Mike, Mike, Forbes, Alan, Milo & Tom,

Ah, plot 14-89. I fear we may be looking at the tip of the proverbial iceberg. At the risk of alienating just about everyone, I think I shall describe this as I see it, as we do need to confront these issues some time. What I do here we will adopt for the CVS website, but we can always change it that proves important. There are two intertwined issues here: the NVC/NCNH types recognized and the assignment of plots to NVC types. In short, given the scientific rigor and published status of Wiser’s work, why are we not accepting either her community types or her assignment of plots to community types?

To start with the context of the email that got this going, Wiser classified 14-89 as “Calamagrostis cainii-Rhododendron carolinianum outcrop community” along with 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, & 86. All are from Mt. Le Conte, except 89 from Charlie’s Bunion on the Swain/Sevier line. On the NatureServe site this type is synonymized with 7278 = Saxifraga michauxii - Carex misera - Calamagrostis cainii Herbaceous Vegetation, a Le Conte endemic with probably one occurrence on the NC line (if we trust Wiser, which I do). Forbes assigned most of the above plots to 7279 (except 83=7877 and 89=3948), whereas I think they should all be assigned to 7278 as per Wiser’s earlier decision.

Looking more broadly at Wiser’s plots (see attached spreadsheet), there is remarkably little correspondence between Wiser’s types and where they are currently assigned. I worry about this as Wiser put considerable effort into her work, it is published in a mainline journal (JVS 7:703-722), and no one has in any systematic fashion challenged it. By this logic, Susan’s work has priority and we should all accept it until someone demonstrates in a public way why this would not be desirable.....see attached doc