preserve), Galen Hasler (Friends), John Magnuson (Friends), Bryn Scriver (Preserve)

Minutes:

The minutes from the Oct. 4, 2012 meeting were approved with the following changes:

- Be more clear about the following sentence, "Andrea Coffin will go in and clean it up".
- Spell out NSF and LTER.
- Margaret Palmer is an upcoming speaker at the Wisconsin Ecology 16th Annual Spring Symposium not someone associated with the Long Term Ecological Research program.
- The head of the Long Term Ecological Research program at UW-Madison is Emily Stanley and the data and information manager is Corinna Gries.
- Change "study Johnny Uelmen" to "student Johnny Uelmen"
- Remove Gary Brown's name from discussion of work plan and budgeting process since he was not present at meeting

Public comment:

None

Preserve Budget/Workplan status report (Gary Brown)

The draft budget and workplan will be presented to the Preserve Committee at the Dec. meeting and at the Jan. 29 Stakeholder meeting. The Committee will vote on the budget and workplan at the Feb. meeting. This is the same process as the last couple of years.

The deadline for project proposals is today. We have received 4 project proposals: 1) continued support for the Prairie Partners Interns next summer from the Friends of the Preserve, 2) Harriet Riley memorial funds to purchase and plant wildflowers in the Preserve also from the Friends of the Preserve, 3) funds from Tom and Kathy Brock to clear trails in Eagle Heights Woods, and 4)

continued work to remove invasive plants from the second tree island adjacent to F.H. King student farm.

Status report on Eagle Heights Woods plan (Rhonda James)

The draft is nearly complete. The Planning and Implementation subcommittee of the Preserve Committee reviewed and discussed the draft plan yesterday. It should be ready for committee review by Dec. or Jan. The plan includes site inventory and analysis, opportunities, and potential goals to support the Preserve mission and the direction we want the vegetation to go. The vision set out in the Master Plan is for the area to be southern dry mesic forest; we've narrowed this down to what we think is possible: the north slope is more mesic, the mounds at the top of the hill and the gentle slope towards the south could be opened up to get more native groundlayer and to allow the oaks to regenerate, and on the west and east slopes we need to keep invasive plant species at bay.

Continue discussion on handling requests to use the Preserve for teaching, research, and outreach (Cathie Bruner for Bill Barker)

Increases in requests for academic use and support in the Preserve affect staff and our limited resources. We run a volunteer program that can give students hands on experience in the field but we are busy managing the "facility" and cannot meet the increased demand from for example, the GreenHouse and Bradley Residential Learning Community for more learning opportunities. Add to that the addition of Dejope Hall and increased interest from F.H. King Student Farm and the new Environmental Sciences degree program. We would like to explore how we can move forward with educational opportunities with limited resources.

One specific request came from Ron Harris a Bradley Residential Learning Community Fellow who would like to have a curriculum module on the Preserve that he could use in his Bradley Roundtable but that could also be used by other Housing programs. Since Preserve staff does not have the time to create curriculum, Bruner has tried to connect Harris with Lynn Keller from the Center for Culture, History and Environment (CHE) who may have the resources (grad students) to do this.

Bruner sees the staff as having two roles in the area of educational and research use of the Preserve:

- 1) identify areas that meet the needs for research, and
- 2) assure that whatever the activity is, that it's compatible with overall management objectives

Preserve staff does not have the resources to regularly lead tours, or create curriculum for faculty or staff.

Discussion:

- 1) Funding to create curriculum, lead tours, etc.

- a. Rachel Bower suggested that we look at the: Course, Curriculum, and Laboratory Improvement (CCLI), Transforming Undergraduate Education, and Advanced Technological Education (ATE) programs for resources. She could help, but not lead, grant writing activities.
 - b. National Science Foundation based proposal? Who can write? Maybe we could partner with Edgewood College on this; They have curriculum developed around Lake Wingra.
 - c. All NSF grants have a requirement to describe the broader impacts of the work. If we build a strong undergraduate educational component into this it could be a prize proposal that gets funded.
 - d. Could we get volunteers, grad or undergrad students to give tours?
- 2) A more organized way to do research in the Preserve—contacts, permitting, review process. What is the permitting process?
- a. There is a permit process. Currently Bruner looks over permit requests and if she has questions she takes them to experts on campus. An example is a request from F.H. King to grow edible mushrooms in the Preserve; Bruner had questions and took the proposal to Glen Stanosz who said he would not recommend it because it could introduce unwanted fungi into the environment.
 - b. Bruner noted that the Preserve is working on a new ‘research’ landing page for its website.
 - c. Should we have researchers bring their permit proposals to the committee? Would this be helpful or would it be an unnecessary hurdle?
 - d. Researchers wouldn’t have to come to a Preserve Committee meeting but their proposal should go through a review process if the research would change or subtract something from the Preserve. Once the research is under way we can ask the researcher to come present at the Preserve Committee meeting.
- 3) What are the needs of educators and researchers?
- a. Townsend said it sounds like people want tours that serve their needs. Faculty would need to guide how to put together the tour.
 - b. What would be the goal of tours? Are they for faculty and staff to learn about educational and research opportunities in the Preserve or are they for the public and students?
 - c. We need to let people know about the research and educational opportunities available in the Preserve; Make poster for the WI Ecology group symposium, the Culture, History, and Environment grad student symposium, and the Nelson Institute on opportunities available: capstone, tours, virtual tours, an award winning website.
 - d. Create a survey that we send out to faculty and staff?

- e. Invite faculty and staff who use the Preserve for a discussion to the next meeting?
- 4) How does the Arboretum handle research requests?
- a. Typically undergrads are not seeking out opportunities there because it is not as accessible.
 - b. Most grad students are brought in by faculty with research interests at the Arboretum.
 - c. Research permits are reviewed by the Arboretum Ecologist and the Research Director, Joy Zedler.
- 5) Do we need to create a new position in the Preserve to deal with research requests?
- a. Do we grow a professor on campus to be research director?
 - b. What about a grad student PA (although PAs are often project specific and focused on own agendas, also students turnover then you lose institutional memory).
 - c. Is it a subgroup from this Preserve Committee?

The following motion was made and seconded:

We will invite faculty/staff who have been identified as the major users of the Preserve for teaching (not research) for a 1 hour roundtable discussion where they can articulate their curricular needs, opportunities and possible limitations, and we can discuss funding sources and advertising teaching opportunities to an ecology audience.

Discussion:

What are the goals for this discussion? How to make it work for other faculty? How to make it work better for them? Get more clarification of their curriculum goals? We'll need a specific set of questions to ask these folks, and we'll need a bigger room.

The motion passed.

Adjournment

Submitted by Bryn Scriver