National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Natural Resource Program Center
Fort Collins, Colorado

Weather and Climate Inventory National Park Service Mid-Atlantic Network

Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/MIDN/NRTR—2006/013

ON THE COVER
Shenandoah National Park
Photograph copyrighted by the National Park Service

Weather and Climate Inventory
National Park Service
Mid-Atlantic Network

Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/MIDN/NRTR—2006/013
WRCC Report 2006-12

Christopher A. Davey, Kelly T. Redmond, and David B. Simeral
Western Regional Climate Center
Desert Research Institute
2215 Raggio Parkway
Reno, Nevada 89512-1095

December 2006

U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Natural Resource Program Center
Fort Collins, Colorado

The Natural Resource Publication series addresses natural resource topics that are of interest and applicability to a broad readership in the National Park Service and to others in the management of natural resources, including the scientific community, the public, and the National Park Service conservation and environmental constituencies. Manuscripts are peer-reviewed to ensure that the information is scientifically credible, technically accurate, appropriately written for the intended audience, and designed and published in a professional manner.

The Natural Resources Technical Reports series is used to disseminate the peer-reviewed results of scientific studies in the physical, biological, and social sciences for both the advancement of science and the achievement of the National Park Service mission. The reports provide contributors with a forum for displaying comprehensive data that are often deleted from journals because of page limitations. Current examples of such reports include the results of research that address natural resource management issues; natural resource inventory and monitoring activities; resource assessment reports; scientific literature reviews; and peer-reviewed proceedings of technical workshops, conferences, or symposia.

Printed copies of reports in these series may be produced in a limited quantity and they are only available as long as the supply lasts. This report is also available from the Natural Resource Publications Management website (http://www.nature.nps.gov/publications/NRPM) on the Internet or by sending a request to the address on the back cover.

Please cite this publication as follows:

Davey, C. A., K. T. Redmond, and D. B. Simeral. 2006. Weather and Climate Inventory, National Park Service, Mid-Atlantic Network. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/MIDN/NRTR—2006/013. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

NPS/MIDN/NRTR—2006/013, December 2006

Contents

Page

Contents (continued)

Page

Figures

Tables

Appendixes

Acronyms

AASC	American Association of State Climatologists
ACIS	Applied Climate Information System
APCO	Appomattox Court House National Historical Park
ASOS	Automated Surface Observing System
AWOS	Automated Weather Observing System
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BOWA	Booker T. Washington National Monument
CASTNet	Clean Air Status and Trends Network
COOP	Cooperative Observer Program
CRN	Climate Reference Network
CWOP	Citizen Weather Observer Program
DFIR	Double-Fence Intercomparison Reference
DST	daylight savings time
EISE	Eisenhower National Historic Site
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standards
FRSP	Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park
GETT	Gettysburg National Military Park
GMT	Greenwich Mean Time
GOES	Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite
GPMP	NPS Gaseous Pollutant Monitoring Program
GPS	Global Positioning System
HOFU	Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site
I&M	NPS Inventory and Monitoring Program
LST	local standard time
MIDN	Mid-Atlantic Inventory and Monitoring Network
NADP	National Atmospheric Deposition Program
NCDC	National Climatic Data Center
NetCDF	Network Common Data Form
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NWS	National Weather Service
PETE	Petersburg National Battlefield
PRISM	Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model
RAWS	Remote Automated Weather Station network
RCC	regional climate center
RICH	Richmond National Battlefield Park
SAO	Surface Airways Observation network
Surfrad	Surface Radiation Budget network
SHEN	Shenandoah National Park
SNOTEL	Snowfall Telemetry network
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture

USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UTC	Coordinated Universal Time
VAFO	Valley Forge National Historical Park
WBAN	Weather Bureau Army Navy
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WRCC	Western Regional Climate Center
WX4U	Weather For You network

Executive Summary

Climate is a dominant factor driving the physical and ecologic processes affecting the Mid-Atlantic Inventory and Monitoring Network (MIDN). Climate variations are responsible for short- and long-term changes in ecosystem fluxes of energy and matter and have profound effects on underlying geomorphic and biogeochemical processes. Individual storm events do occasionally impact and alter the structure of plant and animal communities in the MIDN. Future climate changes will likely cause migrations of plant and animal communities both northward and to higher elevations. Superimposed on this is a long history of human use in the region, with accompanying land-use patterns that have fragmented the original MIDN landscape of wetlands and upland forests and will influence the ability of the plant and animal communities of the MIDN to adapt to climate changes. Because of its influence on the ecology of MIDN park units and the surrounding areas, climate was identified as a high-priority vital sign for MIDN and is one of the 12 basic inventories to be completed for all National Park Service (NPS) Inventory and Monitoring Program (I&M) networks.

This project was initiated to inventory past and present climate monitoring efforts. In this report, we provide the following information:

- Overview of broad-scale climatic factors and zones important to MIDN park units.
- Inventory of weather and climate station locations in and near MIDN park units relevant to the NPS I&M Program.
- Results of an inventory of metadata on each weather station, including affiliations for weather-monitoring networks, types of measurements recorded at these stations, and information about the actual measurements (length of record, etc.).
- Initial evaluation of the adequacy of coverage for existing weather stations and recommendations for improvements in monitoring weather and climate.

The MIDN climate is influenced by the Appalachian Mountains to the north and west, and the Atlantic Ocean to the south and east. Mean annual precipitation varies from just over 1000 mm for lower-elevation parks to over 1300 mm in the higher elevations of Shenandoah National Park (SHEN). Precipitation is distributed fairly evenly through the year, but has a slight summertime maximum particularly in southern MIDN park units. Mean annual temperatures range from below 10°C in the Pennsylvania park units to almost 15°C in the park units in southern Virginia. Precipitation appears to have increased across the MIDN over the last century, while warming trends in temperature are less evident.

Through a search of national databases and inquiries to NPS staff, we have identified 12 weather and climate stations within MIDN park units. These include two stations in Gettysburg National Military Park (GETT), nine stations in SHEN, and one station in Valley Forge National Historical Park (VAFO). Most MIDN park units have no weather/climate stations within their boundaries and must therefore rely on outside sources of weather/climate data. We identified any of these outside sources that were located within 20 km of MIDN park units. Most of the weather and climate stations identified for MIDN park units had metadata and data records that are sufficiently complete and satisfactory in quality.

Station coverage for the park units in the MIDN generally appears to fall into one of two categories. Park units located in or near urban settings generally have satisfactory coverage of weather and climate stations, including a mixture of both long-term climate stations and automated stations. On the other hand, at park units in more rural settings, station coverage is not satisfactory, with relatively few identified weather and climate stations including few if any automated weather stations or long-term climate stations.

Although various manual and automated weather and climate stations are situated around SHEN, the only near-real-time weather observations identified in this report for SHEN are at the Big Meadows visitor center. Near-real-time observations are not currently available in either the northern or southern portions of SHEN. Airport stations near the southern end of SHEN do provide near-real-time weather data, although they are located at much lower elevations and thus may not be representative of SHEN under all conditions. The current lack of automated weather data in SHEN may soon be remedied, however, with the installation of two Remote Automated Weather Stations (RAWS) during the next year or two. One of these stations will be at the SHEN park headquarters office east of Luray, while the other will be at Sawmill Ridge, just north of the southern entrance of SHEN.

Reliable long-term climate records are lacking for several MIDN park units. This finding is not surprising for the more rural park units we identified in this category, including Appomattox Court House National Historical Park (APCO) and Booker T. Washington National Monument (BOWA). However, it is unexpected that some MIDN park units located closer to urban areas, such as Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site (HOFU) and Valley Forge National Historical Park (VAFO) also lack reliable long-term climate records. Two of the MIDN park units, including SHEN and Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park (FRSP), had long-term climate stations which have become inactive only in the last few years. In SHEN, the station “Big Meadows” was a National Weather Service (NWS) Cooperative Observer Program (COOP) station that operated from 1935-2003. The COOP station “Fredericksburg N P” operated between 1893 and 1997 within FRSP. The loss of such stations is unfortunate and highlights the need to support the continued operation of any currently-active long-term climate stations.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported and completed under Task Agreement H8R07010001, with the Great Basin Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit. We would like to acknowledge very helpful assistance from various National Park Service personnel associated with the Mid-Atlantic Inventory and Monitoring Network. Particular thanks are extended to Jim Comiskey. We also thank John Gross, Margaret Beer, Grant Kelly, Greg McCurdy, and Heather Angeloff for all their help. Portions of the work were supported by the NOAA Western Regional Climate Center.

1.0. Introduction

Weather and climate are key drivers in ecosystem structure and function. Global- and regional-scale climate variations will have a tremendous impact on natural systems (Chapin et al. 1996; Schlesinger 1997; Jacobson et al. 2000; Bonan 2002). Long-term patterns in temperature and precipitation provide first-order constraints on potential ecosystem structure and function. Secondary constraints are realized from the intensity and duration of individual weather events and, additionally, from seasonality and inter-annual climate variability. These constraints influence the fundamental properties of ecologic systems, such as soil–water relationships, plant–soil processes, and nutrient cycling, as well as disturbance rates and intensity. These properties, in turn, influence the life-history strategies supported by a climatic regime (Neilson 1987; Comiskey et al. 2005).

Given the importance of climate, it is one of 12 basic inventories to be completed by the National Park Service (NPS) Inventory and Monitoring Program (I&M) network (I&M 2006). As primary environmental drivers for the other vital signs, weather and climate patterns present various practical and management consequences and implications for the NPS (Oakley et al. 2003). Most park units observe weather and climate elements as part of their overall mission. The lands under NPS stewardship provide many excellent locations for monitoring climatic conditions.

It is essential that park units within the Mid-Atlantic Inventory and Monitoring Network (MIDN) have an effective climate-monitoring system in place to track climate changes and to aid in management decisions relating to these changes. The purpose of this report is to determine the current status of weather and climate monitoring within the MIDN (Table 1.1; Figure 1.1). In this report, we provide the following informational elements:

- Overview of broad-scale climatic factors and zones important to MIDN park units.
- Inventory of locations for all weather stations in and near MIDN park units that are relevant to the NPS I&M networks.
- Results of metadata inventory for each station, including weather-monitoring network affiliations, types of recorded measurements, and information about actual measurements (length of record, etc.).
- Initial evaluation of the adequacy of coverage for existing weather stations and recommendations for improvements in monitoring weather and climate.

The primary objectives for climate- and weather-monitoring in MIDN are as follows (Comiskey et al. 2005):

A. Track trends in climate of network parks.
B. Assess frequency and intensity of weather related natural disturbances that affect the network parks, including ice and snow storms, and tropical fronts.

1.1. Network Terminology

Before proceeding, it is important to stress that this report discusses the idea of “networks” in two different ways. Modifiers are used to distinguish between NPS I&M networks and weather/climate station networks. See Appendix A for a full definition of these terms.

Table 1.1. Park units in the MIDN.

Acronym	Name
APCO	Appomattox Court House National Historical Park
BOWA	Booker T. Washington National Monument
EISE	Eisenhower National Historic Site
FRSP	Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park
GETT	Gettysburg National Military Park
HOFU	Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site
PETE	Petersburg National Battlefield
RICH	Richmond National Battlefield Park
SHEN	Shenandoah National Park
VAFO	Valley Forge National Historical Park

1.1.1. Weather/Climate Station Networks

Most weather and climate measurements are made not from isolated stations but from stations that are part of a network operated in support of a particular mission. The limiting case is a network of one station, where measurements are made by an interested observer or group. Larger networks usually have more and better inventory data and station-tracking procedures. Some national weather/climate networks are associated with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), including the National Weather Service (NWS) Cooperative Observer Program (COOP). Other national networks include the interagency Remote Automated Weather Station network (RAWS) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture/Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA/NRCS) Snowfall Telemetry (SNOTEL) and snowcourse networks. Usually a single agency, but sometimes a consortium of interested parties, will jointly support a particular weather/climate network.

1.1.2. NPS I&M Networks

Within the NPS, the system for monitoring various attributes in the participating park units (about 270–280 in total) is divided into 32 NPS I&M networks. These networks are collections of park units grouped together around a common theme, typically geographical.

1.2. Weather versus Climate Definitions

It is also important to distinguish whether the primary use of a given station is for weather purposes or for climate purposes. Weather station networks are intended for near-real-time usage, where the precise circumstances of a set of measurements are typically less important. In these cases, changes in exposure or other attributes over time are not as critical. Climate networks, however, are intended for long-term tracking of atmospheric conditions. Siting and exposure are critical factors for climate networks, and it is vitally important that the observational circumstances remain essentially unchanged over the duration of the station record.



Figure 1.1. Map of the Mid-Atlantic Network.

Some climate networks can be considered hybrids of weather/climate networks. These hybrid climate networks can supply information on a short-term “weather” time scale and a longer-term “climate” time scale.

In this report, “weather” generally refers to current (or near-real-time) atmospheric conditions, while “climate” is defined as the complete ensemble of statistical descriptors for temporal and spatial properties of atmospheric behavior (see Appendix A). Climate and weather phenomena shade gradually into each other and are ultimately inseparable.

1.3. Purpose of Measurement

Climate inventory and monitoring climate activities should be based on a set of guiding fundamental principles. Any evaluation of weather/climate monitoring programs begins with asking the following question:

- What is the purpose of weather and climate measurements?

Evaluation of past, present, or planned weather/climate monitoring activities must be based on the answer to this question.

Weather and climate data and information constitute a prominent and widely requested component of the NPS I&M networks (I&M 2006). Within the context of the NPS, the following services constitute the main purposes for recording weather and climate observations:

- Provide measurements for real-time operational needs and early warnings of potential hazards (landslides, mudflows, washouts, fallen trees, plowing activities, fire conditions, aircraft and watercraft conditions, road conditions, rescue conditions, fog, restoration and remediation activities, etc.).
- Provide visitor education and aid interpretation of expected and actual conditions for visitors while they are in the park and for deciding if and when to visit the park.
- Establish engineering and design criteria for structures, roads, culverts, etc., for human comfort, safety, and economic needs.
- Consistently monitor climate over the long-term to detect changes in environmental drivers affecting ecosystems, including both gradual and sudden events.
- Provide retrospective data to understand *a posteriori* changes in flora and fauna.
- Document for posterity the physical conditions in and near the park units, including mean, extreme, and variable measurements (in time and space) for all applications.

The last three items in the preceding list are pertinent primarily to the NPS I&M networks; however, all items are important to NPS operations and management. Most of the needs in this list overlap heavily. It is often impractical to operate separate climate measuring systems that also cannot be used to meet ordinary weather needs, where there is greater emphasis on timeliness and reliability.

1.4. Design of Climate-Monitoring Programs

Determining the purposes for collecting measurements in a given weather/climate monitoring program will guide the process of identifying weather/climate stations suitable for the monitoring program. The context for making these decisions is provided in Chapter 2 where background on the MIDN climate is presented. However, this process is only one step in evaluating and designing a climate-monitoring program. The following steps must also be included:

- Define park and network-specific monitoring needs and objectives.
- Identify locations and data repositories of existing and historic stations.
- Acquire existing data when necessary or practical.
- Evaluate the quality of existing data.
- Evaluate the adequacy of coverage of existing stations.
- Develop a protocol for monitoring the weather and climate, including the following:
  - Standardized summaries and reports of weather/climate data.
  - Data management (quality assurance and quality control, archiving, data access, etc.).
- Develop and implement a plan for installing or modifying stations, as necessary.

Throughout the design process, there are various factors that require consideration in evaluating weather and climate measurements. Many of these factors have been summarized by Dr. Tom Karl, director of the NOAA National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), and widely distributed as the "Ten Principles for Climate Monitoring" (Karl et al. 1996a; NRC 2001). These principals are presented in Appendix B, and the guidelines are embodied in many of the comments made throughout this report. The most critical factors are presented here. In addition, an overview of requirements necessary to operate a climate network is provided in Appendix C, with further discussion in Appendix D.

1.4.1. Need for Consistency

A principal goal in climate monitoring is to detect and characterize slow and sudden changes in climate through time. This is of less concern for day-to-day weather changes, but it is of paramount importance for climate variability and change. There are many ways whereby changes in techniques for making measurements, changes in instruments or their exposures, or seemingly innocuous changes in site characteristics can lead to apparent changes in climate. Safeguards must be in place to avoid these false sources of temporal "climate" variability if we are to draw correct inferences about climate behavior over time from archived measurements.

For climate monitoring, consistency through time is vital, counting at least as important as absolute accuracy. Sensors record only what is occurring at the sensor—this is all they can detect. It is the responsibility of station or station network managers to ensure that observations are representative of the spatial and temporal climate scales that we wish to record.

1.4.2. Metadata

Changes in instruments, site characteristics, and observing methodologies can lead to apparent changes in climate through time. It is therefore vital to document all factors that can bear on the interpretation of climate measurements and to update the information repeatedly through time. This information ("metadata," data about data) has its own history and set of quality-control issues that parallel those of the actual data. There is no single standard for the content of climate metadata, but a simple rule suffices:

- Observers should record all information that could be needed in the future to interpret observations correctly without benefit of the observers' personal recollections.

Such documentation includes notes, drawings, site forms, and photos, which can be of inestimable value if taken in the correct manner. That stated, it is not always clear to the metadata provider *what is important* for posterity and *what will be important* in the future. It is almost impossible to "over document" a station. Station documentation is greatly underappreciated and is seldom thorough enough (especially for climate purposes). Insufficient attention to this issue often lowers the present and especially future value of otherwise useful data.

The convention followed throughout climatology is to refer to metadata as information about the measurement process, station circumstances, and data. The term "data" is reserved solely for the actual weather and climate records obtained from sensors.

1.4.3. Maintenance

Inattention to maintenance is the greatest source of failure in weather/climate stations and networks. Problems begin to occur soon after sites are deployed. A regular visit schedule must be implemented, where sites, settings (e.g., vegetation), sensors, communications, and data flow are checked routinely (once or twice a year at a minimum) and updated as necessary. Parts must be changed out for periodic recalibration or replacement. With adequate maintenance, the entire instrument suite should be replaced or completely refurbished about once every five to seven years.

Simple preventive maintenance is effective but requires much planning and skilled technical staff. Changes in technology and products require retraining and continual re-education. Travel, logistics, scheduling, and seasonal access restrictions consume major amounts of time and budget but are absolutely necessary. Without such attention, data gradually become less credible and then often are misused or not used at all.

1.4.4. Automated versus Manual Stations

Historic stations often have depended on manual observations and many continue to operate in this mode. Manual observations frequently produce excellent data sets. Sensors and data are simple and intuitive, well tested, and relatively cheap. Manual stations have much to offer in certain circumstances and can be a source of both primary and backup data. However, methodical consistency for manual measurements is a constant challenge, especially with a mobile work force. Operating manual stations takes time and needs to be done on a regular schedule, though sometimes the routine is welcome.

Nearly all newer stations are automated. Automated stations provide better time resolution, increased (though imperfect) reliability, greater capacity for data storage, and improved accessibility to large amounts of data. The purchase cost for automated stations is higher than for manual stations. A common expectation and serious misconception is that an automated station can be deployed and left to operate on its own. In reality, automation does not eliminate the need for people but rather changes the type of person that is needed. Skilled technical personnel are needed and must be readily available, especially if live communications exist and data gaps are not wanted. Site visits are needed at least annually and spare parts must be maintained. Typical annual costs for sensors and maintenance are $1500–2500 per station per year.

1.4.5. Communications

With manual stations, the observer is responsible for recording and transmitting station data. Data from automated stations, however, can be transmitted quickly for access by research and operations personnel, which is a highly preferable situation. A comparison of communication systems for automated and manual stations shows that automated stations generally require additional equipment, more power, higher transmission costs, attention to sources of disruption or garbling, and backup procedures (e.g. manual downloads from data loggers).

Automated stations are capable of functioning normally without communication and retaining many months of data. At such sites, however, alerts about station problems are not possible, large gaps can accrue when accessible stations quit, and the constituencies needed to support such stations are smaller and less vocal. Two-way communications permit full recovery from disruptions, ability to reprogram data loggers remotely, and better opportunities for diagnostics and troubleshooting. In virtually all cases, two-way communications are much preferred to all other communication methods. However, two-way communications require considerations of cost, signal access, transmission rates, interference, and methods for keeping sensor and communication power loops separate. Two-way communications are frequently impossible (no service) or impractical, expensive, or power consumptive. Two-way methods (cellular, land line, radio, Internet) require smaller up-front costs as compared to other methods of communication and have variable recurrent costs, starting at zero. Satellite links work everywhere (except when blocked by trees or cliffs) and are quite reliable but are one-way and relatively slow, allow no re-transmissions, and require high up-front costs ($3000–4000) but no recurrent costs. Communications technology is changing constantly and requires vigilant attention by maintenance personnel.

1.4.6. Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Quality control and quality assurance are issues at every step through the entire sequence of sensing, communication, storage, retrieval, and display of environmental data. Quality assurance is an umbrella concept that covers all data collection and processing (start-to-finish) and ensures that credible information is available to the end user. Quality control has a more limited scope and is defined by the International Standards Organization as “the operational techniques and activities that are used to satisfy quality requirements.” The central problem can be better appreciated if we approach quality control in the following way.

- Quality control is the evaluation, assessment, and rehabilitation of imperfect data by utilizing other imperfect data.

The quality of the data only decreases with time once the observation is made. The best and most effective quality control, therefore, consists in making high-quality measurements from the start and then successfully transmitting the measurements to an ingest process and storage site. Once the data are received from a monitoring station, a series of checks with increasing complexity can be applied, ranging from single-element checks (self-consistency) to multiple-element checks (inter-sensor consistency) to multiple-station/single-element checks (inter-station consistency). Suitable ancillary data (battery voltages, data ranges for all measurements, etc.) can prove extremely useful in diagnosing problems.

There is rarely a single technique in quality control procedures that will work satisfactorily for all situations. Quality-control procedures must be tailored to individual station circumstances, data access and storage methods, and climate regimes.

The fundamental issue in quality control centers on the tradeoff between falsely rejecting good data (Type I error) and falsely accepting bad data (Type II error). We cannot reduce the incidence of one type of error without increasing the incidence of the other type. In weather and climate data assessments, since good data are absolutely crucial for interpreting climate records properly, Type I errors are deemed far less desirable than Type II errors.

Not all observations are equal in importance. Quality-control procedures are likely to have the greatest difficulty evaluating the most extreme observations, where independent information usually must be sought and incorporated. Quality-control procedures involving more than one station usually involve a great deal of infrastructure with its own (imperfect) error-detection methods, which must be in place before a single value can be evaluated.

1.4.7. Standards

Although there is near-universal recognition of the value in systematic weather and climate measurements, these measurements will have little value unless they conform to accepted standards. There is not a single source for standards for collecting weather and climate data nor a single standard that meets all needs. Measurement standards have been developed by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO 1983; 2005), the American Association of State Climatologists (AASC 1985), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 1987), Finklin and Fischer (1990), the RAWS program (Bureau of Land Management [BLM] 1997), and the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (2004). Variations to these measurement standards also have been offered by instrument makers (e.g., Tanner 1990).

1.4.8. Who Makes the Measurements?

The lands under NPS stewardship provide many excellent locations to host the monitoring of climate by the NPS or other collaborators. These lands are largely protected from human development and other land changes that can impact observed climate records. Most park units historically have observed weather/climate elements as part of their overall mission. Many of these measurements come from station networks managed by other agencies, with observations taken or overseen by NPS personnel, in some cases, or by collaborators from the other agencies. National Park Service units that are small, lack sufficient resources, or lack sites presenting adequate exposure may benefit by utilizing weather/climate measurements collected from nearby stations.

2.0. Climate Background

Ecosystem processes in the MIDN are governed by climate characteristics (Comiskey et al. 2005). It is essential that the MIDN park units have an effective climate monitoring system to track climate changes and to aid in management decisions relating to these changes. These efforts are needed in order to support current vital sign monitoring activities within the park units of the MIDN. In order to do this, it is essential to understand the climate characteristics of the MIDN, as discussed in this chapter.

2.1. Climate and the MIDN Environment

The climate of the MIDN is characterized by hot, humid summers, and short, relatively cold winters (Cox and Moore 2005). Some variations to these overall patterns occur along both latitudinal and altitudinal gradients (Bryson and Hare 1974; Barnes 1991). The Blue Ridge tends to have the most extreme climate while the Coastal Plain is the most moderate. Precipitation is a common occurrence throughout much of the year. During the summer and early fall, the MIDN area is affected occasionally by tropical systems that can account for 10 to 40 percent of the total rainfall during this period (Hayden and Michaels 2005). These tropical systems can have adverse impacts on the region's ecosystems. In September 2003, Hurricane Isabel made landfall in North Carolina and tracked through Virginia with sustained winds of 55 to 80 km/h (30 to 50 mph) and 110 mm of rainfall (just over 4 inches; Beven and Cobb 2004). The MIDN parks most affected by the storm were PETE, RICH, FRSP, and SHEN, with numerous tree falls that impacted bird, amphibian, and reptile communities (Comiskey et al. 2005).

The MIDN has a long history of human use which spans millennia. Although Native Americans have influenced the MIDN environment for several millennia through a variety of agricultural practices (Delcourt et al. 1993; Delcourt and Delcourt 2000), human influences on and alterations to the MIDN environment increased after European colonization during the past 400 years. The MIDN was originally characterized by extensive stands of upland forest, along with wetlands (Comiskey et al. 2005). Much of the original wetland area in the MIDN area has been lost. Extensive clearing of the forests in the MIDN has occurred during the last 200 years, with maximum clearing taking place primarily between the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (White and Wilds 1998). Although some forest recolonization has occurred in the region (Skeen et al. 1993), habitat fragmentation still remains the largest threat to eastern forests and likely to continue altering biological diversity in the region (White and Wilds 1998; Yahner 2000).

This habitat fragmentation will also likely hinder the ability of the plant and animal communities of the MIDN to adapt to future climate changes. Over the past century, average temperatures in the mid-Atlantic region, including the MIDN, may have increased by as much as 0.5°C (Mid-Atlantic Regional Assessment Team [MARA] 2000; Polsky et al. 2000; NAST 2001). Current projections of future climate conditions in the MIDN indicate the possibility of warmer and perhaps wetter conditions prevailing, along with the potential for greater weather variability (MARA 2000; Polsky et al. 2000; EPA 2001; NAST 2001). Plant and animal communities in the MIDN would likely migrate northward and to higher elevations in response to these projected climate changes (MARA 2000; Comiskey et al. 2005).

Projections on trends in the number and severity of severe climate events in the MIDN remain inconclusive (Fischer et al. 2000; MARA 2000; NAST 2001). Any such climate changes will, however, influence changes in species composition and the likely migration of flora and fauna in response to changing environmental conditions. The frequency and intensity of other stressors may also increase, including forest fires, pests, and pathogens (Comiskey et al. 2005).

2.2. Spatial Variability

The climate characteristics of the MIDN are influenced both by the Blue Ridge and the Appalachian Mountains to the north and west, and the Atlantic Ocean to the south and east. Mean annual precipitation varies from just over 1000 mm for lower-elevation park units such as GETT, to over 1300 mm in the southern portions of SHEN (Figure 2.1). Besides the higher elevations of SHEN, the eastern portions of MIDN also tend to receive higher annual precipitation amounts due to storms coming in from the west that meet the warm Gulf Stream in coastal regions and discharge precipitation as they move northeast (Hayden and Michaels 2005). Precipitation is generally well-distributed throughout the year, with an increasing tendency towards more summer precipitation in the southern portions of the MIDN (Figure 2.2). This summertime precipitation is usually due to thunderstorm activity in the region (Comiskey et al. 2005). Snowfall is common in the winter at higher elevations in the MIDN, with annual totals exceeding 1100 mm at Big Meadows in SHEN (Comiskey et al. 2005). Precipitation usually exceeds evaporation in the MIDN, but summer droughts do occur occasionally (Comiskey et al. 2005). Southeast- and south-facing slopes are notably warmer and drier than northwest- and north-facing slopes, receiving more direct sunlight. As a result, forest fires are more frequent on south-facing slopes in the MIDN (Comiskey et al. 2005).

Mean annual temperatures in the MIDN (Figure 2.3) range from below 10°C in the northern MIDN park units and the higher elevations of SHEN, to almost 15°C near RICH and PETE in southeastern MIDN. The average length of the growing season in the northern portions of MIDN is about 160 days (The Pennsylvania State Climatologist 2005), while to the south, the growing season along the Blue Ridge is about 150 to 220 days (varies with elevation) and can last up to 280 days in the Coastal Plain of Virginia (Comiskey et al. 2005).

The southern park units of the MIDN are in the Virginia Piedmont and thus tend to experience mild winters and hot, humid summers. Minimum temperatures in January are commonly above -4°C in this area (Figure 2.4). July maximum temperatures are regularly over 30°C in the Virginia Piedmont (Figure 2.5) and have topped 40°C on some occasions. Further north and at higher elevations, the winters are much colder relative to the Piedmont. January minimum temperatures are regularly below -8°C in SHEN and HOFU and have gotten as low as -30°C during the past 60 years.



Figure 2.1. Mean annual precipitation, 1961-1990, for the MIDN.



Figure 2.2. Mean monthly precipitation at selected stations in the MIDN. Phoenixville 1E (a) is near VAFO, Luray 5E (b) is just west of SHEN, and Richmond Airport (c) is near RICH.



Figure 2.3. Mean annual temperature, 1961-1990, for the MIDN.



Figure 2.4. Mean January minimum temperature, 1961-1990, for the MIDN.



Figure 2.5. Mean July maximum temperature, 1961-1990, for the MIDN.

2.3. Temporal Variability

Precipitation appears to have increased slightly over the last century for much of the eastern U.S. (Karl et al. 1996b; Karl and Knight 1998; NAST 2001), including the MIDN (MARA 2000). This pattern is more apparent in northern portions of the MIDN, from northern Virginia into southern Pennsylvania (Figure 2.6a; 2.6b), and less apparent to the south (Figure 2.6c). Superimposed on these long-term patterns is a significant drought during the 1960s.

Although temporal temperature patterns for the MIDN (Figure 2.7) show a slight warming for each record as a whole, the warmest temperatures occurred during the 1940s and 1950s. Temperatures in the MIDN became abruptly cooler in the 1960s and commenced a gradual warming trend that continues to this day. It is not clear how much of this observed pattern may be due to discontinuities in temperature records at individual stations, caused by artificial changes such as station moves. These patterns highlight the emphasis on measurement consistency that is needed in order to properly detect long-term climatic changes.

Tropical cyclones and their remnants are significant extreme storm events that occasionally impact the MIDN. Although wind damage can accompany these storms, the heavy precipitation and flooding from these storms is by far the more important disturbance factor for the MIDN ecosystems. About three tropical storms and/or hurricanes have made landfall in the U.S. each year over the past century (Lyons 2004). Most of these storms that make landfall in the U.S. originate either in the Gulf of Mexico or the Western Caribbean (Lyons 2004). Strong hurricanes have generally made landfall in the U.S. at a rate of just under one per year over the past century (Smith 1999; Lyons 2004). The number of these storms that impact the MIDN has been very sporadic during this time period but the events, when they do occur, tend to do so in clusters. These clusters of storms occur on time scales of a couple decades (Smith 1999).

2.4. Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM)

Figures 2.1-2.2 and Figures 2.4-2.5 were generated using the Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM). This model was developed to address the extreme spatial and elevation gradients exhibited by the climate of the western United States (Daly et al. 1994; 2002; Gibson et al. 2002; Doggett et al. 2004). The maps produced through PRISM have undergone rigorous evaluation in the western U.S. Originally, this model was developed to provide climate information at scales matching available land-cover maps to assist in ecologic modeling. The PRISM technique accounts for the scale-dependent effects of topography on mean values of climate elements. Elevation provides the first-order constraint for the mapped climate fields, with slope and orientation (aspect) providing second-order constraints. The model has been enhanced gradually to address inversions, coast/land gradients, and climate patterns in small-scale trapping basins. Monthly climate fields are generated by PRISM to account for seasonal variations in elevation gradients in climate elements. These monthly climate fields then can be combined into seasonal and annual climate fields. Since PRISM maps are grid maps, they do not replicate point values but rather, for a given grid cell, represent the grid-cell average of the climate variable in question at the average elevation for that cell. The model relies on observed surface and upper-air measurements to estimate spatial climate fields.



Figure 2.6. Precipitation time series, 1895-2005, for selected regions in the MIDN. These include twelve-month precipitation (ending in December) (red), 10-year running mean (blue), mean (green), and plus/minus one standard deviation (green dotted). Locations include southeastern Pennsylvania (a), northern Virginia (b), and the eastern Piedmont of Virginia (c).



a)

b)

c)

Figure 2.7. Temperature time series, 1895-2005, for selected regions in the MIDN. These include twelve-month average temperature (ending in December) (red), 10-year running mean (blue), mean (green), and plus/minus one standard deviation (green dotted). Locations include southeastern Pennsylvania (a), northern Virginia (b), and the eastern Piedmont of Virginia (c).

3.0. Methods

Having discussed the climatic characteristics of the MIDN, we now present the procedures that were used to obtain information for weather/climate stations within the MIDN. This information was obtained from various sources, as mentioned in the following paragraphs. Retrieval of station metadata constituted a major component of this work.

3.1. Metadata Retrieval

A key component of station inventories is determining the kinds of observations that have been conducted over time, by whom, and in what manner; when each type of observation began and ended; and whether these observations are still being conducted. Metadata about the observational process (Table 3.1) generally consist of a series of vignettes that apply to time intervals and, therefore, constitute a *history* rather than a single snapshot. An expanded list of relevant metadata fields for this inventory is provided in Appendix E. This report has relied on metadata records from three sources: (a) Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC), (b) NPS personnel, and (c) other knowledgeable personnel, such as state climate office staff.

The initial metadata sources for this report were stored at WRCC. This regional climate center (RCC) acts as a working repository of many western climate records, including the main networks outlined in this section. The WRCC conducts live and periodic data collection (ingests) from all major national and western weather/climate networks. These networks include the COOP network, the Surface Airways Observation network (SAO) operated by NWS and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the interagency RAWS network, and various smaller networks. The WRCC is expanding its capability to ingest information from other networks as resources permit and usefulness dictates. This center has relied heavily on historic archives (in many cases supplemented with live ingests) to assess the quantity (not necessarily quality) of data available for NPS I&M network applications.

The primary source of metadata at WRCC is the Applied Climate Information System (ACIS), a joint effort among RCCs and other NOAA entities. Metadata for MIDN weather/climate stations identified from the ACIS database are available in file “MIDN_from_ACIS.tar.gz” (see Appendix F). Historic metadata pertaining to major climate- and weather-observing systems in the U.S. are stored in ACIS where metadata are linked to the observed data. A distributed system, ACIS is synchronized among the RCCs. Mainstream software is utilized, including Postgress, Python™, and Java™ programming languages; CORBA®-compliant network software; and industry-standard, nonproprietary hardware and software. Metadata and data for all major national climate and weather networks have been entered into the ACIS database. For this project, the available metadata from many smaller networks also have been entered but in most cases the actual data have not yet been entered. Data sets are in the NetCDF (Network Common Data Form) format, but the design allows for integration with legacy systems, including non-NetCDF files (used at WRCC) and additional metadata (added for this project). The ACIS also supports a suite of products to visualize or summarize data from these data sets. National climate-monitoring maps are updated daily using the ACIS data feed. The developmental phases of ACIS have utilized metadata supplied by the NCDC and NWS with many tens of thousands of entries, screened as well as possible for duplications, mistakes, and omissions.

Table 3.1. Primary metadata fields for MIDN weather/climate stations. Explanations are provided as appropriate.

Metadata Field	**Notes**
Station name	Station name associated with network listed in “Climate Network.”
Latitude	Numerical value (units: see coordinate units).
Longitude	Numerical value (units: see coordinate units).
Coordinate units	Latitude/longitude (units: decimal degrees, degree-minute-second, etc.).
Datum	Datum used as basis for coordinates: WGS 84, NAD 83, etc.
Elevation	Elevation of station above mean sea level (m).
Slope	Slope of ground surface below station (degrees).
Aspect	Azimuth that ground surface below station faces.
Climate division	NOAA climate division where station is located. Climate divisions are NOAA-specified zones sharing similar climate and hydrology characteristics.
Country	Country where station is located.
State	State where station is located.
County	County where station is located.
Weather/climate network	Primary weather/climate network the station belongs to (COOP, RAWS, etc.).
NPS unit code	Four-letter code identifying park unit where station resides.
NPS unit name	Full name of park unit.
NPS unit type	National park, national monument, etc.
UTM zone	If UTM is the only coordinate system available.
Location notes	Useful information not already included in “station narrative.”
Climate variables	Temperature, precipitation, etc.
Installation date	Date of station installation.
Removal date	Date of station removal.
Station photograph	Digital image of station.
Photograph date	Date photograph was taken.
Photographer	Name of person who took the photograph.
Station narrative	Anything related to general site description; may include site exposure, characteristics of surrounding vegetation, driving directions, etc.
Contact name	Name of the person involved with station operation.
Organization	Group or agency affiliation of contact person.
Contact type	Designation that identifies contact person as the station owner, observer, maintenance person, data manager, etc.
Position/job title	Official position/job title of contact person.
Address	Address of contact person.
E-mail address	E-mail address of contact person.
Phone	Phone number of contact person (and extension if available).
Contact notes	Other information needed to reach contact person.

Two types of information have been used to complete the MIDN climate station inventory.

- Station inventories: Information about observational procedures, latitude/longitude, elevation, measured elements, measurement frequency, sensor types, exposures, ground cover and vegetation, data-processing details, network, purpose, and managing individual or agency, etc.

- Data inventories: Information about measured data values including completeness, seasonality, data gaps, representation of missing data, flagging systems, how special circumstances in the data record are denoted, etc.

This is not a straightforward process. Extensive searches are typically required to develop historic station and data inventories. Both types of inventories frequently contain information gaps and often rely on tacit and unrealistic assumptions. Sources of information for these inventories frequently are difficult to recover or are undocumented and unreliable. In many cases, the actual weather/climate data available from different sources are not linked directly to metadata records. To the extent that actual data can be acquired (rather than just metadata), it is possible to cross-check these records and perform additional assessments based on the amount and completeness of the data.

Certain types of weather/climate networks that possess any of the following attributes have not been considered for inclusion in the inventory:

- Private networks with proprietary access and/or inability to obtain or provide sufficient metadata.
- Private weather enthusiasts (often with high-quality data) whose metadata are not available and whose data are not readily accessible.
- Unofficial observers supplying data to the NWS (lack of access to current data and historic archives; lack of metadata).
- Networks having no available historic data.
- Networks having poor-quality metadata.
- Networks having poor access to metadata.
- Real-time networks having poor access to real-time data.

Previous inventory efforts at WRCC have shown that for the weather networks identified in the preceding list, in light of the need for quality data to track weather and climate, the resources required and difficulty encountered in obtaining metadata or data are prohibitively large.

3.2. Criteria for Locating Stations

To identify weather and climate stations for each park unit in the MIDN we selected only those stations located within 20 km of the MIDN park units. This buffer distance was selected in an attempt to include at least a few automated stations from major networks such as SAO, but also to keep the size of the stations lists to a reasonable number.

The station locator maps presented in Chapter 4 were designed to show clearly the spatial distributions of all major weather/climate station networks in MIDN. We recognize that other mapping formats may be more suitable for other specific needs.

4.0. Station Inventory

An objective of this report is to show the locations of weather/climate stations for the MIDN region in relation to the boundaries of the NPS park units within the MIDN. A station does not have to be within park boundaries to provide useful data and information for a park unit.

4.1. Climate and Weather Networks

Most stations in the MIDN region are associated with at least one of eight major weather/climate networks (Table 4.1). Brief descriptions of each weather/climate network are provided below (see Appendix G for greater detail).

Table 4.1. Weather/climate networks represented within the MIDN.

Acronym	Name
CASTNet	Clean Air Status and Trends Network
COOP	NWS Cooperative Observer Program
CWOP	Citizen Weather Observer Program
GPMP	NPS Gaseous Pollutant Monitoring Program
NADP	National Atmospheric Deposition Program
RAWS	Remote Automated Weather Station network
SAO	NWS/FAA Surface Airways Observation network
WX4U	Weather For You network

4.1.1. Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNet)

CASTNet is primarily an air-quality monitoring network managed by the EPA. Standard hourly weather and climate elements are measured and include temperature, wind, humidity, solar radiation, soil temperature, and sometimes moisture. These elements are intended to support interpretation of air-quality parameters that also are measured at CASTNet sites. Data records at CASTNet sites are generally one–two decades in length.

4.1.2. NWS Cooperative Observer Program (COOP)

The COOP network has been a foundation of the U.S. climate program for decades and continues to play an important role. Manual measurements are made by volunteers and consist of daily maximum and minimum temperatures, observation-time temperature, daily precipitation, daily snowfall, and snow depth. When blended with NWS measurements, the data set is known as SOD, or “Summary of the Day.” The quality of data from COOP sites ranges from excellent to modest.

4.1.3. Citizen Weather Observer Program (CWOP)

The CWOP network consists primarily of automated weather stations operated by private citizens who have either an Internet connection and/or a wireless Ham radio setup. Data from CWOP stations are specifically intended for use in research, education, and homeland security activities. Although standard meteorological elements such as temperature, precipitation, and wind are measured at all CWOP stations, station characteristics do vary, including sensor types and site exposure.

4.1.4. Gaseous Pollutant Monitoring Program (GPMP)

The GPMP network measures hourly meteorological data in support of pollutant monitoring activities. Measured elements include temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind, solar radiation, and surface wetness. These data are generally of high quality, with records extending up to two decades in length.

4.1.5. National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)

The purpose of the NADP network is to monitor primarily wet deposition at selected sites around the U.S. and its territories. The network is a collaborative effort among several agencies including USGS and USDA. Precipitation is the primary climate parameter measured at NADP sites.

4.1.6. Remote Automated Weather Station Network (RAWS)

The RAWS network is administered through many land management agencies, particularly the BLM and the Forest Service. Hourly meteorology elements are measured and include temperature, wind, humidity, solar radiation, barometric pressure, fuel temperature, and precipitation (when temperatures are above freezing). The fire community is the primary client for RAWS data. These sites are remote and data typically are transmitted via GOES (Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite). Some sites operate all winter. Most data records for RAWS sites began during or after the mid-1980s.

4.1.7. NWS Surface Airways Observation Network (SAO)

These stations are located usually at major airports and military bases. Almost all SAO sites are automated. The hourly data measured at these sites include temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind, pressure, sky cover, ceiling, visibility, and current weather. Most data records begin during or after the 1940s, and these data are generally of high quality.

4.1.8. Weather Bureau Army Navy (WBAN)

Some stations are identified in this report as WBAN stations. This is a station identification system rather than a true weather/climate network. Stations identified with WBAN are largely historical stations that reported meteorological observations on the WBAN weather observation forms that were common during the early and middle parts of the twentieth century. The use of WBAN numbers to identify stations was one of the first attempts in the U.S. to use a coordinated station numbering scheme between several weather station networks, such as the COOP and SAO networks.

4.1.9. Weather For You Network (WX4U)

The WX4U network is a nationwide collection of weather stations run by local observers. Data quality varies with site. Standard meteorological elements are measured and usually include temperature, precipitation, wind, and humidity.

4.1.10. Other Networks

In addition to the major networks mentioned above, there are various networks that are operated for specific purposes by specific organizations or governmental agencies or scientific research projects. These networks could be present within MIDN but have not been identified in this report. Some of the commonly used networks include the following:

- NOAA upper-air stations
- Federal and state departments of transportation
- U.S. Department of Energy Surface Radiation Budget Network (Surfrad)
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) hydrologic stations
- Park-specific-monitoring networks and stations
- Other research or project networks having many possible owners

4.2. Station Locations

The major weather/climate networks in the MIDN (discussed in Section 4.1) have at most several stations at or inside each park unit (Table 4.2). Most stations are located in SHEN.

Table 4.2. Number of stations within or nearby MIDN park units. Numbers are listed by park unit and by weather/climate network. Figures in parentheses indicate the numbers of stations within park boundaries.

Network	APCO	BOWA	EISE	FRSP	GETT	HOFN	PETE	RICH	SHEN	VAFO
CASTNet	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(1)	**0**(0)
COOP	**5**(0)	**1**(0)	**12**(0)	**13**(0)	**13**(2)	**6**(0)	**7**(0)	**14**(0)	**29**(4)	**11**(1)
CWOP	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**7**(0)	**1**(0)	**3**(0)	**2**(0)	**8**(0)	**13**(0)	**15**(0)
GPMP	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**3**(3)	**0**(0)
NADP	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**1**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**3**(1)	**0**(0)
RAWS	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**1**(0)	**1**(0)	**0**(0)
SAO	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**2**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**0**(0)	**2**(0)	**2**(0)	**2**(0)
WX4U	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**2**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**1**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**3**(0)
Other	**0**(0)	**0**(0)	**2**(0)	**0**(0)	**2**(0)	**0**(0)	**1**(0)	**2**(0)	**0**(0)	**0**(0)
Total	**5**(0)	**1**(0)	**17**(0)	**24**(0)	**18**(2)	**12**(0)	**12**(0)	**27**(0)	**53**(9)	**31**(1)

Lists of stations have been compiled for the MIDN. A station does not have to be within the boundaries to provide useful data and information regarding the park unit in question. Some might be physically *within* the administrative or political boundaries, whereas others might be just outside, or even some distance away, but would be *nearby* in behavior and representativeness. What constitutes “useful” and “representative” are also significant questions, whose answers can vary according to application, type of element, period of record, procedural or methodological observation conventions, and the like.

4.2.1. Northern park units

Since the park units of EISE and GETT are largely co-located with each other, they generally have the same list of weather and climate stations within 20 km of the park units. Two COOP stations are located within the boundaries of GETT (Table 4.3; Figure 4.1). These stations are, in turn, located very close to EISE, which has no stations located within its boundaries. One of these is the COOP station “Eisenhower NHS,” which has been active since 1982. The other COOP station, “Gettysburg 1 S,” is a historical station that ceased operations in 1980. In addition, there are four active COOP stations within 20 km of the boundaries of EISE and GETT. The longest data record among these COOP sites is found from the station “South Mountain,” which has been active since 1940. The precipitation record at this station is largely complete, while the temperature record is very sporadic and unreliable. The other COOP stations have data records beginning in the 1970s or later. Besides the COOP station “South Mountain,” a fairly long data record is found at the WBAN station “Fort Ritchie,” which has taken observations since 1960. The primary source of automated weather data for EISE and GETT is the CASTNet station in Arendtsville, Pennsylvania, about 13 km north of the park units.

Table 4.3. Weather/climate stations for the northern MIDN park units. Stations inside park units and within 20 km of the park unit boundary are included. Missing entries are indicated by “M”.

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
Eisenhower National Historic Site (EISE)							
Arendtsville	39.923	-77.308	269	CASTNet	6/1/1988	Present	No
Arendtsville	39.917	-77.300	217	COOP	9/1/1918	8/17/1971	No
Biglerville	39.936	-77.258	219	COOP	8/1/1971	Present	No
Bridgeport	39.679	-77.234	104	COOP	7/1/1996	1/9/2003	No
Eisenhower NHS	39.805	-77.229	165	COOP	2/1/1982	Present	No
Emmitsburg	39.683	-77.350	220	COOP	1/1/1893	5/31/1956	No
Emmitsburg 2 SE	39.681	-77.290	127	COOP	5/1/1956	10/1/2005	No
Gardners	40.017	-77.217	244	COOP	7/1/1962	12/31/1978	No
Gettysburg	39.833	-77.233	165	COOP	11/1/1892	2/1/1982	No
Gettysburg 1 S	39.800	-77.233	162	COOP	5/1/1948	6/30/1980	No
Hanover	39.800	-76.983	183	COOP	4/1/1904	6/1/1995	No
Hanover 4 SW	39.767	-77.033	170	COOP	6/1/1993	Present	No
South Mountain	39.858	-77.477	463	COOP	5/23/1940	Present	No
WA0OJS-1 Hanover	39.747	-76.955	263	CWOP	M	Present	No
Arendtsville	39.923	-77.308	269	NADP	11/14/2000	Present	No
Fort Ritchie	39.733	-77.400	278	WBAN	1/1/1962	Present	No
Fountain Dale Site R	39.733	-77.433	275	WBAN	1/1/1984	Present	No
Gettysburg National Military Park (GETT)							
Eisenhower NHS	39.805	-77.229	165	COOP	2/1/1982	Present	Yes
Gettysburg 1 S	39.800	-77.233	162	COOP	5/1/1948	6/30/1980	Yes
Arendtsville	39.923	-77.308	269	CASTNet	6/1/1988	Present	No
Arendtsville	39.917	-77.300	217	COOP	9/1/1918	8/17/1971	No
Biglerville	39.936	-77.258	219	COOP	8/1/1971	Present	No
Bridgeport	39.679	-77.234	104	COOP	7/1/1996	1/9/2003	No
Emmitsburg	39.683	-77.350	220	COOP	1/1/1893	5/31/1956	No
Emmitsburg 2 SE	39.681	-77.290	127	COOP	5/1/1956	10/1/2005	No
Fayetteville 10 ENE	39.991	-77.409	625	COOP	1/1/1973	Present	No
Gardners	40.017	-77.217	244	COOP	7/1/1962	12/31/1978	No
Gettysburg	39.833	-77.233	165	COOP	11/1/1892	2/1/1982	No
Hanover	39.800	-76.983	183	COOP	4/1/1904	6/1/1995	No
Hanover 4 SW	39.767	-77.033	170	COOP	6/1/1993	Present	No

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
South Mountain	39.858	-77.477	463	COOP	5/23/1940	Present	No
WA0OJS-1 Hanover	39.747	-76.955	263	CWOP	M	Present	No
Arendtsville	39.923	-77.308	269	NADP	11/14/2000	Present	No
Fort Ritchie	39.733	-77.400	278	WBAN	1/1/1962	Present	No
Fountain Dale Site R	39.733	-77.433	275	WBAN	1/1/1984	Present	No
Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site (HOFU)							
Geigertown	40.200	-75.833	122	COOP	8/4/1945	10/1/1976	No
Glenmoore	40.100	-75.751	152	COOP	11/1/1956	Present	No
Honey Brook 2 SSE	40.079	-75.898	203	COOP	8/1/1957	Present	No
Hopewell Morgantown	40.159	-75.886	168	COOP	3/1/1970	10/1/2002	No
Morgantown	40.158	-75.886	180	COOP	6/1/1951	Present	No
Pottstown	40.250	-75.650	37	COOP	1/1/1894	1/15/2004	No
CW3157 Boyertown	40.343	-75.683	210	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW4576 Royersford	40.181	-75.523	60	CWOP	M	Present	No
WX3FRD Sanatoga	40.250	-75.599	98	CWOP	M	Present	No
Valley Forge	40.117	-75.883	46	NADP	11/23/1999	Present	No
Pottstown Limerick Arpt.	40.238	-75.557	89	SAO	3/3/1999	Present	No
Eagle	40.070	-75.670	122	WX4U	M	Present	No
Valley Forge National Historical Park (VAFO)							
Valley Forge Natl. Pk.	40.098	-75.420	49	COOP	8/1/1982	Present	Yes
Conshohocken	40.074	-75.318	21	COOP	8/1/1923	Present	No
Devault 1 W	40.083	-75.550	110	COOP	6/1/1951	1/1/1989	No
Graterford	40.233	-75.450	46	COOP	2/21/1920	5/14/1974	No
Graterford 1 E	40.231	-75.435	73	COOP	8/1/1960	Present	No
Norristown	40.120	-75.358	21	COOP	5/1/1948	Present	No
Philadelphia Shawmon	40.033	-75.250	21	COOP	3/1/1896	6/30/1957	No
Phoenixville 1 E	40.120	-75.501	32	COOP	1/1/1893	Present	No
Phoenixville 1 NE	40.133	-75.533	34	COOP	10/1/1956	11/1/1976	No
Upper Darby	39.967	-75.300	610	COOP	5/1/1949	11/30/1959	No
West Chester 2 NW	39.971	-75.635	114	COOP	1/1/1893	Present	No
AA3SD Worcester	40.167	-75.376	160	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW0843 West Chester	39.938	-75.546	101	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW1648 Worcester	40.201	-75.358	71	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW1843 Drexel Hill	39.958	-75.290	59	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW2260 Lansdale	40.243	-75.296	112	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW2270 Blue Bell	40.150	-75.328	56	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW2844 Paoli	40.044	-75.499	153	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW4510 Phoenixville	40.131	-75.510	43	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW4576 Royersford	40.181	-75.523	60	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW5042 Erdenheim	40.089	-75.212	58	CWOP	M	Present	No
KA1UDX Collegeville	40.204	-75.464	70	CWOP	M	Present	No
W3UGI Ambler	40.150	-75.237	70	CWOP	M	Present	No
WA3NNA Larchmont	39.985	-75.379	135	CWOP	M	Present	No
WX3FRD Sanatoga	40.250	-75.599	98	CWOP	M	Present	No
WX3I Eagleville	40.158	-75.398	137	CWOP	M	Present	No

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
Pottstown Limerick Arpt.	40.238	-75.557	89	SAO	3/3/1999	Present	No
Wings Field	40.100	-75.267	95	SAO	5/1/1974	Present	No
Broomall	39.994	-75.365	113	WX4U	M	Present	No
Eagle	40.070	-75.670	122	WX4U	M	Present	No
Malvern	40.036	-75.514	111	WX4U	M	Present	No

No weather or climate stations are currently in operation within HOFU (Table 4.3; Figure 4.1). Three COOP stations are currently active within 20 km of HOFU. The closest active COOP stations to HOFU, “Glenmoore” and “Morgantown,” are both 10 km away. The quality of the data record at “Glenmoore” is not well-known, while the data record for “Morgantown” has been sporadic since 1986. The third COOP station, “Honey Brook 2 SSE,” is about 16 km southwest of HOFU. This station measures precipitation only, but has a very complete data record going back to 1957. The COOP station “Pottstown” provided a very useful long-term climate record for the area but unfortunately, it is no longer active, as observations ceased in 2004. A SAO station, “Pottstown Limerick Arpt.,” is the primary source of automated weather data within 20 km of HOFU. This station has operated since 1999 and is located about 17 km north of HOFU.

Valley Forge National Historical Park (VAFO) has one station within its boundaries (Table 4.3). This is a COOP station (Valley Forge Natl. Pk.) which has been active since 1982. Five COOP stations are currently active within 20 km of VAFO. Of these stations, the longest data record is found at “Phoenixville 1 E,” which has been operating since 1893. This station is three kilometers northwest of VAFO. The data record from this station was quite reliable until 1990. Since then, there have been many gaps in the record, the most recent gap occurring in January, 2004. The COOP station “Conshohocken,” nine kilometers east of VAFO, has a very complete data record that extends back to 1921. This station measures precipitation only. The other active COOP stations we have identified for VAFO all have data records that contain frequent gaps and are therefore unreliable for climate monitoring. The primary sources of automated weather data for VAFO are the SAO stations “Pottstown Limerick Arpt.,” discussed previously, and “Wings Field.” The latter station has the longer data record of the two sites, going back to 1974. The SAO station “Pottstown Limerick Arpt.” is located 20 km northwest of VAFO while the SAO station “Wings Field” is 13 km north of VAFO (Figure 4.1).



Figure 4.1. Station locations for the northern MIDN park units.

4.2.2. Shenandoah National Park

We have identified nine weather and climate stations within the boundaries of SHEN (Table 4.4). Most of the stations identified within SHEN are located at or near Big Meadows visitor center in the central portion of SHEN (Figure 4.2). Four of the stations identified within SHEN are currently active. The CASTNet station at Big Meadows, operational since 1983, is the main source of automated weather data inside the park unit. Additional precipitation data are provided by a NADP station at Big Meadows. Two COOP stations are currently active within SHEN. One of these stations is “Luray 5 E,” about 20 km northeast of Big Meadows. This station has the longest data record of any of the active stations, going back to 1941. However, the data from “Luray 5 E” have not been reliable since December, 2002. Another active COOP station, “Mathews Arm,” is about 25 km northeast of Big Meadows, yet it has only been operating since 1992. A long-term COOP station had operated at Big Meadows from 1935 to 2003 and had a reliably complete data record.

Outside of SHEN, we have identified 13 active COOP stations within 20 km of the park unit (Table 4.4). The longest record among these stations is found at “Woodstock 2 NE,” about 20 km west of Front Royal (Figure 4.2). This station has been active since 1889 and has a very complete data record. Another data record that is at least 50 years in length is found at the COOP station “Charlottesville Albemarle Airport.” This station is about 20 km east of the southern tip of SHEN and has been active since 1955.

Table 4.4. Weather/climate stations for Shenandoah National Park (SHEN). Stations inside SHEN and within 20 km of SHEN are included. Missing entries are indicated by “M”.

Shenandoah National Park (SHEN)

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
Big Meadows	38.523	-78.435	1073	CASTNet	5/1/1983	Present	YES
Big Meadows	38.522	-78.436	1079	COOP	1/1/1935	11/19/2003	YES
Big Meadows 2	38.500	-78.417	1007	COOP	4/10/1943	10/31/1949	YES
Luray 5 E	38.666	-78.373	427	COOP	3/1/1941	Present	YES
Mathews Arm	38.752	-78.299	938	COOP	7/31/1992	Present	YES
Big Meadows	38.523	-78.435	1073	GPMP	1/1/1988	7/31/1995	YES
Dickey Ridge	38.857	-78.201	610	GPMP	5/1/1983	10/31/1994	YES
Sawmill Run	38.106	-78.831	445	GPMP	5/1/1983	10/31/1994	YES
Shenandoah NP-Big Meadows	38.523	-78.436	1074	NADP	10/22/2002	Present	YES
Afton Boxwood Garden	38.033	-78.833	381	COOP	1/1/1931	9/30/1957	NO
Amissville	38.683	-78.017	168	COOP	7/1/1943	10/19/1983	NO
Boston 4 SE	38.545	-78.097	180	COOP	3/12/1997	Present	NO
Charlottesville Albemarle Arpt.	38.139	-78.453	195	COOP	8/1/1955	Present	NO
Criglersville	38.450	-78.283	153	COOP	11/1/1949	5/22/1985	NO
Crozet 2 N	38.083	-78.700	214	COOP	5/25/1941	1/31/1964	NO
Edinburg	38.823	-78.565	256	COOP	3/16/1995	Present	NO
Free Union	38.095	-78.587	174	COOP	7/1/1955	1/1/2006	NO
Front Royal	39.000	-78.233	208	COOP	10/1/1934	4/30/1957	NO
Front Royal	38.903	-78.182	283	COOP	2/1/1964	Present	NO

Shenandoah National Park (SHEN)

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
Front Royal 1 SW	38.914	-78.211	163	COOP	8/1/1967	Present	NO
Luray 7 W	38.629	-78.535	219	COOP	4/15/1996	Present	NO
Lynnwood	38.323	-78.755	309	COOP	1/1/1983	Present	NO
Madison	38.383	-78.253	177	COOP	7/12/1995	7/26/2006	NO
McGaheysville 2 S	38.350	-78.733	332	COOP	10/1/1940	1/1/1983	NO
North Garden	37.950	-78.633	209	COOP	M	4/1/1992	NO
Riverton	38.933	-78.200	171	COOP	11/1/1892	9/1/1978	NO
Sperryville	38.655	-78.227	229	COOP	4/1/1995	Present	NO
Strasburg 2 ESE	38.977	-78.336	195	COOP	8/1/1967	Present	NO
Stuarts Draft	38.010	-79.049	442	COOP	11/1/1945	Present	NO
Timberville 3 E	38.650	-78.717	305	COOP	8/1/1931	5/13/1990	NO
Washington 3 SSW	38.667	-78.183	195	COOP	11/1/1944	1/19/1995	NO
Waynesboro	38.058	-78.908	395	COOP	1/14/1987	Present	NO
Waynesboro Sewage	38.080	-78.875	390	COOP	10/1/1993	Present	NO
Woodstock 2 NE	38.902	-78.475	207	COOP	9/6/1889	Present	NO
CW2018 Woodstock	38.872	-78.557	282	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW2952 Broadway	38.583	-78.767	366	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW3977 Middletown	39.027	-78.276	227	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW4099 Elkton	38.360	-78.644	366	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW4248 Earlysville	38.138	-78.516	165	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW5110 Hume	38.839	-78.066	244	CWOP	M	Present	NO
K4QJZ Milldale	38.887	-78.112	717	CWOP	M	Present	NO
K4QJZ-7 High Knob Mt.	38.887	-78.112	722	CWOP	M	Present	NO
K4XTT Broadway	38.607	-78.784	378	CWOP	M	Present	NO
KE4LKQ Broadway	38.605	-78.786	384	CWOP	M	Present	NO
KG4QXL Fort Valley	38.879	-78.391	298	CWOP	M	Present	NO
N4DSL Keezletown	38.435	-78.799	438	CWOP	M	Present	NO
N7IVV Ruckersville	38.268	-78.430	183	CWOP	M	Present	NO
Culpeper	38.422	-78.104	163	NADP	11/19/2002	Present	NO
James Madison University Farm	38.303	-78.818	336	NADP	7/9/2002	Present	NO
Fort Valley	38.833	-78.400	244	RAWS	4/1/1998	5/31/2005	NO
Charlottesville Albemarle Arpt.	38.139	-78.453	195	SAO	8/1/1955	Present	NO
Staunton	38.264	-78.896	362	SAO	2/1/1960	Present	NO
Harrisonburg	38.250	-78.530	208	WX4U	M	Present	NO

The most reliable sources of automated data within 20 km of SHEN are found at two SAO stations, “Charlottesville Albemarle Airport” and “Staunton.” The former SAO site is co-located with the previously-discussed COOP station of the same name, while the latter SAO site is located 8 km southwest of SHEN and has provided data since 1960 (Table 4.4). A RAWS station was operational between 1995-2003 at Fort Valley, 6 km northwest of the northern edge of SHEN. It is currently undergoing a modification in how it transmits data and will soon be reactivated. Numerous other stations associated with the CWOP and WX4U networks also provided automated weather data in the SHEN region.

4.2.3. Southern park units

We have identified no weather or climate stations within APCO. However, five active COOP stations are located within 20 km of APCO (Figure 4.3, Table 4.5). The closest COOP station to APCO is “Appomattox,” which is 2 km southwest of the park unit and has been operating since 1937. While precipitation has been measured at “Appomattox” since 1937, temperature has only been measured since November, 1961. There are some data gaps in the observation record at “Appomattox” that should be addressed. These gaps occurred in February-September, 1981; October, 1984; October, 1990; April, 1991; June, 1995; and January-February, 2005. Another long-term record going back to 1950 is provided at the COOP station “Concord 4 SSW.” This station measures precipitation only. The data record at this station has gap between November, 2004 and February, 2005; otherwise, the record is quite complete. We have identified no sources of automated weather data within 20 km of APCO. Some of the closest reliable automated weather information likely comes from Lynchburg Regional Airport, about 40 km west of APCO.

Like APCO, BOWA has no weather or climate stations within its boundaries and no automated stations within 20 km of the park unit (Table 4.5). The only station identified in this report for BOWA is a COOP station (Huddleston 4 SW), located about 18 km east of BOWA (Figure 4.3). This station measures precipitation only, has been operating since 1950, and has a very complete data record. The closest automated weather data likely come from Roanoke Regional Airport, at least 30 km northwest of BOWA.

No weather or climate stations are currently in operation within FRSP (Table 4.5; Figure 4.3). Three COOP stations are currently active within 20 km of FRSP units. Of these stations, the closest to a FRSP unit is “Fredericksburg Sewag,” at just under two kilometers away. The primary source of long-term climate information on precipitation and temperature for FRSP is the COOP station “Corbin,” located about seven kilometers southeast of FRSP. The observational record from “Corbin” extends back to 1959 and is very complete. The COOP station “Fredericksburg N P” operated from 1893 until 1997 and was a valuable long-term climate station for FRSP. Unfortunately, this station is no longer active. The best source for automated weather data for FRSP is the SAO station “Fredericksburg Shannon Arpt.,” active since 1991. Other useful automated weather data come from the SAO station “Stafford Regl. Arpt.,” about 15 km north of FRSP.



Figure 4.2. Station locations for Shenandoah National Park.

No weather or climate stations are currently in operation within PETE (Table 4.5; Figure 4.3). Five COOP stations are currently active within 20 km of PETE. The closest active COOP station to PETE is “Hopewell,” which is just under 2 km northeast of the park unit. This station has a very complete data record. The last data gap at “Hopewell” was in January, 1990. The COOP station “Stony Creek 2 N,” about 13 km south of PETE, also has a long-term data record. This record extends back to 1948 but it is unfortunately riddled with data gaps and is therefore not reliable. A RAWS station, “James River,” is the primary source of automated weather data within 20 km of PETE, operating since 1997. This RAWS station is 7 km east of the easternmost unit of PETE. Besides this station, the only other reliable sources of automated weather data are at airports in and near Richmond, Virginia, over 30 km north of PETE (see station list for RICH).

There are in fact three stations providing near-real-time weather information within 20 km of RICH (Table 4.5). Two sites are SAO stations, while the third site is the aforementioned James River RAWS station. The SAO station “Richmond Intl. Arpt.” provides the longest data record of these automated stations, going back to 1921. Several stations associated with the CWOP network also provide near-real-time information within 20 km of RICH.

Eight COOP stations are currently active within 20 km of RICH. A couple of these COOP stations have observation records going back to the 1890s. For example, “Richmond City Locks” is a COOP station that has been active since 1892. The COOP station “Ashland” has been active since 1893 and has a fairly complete data record, especially since February, 1970. The only two data gaps in the last 30 years for “Ashland” occurred in November, 2003 and May, 2004. The COOP station “Hopewell,” discussed previously, and “Richmond Intl. Arpt.” also provide reliable long-term data records for RICH.



Figure 4.3. Station locations for the southern MIDN park units.

Table 4.5. Weather/climate stations for the southern MIDN park units. Stations inside park units and within 20 km of the park unit boundary are included. Missing entries are indicated by “M”.

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
Appomattox Court House National Historical Park (APCO)							
Appomattox	37.356	-78.831	277	COOP	11/6/1937	Present	NO
Bent Creek	37.537	-78.829	116	COOP	2/1/1972	Present	NO
Concord 4 SSW	37.282	-78.959	194	COOP	9/1/1950	Present	NO
Holliday Lake	37.396	-78.641	146	COOP	12/1/1972	Present	NO
Pamplin City 1 SE	37.249	-78.667	223	COOP	1/1/1973	Present	NO
Booker T. Washington National Monument (BOWA)							
Huddleston 4 SW	37.126	-79.526	319	COOP	9/1/1950	Present	NO
Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park (FRSP)							
Bowling Green	38.050	-77.350	70	COOP	3/1/1950	6/30/1962	NO
Corbin	38.202	-77.375	67	COOP	1/1/1959	Present	NO
Culpeper 9 S	38.350	-77.975	73	COOP	10/1/1966	Present	NO
Culpeper Riverside CG	38.359	-77.965	79	COOP	7/1/1979	1/1/2004	NO
Elkwood 6 SE	38.450	-77.767	100	COOP	5/1/1940	4/1/1984	NO
Fredericksburg	38.315	-77.461	16	COOP	3/24/1988	11/17/2003	NO
Fredericksburg 2	38.300	-77.467	37	COOP	9/1/1978	11/10/1992	NO
Fredericksburg Embry	38.300	-77.467	6	COOP	7/13/1943	8/20/1969	NO
Fredericksburg N P	38.317	-77.450	27	COOP	4/17/1893	4/1/1997	NO
Fredericksburg Sewag	38.287	-77.451	5	COOP	2/15/1993	Present	NO
Lake Of The Woods	38.351	-77.753	110	COOP	10/1/1969	10/1/2001	NO
Partlow 3 WNW	38.050	-77.700	76	COOP	5/1/1952	12/31/1976	NO
Richardsville	38.400	-77.733	105	COOP	4/1/1984	4/1/1987	NO
CW0802 Fredericksburg	38.302	-77.465	9	CWOP	M	Present	NO
KC4ASF Fredericksburg	38.279	-77.588	10	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW1619 Falmouth	38.293	-77.417	59	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW1354 Fredricksburg	38.239	-77.518	67	CWOP	M	Present	NO
K4MQF-3 Marstens Corner	38.190	-77.773	130	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW0643 Goldvein	38.438	-77.661	109	CWOP	M	Present	NO
N4NW Stafford County	38.461	-77.463	102	CWOP	M	Present	NO
Fredericksburg Shannon Arpt.	38.267	-77.449	26	SAO	7/1/1991	Present	NO
Stafford Regl. Arpt.	38.398	-77.456	65	SAO	1/7/2004	Present	NO
Stafford	38.420	-77.400	52	WX4U	M	Present	NO
N4NW Stafford	38.463	-77.463	102	WX4U	M	Present	NO
Petersburg National Battlefield (PETE)							
Fort Lee	37.233	-77.333	18	COOP	11/1/1945	6/30/1974	NO
Hopewell	37.299	-77.277	12	COOP	10/1/1916	Present	NO
Lake Chesdin	37.233	-77.517	64	COOP	11/1/1972	2/23/2005	NO
Matoaca	37.217	-77.467	21	COOP	7/1/1973	Present	NO
Petersburg	37.239	-77.393	5	COOP	6/1/1979	Present	NO
Stony Creek 2 N	36.974	-77.404	32	COOP	8/1/1948	Present	NO
Winterpock 4 W	37.325	-77.650	91	COOP	12/1/1972	Present	NO
CW1481 Richmond	37.464	-77.326	45	CWOP	M	Present	NO

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
CW4862 Matoaca	37.241	-77.539	76	CWOP	M	Present	NO
James River	37.250	-77.250	15	RAWS	3/1/1997	Present	NO
Petersburg	37.183	-77.517	59	WBAN	7/1/1944	6/30/1946	NO
Walnut Hill Petersburg	37.180	-77.500	50	WX4U	M	Present	NO
Richmond National Battlefield Park (RICH)							
Ashland	37.750	-77.483	67	COOP	1/1/1893	Present	NO
Fort Lee	37.233	-77.333	18	COOP	11/1/1945	6/30/1974	NO
Hopewell	37.299	-77.277	12	COOP	10/1/1916	Present	NO
Lake Chesdin	37.233	-77.517	64	COOP	11/1/1972	2/23/2005	NO
Matoaca	37.217	-77.467	21	COOP	7/1/1973	Present	NO
Petersburg	37.239	-77.393	5	COOP	6/1/1979	Present	NO
Richmond Chimborazo Park	37.533	-77.417	49	COOP	1/1/1887	7/16/1992	NO
Richmond City Locks	37.533	-77.417	0	COOP	12/1/1892	Present	NO
Richmond Civic Ctr.	37.550	-77.433	61	COOP	10/1/1968	6/1/1992	NO
Richmond Intl. Arpt.	37.505	-77.320	50	COOP	1/2/1921	Present	NO
Richmond Three Chopt.	37.600	-77.550	81	COOP	4/1/1960	2/1/1993	NO
Richmond Westham Ga.	37.567	-77.550	30	COOP	9/6/1957	Present	NO
Sandston	37.544	-77.276	50	COOP	4/1/1999	Present	NO
Westbrook Sanatorium	37.600	-77.400	61	COOP	4/1/1895	12/31/1948	NO
CW1481 Richmond	37.464	-77.326	45	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW4237 Glen Allen	37.656	-77.582	85	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW4862 Matoaca	37.241	-77.539	76	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW4989 Chesterfield	37.388	-77.624	74	CWOP	M	Present	NO
CW5612 Midlothian	37.426	-77.642	74	CWOP	M	Present	NO
K4RCB Richmond	37.514	-77.567	95	CWOP	M	Present	NO
KO4XB-2 Glen Allen	37.650	-77.517	69	CWOP	M	Present	NO
WB4PGT-1 Quinton	37.506	-77.164	32	CWOP	M	Present	NO
James River	37.250	-77.250	15	RAWS	3/1/1997	Present	NO
Richmond Ashland Hanover Co. Muni.	37.708	-77.434	62	SAO	3/1/1995	Present	NO
Richmond Intl Arpt.	37.505	-77.320	50	SAO	1/2/1921	Present	NO
Petersburg	37.183	-77.517	59	WBAN	7/1/1944	6/30/1946	NO
Richmond Byrd AAB	37.500	-77.333	51	WBAN	9/1/1942	2/28/1946	NO

5.0. Conclusions and Recommendations

We have based our findings on an examination of available climate records within MIDN units, discussions with NPS staff and other collaborators, and prior knowledge of the area. Here, we offer an evaluation and general comments pertaining to the status, prospects, and needs for climate-monitoring capabilities in MIDN.

5.1. Mid-Atlantic Inventory and Monitoring Network

Station coverage for the park units in the MIDN generally appears to fall into one of two categories. The first category consists of park units located in or near urban settings. These park units include FRSP, HOFU, VAFO, PETE, and RICH. At these park units, we have generally identified a satisfactory number of weather and climate stations, including a mixture of both stations with long-term, reliable climate records and one or more stations providing reliable, near-real-time weather data for the area.

In the second category of station coverage, however, station coverage is not satisfactory. These park units are generally located in more rural settings, away from major towns or cities, and include APCO, BOWA, EISE, and GETT. For the park units falling in this category, relatively few weather and climate stations were identified. The stations that we have identified at these park units are generally manual observations sites, where once-daily measurements of temperature and precipitation are made. Unfortunately, very few long-term climate records of satisfactory quality exist among the manual sites we have identified. In addition, these park units generally have very few or no near-real-time stations present within 20 km of their boundaries. In most cases, the closest automated measurements come from airport stations that are located at least 30 km away from these park units and therefore may not be representative of weather/climate conditions within these park units.

Shenandoah National Park (SHEN) is the most recognizable park unit of the MIDN. Various manual and automated weather and climate stations are situated around SHEN. However, within SHEN, there are some inadequacies in station coverage. The only near-real-time weather observations identified within SHEN in this report are found at the Big Meadows visitor center. Near-real-time observations are not currently available in either the northern or southern portions of SHEN. The southern end of SHEN can fortunately utilize SAO stations both west and east of the park (“Staunton” and “Charlottesville Albemarle Arpt.,” respectively), although these stations are located at much lower elevations than those in southern SHEN and thus their observations may not be representative of SHEN under all conditions. This report has identified no near-real-time stations either in the northern portion of SHEN or within 20 km of northern SHEN. The current lack of automated weather data in SHEN may soon be remedied, however. Two RAWS stations will likely become operational within SHEN during the next year or two. One of these stations is planned to be at the headquarters office of SHEN, just over 5 km east of Luray, Virginia, and will provide much-needed automated weather data for northern SHEN. In addition, a RAWS station is planned for installation along Sawmill Ridge, about 10 km northeast of the southern entrance of SHEN.

Reliable long term climate records are lacking for several MIDN park units. For those park units where few stations have been identified, such as APCO and BOWA, this is not surprising.

However, the lack of reliable long-term climate records near HOFU and VAFO is unexpected, given their location just west of the Philadelphia metropolitan areas. Most of the long-term stations that we have identified for HOFU and VAFO either have significant data gaps in their records or measure precipitation only. This includes all of the stations we identified having records that go back to the 1800s. A lack of reliable long-term data was also observed at EISE and GETT.

A couple of the MIDN park units had long-term climate stations which have become inactive only in the last few years. In SHEN, a long-term COOP station operated at Big Meadows from 1935 until 2003. In FRSP, a COOP station (Fredericksburg N P) operated from 1893 until 1997. The loss of such stations is unfortunate and highlights the need to support the continued operation of any currently-active long-term climate stations.

5.2. Spatial Variations in Mean Climate

Land-use heterogeneity, along with topography at SHEN, influences heavily the park units within MIDN, leading to systematic spatial variations in mean surface climate, particularly at local scales. With local variations over short horizontal and vertical distances, topography and land use patterns introduce considerable fine-scale structure to mean climate (temperature and precipitation). Issues encountered in mapping mean climate are discussed in Appendix D and in Redmond et al. (2005).

For areas where new stations will be installed, if only a few new stations will be emplaced, the primary goal should be overall characterization of the main climate elements (temperature and precipitation and their joint relative, snow). This level of characterization generally requires that (a) stations should not be located in deep valley bottoms (cold air drainage pockets) or near excessively steep slopes and (b) stations should be distributed spatially in the major biomes of each park. If such stations already are present in the vicinity, then additional stations would be best used for two important and somewhat competing purposes: (a) add redundancy as backup for loss of data from current stations (or loss of the physical stations) or (b) provide added information on spatial heterogeneity in climate arising from topographic diversity.

5.3. Climate Change Detection

There is much interest in the adaptation of MIDN ecosystems in response to possible future climate change. This particularly includes the migration of plant and animal communities northward and to higher elevations and how introduced human land uses on the MIDN landscape hinder or help such migrations. The placement and/or utilization of weather/climate stations along latitudinal and elevational gradients could be quite useful for such monitoring activities. Other applications for climate monitoring related to climate change detection in the MIDN include hydrologic studies.

The desire for credible, accurate, complete, and long-term climate records—from any location—cannot be overemphasized. Thus, this consideration always should have a high priority. However, because of spatial diversity in climate, monitoring that fills knowledge gaps and provides information on long-term temporal variability in short-distance relationships also will be valuable. We cannot be sure that climate variability and climate change will affect all parts of a given park unit equally. In fact, it is appropriate to speculate that this is not the case, and spatial variations in temporal variability extend to small spatial scales, a consequence of diversity within MIDN in both topography and in land use patterns.

5.4. Aesthetics

This issue arises frequently enough to deserve comment. Standards for quality climate measurements require open exposures away from heat sources, buildings, pavement, close vegetation and tall trees, and human intrusion (thus away from property lines). By their nature, sites that meet these standards are usually quite visible. In many settings (such as heavily forested areas) these sites also are quite rare, making them precisely the same places that managers wish to protect from aesthetic intrusion. The most suitable and scientifically defensible sites frequently are rejected as candidate locations for weather/climate stations. Most weather/climate stations, therefore, tend to be “hidden” but many of these hidden locations have inferior exposures. Some measure of compromise is nearly always called for in siting weather and climate stations.

The public has vast interest and curiosity in weather and climate, and within the NPS I&M networks, such measurements consistently rate near or at the top of desired public information. There seem to be many possible opportunities for exploiting and embracing this widespread interest within the interpretive mission of the NPS. One way to do this would be to highlight rather than hide these stations and educate the public about the need for adequate siting. A number of weather displays we have encountered during visits have proven inadvertently to serve as counterexamples for how measurements should not be made.

5.5. Information Access

Access to information promotes its use, which in turn promotes attention to station care and maintenance, better data, and more use. An end-to-end view that extends from sensing to decision support is far preferable to isolated and disconnected activities and aids the support infrastructure that is ultimately so necessary for successful, long-term climate monitoring.

Decisions about improvements in monitoring capacity are facilitated greatly by the ability to examine available climate information. Various methods are being created at WRCC to improve access to that information. Web pages providing historic and ongoing climate data, and information from MIDN park units can be accessed at http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps. In the event that this URL changes, there still will be links from the main WRCC Web page entitled “Projects” under NPS.

The WRCC has been steadily developing software to summarize data from hourly sites. This has been occurring under the aegis of the RAWS program and a growing array of product generators ranging from daily and monthly data lists to wind roses and hourly frequency distributions. All park data are available to park personnel via an access code (needed only for data listings) that can be acquired by request. The WRCC RAWS Web page is located at http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/wraws or http://www.raws.dri.edu.

Web pages have been developed to provide access not only to historic and ongoing climate data and information from MIDN park units but also to climate-monitoring efforts for MIDN. These pages can be found through http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps.

Additional access to more standard climate information is accessible though the previously mentioned Web pages, as well as through http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/summary. These summaries are generally for COOP stations.

5.6. Summarized Conclusions and Recommendations

- Station coverage in the MIDN generally falls into two categories. Park units in and near urban areas have satisfactory coverage, while park units in more rural settings have unsatisfactory coverage.
- Although various manual and automated stations exist within 20 km of SHEN, including a couple stations with longer-term climate records, automated data are currently lacking in both the northern and southern parts of SHEN. Two RAWS sites that will soon be activated in SHEN will help remedy these coverage gaps.
- Reliable long-term climate records are lacking in and near several MIDN park units. This is particularly surprising at park units in more urban settings such as HOFU and VAFO.
- Important long-term climate stations have become inactive in recent years at both FRSP and SHEN.
- The response of plant and animal communities in the MIDN to future climate change is likely an important climate-monitoring application. These monitoring efforts will help guide future weather/climate station installations in the MIDN

6.0 Literature Cited

American Association of State Climatologists. 1985. Heights and exposure standards for sensors on automated weather stations. The State Climatologist **9**.

Barnes, B. V. 1991. Deciduous forests of North America. Pages 219-344 *in* E. Röhrig and B. Ulrich, editors. Temperate deciduous forests. Elsevier, New York.

Beven, J., and H. Cobb. 2004. Tropical Cyclone Report. Hurricane Isabel: 6 - 19 September 2003. National Hurricane Center. National Weather Service. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Miami, Florida.

Bonan, G. B. 2002. Ecological Climatology: Concepts and Applications. Cambridge University Press.

Bryson, R. A., and F. K. Hare. 1974. Climates of North America: World Survey of Climatology Volume 11. Elseiver Scientific Publishing Company, New York.

Bureau of Land Management. 1997. Remote Automatic Weather Station (RAWS) and Remote Environmental Monitoring Systems (REMS) standards. RAWS/REMS Support Facility, Boise, Idaho.

Chapin III, F. S., M. S. Torn, and M. Tateno. 1996. Principles of ecosystem sustainability. The American Naturalist **148**:1016-1037.

Comiskey, J. A., K. K. Callahan, and C. M. Davis. 2005. Mid-Atlantic Network Vitals Signs Monitoring Plan: Phase One. Inventory and Monitoring Program, National Park Service: Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Cox, C. B., and P. D. Moore. 2005. Biogeography : an ecological and evolutionary approach. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Massachusetts.

Daly, C., R. P. Neilson, and D. L. Phillips. 1994. A statistical-topographic model for mapping climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain. Journal of Applied Meteorology **33**:140-158.

Daly, C., W. P. Gibson, G. H. Taylor, G. L. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2002. A knowledge-based approach to the statistical mapping of climate. Climate Research **22**:99-113.

Doggett, M., C. Daly, J. Smith, W. Gibson, G. Taylor, G. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2004. High-resolution 1971-2000 mean monthly temperature maps for the western United States. Fourteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology, 84th AMS Annual Meeting. Seattle, Washington, American Meteorological Society, Boston, Massachusetts, January 2004, Paper 4.3, CD-ROM.

Delcourt, H. R., and P. A. Delcourt. 2000. Eastern deciduous forests. Pages 358-395 *in* M. G. Barbour and W. D. Billings, editors. North American terrestrial vegetation. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Delcourt, P. A., H. R. Delcourt, D. F. Morse, and P. A. Morse. 1993. History, evolution, and organization of vegetation and human culture. Pages 47-79 *in* W. H. Martin, S. G. Boyce, and A. C. Echternacht, editors. Biodiversity of the southeastern United States: lowland terrestrial communities. Wiley, New York

Environmental Protection Agency. 1987. On-site meteorological program guidance for regulatory modeling applications. EPA-450/4-87-013. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

Environmental Protection Agency. 2001. How Will Climate Change Affect the Mid-Atlantic Region? EPA/903/F-00/002. US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, District of Columbia.

Finklin, A. I., and W. C. Fischer. 1990. Weather station handbook –an interagency guide for wildland managers. NFES No. 2140. National Wildfire Coordinating Group, Boise, Idaho.

Fischer, A., D. Abler, E. Barron, R. Bord, R. Crane, D. DeWalle, C. G. Knight, R. Najjar, E. Nizeyimana, R. O'Connor, and others. 2000. Preparing For A Changing Climate: The Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change. Mid-Atlantic Foundations. A report of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Assessment Team. Mid-Atlantic Regional Assessment Team, Mid-Atlantic Foundations, Washington, District of Columbia.

Gibson, W. P., C. Daly, T. Kittel, D. Nychka, C. Johns, N. Rosenbloom, A. McNab, and G. Taylor. 2002. Development of a 103-year high-resolution climate data set for the conterminous United States. Thirteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology. Portland, Oregon, American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, May 2002:181-183.

Hayden, B., and P. Michaels. 2005. Virginia Climate Description. Virginia State Climatology Office. Available from: http://climate.virginia.edu/description.htm (accessed 1 November 2006).

I&M. 2006. I&M Inventories home page. http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/inventory/index.cfm.

Jacobson, M. C., R. J. Charlson, H. Rodhe, and G. H. Orians. 2000. Earth System Science: From Biogeochemical Cycles to Global Change. Academic Press, San Diego.

Karl, T. R., V. E. Derr, D. R. Easterling, C. K. Folland, D. J. Hoffman, S. Levitus, N. Nicholls, D. E. Parker, and G. W. Withee. 1996a. Critical issues for long-term climate monitoring. Pages 55-92 *in* T. R. Karl, editor. Long Term Climate Monitoring by the Global Climate Observing System, Kluwer Publishing.

Karl, T. R., R. W. Knight, D. R. Easterling, and R. G. Quayle, 1996b. Trends in U.S. climate during the twentieth century. Consequences **1**:2-12.

Karl, T. R., and R. W. Knight. 1998. Secular trends in precipitation amount, frequency, and intensity in the United States. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc. **79**:231-241.

Lyons, S. W. 2004. U.S. tropical cyclone landfall variability: 1950-2002. Weather and Forecasting **19**:473-480.

Mid-Atlantic Regional Assessment Team. 2000. Preparing for a Changing Climate: The Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change – Mid-Atlantic Overview. Report for the U.S. Global Change Research Program. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

National Assessment Synthesis Team. 2001. Climate Change Impacts on the United States: The Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change, Report for the U.S. Global Change Research Program. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

National Research Council. 2001. A Climate Services Vision: First Steps Toward the Future. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.

National Wildfire Coordinating Group. 2004. National fire danger rating system weather station standards. Report PMS 426.3. National Wildfire Coordinating Group, Boise, Idaho.

Neilson, R. P. 1987. Biotic regionalization and climatic controls in western North America. Vegetatio **70**:135-147.

Oakley, K. L., L. P. Thomas, and S. G. Fancy. 2003. Guidelines for long-term monitoring protocols. Wildlife Society Bulletin **31**:1000-1003.

Polsky, C., J. Allard, N. Currit, R. Crane, and B. Yarnal. 2000. The Mid-Atlantic region and its climate: past, present, and future. Climate Research **14**:161-173.

Redmond, K. T., D. B. Simeral, and G. D. McCurdy. 2005. Climate monitoring for southwest Alaska national parks: network design and site selection. Report 05-01. Western Regional Climate Center, Reno, Nevada.

Schlesinger, W. H. 1997. Biogeochemistry: An Analysis of Global Change. Academic Press, San Diego.

Smith, E. 1999. Atlantic and East Coast hurricanes 1900-98: a frequency and intensity study for the twenty-first century. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society **80**:2717-2720.

Tanner, B. D. 1990. Automated weather stations. Remote Sensing Reviews **5**:73-98.

The Pennsylvania State Climatologist. 2005. Summary of Pennsylvania Climate: 1888 to present. Penn State University. Available at: http://pasc.met.psu.edu/PA_Climatologist/state/index.html (accessed 1 November 2006).

White, P. S. and S. P. Wilds. 1998. Southeast. Pages 255-314 *in* M. J. Mac, P. A. Opler, C. E. Puckett Haecker, and P. D. Doran, editors. Status and trends of the nation's biological resources. 2 vols. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.

World Meteorological Organization. 1983. Guide to meteorological instruments and methods of observation, No. 8, 5th edition, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva Switzerland.

World Meteorological Organization. 2005. Organization and planning of intercomparisons of rainfall intensity gauges. World Meteorological Organization, Geneva Switzerland.

Yahner, R. H. 2000. Eastern deciduous forest: ecology and wildlife conservation. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Appendix A. Glossary

Climate—Complete and entire ensemble of statistical descriptors of temporal and spatial properties comprising the behavior of the atmosphere. These descriptors include means, variances, frequency distributions, autocorrelations, spatial correlations and other patterns of association, temporal lags, and element-to-element relationships. The descriptors have a physical basis in flows and reservoirs of energy and mass. Climate and weather phenomena shade gradually into each other and are ultimately inseparable.

Climate Element—(same as Weather Element) Attribute or property of the state of the atmosphere that is measured, estimated, or derived. Examples of climate elements include temperature, wind speed, wind direction, precipitation amount, precipitation type, relative humidity, dewpoint, solar radiation, snow depth, soil temperature at a given depth, etc. A derived element is a function of other elements (like degree days or number of days with rain) and is not measured directly with a sensor. The terms "parameter" or "variable" are not used to describe elements.

Climate Network—Group of climate stations having a common purpose; the group is often owned and maintained by a single organization.

Climate Station—Station where data are collected to track atmospheric conditions over the long-term. Often, this station operates to additional standards to verify long-term consistency. For these stations, the detailed circumstances surrounding a set of measurements (siting and exposure, instrument changes, etc.) are important.

Data—Measurements specifying the state of the physical environment. Does not include metadata.

Data Inventory—Information about overall data properties for each station within a weather or climate network. A data inventory may include start/stop dates, percentages of available data, breakdowns by climate element, counts of actual data values, counts or fractions of data types, etc. These properties must be determined by actually reading the data and thus require the data to be available, accessible, and in a readable format.

NPS I&M Network—A set of NPS park units grouped by a common theme, typically by natural resource and/or geographic region.

Metadata—Information necessary to interpret environmental data properly, organized as a history or series of snapshots—data about data. Examples include details of measurement processes, station circumstances and exposures, assumptions about the site, network purpose and background, types of observations and sensors, pre-treatment of data, access information, maintenance history and protocols, observational methods, archive locations, owner, and station start/end period.

Quality Assurance—Planned and systematic set of activities to provide adequate confidence that products and services are resulting in credible and correct information. Includes quality control.

Quality Control—Evaluation, assessment, and improvement of imperfect data by utilizing other imperfect data.

Station Inventory—Information about a set of stations obtained from metadata that accompany the network or networks. A station inventory can be compiled from direct and indirect reports prepared by others.

Weather—Instantaneous state of the atmosphere at any given time, mainly with respect to its effects on biological activities. As distinguished from climate, weather consists of the short-term (minutes to days) variations in the atmosphere. Popularly, weather is thought of in terms of temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind, sky condition, visibility, and cloud conditions.

Weather Element (same as Climate Element)—Attribute or property of the state of the atmosphere that is measured, estimated, or derived. Examples of weather elements include temperature, wind speed, wind direction, precipitation amount, precipitation type, relative humidity, dewpoint, solar radiation, snow depth, soil temperature at a given depth, etc. A derived weather element is a function of other elements (like degree days or number of days with rain) and is not measured directly. The terms "parameter" and "variable" are not used to describe weather elements.

Weather Network—Group of weather stations usually owned and maintained by a particular organization and usually for a specific purpose.

Weather Station—Station where collected data are intended for near-real-time use with less need for reference to long-term conditions. In many cases, the detailed circumstances of a set of measurements (siting and exposure, instrument changes, etc.) from weather stations are not as important as for climate stations.

Appendix B. Climate-monitoring principles

Since the late 1990s, frequent references have been made to a set of climate-monitoring principles enunciated in 1996 by Tom Karl, director of the NOAA NCDC in Asheville, North Carolina. These monitoring principles also have been referred to informally as the "Ten Commandments of Climate Monitoring." Both versions are given here. In addition, these principles have been adopted by the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS 2004).

(Compiled by Kelly Redmond, Western Regional Climate Center, Desert Research Institute, August 2000.)

B.1. Full Version (Karl et al. 1996)

B.1.1. Effects on climate records of instrument changes, observing practices, observation locations, sampling rates, etc., must be known before such changes are implemented. This can be ascertained through a period where overlapping measurements from old and new observing systems are collected or sometimes by comparing the old and new observing systems with a reference standard. Site stability for in situ measurements, both in terms of physical location and changes in the nearby environment, also should be a key criterion in site selection. Thus, many synoptic network stations, which are primarily used in weather forecasting but also provide valuable climate data, and dedicated climate stations intended to be operational for extended periods must be subject to this policy.

B.1.2. Processing algorithms and changes in these algorithms must be well documented. Documentation should be carried with the data throughout the data-archiving process.

B.1.3. Knowledge of instrument, station, and/or platform history is essential for interpreting and using the data. Changes in instrument sampling time, local environmental conditions for in situ measurements, and other factors pertinent to interpreting the observations and measurements should be recorded as a mandatory part in the observing routine and be archived with the original data.

B.1.4. In situ and other observations with a long, uninterrupted record should be maintained. Every effort should be applied to protect the data sets that have provided long-term, homogeneous observations. "Long-term" for space-based measurements is measured in decades, but for more conventional measurements, "long-term" may be a century or more. Each element in the observational system should develop a list of prioritized sites or observations based on their contribution to long-term climate monitoring.

B.1.5. Calibration, validation, and maintenance facilities are critical requirements for long-term climatic data sets. Homogeneity in the climate record must be assessed routinely, and corrective action must become part of the archived record.

B.1.6. Where feasible, some level of "low-technology" backup to "high-technology" observing systems should be developed to safeguard against unexpected operational failures.

B.1.7. Regions having insufficient data, variables and regions sensitive to change, and key measurements lacking adequate spatial and temporal resolution should be given the highest priority in designing and implementing new climate-observing systems.

B.1.8. Network designers and instrument engineers must receive long-term climate requirements at the outset of the network design process. This is particularly important because most observing systems have been designed for purposes other than long-term climate monitoring. Instruments must possess adequate accuracy with biases small enough to document climate variations and changes.

B.1.9. Much of the development of new observational capabilities and the evidence supporting the value of these observations stem from research-oriented needs or programs. A lack of stable, long-term commitment to these observations and lack of a clear transition plan from research to operations are two frequent limitations in the development of adequate, long-term monitoring capabilities. Difficulties in securing a long-term commitment must be overcome in order to improve the climate-observing system in a timely manner with minimal interruptions.

B.1.10. Data management systems that facilitate access, use, and interpretation are essential. Freedom of access, low cost, mechanisms that facilitate use (directories, catalogs, browse capabilities, availability of metadata on station histories, algorithm accessibility and documentation, etc.) and quality control should guide data management. International cooperation is critical for successful management of data used to monitor long-term climate change and variability.

B.2. Abbreviated version, “Ten Commandments of Climate Monitoring”

B.2.1. Assess the impact of new climate-observing systems or changes to existing systems before they are implemented.

“Thou shalt properly manage network change.” (assess effects of proposed changes)

B.2.2. Require a suitable period where measurement from new and old climate-observing systems will overlap.

“Thou shalt conduct parallel testing.” (compare old and replacement systems)

B.2.3. Treat calibration, validation, algorithm-change, and data-homogeneity assessments with the same care as the data.

"Thou shalt collect metadata." (fully document system and operating procedures)

B.2.4. Verify capability for routinely assessing the quality and homogeneity of the data including high-resolution data for extreme events.

“Thou shalt assure data quality and continuity.” (assess as part of routine operating procedures)

B.2.5. Integrate assessments like those conducted by the International Panel on Climate Change into global climate-observing priorities.

“Thou shalt anticipate the use of data.” (integrated environmental assessment; component in operational plan for system)

B.2.6. Maintain long-term weather and climate stations.

“Thou shalt worship historic significance.” (maintain homogeneous data sets from long–term, climate-observing systems)

B.2.7. Place high priority on increasing observations in regions lacking sufficient data and in regions sensitive to change and variability.

"Thou shalt acquire complementary data." (new sites to fill observational gaps)

B.2.8. Provide network operators, designers, and instrument engineers with long-term requirements at the outset of the design and implementation phases for new systems.

“Thou shalt specify requirements for climate observation systems.” (application and usage of observational data)

B.2.9. Carefully consider the transition from research-observing system to long-term operation.

“Thou shalt have continuity of purpose.” (stable long-term commitments)

B.2.10. Focus on data-management systems that facilitate access, use, and interpretation of weather data and metadata.

“Thou shalt provide access to data and metadata.” (readily available weather and climate information)

B.3. Literature Cited

Karl, T. R., V. E. Derr, D. R. Easterling, C. K. Folland, D. J. Hoffman, S. Levitus, N. Nicholls, D. E. Parker, and G. W. Withee. 1996. Critical Issues for Long-Term Climate Monitoring. Pages 55-92 *in* T. R. Karl, editor. Long Term Climate Monitoring by the Global Climate Observing System, Kluwer Publishing.

Global Climate Observing System. 2004. Implementation Plan for the Global Observing System for Climate in Support of the UNFCCC. GCOS-92, WMO/TD No. 1219, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Appendix C. Factors in operating a weather/ climate network

C.1. Climate versus Weather

- Climate measurements require *consistency through time.*

C.2. Network Purpose

- Anticipated or desired lifetime.
- Breadth of network mission (commitment by needed constituency).
- Dedicated constituency—no network survives without a dedicated constituency.

C.3. Site Identification and Selection

- Spanning gradients in climate or biomes with transects.
- Issues regarding representative spatial scale—site uniformity versus site clustering.
- Alignment with and contribution to network mission.
- Exposure—ability to measure representative quantities.
- Logistics—ability to service station (Always or only in favorable weather?).
- Site redundancy (positive for quality control, negative for extra resources).
- Power—is AC needed?
- Site security—is protection from vandalism needed?
- Permitting often a major impediment and usually underestimated.

C.4. Station Hardware

- Survival—weather is the main cause of lost weather/climate data.
- Robustness of sensors—ability to measure and record in any condition.
- Quality—distrusted records are worthless and a waste of time and money.
  - High quality—will cost up front but pays off later.
  - Low quality—may provide a lower start-up cost but will cost more later (low cost can be expensive).
- Redundancy—backup if sensors malfunction.
- Ice and snow—measurements are much more difficult than rain measurements.
- Severe environments (expense is about two–three times greater than for stations in more benign settings).

C.5. Communications

- Reliability—live data have a much larger constituency.
- One-way or two-way.
  - Retrieval of missed transmissions.
  - Ability to reprogram data logger remotely.
  - Remote troubleshooting abilities.
  - Continuing versus one-time costs.
- Back-up procedures to prevent data loss during communication outages.
- Live communications increase problems but also increase value.

C.6. Maintenance

- Main reason why networks fail (and most networks do eventually fail!).
- Key issue with nearly every network.
- Who will perform maintenance?
- Degree of commitment and motivation to contribute.
- Periodic? On-demand as needed? Preventive?
- Equipment change-out schedules and upgrades for sensors and software.
- Automated stations require skilled and experienced labor.
- Calibration—sensors often drift (climate).
- Site maintenance essential (constant vegetation, surface conditions, nearby influences).
- Typical automated station will cost about $2K per year to maintain.
- Documentation—photos, notes, visits, changes, essential for posterity.
- Planning for equipment life cycle and technological advances.

C.7. Maintaining Programmatic Continuity and Corporate Knowledge

- Long-term vision and commitment needed.
- Institutionalizing versus personalizing—developing appropriate dependencies.

C.8. Data Flow

- Centralized ingest?
- Centralized access to data and data products?
- Local version available?
- Contract out work or do it yourself?
- Quality control of data.
- Archival.
- Metadata—historic information, not a snapshot. Every station should collect metadata.
- Post-collection processing, multiple data-ingestion paths.

C.9. Products

- Most basic product consists of the data values.
- Summaries.
- Write own applications or leverage existing mechanisms?

C.10. Funding

- Prototype approaches as proof of concept.
- Linking and leveraging essential.
- Constituencies—every network needs a constituency.
- Bridging to practical and operational communities? Live data needed.
- Bridging to counterpart research efforts and initiatives—funding source.
- Creativity, resourcefulness, and persistence usually are essential to success.

C.11. Final Comments

- Deployment is by far the easiest part in operating a network.
- Maintenance is the main issue.
- Best analogy: Operating a network is like raising a child; it requires constant attention.

Source: Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC)

Appendix D. General design considerations for weather/ climate-monitoring programs

The process for designing a climate-monitoring program benefits from anticipating design and protocol issues discussed here. Much of this material is been excerpted from a report addressing the Channel Islands National Park (Redmond and McCurdy 2005), where an example is found illustrating how these factors can be applied to a specific setting. Many national park units possess some climate or meteorology feature that sets them apart from more familiar or "standard" settings.

D.1. Introduction

There are several criteria that must be used in deciding to deploy new stations and where these new stations should be sited.

- Where are existing stations located?
- Where have data been gathered in the past (discontinued locations)?
- Where would a new station fill a knowledge gap about basic, long-term climatic averages for an area of interest?
- Where would a new station fill a knowledge gap about how climate behaves over time?
- As a special case for behavior over time, what locations might be expected to show a more sensitive response to climate change?
- How do answers to the preceding questions depend on the climate element? Are answers the same for precipitation, temperature, wind, snowfall, humidity, etc.?
- What role should manual measurements play? How should manual measurements interface with automated measurements?
- Are there special technical or management issues, either present or anticipated in the next 5–15 years, requiring added climate information?
- What unique information is provided in addition to information from existing sites? "Redundancy is bad."
- What nearby information is available to estimate missing observations because observing systems always experience gaps and lose data? "Redundancy is good."
- How would logistics and maintenance affect these decisions?

In relation to the preceding questions, there are several topics that should be considered. The following topics are not listed in a particular order.

D.1.1. Network Purpose

Humans seem to have an almost reflexive need to measure temperature and precipitation, along with other climate elements. These reasons span a broad range from utilitarian to curiosity-driven. Although there are well-known recurrent patterns of need and data use, new uses are always appearing. The number of uses ranges in the thousands. Attempts have been made to categorize such uses (see NRC, 1998; NRC, 2001). Because climate measurements are accumulated over a long time, they should be treated as multi-purpose and should be undertaken in a manner that serves the widest possible applications. Some applications remain constant, while others rise and fall in importance. An insistent issue today may subside, while the next pressing issue of tomorrow barely may be anticipated. The notion that humans might affect the climate of the entire Earth was nearly unimaginable when the national USDA (later NOAA) cooperative weather network began in the late 1800s. Abundant experience has shown, however, that there always will be a demand for a history record of climate measurements and their properties. Experience also shows that there is an expectation that climate measurements will be taken and made available to the general public.

An exhaustive list of uses for data would fill many pages and still be incomplete. In broad terms, however, there are needs to document environmental conditions that disrupt or otherwise affect park operations (e.g., storms and droughts). Design and construction standards are determined by climatological event frequencies that exceed certain thresholds. Climate is a determinant that sometimes attracts and sometimes discourages visitors. Climate may play a large part in the park experience (e.g., Death Valley and heat are nearly synonymous). Some park units are large enough to encompass spatial or elevation diversity in climate and the sequence of events can vary considerably inside or close to park boundaries. That is, temporal trends and statistics may not be the same everywhere, and this spatial structure should be sampled. The granularity of this structure depends on the presence of topography or large climate gradients or both, such as that found along the U.S. West Coast in summer with the rapid transition from the marine layer to the hot interior.

Plant and animal communities and entire ecosystems react to every nuance in the physical environment. No aspect of weather and climate goes undetected in the natural world. Wilson (1998) proposed “an informal rule of biological evolution” that applies here: “If an organic sensor can be imagined that is capable of detecting any particular environmental signal, a species exists somewhere that possesses this sensor.” Every weather and climate event, whether dull or extraordinary to humans, matters to some organism. Dramatic events and creeping incremental change both have consequences to living systems. Extreme events or disturbances can “reset the clock” or “shake up the system” and lead to reverberations that last for years to centuries or longer. Slow change can carry complex nonlinear systems (e.g., any living assemblage) into states where chaotic transitions and new behavior occur. These changes are seldom predictable, typically are observed after the fact, and understood only in retrospect. Climate changes may not be exciting, but as a well-known atmospheric scientist, Mike Wallace, from the University of Washington once noted, “subtle does not mean unimportant.”

Thus, individuals who observe the climate should be able to record observations accurately and depict both rapid and slow changes. In particular, an array of artificial influences easily can confound detection of slow changes. The record as provided can contain both real climate variability (that took place in the atmosphere) and fake climate variability (that arose directly from the way atmospheric changes were observed and recorded). As an example, trees growing near a climate station with an excellent anemometer will make it appear that the wind gradually slowed down over many years. Great care must be taken to protect against sources of fake climate variability on the longer-time scales of years to decades. Processes leading to the observed climate are not stationary; rather these processes draw from probability distributions that vary with time. For this reason, climatic time series do not exhibit statistical stationarity. The implications are manifold. There are no true climatic “normals” to which climate inevitably must return. Rather, there are broad ranges of climatic conditions. Climate does not demonstrate exact repetition but instead continual fluctuation and sometimes approximate repetition. In addition, there is always new behavior waiting to occur. Consequently, the business of climate monitoring is never finished, and there is no point where we can state confidently that “enough” is known.

D.1.2. Robustness

The most frequent cause for loss of weather data is the weather itself, the very thing we wish to record. The design of climate and weather observing programs should consider the meteorological equivalent of “peaking power” employed by utilities. Because environmental disturbances have significant effects on ecologic systems, sensors, data loggers, and communications networks should be able to function during the most severe conditions that realistically can be anticipated over the next 50–100 years. Systems designed in this manner are less likely to fail under more ordinary conditions, as well as more likely to transmit continuous, quality data for both tranquil and active periods.

D.1.3. Weather versus Climate

For “weather” measurements, pertaining to what is approximately happening here and now, small moves and changes in exposure are not as critical. For “climate” measurements, where values from different points in time are compared, siting and exposure are critical factors, and it is vitally important that the observing circumstances remain essentially unchanged over the duration of the station record.

Station moves can affect different elements to differing degrees. Even small moves of several meters, especially vertically, can affect temperature records. Hills and knolls act differently from the bottoms of small swales, pockets, or drainage channels (Whiteman 2000; Geiger et al. 2003). Precipitation is probably less subject to change with moves of 50–100 m than other elements (that is, precipitation has less intrinsic variation in small spaces) except if wind flow over the gauge is affected.

D.1.4. Physical Setting

Siting and exposure, and their continuity and consistency through time, significantly influence the climate records produced by a station. These two terms have overlapping connotations. We use the term “siting” in a more general sense, reserving the term “exposure” generally for the particular circumstances affecting the ability of an instrument to record measurements that are representative of the desired spatial or temporal scale.

D.1.5. Measurement Intervals

Climatic processes occur continuously in time, but our measurement systems usually record in discrete chunks of time: for example, seconds, hours, or days. These measurements often are referred to as “systematic” measurements. Interval averages may hide active or interesting periods of highly intense activity. Alternatively, some systems record “events” when a certain threshold of activity is exceeded (examples: another millimeter of precipitation has fallen, another kilometer of wind has moved past, the temperature has changed by a degree, a gust higher than 9.9 m/s has been measured). When this occurs, measurements from all sensors are reported. These measurements are known as “breakpoint” data. In relatively unchanging conditions (long calm periods or rainless weeks, for example), event recorders should send a signal that they are still “alive and well.” If systematic recorders are programmed to note and periodically report the highest, lowest, and mean value within each time interval, the likelihood is reduced that interesting behavior will be glossed over or lost. With the capacity of modern data loggers, it is recommended to record and report extremes within the basic time increment (e.g., hourly or 10 minutes). This approach also assists quality-control procedures.

There is usually a trade-off between data volume and time increment, and most automated systems now are set to record approximately hourly. A number of field stations maintained by WRCC are programmed to record in 5- or 10-minute increments, which readily serve to construct an hourly value. However, this approach produces 6–12 times as much data as hourly data. These systems typically do not record details of events at sub-interval time scales, but they easily can record peak values, or counts of threshold exceedance, within the time intervals.

Thus, for each time interval at an automated station, we recommend that several kinds of information—mean or sum, extreme maximum and minimum, and sometimes standard deviation—be recorded. These measurements are useful for quality control and other purposes. Modern data loggers and office computers have quite high capacity. Diagnostic information indicating the state of solar chargers or battery voltages and their extremes is of great value. This topic will be discussed in greater detail in a succeeding section.

Automation also has made possible adaptive or intelligent monitoring techniques where systems vary the recording rate based on detection of the behavior of interest by the software. Sub-interval behavior of interest can be masked on occasion (e.g., a 5-minute extreme downpour with high-erosive capability hidden by an innocuous hourly total). Most users prefer measurements that are systematic in time because they are much easier to summarize and manipulate.

For breakpoint data produced by event reporters, there also is a need to send periodically a signal that the station is still functioning, even though there is nothing more to report. “No report” does not necessarily mean “no data,” and it is important to distinguish between the actual observation that was recorded and the content of that observation (e.g., an observation of “0.00” is not the same as “no observation”).

D.1.6. Mixed Time Scales

There are times when we may wish to combine information from radically different scales. For example, over the past 100 years we may want to know how the frequency of 5-minute precipitation peaks has varied or how the frequency of peak 1-second wind gusts have varied. We may also want to know over this time if nearby vegetation gradually has grown up to increasingly block the wind or to slowly improve precipitation catch. Answers to these questions require knowledge over a wide range of time scales.

D.1.7. Elements

For manual measurements, the typical elements recorded included temperature extremes, precipitation, and snowfall/snow depth. Automated measurements typically include temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind speed and direction, and solar radiation. An exception to this exists in very windy locations where precipitation is difficult to measure accurately. Automated measurements of snow are improving, but manual measurements are still preferable, as long as shielding is present. Automated measurement of frozen precipitation presents numerous challenges that have not been resolved fully, and the best gauges are quite expensive ($3–8K).

Soil temperatures also are included sometimes. Soil moisture is extremely useful, but measurements are not made at many sites. In addition, care must be taken in the installation and maintenance of instruments used in measuring soil moisture. Soil properties vary tremendously in short distances as well, and it is often very difficult (“impossible”) to accurately document these variations (without digging up all the soil!). In cooler climates, ultrasonic sensors that detect snow depth are becoming commonplace.

D.1.8. Wind Standards

Wind varies the most in the shortest distance, since it always decreases to zero near the ground and increases rapidly (approximately logarithmically) with height near the ground. Changes in anemometer height obviously will affect distribution of wind speed as will changes in vegetation, obstructions such as buildings, etc. A site that has a 3-m (10-ft) mast clearly will be less windy than a site that has a 6-m (20-ft) or 10-m (33-ft) mast. Historically, many U.S. airports (FAA and NWS) and most current RAWS sites have used a standard 6-m (20-ft) mast for wind measurements. Some NPS RAWS sites utilize shorter masts. Over the last decade, as Automated Surface Observing Systems (ASOSs, mostly NWS) and Automated Weather Observing Systems (AWOSs, mostly FAA) have been deployed at most airports, wind masts have been raised to 8 or 10 m (26 or 33 ft), depending on airplane clearance. The World Meteorological Organization recommends 10 m as the height for wind measurements (WMO 1983; 2005), and more groups are migrating slowly to this standard. The American Association of State Climatologists (AASC 1985) have recommended that wind be measured at 3 m, a standard geared more for agricultural applications than for general purpose uses where higher levels usually are preferred. Different anemometers have different starting thresholds; therefore, areas that frequently experience very light winds may not produce wind measurements thus affecting long-term mean estimates of wind speed. For both sustained winds (averages over a short interval of 2–60 minutes) and especially for gusts, the duration of the sampling interval makes considerable difference. For the same wind history, 1–second gusts are higher than gusts averaging 3 seconds, which in turn are greater than 5-second averages, so that the same sequence would be described with different numbers (all three systems and more are in use). Changes in the averaging procedure, or in height or exposure, can lead to “false” or “fake” climate change with no change in actual climate. Changes in any of these should be noted in the metadata.

D.1.9. Wind Nomenclature

Wind is a vector quantity having a direction and a speed. Directions can be two- or three-dimensional; they will be three-dimensional if the vertical component is important. In all common uses, winds always are denoted by the direction they blow *from* (north wind or southerly breeze). This convention exists because wind often brings weather, and thus our attention is focused upstream. However, this approach contrasts with the way ocean currents are viewed. Ocean currents usually are denoted by the direction they are moving *towards* (eastward current moves from west to east). In specialized applications (such as in atmospheric modeling), wind velocity vectors point in the direction that the wind is blowing. Thus, a southwesterly wind (from the southwest) has both northward and eastward (to the north and to the east) components. Except near mountains, wind cannot blow up or down near the ground, so the vertical component of wind often is approximated as zero, and the horizontal component is emphasized.

D.1.10. Frozen Precipitation

Frozen precipitation is more difficult to measure than liquid precipitation, especially with automated techniques. Goodison et al. (1998), Sevruk and Harmon (1984), Yang et al. (1998, 2001) provide many of the reasons to explain this. The importance of frozen precipitation varies greatly from one setting to another. This subject was discussed in greater detail in a related inventory and monitoring report for the Alaska park units (Redmond et al. 2005).

In climates that receive frozen precipitation, a decision must be made whether or not to try to record such events accurately. This usually means that the precipitation must be turned into liquid either by falling into an antifreeze fluid solution that is then weighed or by heating the precipitation enough to melt and fall through a measuring mechanism such as a nearly-balanced tipping bucket. Accurate measurements from the first approach require expensive gauges; tipping buckets can achieve this resolution readily but are more apt to lose some or all precipitation. Improvements have been made to the heating mechanism on the NWS tipping-bucket gauge used for the ASOS to correct its numerous deficiencies making it less problematic; however, this gauge is not inexpensive. A heat supply needed to melt frozen precipitation usually requires more energy than renewable energy (solar panels or wind recharging) can provide thus AC power is needed. Periods of frozen precipitation or rime often provide less-than-optimal recharging conditions with heavy clouds, short days, low-solar-elevation angles and more horizon blocking, and cold temperatures causing additional drain on the battery.

D.1.11. Save or Lose

A second consideration with precipitation is determining if the measurement should be saved (as in weighing systems) or lost (as in tipping-bucket systems). With tipping buckets, after the water has passed through the tipping mechanism, it usually just drops to the ground. Thus, there is no checksum to ensure that the sum of all the tips adds up to what has been saved in a reservoir at some location. By contrast, the weighing gauges continually accumulate until the reservoir is emptied, the reported value is the total reservoir content (for example, the height of the liquid column in a tube), and the incremental precipitation is the difference in depth between two known times. These weighing gauges do not always have the same fine resolution. Some gauges only record to the nearest centimeter, which is usually acceptable for hydrology but not necessarily for other needs. (For reference, a millimeter of precipitation can get a person in street clothes quite wet.) Other weighing gauges are capable of measuring to the 0.25-mm (0.01-in.) resolution but do not have as much capacity and must be emptied more often. Day/night and storm-related thermal expansion and contraction and sometimes wind shaking can cause fluid pressure from accumulated totals to go up and down in SNOTEL gauges by small increments (commonly 0.3-3 cm, or 0.01–0.10 ft) leading to “negative precipitation” followed by similarly non-real light precipitation when, in fact, no change took place in the amount of accumulated precipitation.

D.1.12. Time

Time should always be in local standard time (LST), and daylight savings time (DST) should never be used under any circumstances with automated equipment and timers. Using DST leads to one duplicate hour, one missing hour, and a season of displaced values, as well as needless confusion and a data-management nightmare. Absolute time, such as Greenwich Mean Time (GMT) or Coordinated Universal Time (UTC), also can be used because these formats are unambiguously translatable. Since measurements only provide information about what already *has* occurred or *is* occurring and not what *will* occur, they should always be assigned to the *ending time* of the associated interval with hour 24 marking the end of the last hour of the day. In this system, midnight always represents the end of the day, not the start. To demonstrate the importance of this differentiation, we have encountered situations where police officers seeking corroborating weather data could not recall whether the time on their crime report from a year ago was the starting midnight or the ending midnight! Station positions should be known to within a few meters, easily accomplished with GPS, so that time zones and solar angles can be determined accurately.

D.1.13. Automated versus Manual

Most of this report has addressed automated measurements. Historically, most measurements are manual and typically collected once a day. In many cases, manual measurements continue because of habit, usefulness, and desire for continuity over time. Manual measurements are extremely useful and when possible should be encouraged. However, automated measurements are becoming more common. For either, it is important to record time in a logically consistent manner.

It should not be automatically assumed that newer data and measurements are “better” than older data or that manual data are “worse” than automated data. Older or simpler manual measurements are often of very high quality even if they sometimes are not in the most convenient digital format.

There is widespread desire to use automated systems to reduce human involvement. This is admirable and understandable, but every automated weather/climate station or network requires significant human attention and maintenance. A telling example concerns the Oklahoma Mesonet (see Brock et al. 1995, and bibliography at http://www.mesonet.ou.edu), a network of about 115 high–quality, automated meteorological stations spread over Oklahoma, where about 80 percent of the annual ($2–3M) budget is nonetheless allocated to humans with only about 20 percent allocated to equipment.

D.1.14. Manual Conventions

Manual measurements typically are made once a day. Elements usually consist of maximum and minimum temperature, temperature at observation time, precipitation, snowfall, snow depth, and sometimes evaporation, wind, or other information. Since it is not actually known when extremes occurred, the only logical approach, and the nationwide convention, is to ascribe the entire measurement to the time-interval date and to enter it on the form in that way. For morning observers (for example, 8 am to 8 am), this means that the maximum temperature written for today often is from yesterday afternoon and sometimes the minimum temperature for the 24-hr period actually occurred yesterday morning. However, this is understood and expected. It is often a surprise to observers to see how many maximum temperatures do not occur in the afternoon and how many minimum temperatures do not occur in the predawn hours. This is especially true in environments that are colder, higher, northerly, cloudy, mountainous, or coastal. As long as this convention is strictly followed every day, it has been shown that truly excellent climate records can result (Redmond 1992). Manual observers should reset equipment only one time per day at the official observing time. Making more than one measurement a day is discouraged strongly; this practice results in a hybrid record that is too difficult to interpret. The only exception is for total daily snowfall. New snowfall can be measured up to four times per day with no observations closer than six hours. It is well known that more frequent measurement of snow increases the annual total because compaction is a continuous process.

Two main purposes for climate observations are to establish the long-term averages for given locations and to track variations in climate. Broadly speaking, these purposes address topics of absolute and relative climate behavior. Once absolute behavior has been "established" (a task that is never finished because long-term averages continue to vary in time)—temporal variability quickly becomes the item of most interest.

D.2. Representativeness

Having discussed important factors to consider when new sites are installed, we now turn our attention to site "representativeness." In popular usage, we often encounter the notion that a site is "representative" of another site if it receives the same annual precipitation or records the same annual temperature or if some other element-specific, long-term average has a similar value. This notion of representativeness has a certain limited validity, but there are other aspects of this idea that need to be considered.

A climate monitoring site also can be said to be representative if climate records from that site show sufficiently strong temporal correlations with a large number of locations over a sufficiently large area. If station A receives 20 cm a year and station B receives 200 cm a year, these climates obviously receive quite differing amounts of precipitation. However, if their monthly, seasonal, or annual correlations are high (for example, 0.80 or higher for a particular time scale), one site can be used as a surrogate for estimating values at the other if measurements for a particular month, season, or year are missing. That is, a wet or dry month at one station is also a wet or dry month (relative to its own mean) at the comparison station. Note that high correlations on one time scale do not imply automatically that high correlations will occur on other time scales.

Likewise, two stations having similar mean climates (for example, similar annual precipitation) might not co-vary in close synchrony (for example, coastal versus interior). This may be considered a matter of climate "affiliation" for a particular location.

Thus, the representativeness of a site can refer either to the basic climatic averages for a given duration (or time window within the annual cycle) or to the extent that the site co-varies in time with respect to all surrounding locations. One site can be representative of another in the first sense but not the second, or vice versa, or neither, or both—all combinations are possible.

If two sites are perfectly correlated then, in a sense, they are "redundant." However, redundancy has value because all sites will experience missing data especially with automated equipment in rugged environments and harsh climates where outages and other problems nearly can be guaranteed. In many cases, those outages are caused by the weather, particularly by unusual weather and the very conditions we most wish to know about. Methods for filling in those values will require proxy information from this or other nearby networks. Thus, redundancy is a virtue rather than a vice.

In general, the cooperative stations managed by the NWS have produced much longer records than automated stations like RAWS or SNOTEL stations. The RAWS stations often have problems with precipitation, especially in winter, or with missing data, so that low correlations may be data problems rather than climatic dissimilarity. The RAWS records also are relatively short, so correlations should be interpreted with care. In performing and interpreting such analyses, however, we must remember that there are physical climate reasons and observational reasons why stations within a short distance (even a few tens or hundreds of meters) may not correlate well.

D.2.1. Temporal Behavior

It is possible that high correlations will occur between station pairs during certain portions of the year (i.e., January) but low correlations may occur during other portions of the year (e.g., September or October). The relative contributions of these seasons to the annual total (for precipitation) or average (for temperature) and the correlations for each month are both factors in the correlation of an aggregated time window of longer duration that encompasses those seasons (e.g., one of the year definitions such as calendar year or water year). A complete and careful evaluation ideally would include such a correlation analysis but requires more resources and data. Note that it also is possible and frequently is observed that temperatures are highly correlated while precipitation is not or vice versa, and these relations can change according to the time of year. If two stations are well correlated for all climate elements for all portions of the year, then they can be considered redundant.

With scarce resources, the initial strategy should be to try to identify locations that do not correlate particularly well, so that each new site measures something new that cannot be guessed easily from the behavior of surrounding sites. (An important caveat here is that lack of such correlation could be a result of physical climate behavior and not a result of faults with the actual measuring process; i.e., by unrepresentative or simply poor-quality data. Unfortunately, we seldom have perfect climate data.) As additional sites are added, we usually wish for some combination of unique and redundant sites to meet what amounts to essentially orthogonal constraints: new information and more reliably-furnished information.

A common consideration is whether to observe on a ridge or in a valley, given the resources to place a single station within a particular area of a few square kilometers. Ridge and valley stations will correlate very well for temperatures when lapse conditions prevail, particularly summer daytime temperatures. In summer at night or winter at daylight, the picture will be more mixed and correlations will be lower. In winter at night when inversions are common and even the rule, correlations may be zero or even negative and perhaps even more divergent as the two sites are on opposite sides of the inversion. If we had the luxury of locating stations everywhere, we would find that ridge tops generally correlate very well with other ridge tops and similarly valleys with other valleys, but ridge tops correlate well with valleys only under certain circumstances. Beyond this, valleys and ridges having similar orientations usually will correlate better with each other than those with perpendicular orientations, depending on their orientation with respect to large-scale wind flow and solar angles.

Unfortunately, we do not have stations everywhere, so we are forced to use the few comparisons that we have and include a large dose of intelligent reasoning, using what we have observed elsewhere. In performing and interpreting such analyses, we must remember that there are physical climatic reasons and observational reasons why stations within a short distance (even a few tens or hundreds of meters) may not correlate well.

Examples of correlation analyses include those for the Channel Islands and for southwest Alaska, which can be found in Redmond and McCurdy (2005) and Redmond et al. (2005). These examples illustrate what can be learned from correlation analyses. Spatial correlations generally vary by time of year. Thus, results should be displayed in the form of annual correlation cycles—for monthly mean temperature and monthly total precipitation and perhaps other climate elements like wind or humidity—between station pairs selected for climatic setting and data availability and quality.

In general, the COOP stations managed by the NWS have produced much longer records than have automated stations like RAWS or SNOTEL stations. The RAWS stations also often have problems with precipitation, especially in winter or with missing data, so that low correlations may be data problems rather than climate dissimilarity. The RAWS records are much shorter, so correlations should be interpreted with care, but these stations are more likely to be in places of interest for remote or under-sampled regions.

D.2.2. Spatial Behavior

A number of techniques exist to interpolate from isolated point values to a spatial domain. For example, a common technique is simple inverse distance weighting. Critical to the success of the simplest of such techniques is that some other property of the spatial domain, one that is influential for the mapped element, does not vary significantly. Topography greatly influences precipitation, temperature, wind, humidity, and most other meteorological elements. Thus, this criterion clearly is not met in any region having extreme topographic diversity. In such circumstances, simple Cartesian distance may have little to do with how rapidly correlation deteriorates from one site to the next, and in fact, the correlations can decrease readily from a mountain to a valley and then increase again on the next mountain. Such structure in the fields of spatial correlation is not seen in the relatively (statistically) well-behaved flat areas like those in the eastern United States.

To account for dominating effects such as topography and inland–coastal differences that exist in certain regions, some kind of additional knowledge must be brought to bear to produce meaningful, physically plausible, and observationally based interpolations. Historically, this has proven to be an extremely difficult problem, especially to perform objective and repeatable analyses. An analysis performed for southwest Alaska (Redmond et al. 2005) concluded that the PRISM (Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model) maps (Daly et al. 1994, Daly et al. 2002; Gibson et al. 2002; Doggett et al. 2004) were probably the best available. An analysis by Simpson et al. (2005) further discussed many issues in the mapping of Alaska's climate and resulted in the same conclusion about PRISM.

D.2.3. Climate-Change Detection

Although general purpose climate stations should be situated to address all aspects of climate variability, it is desirable that they also be in locations that are more sensitive to climate change from natural or anthropogenic influences should it begin to occur. The question here is how well we know such sensitivities. The climate-change issue is quite complex because it encompasses more than just greenhouse gasses.

Sites that are in locations or climates particularly vulnerable to climate change should be favored. How this vulnerability is determined is a considerably challenging research issue. Candidate locations or situations are those that lie on the border between two major biomes or just inside the edge of one or the other. In these cases, a slight movement of the boundary in anticipated direction (toward "warmer," for example) would be much easier to detect as the boundary moves past the site and a different set of biota begin to be established. Such a vegetative or ecologic response would be more visible and would take less time to establish as a real change than would a smaller change in the center of the distribution range of a marker or key species.

D.2.4. Element-Specific Differences

The various climate elements (temperature, precipitation, cloudiness, snowfall, humidity, wind speed and direction, solar radiation) do not vary through time in the same sequence or manner nor should they necessarily be expected to vary in this manner. The spatial patterns of variability should not be expected to be the same for all elements. These patterns also should not be expected to be similar for all months or seasons. The suitability of individual sites for measurement also varies from one element to another. A site that has a favorable exposure for temperature or wind may not have a favorable exposure for precipitation or snowfall. A site that experiences proper air movement may be situated in a topographic channel, such as a river valley or a pass, which restricts the range of wind directions and affects the distribution of speed-direction categories.

D.2.5. Logistics and Practical Factors

Even with the most advanced scientific rationale, sites in some remote or climatically challenging settings may not be suitable because of the difficulty in servicing and maintaining equipment. Contributing to these challenges are scheduling difficulties, animal behavior, snow burial, icing, snow behavior, access and logistical problems, and the weather itself. Remote and elevated sites usually require far more attention and expense than a rain-dominated, easily accessible valley location.

For climate purposes, station exposure and the local environment should be maintained in their original state (vegetation especially), so that changes seen are the result of regional climate variations and not of trees growing up, bushes crowding a site, surface albedo changing, fire clearing, etc. Repeat photography has shown many examples of slow environmental change in the vicinity of a station in rather short time frames (5–20 years), and this technique should be employed routinely and frequently at all locations. In the end, logistics, maintenance, and other practical factors almost always determine the success of weather- and climate-monitoring activities.

D.2.6. Personnel Factors

Many past experiences (almost exclusively negative) strongly support the necessity to place primary responsibility for station deployment and maintenance in the hands of seasoned, highly qualified, trained, and meticulously careful personnel, the more experienced the better. Over time, even in “benign” climates but especially where harsher conditions prevail, every conceivable problem will occur and both the usual and unusual should be anticipated: weather, animals, plants, salt, sensor and communication failure, windblown debris, corrosion, power failures, vibrations, avalanches, snow loading and creep, corruption of the data logger program, etc. An ability to anticipate and forestall such problems, a knack for innovation and improvisation, knowledge of electronics, practical and organizational skills, and presence of mind to bring the various small but vital parts, spares, tools, and diagnostic troubleshooting equipment are highly valued qualities. Especially when logistics are so expensive, a premium should be placed on using experienced personnel, since the slightest and seemingly most minor mistake can render a station useless or, even worse, uncertain. Exclusive reliance on individuals without this background can be costly and almost always will result eventually in unnecessary loss of data. Skilled labor and an apprenticeship system to develop new skilled labor will greatly reduce (but not eliminate) the types of problems that can occur in operating a climate network.

D.3. Site Selection

In addition to considerations identified previously in this appendix, various factors need to be considered in selecting sites for new or augmented instrumentation.

D.3.1. Equipment and Exposure Factors

D.3.1.1. Measurement Suite: All sites should measure temperature, humidity, wind, solar radiation, and snow depth. Precipitation measurements are more difficult but probably should be attempted with the understanding that winter measurements may be of limited or no value unless an all-weather gauge has been installed. Even if an all-weather gauge has been installed, it is desirable to have a second gauge present that operates on a different principle–for example, a fluid-based system like those used in the SNOTEL stations in tandem with a higher–resolution, tipping bucket gauge for summertime. Without heating, a tipping bucket gauge usually is of use only when temperatures are above freezing and when temperatures have not been below freezing for some time, so that accumulated ice and snow is not melting and being recorded as present precipitation. Gauge undercatch is a significant issue in snowy climates, so shielding should be considered for all gauges designed to work over the winter months. It is very important to note the presence or absence of shielding, the type of shielding, and the dates of installation or removal of the shielding.

D.3.1.2. Overall Exposure: The ideal, general all-purpose site has gentle slopes, is open to the sun and the wind, has a natural vegetative cover, avoids strong local (less than 200 m) influences, and represents a reasonable compromise among all climate elements. The best temperature sites are not the best precipitation sites, and the same is true for other elements. Steep topography in the immediate vicinity should be avoided unless settings where precipitation is affected by steep topography are being deliberately sought or a mountaintop or ridgeline is the desired location. The potential for disturbance should be considered: fire and flood risk, earth movement, wind-borne debris, volcanic deposits or lahars, vandalism, animal tampering, and general human encroachment are all factors.

D.3.1.3. Elevation: Mountain climates do not vary in time in exactly the same manner as adjoining valley climates. This concept is emphasized when temperature inversions are present to a greater degree and during precipitation when winds rise up the slopes at the same angle.

There is considerable concern that mountain climates will be (or already are) changing and perhaps changing differently than lowland climates, which has direct and indirect consequences for plant and animal life in the more extreme zones. Elevations of special significance are those that are near the mean rain/snow line for winter, near the tree line, and near the mean annual freezing level (all of these may not be quite the same). Because the lapse rates in wet climates often are nearly moist-adiabatic during the main precipitation seasons, measurements at one elevation may be extrapolated to nearby elevations. In drier climates and in the winter, temperature and to a lesser extent wind will show various elevation profiles.

D.3.1.4. Transects: The concept of observing transects that span climatic gradients is sound. This is not always straightforward in topographically uneven terrain, but these transects could still be arranged by setting up station(s) along the coast; in or near passes atop the main coastal interior drainage divide; and inland at one, two, or three distances into the interior lowlands. Transects need not—and by dint of topographic constraints probably cannot—be straight lines, but the closer that a line can be approximated the better. The main point is to systematically sample the key points of a behavioral transition without deviating too radically from linearity.

D.3.1.5. Other Topographic Considerations: There are various considerations with respect to local topography. Local topography can influence wind (channeling, upslope/downslope, etc.), precipitation (orographic enhancement, downslope evaporation, catch efficiency, etc.), and temperature (frost pockets, hilltops, aspect, mixing or decoupling from the overlying atmosphere, bowls, radiative effects, etc.), to different degrees at differing scales. In general, for measurements to be areally representative, it is better to avoid these local effects to the extent that they can be identified before station deployment (once deployed, it is desirable not to move a station). The primary purpose of a climate-monitoring network should be to serve as an infrastructure in the form of a set of benchmark stations for comparing other stations. Sometimes, however, it is exactly these local phenomena that we want to capture. Living organisms, especially plants, are affected by their immediate environment, whether it is representative of a larger setting or not. Specific measurements of limited scope and duration made for these purposes then can be tied to the main benchmarks. This experience is useful also in determining the complexity needed in the benchmark monitoring process in order to capture particular phenomena at particular space and time scales.

Sites that drain (cold air) well generally are better than sites that allow cold air to pool. Slightly sloped areas (1 degree is fine) or small benches from tens to hundreds of meters above streams are often favorable locations. Furthermore, these sites often tend to be out of the path of hazards (like floods) and to have rocky outcroppings where controlling vegetation will not be a major concern. Benches or wide spots on the rise between two forks of a river system are often the only flat areas and sometimes jut out to give greater exposure to winds from more directions.

D.3.1.6. Prior History: The starting point in designing a program is to determine what kinds of observations have been collected over time, by whom, in what manner, and if these observation are continuing to the present time. It also may be of value to “re-occupy” the former site of a station that is now inactive to provide some measure of continuity or a reference point from the past. This can be of value even if continuous observations were not made during the entire intervening period.

D.3.2. Element-Specific Factors

D.3.2.1. Temperature: An open exposure with uninhibited air movement is the preferred setting. The most common measurement is made at approximately eye level, 1.5–2.0 m. In snowy locations sensors should be at least one meter higher than the deepest snowpack expected in the next 50 years or perhaps 2–3 times the depth of the average maximum annual depth. Sensors should be shielded above and below from solar radiation (bouncing off snow), from sunrise/sunset horizontal input, and from vertical rock faces. Sensors should be clamped tightly, so that they do not swivel away from level stacks of radiation plates. Nearby vegetation should be kept away from the sensors (several meters). Growing vegetation should be cut to original conditions. Small hollows and swales can cool tremendously at night, and it is best avoid these areas. Side slopes of perhaps a degree or two of angle facilitate air movement and drainage and, in effect, sample a large area during nighttime hours. The very bottom of a valley should be avoided. Temperature can change substantially from moves of only a few meters. Situations have been observed where flat and seemingly uniform conditions (like airport runways) appear to demonstrate different climate behaviors over short distances of a few tens or hundreds of meters (differences of 5–10°C). When snow is on the ground, these microclimatic differences can be stronger, and differences of 2–5°C can occur in the short distance between the thermometer and the snow surface on calm evenings.

D.3.2.2. Precipitation (liquid): Calm locations with vegetative or artificial shielding are preferred. Wind will adversely impact readings; therefore, the less the better. Wind effects on precipitation are far less for rain than for snow. Devices that “save” precipitation present advantages, but most gauges are built to dump precipitation as it falls or to empty periodically. Automated gauges give both the amount and the timing. Simple backups that record only the total precipitation since the last visit have a certain advantage (for example, storage gauges or lengths of PVC pipe perhaps with bladders on the bottom). The following question should be asked: Does the total precipitation from an automated gauge add up to the measured total in a simple bucket (evaporation is prevented with an appropriate substance such as mineral oil)? Drip from overhanging foliage and trees can augment precipitation totals.

D.3.2.3. Precipitation (frozen): Calm locations or shielding are a must. Undercatch for rain is only about 5 percent, but with winds of only 2–4 m/s, gauges may catch only 30–70 percent of the actual snow falling depending on density of the flakes. To catch 100 percent of the snow, the standard configuration for shielding is employed by the CRN (Climate Reference Network): the DFIR (Double-Fence Intercomparison Reference) shield with 2.4-m (8-ft.) vertical, wooden slatted fences in two concentric octagons with diameters of 8 m and 4 m (26 ft and 13 ft, respectively) and an inner Alter shield (flapping vanes). Numerous tests have shown this is the only way to achieve complete catch of snowfall (e.g., Yang et al. 1998, 2001). The DFIR shield is large and bulky; it is recommended that all precipitation gauges have at least Alter shields on them.

Near the coast, much snow is heavy and falls more vertically. In colder locations or storms, light flakes frequently will fly in and then out of the gauge. Clearings in forests are usually excellent sites. Snow blowing from trees that are too close can augment actual precipitation totals. Artificial shielding (vanes, etc.) placed around gauges in snowy locales always should be used if accurate totals are desired. Moving parts tend to freeze up. Capping of gauges during heavy snowfall events is a common occurrence. When the cap becomes pointed, snow falls off to the ground and is not recorded. Caps and plugs often will not fall into the tube until hours, days, or even weeks have passed, typically during an extended period of freezing temperature or above or when sunlight finally occurs. Liquid-based measurements (e.g., SNOTEL “rocket” gauges) do not have the resolution (usually 0.3 cm [0.1 in.] rather than 0.03 cm [0.01 in.]) that tipping bucket and other gauges have but are known to be reasonably accurate in very snowy climates. Light snowfall events might not be recorded until enough of them add up to the next reporting increment. More expensive gauges like Geonors can be considered and could do quite well in snowy settings; however, they need to be emptied every 40 cm (15 in.) or so (capacity of 51 cm [20 in.]) until the new 91-cm (36-in.) capacity gauge is offered for sale. Recently, the NWS has been trying out the new (and very expensive) Ott all-weather gauge. Riming can be an issue in windy foggy environments below freezing. Rime, dew, and other forms of atmospheric condensation are not real precipitation, since they are caused by the gauge.

D.3.2.4. Snow Depth: Windswept areas tend to be blown clear of snow. Conversely, certain types of vegetation can act as a snow fence and cause artificial drifts. However, some amount of vegetation in the vicinity generally can help slow down the wind. The two most common types of snow-depth gauges are the Judd Snow Depth Sensor, produced by Judd Communications, and the snow depth gauge produced by Campbell Scientific, Inc. Opinions vary on which one is better. These gauges use ultrasound and look downward in a cone about 22 degrees in diameter. The ground should be relatively clear of vegetation and maintained in a manner so that the zero point on the calibration scale does not change.

D.3.2.5. Snow Water Equivalent: This is determined by the weight of snow on fluid-filled pads about the size of a desktop set up sometimes in groups of four or in larger hexagons several meters in diameter. These pads require flat ground some distance from nearby sources of windblown snow and shielding that is “just right”: not too close to the shielding to act as a kind of snow fence and not too far from the shielding so that blowing and drifting become a factor. Generally, these pads require fluids that possess antifreeze-like properties, as well as handling and replacement protocols.

D.3.2.6. Wind: Open exposures are needed for wind measurements. Small prominences or benches without blockage from certain sectors are preferred. A typical rule for trees is to site stations back 10 tree-heights from all tree obstructions. Sites in long, narrow valleys can obviously only exhibit two main wind directions. Gently rounded eminences are more favored. Any kind of topographic steering should be avoided to the extent possible. Avoiding major mountain chains or single isolated mountains or ridges is usually a favorable approach, if there is a choice. Sustained wind speed and the highest gusts (1-second) should be recorded. Averaging methodologies for both sustained winds and gusts can affect climate trends and should be recorded as metadata with all changes noted. Vegetation growth affects the vertical wind profile, and growth over a few years can lead to changes in mean wind speed even if the “real” wind does not change, so vegetation near the site (perhaps out to 50 m) should be maintained in a quasi-permanent status (same height and spatial distribution). Wind devices can rime up and freeze or spin out of balance. In severely rimed or windy climates, rugged anemometers, such as those made by Taylor, are worth considering. These anemometers are expensive but durable and can withstand substantial abuse. In exposed locations, personnel should plan for winds to be at least 50 m/s and be able to measure these wind speeds. At a minimum, anemometers should be rated to 75 m/s.

D.3.2.7. Humidity: Humidity is a relatively straightforward climate element. Close proximity to lakes or other water features can affect readings. Humidity readings typically are less accurate near 100 percent and at low humidities in cold weather.

D.3.2.8. Solar Radiation: A site with an unobstructed horizon obviously is the most desirable. This generally implies a flat plateau or summit. However, in most locations trees or mountains will obstruct the sun for part of the day.

D.3.2.9. Soil Temperature: It is desirable to measure soil temperature at locations where soil is present. If soil temperature is recorded at only a single depth, the most preferred depth is 10 cm. Other common depths include 25 cm, 50 cm, 2 cm, and 100 cm. Biological activity in the soil will be proportional to temperature with important threshold effects occurring near freezing.

D.3.2.10. Soil Moisture: Soil-moisture gauges are somewhat temperamental and require care to install. The soil should be characterized by a soil expert during installation of the gauge. The readings may require a certain level of experience to interpret correctly. If accurate, readings of soil moisture are especially useful.

D.3.2.11. Distributed Observations: It can be seen readily that compromises must be struck among the considerations described in the preceding paragraphs because some are mutually exclusive.

How large can a “site” be? Generally, the equipment footprint should be kept as small as practical with all components placed next to each other (within less than 10–20 m or so). Readings from one instrument frequently are used to aid in interpreting readings from the remaining instruments.

What is a tolerable degree of separation? Some consideration may be given to locating a precipitation gauge or snow pillow among protective vegetation, while the associated temperature, wind, and humidity readings would be collected more effectively in an open and exposed location within 20–50 m. Ideally, it is advantageous to know the wind measurement precisely at the precipitation gauge, but a compromise involving a short split, and in effect a “distributed observation,” could be considered. There are no definitive rules governing this decision, but it is suggested that the site footprint be kept within approximately 50 m. There also are constraints imposed by engineering and electrical factors that affect cable lengths, signal strength, and line noise; therefore, the shorter the cable the better. Practical issues include the need to trench a channel to outlying instruments or to allow lines to lie atop the ground and associated problems with animals, humans, weathering, etc. Separating a precipitation gauge up to 100 m or so from an instrument mast may be an acceptable compromise if other factors are not limiting.

D.3.2.12. Instrument Replacement Schedules: Instruments slowly degrade, and a plan for replacing them with new, refurbished, or recalibrated instruments should be in place. After approximately five years, a systematic change-out procedure should result in replacing most sensors in a network. Certain parts, such as solar radiation sensors, are candidates for annual calibration or change-out. Anemometers tend to degrade as bearings erode or electrical contacts become uneven. Noisy bearings are an indication, and a stethoscope might aid in hearing such noises. Increased internal friction affects the threshold starting speed; once spinning, they tend to function properly. Increases in starting threshold speeds can lead to more zero-wind measurements and thus reduce the reported mean wind speed with no real change in wind properties. A field calibration kit should be developed and taken on all site visits, routine or otherwise. Rain gauges can be tested with drip testers during field visits. Protective conduit and tight water seals can prevent abrasion and moisture problems with the equipment, although seals can keep moisture in as well as out. Bulletproof casings sometimes are employed in remote settings. A supply of spare parts, at least one of each and more for less-expensive or more-delicate sensors, should be maintained to allow replacement of worn or nonfunctional instruments during field visits. In addition, this approach allows instruments to be calibrated in the relative convenience of the operational home—the larger the network, the greater the need for a parts depot.

D.3.3. Long-Term Comparability and Consistency

D.3.3.1. Consistency: The emphasis here is to hold biases constant. Every site has biases, problems, and idiosyncrasies of one sort or another. The best rule to follow is simply to try to keep biases constant through time. Since the goal is to track climate through time, keeping sensors, methodologies, and exposure constant will ensure that only true climate change is being measured. This means leaving the site in its original state or performing maintenance to keep it that way. Once a site is installed, the goal should be to never move the site even by a few meters or to allow significant changes to occur within 100 m for the next several decades.

Sites in or near rock outcroppings likely will experience less vegetative disturbance or growth through the years and will not usually retain moisture, a factor that could speed corrosion. Sites that will remain locally similar for some time are usually preferable. However, in some cases the intent of a station might be to record the local climate effects of changes within a small-scale system (for example, glacier, recently burned area, or scene of some other disturbance) that is subject to a regional climate influence. In this example, the local changes might be much larger than the regional changes.

D.3.3.2. Metadata: Since the climate of every site is affected by features in the immediate vicinity, it is vital to record this information over time and to update the record repeatedly at each service visit. Distances, angles, heights of vegetation, fine-scale topography, condition of instruments, shielding discoloration, and other factors from within a meter to several kilometers should be noted. Systematic photography should be undertaken and updated at least once every one–two years.

Photographic documentation should be taken at each site in a standard manner and repeated every two–three years. Guidelines for methodology were developed by Redmond (2004) as a result of experience with the NOAA CRN and can be found on the WRCC NPS Web pages at http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps and at ftp://ftp.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/photodocumentation.pdf.

The main purpose for climate stations is to *track climatic conditions through time*. Anything that affects the interpretation of records through time must to be noted and recorded for posterity. The important factors should be clear to a person who has never visited the site, no matter how long ago the site was installed.

In regions with significant, climatic transition zones, transects are an efficient way to span several climates and make use of available resources. Discussions on this topic at greater detail can be found in Redmond and Simeral (2004) and in Redmond et al. (2005).

D.4. Literature Cited

American Association of State Climatologists. 1985. Heights and exposure standards for sensors on automated weather stations. The State Climatologist **9**.

Brock, F. V., K. C. Crawford, R. L. Elliott, G. W. Cuperus, S. J. Stadler, H. L. Johnson and M. D. Eilts. 1995. The Oklahoma Mesonet: A technical overview. Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology **12**:5-19.

Daly, C., R. P. Neilson, and D. L. Phillips. 1994. A statistical-topographic model for mapping climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain. Journal of Applied Meteorology **33**:140-158.

Daly, C., W. P. Gibson, G. H. Taylor, G. L. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2002. A knowledge-based approach to the statistical mapping of climate. Climate Research **22**:99-113.

Doggett, M., C. Daly, J. Smith, W. Gibson, G. Taylor, G. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2004. High-resolution 1971-2000 mean monthly temperature maps for the western United States. Fourteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology, 84th AMS Annual Meeting. Seattle, WA, American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, January 2004, Paper 4.3, CD-ROM.

Geiger, R., R. H. Aron, and P. E. Todhunter. 2003. The Climate Near the Ground. 6th edition. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., New York.

Gibson, W. P., C. Daly, T. Kittel, D. Nychka, C. Johns, N. Rosenbloom, A. McNab, and G. Taylor. 2002. Development of a 103-year high-resolution climate data set for the conterminous United States. Thirteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology. Portland, OR, American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, May 2002:181-183.

Goodison, B. E., P. Y. T. Louie, and D. Yang. 1998. WMO solid precipitation measurement intercomparison final report. WMO TD 982, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

National Research Council. 1998. Future of the National Weather Service Cooperative Weather Network. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.

National Research Council. 2001. A Climate Services Vision: First Steps Toward the Future. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.

Redmond, K. T. 1992. Effects of observation time on interpretation of climatic time series - A need for consistency. Eighth Annual Pacific Climate (PACLIM) Workshop. Pacific Grove, CA, March 1991:141-150.

Redmond, K. T. 2004. Photographic documentation of long-term climate stations. Available from ftp://ftp.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/photodocumentation.pdf. (accessed 15 August 2004)

Redmond, K. T. and D. B. Simeral. 2004. Climate monitoring comments: Central Alaska Network Inventory and Monitoring Program. Available from ftp://ftp.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/alaska/cakn/npscakncomments040406.pdf. (accessed 6 April 2004)

Redmond, K. T., D. B. Simeral, and G. D. McCurdy. 2005. Climate monitoring for southwest Alaska national parks: network design and site selection. Report 05-01. Western Regional Climate Center, Reno, Nevada.

Redmond, K. T., and G. D. McCurdy. 2005. Channel Islands National Park: Design considerations for weather and climate monitoring. Report 05-02. Western Regional Climate Center, Reno, Nevada.

Sevruk, B., and W. R. Hamon. 1984. International comparison of national precipitation gauges with a reference pit gauge. Instruments and Observing Methods, Report No 17, WMO/TD – 38, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Simpson, J. J., Hufford, G. L., C. Daly, J. S. Berg, and M. D. Fleming. 2005. Comparing maps of mean monthly surface temperature and precipitation for Alaska and adjacent areas of Canada produced by two different methods. Arctic **58**:137-161.

Whiteman, C. D. 2000. Mountain Meteorology: Fundamentals and Applications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Wilson, E. O. 1998. Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge. Knopf, New York.

World Meteorological Organization. 1983. Guide to meteorological instruments and methods of observation, No. 8, 5th edition, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva Switzerland.

World Meteorological Organization. 2005. Organization and planning of intercomparisons of rainfall intensity gauges. World Meteorological Organization, Geneva Switzerland.

Yang, D., B. E. Goodison, J. R. Metcalfe, V. S. Golubev, R. Bates, T. Pangburn, and C. Hanson. 1998. Accuracy of NWS 8” standard nonrecording precipitation gauge: results and application of WMO intercomparison. Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology **15**:54-68.

Yang, D., B. E. Goodison, J. R. Metcalfe, P. Louie, E. Elomaa, C. Hanson, V. Bolubev, T. Gunther, J. Milkovic, and M. Lapin. 2001. Compatibility evaluation of national precipitation gauge measurements. Journal of Geophysical Research **106**:1481-1491.

Appendix E. Master metadata field list

Field Name	Field Type	Field Description
begin_date	date	Effective beginning date for a record.
begin_date_flag	char(2)	Flag describing the known accuracy of the begin date for a station.
best_elevation	float(4)	Best known elevation for a station (in feet).
clim_div_code	char(2)	Foreign key defining climate division code (primary in table: clim_div).
clim_div_key	int2	Foreign key defining climate division for a station (primary in table: clim_div.
clim_div_name	varchar(30)	English name for a climate division.
controller_info	varchar(50)	Person or organization who maintains the identifier system for a given weather or climate network.
country_key	int2	Foreign key defining country where a station resides (primary in table: none).
county_key	int2	Foreign key defining county where a station resides (primary in table: county).
county_name	varchar(31)	English name for a county.
description	text	Any description pertaining to the particular table.
end_date	date	Last effective date for a record.
end_date_flag	char(2)	Flag describing the known accuracy of station end date.
fips_country_code	char(2)	FIPS (federal information processing standards) country code.
fips_state_abbr	char(2)	FIPS state abbreviation for a station.
fips_state_code	char(2)	FIPS state code for a station.
history_flag	char(2)	Describes temporal significance of an individual record among others from the same station.
id_type_key	int2	Foreign key defining the id_type for a station (usually defined in code).
last_updated	date	Date of last update for a record.
latitude	float(8)	Latitude value.
longitude	float(8)	Longitude value.
name_type_key	int2	“3”: COOP station name, “2”: best station name.
name	varchar(30)	Station name as known at date of last update entry.
ncdc_state_code	char(2)	NCDC, two-character code identifying U.S. state.
network_code	char(8)	Eight-character abbreviation code identifying a network.
network_key	int2	Foreign key defining the network for a station (primary in table: network).
network_station_id	int4	Identifier for a station in the associated network, which is defined by id_type_key.
remark	varchar(254)	Additional information for a record.
src_quality_code	char(2)	Code describing the data quality for the data source.
state_key	int2	Foreign key defining the U.S. state where a station resides (primary in table: state).
state_name	varchar(30)	English name for a state.
station_alt_name	varchar(30)	Other English names for a station.
station_best_name	varchar(30)	Best, most well-known English name for a station.
time_zone	float4	Time zone where a station resides.
ucan_station_id	int4	Unique station identifier for every station in ACIS.
unit_key	int2	Integer value representing a unit of measure.

Field Name	Field Type	Field Description
updated_by	char(8)	Person who last updated a record.
var_major_id	int2	Defines major climate variable.
var_minor_id	int2	Defines data source within a var_major_id.
zipcode	char(5)	Zipcode where a latitude/longitude point resides.
nps_netcode	char(4)	Network four-character identifier.
nps_netname	varchar(128)	Displayed English name for a network.
parkcode	char(4)	Park four-character identifier.
parkname	varchar(128)	Displayed English name for a park/
im_network	char(4)	NPS I&M network where park belongs (a net code)/
station_id	varchar(16)	Station identifier.
station_id_type	varchar(16)	Type of station identifier.
network.subnetwork.id	varchar(16)	Identifier of a sub-network in associated network.
subnetwork_key	int2	Foreign key defining sub-network for a station.
subnetwork_name	varchar(30)	English name for a sub-network.
slope	integer	Terrain slope at the location.
aspect	integer	Terrain aspect at the station.
gps	char(1)	Indicator of latitude/longitude recorded via GPS (global positioning system).
site_description	text(0)	Physical description of site.
route_directions	text(0)	Driving route or site access directions.
station_photo_id	integer	Unique identifier associating a group of photos to a station. Group of photos all taken on same date.
photo_id	char(30)	Unique identifier for a photo.
photo_date	datetime	Date photograph taken.
photographer	varchar(64)	Name of photographer.
maintenance_date	datetime	Date of station maintenance visit.
contact_key	Integer	Unique identifier associating contact information to a station.
full_name	varchar(64)	Full name of contact person.
organization	varchar(64)	Organization of contact person.
contact_type	varchar(32)	Type of contact person (operator, administrator, etc.)
position_title	varchar(32)	Title of contact person.
address	varchar(32)	Address for contact person.
city	varchar(32)	City for contact person.
state	varchar(2)	State for contact person.
zip_code	char(10)	Zipcode for contact person.
country	varchar(32)	Country for contact person.
email	varchar(64)	E-mail for contact person.
work_phone	varchar(16)	Work phone for contact person.
contact_notes	text(254)	Other details regarding contact person.
equipment_type	char(30)	Sensor measurement type; i.e., wind speed, air temperature, etc.
eq_manufacturer	char(30)	Manufacturer of equipment.
eq_model	char(20)	Model number of equipment.
serial_num	char(20)	Serial number of equipment.
eq_description	varchar(254)	Description of equipment.
install_date	datetime	Installation date of equipment.
remove_date	datetime	Removal date of equipment.
ref_height	integer	Sensor displacement height from surface.
sampling_interval	varchar(10)	Frequency of sensor measurement.

Appendix F. Electronic supplements

F.1. ACIS metadata file for weather and climate stations associated with the MIDN: http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/pub/MIDN/metadata/MIDN_from_ACIS.tar.gz.

Appendix G. Descriptions of weather/climate monitoring networks

G.1. Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNet)

- Purpose of network: provide information for evaluating the effectiveness of national emission-control strategies.
- Primary management agency: EPA.
- Data website: http://epa.gov/castnet/.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Relative humidity.
  - Wind speed.
  - Wind direction.
  - Wind gust.
  - Gust direction.
  - Solar radiation.
  - Soil moisture and temperature.
- Sampling frequency: hourly.
- Reporting frequency: hourly.
- Estimated station cost: $13000.
- Network strengths:
  - High-quality data.
  - Sites are well maintained.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Density of station coverage is low.
  - Shorter periods of record for western United States.

CASTNet primarily is an air-quality-monitoring network managed by the EPA. The elements shown here are intended to support interpretation of measured air-quality parameters such as ozone, nitrates, sulfides, etc., which also are measured at CASTNet sites.

G.2. NWS Cooperative Observer Program (COOP)

- Purpose of network:
  - Provide observational, meteorological data required to define U.S. climate and help measure long-term climate changes.
  - Provide observational, meteorological data in near real-time to support forecasting and warning mechanisms and other public service programs of the NWS.
- Primary management agency: NOAA (NWS).
- Data website: data are available from the NCDC (http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov), RCCs (e.g., WRCC, http://www.wrcc.dri.edu), and state climate offices.
- Measured weather/climate elements
  - Maximum, minimum, and observation-time temperature.
  - Precipitation, snowfall, snow depth.

  - Pan evaporation (some stations).
- Sampling frequency: daily.
- Reporting frequency: daily or monthly (station-dependent).
- Estimated station cost: $2000 with maintenance costs of $500–900/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Decade–century records at most sites.
  - Widespread national coverage (thousands of stations).
  - Excellent data quality when well maintained.
  - Relatively inexpensive; highly cost effective.
  - Manual measurements; not automated.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Uneven exposures; many are not well-maintained.
  - Dependence on schedules for volunteer observers.
  - Slow entry of data from many stations into national archives.
  - Data subject to observational methodology; not always documented.
  - Manual measurements; not automated and not hourly.

The COOP network has long served as the main climate observation network in the United States. Readings are usually made by volunteers using equipment supplied, installed, and maintained by the federal government. The observer in effect acts as a host for the data-gathering activities and supplies the labor; this is truly a "cooperative" effort. The SAO sites often are considered to be part of the cooperative network as well if they collect the previously mentioned types of weather/climate observations. Typical observation days are morning to morning, evening to evening, or midnight to midnight. By convention, observations are ascribed to the date the instrument was reset at the end of the observational period. For this reason, midnight observations represent the end of a day. The Historical Climate Network is a subset of the cooperative network but contains longer and more complete records.

G.3. Citizen Weather Observer Program (CWOP)

- Purpose of network: collect observations from private citizens and make these data available for homeland security and other weather applications, providing constant feedback to the observers to maintain high data quality.
- Primary management agency: NOAA MADIS program.
- Data Website: http://www.wxqa.com.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Dewpoint temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Wind speed and direction.
  - Barometric Pressure.
- Sampling frequency: 15 minutes or less.
- Reporting frequency: 15 minutes.
- Estimated station cost: unknown.
- Network strengths:
  - Active partnership between public agencies and private citizens.

  - Large number of participant sites.
  - Regular communications between data providers and users, encouraging higher data quality.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Variable instrumentation platforms.
  - Metadata are sometimes limited.

The CWOP network is a public-private partnership with U.S. citizens and various agencies including NOAA, NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration), and various universities. There are over 4500 registered sites worldwide, with close to 3000 of these sites located in North America.

G.4. NPS Gaseous Pollutant Monitoring Program (GPMP)

- Purpose of network: measurement of ozone and related meteorological elements.
- Primary management agency: NPS.
- Data website: http://www2.nature.nps.gov/air/monitoring.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Relative humidity.
  - Precipitation.
  - Wind speed and direction.
  - Solar radiation.
  - Surface wetness.
- Sampling frequency: continuous.
- Reporting frequency: hourly.
- Estimated station cost: unknown.
- Network strengths:
  - Stations are located within NPS park units.
  - Data quality is excellent, with high data standards.
  - Provides unique measurements that are not available elsewhere.
  - Records are up to 2 decades in length.
  - Site maintenance is excellent.
  - Thermometers are aspirated.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Not easy to download the entire data set or to ingest live data.
  - Period of record is short compared to other automated networks. Earliest sites date from 2004.
  - Station spacing and coverage: station installation is episodic, driven by opportunistic situations.

The NPS web site indicates that there are 33 sites with continuous ozone analysis run by NPS, with records from a few to about 16-17 years. Of these stations, 12 are labeled as GPMP sites and the rest are labeled as CASTNet sites. All of these have standard meteorological measurements, including a 10-m mast. Another nine GPMP sites are located within NPS units but run by cooperating agencies. A number of other sites (1-2 dozen) ran for differing periods in the past, generally less than 5-10 years.

G.5. National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)

- Purpose of network: measurement of precipitation chemistry and atmospheric deposition.
- Primary management agencies: USDA, but multiple collaborators.
- Data website: http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Precipitation.
- Sampling frequency: daily.
- Reporting frequency: daily.
- Estimated station cost: unknown.
- Network strengths:
  - Data quality is excellent, with high data standards.
  - Site maintenance is excellent.
- Network weaknesses:
  - A very limited number of climate parameters are measured.

Stations within the NADP network monitor primarily wet deposition through precipitation chemistry at selected sites around the U.S. and its territories. The network is a collaborative effort among several agencies including USGS and USDA. Precipitation is the primary climate parameter measured at NADP sites.

G.6. Remote Automated Weather Station Network (RAWS)

- Purpose of network: provide near-real-time (hourly or near hourly) measurements of meteorological variables for use in fire weather forecasts and climatology. Data from RAWS also are used for natural resource management, flood forecasting, natural hazard management, and air-quality monitoring.
- Primary management agency: WRCC, National Interagency Fire Center.
- Data website: http://www.raws.dri.edu/index.html.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Relative humidity.
  - Wind speed.
  - Wind direction.
  - Wind gust.
  - Gust direction.
  - Solar radiation.
  - Soil moisture and temperature.
- Sampling frequency: 1 or 10 minutes, element-dependent.
- Reporting frequency: generally hourly. Some stations report every 15 or 30 minutes.
- Estimated station cost: $12000 with satellite telemetry ($8000 without satellite telemetry); maintenance costs are around $2000/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Metadata records are usually complete.
  - Sites are located in remote areas.
  - Sites are generally well-maintained.

  - Entire period of record available on-line.
- Network weaknesses:
  - RAWS network is focused largely on fire management needs (formerly focused only on fire needs).
  - Frozen precipitation is not measured reliably.
  - Station operation is not always continuous.
  - Data transmission is completed via one-way telemetry. Data are therefore recoverable either in real-time or not at all.

The RAWS network is used by many land-management agencies, such as the BLM, NPS, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Forest Service, and other agencies. The RAWS network was one of the first automated weather station networks to be installed in the United States. Most gauges do not have heaters, so hydrologic measurements are of little value when temperatures dip below freezing or reach freezing after frozen precipitation events. There are approximately 1,100 real-time sites in this network and about 1,800 historic sites (some are decommissioned or moved). The sites can transmit data all winter but may be in deep snow in some locations. The WRCC is the archive for this network and receives station data and metadata through a special connection to the National Interagency Fire Center in Boise, Idaho.

G.7. NWS/FAA Surface Airways Observation Network (SAO)

- Purpose of network: provide near-real-time (hourly or near hourly) measurements of meteorological variables and are used both for airport operations and weather forecasting.
- Primary management agency: NOAA, FAA.
- Data website: data are available from state climate offices, RCCs (e.g., WRCC, http://www.wrcc.dri.edu), and NCDC (http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov).
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Dewpoint and/or relative humidity.
  - Wind speed.
  - Wind direction.
  - Wind gust.
  - Gust direction.
  - Barometric pressure.
  - Precipitation (not at many FAA sites).
  - Sky cover.
  - Ceiling (cloud height).
  - Visibility.
- Sampling frequency: element-dependent.
- Reporting frequency: element-dependent.
- Estimated station cost: $100000–$200000, with maintenance costs approximately $10000/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Records generally extend over several decades.
  - Consistent maintenance and station operations.
  - Data record is reasonably complete and usually high quality.

  - Hourly or sub-hourly data.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Nearly all sites are located at airports.
  - Data quality can be related to size of airport—smaller airports tend to have poorer datasets.
  - Influences from urbanization and other land-use changes.

These stations are managed by NOAA, U. S. Navy, U. S. Air Force, and FAA. These stations are located generally at major airports and military bases. The FAA stations often do not record precipitation, or they may provide precipitation records of reduced quality. Automated stations are typically ASOSs for the NWS or AWOSs for the FAA. Some sites only report episodically with observers paid per observation.

G.8. Weather For You Network (WX4U)

- Purpose of network: allow volunteer weather enthusiasts around the U.S. to observe and share weather data.
- Data website: http://www.met.utah.edu/jhorel/html/mesonet.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Relative humidity and dewpoint temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Wind speed and direction.
  - Wind gust and direction.
  - Pressure.
- Sampling frequency: 10 minutes.
- Reporting frequency: 10 minutes.
- Estimated station cost: unknown.
- Network strengths:
  - Stations are located throughout the U.S.
  - Stations provide near-real-time observations
- Network weaknesses:
  - Instrumentation platforms can be variable.
  - Data are sometimes of questionable quality.

The WX4U network is a nationwide collection of weather stations run by local observers. Meteorological elements that are measured usually include temperature, precipitation, wind, and humidity.

NPS/MIDN/NRTR—2006/013, November 2006

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Natural Resource Program Center
Fort Collins, Colorado

Natural Resource Program Center
1201 Oakridge Drive, Suite 150
Fort Collins, Colorado 80525

www.nps.gov