

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For Jan. 15, 2021

*(This meeting was conducted via Zoom meeting with call in number due to social distancing requirements resulting from the COVID-19 global pandemic)*

Major Items	Steering Committee decides to postpone the 2021 CWEMF Annual Meeting from June to October/Fall timeframe when an in-person meeting is more likely.
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N. Sandhu requested a breakdown in expenses related to the website, acknowledged by Treasurer S. Tanaka with a commitment to providing the information to N. Sandhu and the website subcommittee.</li><li>• ED. P. Hutton to contact Lake Natoma Inn and request the Annual Meeting be rescheduled to October.</li><li>• T. Kadir will contact Mark Arax again to see if he would agree to another reschedule to October.</li><li>• ED (P. Hutton) will send a "blind carbon copy" or BCC email to all of the SC mailing list to remind to pay dues to extend the grace period to the end of February and notify these people they will be dropped from the roster at the end of Feb if they have not paid their dues.</li><li>• ED (P. Hutton) to let Mr. Jon Traum (and CC any other USGS contact on file) know that USGS will go inactive be and removed from the roster of organizational members.</li><li>• SC proposes a subcommittee to consider changing the logo. T. Kadir, A. Huber, and A. Khan join the ad-hoc subcommittee. T. Kadir volunteers to serve as chair.</li></ul>
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Decision on need for conducting a CWEMF business meeting that may include officer elections in fiscal year 2021 given that the annual meeting has been rescheduled to fall. Deferred to the March SC meeting.</li><li>• Defining CWEMF's role in connection to model user groups and consider whether CWEMF is willing to support, and define what support means in this context, as related to model user groups.</li></ul>
Motions Passed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• S. Tanaka moves to accept the minutes as amended, seconded by N. Johns, and carried by unanimous vote.</li><li>• Motion that 2021 annual meeting will be rescheduled for in-person meeting in the fall around October unless unforeseen circumstances warrant changing it to a virtual meeting by T. Kadir, seconded by N. Johns passes with 19 ayes and 1 abstention.</li><li>• Motion to extend Tetra Tech contract end date from December 31, 2020 by one year to December 31, 2021 with no additional funds added to the contract by R. Satkowski seconded by B. Bray passes with 19 ayes and 1 abstention.</li><li>• Motion to approve amended scholarship proposal by R. Satkowski, seconded by B Bray passes unanimously.</li></ul>

REFERENCES INCLUDED IN THE MEETING PACKET:

1. Executive Director's Report for the January 15, 2021 meeting (Attachment 2-1 1p).
2. Secretary's Report, Draft Minutes of the Nov. 20, 2020 SC meeting (Attachment 2-2 11p).
3. Treasurer's Report, FY 2020 SC Meeting: January 15, 2021 (Attachment 2-3 1p).
4. Technical Workshops Subcommittee Recommendation to the CWEMF Steering Committee to Provide and Incentive for Organizing Technical Workshops and Attachment 1: Steps in Organizing a CWEMF Technical Workshop (Attachment 5-1 3p).
5. CWEMF Steering Committee Meeting January 15, 2021 Subcommittee on Workshops (Attachment 11-1 1p.)

- 
1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM – T. Kadir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. T. Kadir is stepping in for S. Chowdhury as convener as Mr. Chowdhury is unable to attend. Introductions were made. Nineteen persons were present via Zoom. S. Tanaka has J. Medellin-Azura's proxy. A quorum was declared.

T. Kadir wishes all a happy new year. And hopes all are staying safe given the pandemic situation, and he shares his optimism and that he is really looking forward to a better 2021 than last year.

## 2. Consent Calendar

- a. Executive Director's Report – The Executive Director (ED) (P. Hutton) highlighted two items from his report (see Attachment 2-1).

At the beginning of the year, organizational dues have been invoiced for the year.

Unfortunately, USGS remains delinquent on the previous year's dues. Our USGS point of contact was attempted to be reached several times.

ED (P. Hutton) also relays to the SC that individual membership renewals are dribbling in slowly, given the new calendar year membership and noted that this will be discussed later as item 4 on the agenda. Closer to home, many of the SC members—that are not organizational members—have not paid. We will need to discuss how to move that forward and how to handle delinquency.

- b. Secretary's Report – B. Bray refers members to the Nov. 20, 2020 Steering Committee Minutes (see attachment 2-2). N. Johns requests that a typo on page 6 be corrected<sup>1</sup>.

S. Tanaka moves to accept the minutes as amended, seconded by N. Johns, and were unanimously approved.

One additional note on the prior action item dealing with a Google Docs account. For the record the action item was carried out *without* the need for Google Docs. The topic of a CWEMF Google Docs can be referred to the website subcommittee led by N. Sandhu.

- c. Treasurer's Report – Summarized treasurers report attachment 2-3 and reports that there has been some recent revenue related to memberships.

---

<sup>1</sup> Striking of the extra word "can" in the 2nd sentence of the last paragraph.

N. Sandhu requested a clarification about the Treasurer's report referring to his request for the breakdown in expenses related to the website, specifically under which category did the expenses fall under in the attached report. S. Tanaka clarified that this information is lumped into the expense category "OTHER" and for the information requested it does fall across several categories because there is website hosting, but also email, and other services. However, S. Tanaka acknowledged the request and voiced her commitment to providing the information to N. Sandhu and his subcommittee (ACTION ITEM).

A. Constantino requested that S. Tanaka clarify what other expenses fall under the category OTHER specifically about Modeling Protocols payments. S. Tanaka responded that these are payments to Tetra Tech under a contract the SC entered into as part of the modeling protocols project that, for the moment, is lumped into the OTHER category.

T. Kadir notes that because we did not have an annual meeting, revenue for the year is a little bit down. S. Tanaka confirms; that is reflected in the report for Fiscal Year 2020.

## ACTION ITEMS

### 3. 2021 ANNUAL MEETING

#### a. Call for abstracts, session pop-ups, posters (Anderson)–

W. Anderson begins his report with a brief recap of CWEMF 2020 Online Sessions from this past November and December. Thanks to all who helped host the sessions as it was a new format. Most went well with a few technical difficulties. For the most part, folks liked the pop-ups, however, a lesson learned was to not use the Zoom option to optimize for video because the video was grainy or poorer quality.

The sessions committee was charged with soliciting new talks and sessions proposals for the next annual meeting in *June* with the facility reserved. Subcommittee met several times to begin organizing. A. Constantino developed a Google form that will be helpful for facilitating submissions for the annual meeting. ED (P. Hutton) attended the last subcommittee and was helpful in shaping the discussion, raising a key issue for the SC to consider.

ED (P. Hutton) asks for point of order to table the current agenda item, and move to the item c (consider whether the SC wishes to move forward with the 2021 AM in June).

#### c. Contingency Planning for Online Sessions (discussion) –

T. Kadir agrees and starts the discussion to re-consider schedule and date for the annual meeting now scheduled for June with reservation with Lake Natoma Inn. T. Kadir proposes the annual meeting be postponed to October as an in-person meeting with the option to reconsider.

N. Sandhu: Can we move forward considering a hybrid? To give attendees the option to attend remotely. T. Kadir responds that he likes the idea but is a technical consideration with a host of issues such as controlling access that can be taken up down the road. N. Sandhu withdraws the question and will bring this up as a separate topic.

S. Tanaka asks ED (P. Hutton) what his feeling is about moving dates. ED (P. Hutton) responds that, to protect our deposit with Lake Natoma Inn, we would need a compelling reason

T. Kadir: Responds that COVID-19 is a compelling reason. A Khan agrees; one would think the pandemic conditions and health restrictions is still compelling and expresses his preference for a

physical meeting. Also, believes it would be difficult for DWR to authorize participation in a physical meeting in June. Believes that a further delay would increase the likelihood of an in-person meeting, which, again, is his preference.

ED (P.Hutton): Not sure if they would officially allow it. At some point we are going to need to reconcile the annual meeting cycle where at some point we won't have a full year if we want to go back to the old cycle with the meeting in April. October gives an advantage of more time for this year and increases likelihood of physical meeting. But, even if we do, have we compromised our ability to pull off a successful meeting the following April?

T. Kadir: The immediate concern is to try to move forward with an option that would more likely allow for a physical meeting in terms of timing and allow members to maintain relationships and connections with other members. Less of a concern is having the meeting *next year*, in April 2022.

N Johns: Concurs with the sentiment expressed by T. Kadir especially as a new member. Other conferences have been delayed as well. All organizations are in competition to speak in these conferences. One meeting that would compete for some of the same speakers or talks is the Bay-Delta Science Conference (BDSC). The BDSC is normally in September, but right now, their meeting will be in April as well. If these occur at the same time it could create a conflict or competition. It might be better to have more time separating these meeting rather than be right on the heels of Bay-Delta.

T. Kadir: Agrees that this is one consideration, although there will be other conferences that still may compete in the Fall if we hold the meeting in October.

S. Tanaka: The other side of the debate, perhaps, is that if people have something to present in the spring it could keep CWEMF active.

T. Kadir: Believes that there could be one or more workshops that could occur before October to serve that purpose.

S. Tanaka: Is it possible to do a hybrid where maybe we have one day in June and two or more days in October.

M. Deas: Recommend that the subcommittee plan for the April 2022 *and* October agenda at the same time as something to consider. There should be a lot of proposals to fill in our agenda.

ED (P Hutton): If we want to do something in June, we will need to make a decision on that today. If we are to have something in June, we would need to make a call for abstracts.

C. Wang: I don't think an in-person meeting in June is possible. I don't think agencies would allow staff to attend. If it is to be in June, it would have to be online. Moving the meeting may increase the probability of in-person meeting, however, I think we still need to have an on-line contingency plan as it is not a guarantee that in-person will be possible but that we hold to the October timeframe.

J. Jankowski: Agrees with ED (P. Hutton's) view in that if we move forward with June as an on-line option, organizers will know what to expect and have enough time to organize for the virtual option. If we move the meeting to October, it could increase the workload to organize both in-person with an online contingency.

ED (P. Hutton): Sounds like we all agree that a physical meeting in June is off the table. What is the probability of a physical meeting in October?

T. Kadir: I think there is a pretty good chance that a physical meeting in October is likely, based on the information we have, unless there is a big outbreak of a variance in the virus. LNI would need to weigh the benefit of receiving the full funds in October versus only the deposit, I believe they would allow for us to reschedule under that business decision. But worst-case scenario, if we move it to October and we lose the deposit, we lose it anyway; it's a sunk cost. With everyone being inoculated by summer we should expect the restrictions to be lifted.

A. Huber: Agree, news seems to indicate that vaccinations will be widespread all summer. UC is planning for in-person classes starting next fall. It's a pretty good bet, but not a guarantee for in-person meeting in October. Should there be a single proposal that solves [*i.e.*, sets a plan for the] 2022 and 2021 cycle?

Other members offer additional comments. One member agrees that *after* the pandemic, it would not be good to have the CWEMF annual meeting occur at the same time of year as the BDSC. Another member notes that the meeting occurs in spring and not necessarily in May, and that decoupling the membership year with the annual meeting makes it easier to move around the date of the meeting.

T. Kadir: proposes the following motion.

Motion: 2021 annual meeting will be rescheduled for in-person meeting in the fall around October unless unforeseen circumstances warrant changing it to a virtual meeting. N. Johns seconds.

Discussion: W. Anderson: Clarifying that, with this motion, the ED (P. Hutton) will have to contact LNI (ACTION ITEM).

TK: I believe the question about the deposit is moot but thinks that LNI would OK the delay to October.

ED (P. Hutton): His feeling is that LNI will allow us to try to move the meeting to fall. The motion carries via voice vote with 20 Ayes (including one proxy), no nays, and 1 abstention.

With the motion approved for an October date, the call for session proposals and abstracts would go out in March and hear back in April.

b. Call for award nominations (Kadir)–

T. Kadir: Noting for the record that 2020 Awards Ceremony will be postponed and merged with 2021 Awards Ceremony.

Now that we've pushed the annual meeting back in 2021 there is a question about officer transition and business meeting sometime before the end of this FY. Decision on this topic is to defer/table decision on a business meeting to the March SC meeting (PARKING LOT).

N. Johns: Before we move on, T. Kadir will contact Mark Arax again to see if he would agree to another reschedule to October (ACTION ITEM).

#### 4. 2021 INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL (Hutton)

ED (P. Hutton) There is a problem getting individual membership renewal payments. Only a handful of members have paid their dues to date given the recent policy change to move over to a calendar year. May need a policy in terms of how the SC considers treat delinquency.

T. Kadir: Can the ED provide statistics regarding who has paid and who has not paid.

ED (P. Hutton): There are fewer than 10 people that have paid, out of maybe 80 folks. Less than 10% have paid. Even more concerning, the SC members are representative of this issue.

S. Tanaka: Not surprised, some/many members will hold off, only joining when they need to. The SC, however, is another story. A reminder should be sent.

A. Huber: Should there be a small late fee assessed?

ED (P. Hutton): Maybe this is more of a technical issue. As a practical matter, individual members normally wait until there is an activity to participate in. However, since we are doing most of these things online, what is our mechanism to prevent people from participating in an online activity if they are not in good standing. For example, when we had the online meetings, the notice was only sent out to members in good standing, *not* to the entire email list. Although, there is nothing we can do about others sharing the link or joining colleagues in the room for the online meetings. There wasn't a designated gatekeeper at the meeting. There was also the issue that membership fees were not assessed in 2020.

S. Tanaka: Zoom has features that can enable a gatekeeper function in terms of registration using pass codes. That feature can be enabled for future workshops with a registration process. For workshops, for example, a registration process is conducted to develop the list of attendees. The day before the meeting a unique link can be sent out to each member of the registration list. There may be links generated for unique for individuals to use: we can look into it to help control access.

T. Kadir: CWEMF has been lenient when it comes to grace periods. At some point we need to become strict in regard to our enforcing memberships. I can understand for this year. There can be a grace period up to a point and we should try to enforce the policy. As far as joining the meeting, having 25 people for a workshop, a gatekeeper role should be manageable. If there is a name or number not recognized it should/can be blocked.

SC members should be more responsible in terms of meeting their commitments. Keeping in mind there are about 30 folks on the SC, some/many of whom are organizational members.

J. DeGeorge: As a representative of the 90%. The normal trigger for membership payment was the annual meeting. Not having the annual meeting made that trigger not happen. In general, though, who would we pay fees for an individual member, it would come down to what services are they taking advantage of. If there is no benefit, there's no trigger. It's the service that triggers the payment. Being a member of the SC, I agree that we need to be more proactive to stay in good standing. However, if I only occasionally used PG&E I wouldn't send them a check every month. It is important to communicate the benefits of members. If a lot of things are online, reminding for access to benefits all year to encourage membership dues to be paid. Rethink the discount incentive to encourage dues early in the year (if you paid within the first few months, for example). Also, could let folks know you do have to pay the full years membership to participate.

J. Jankowski: I have some good faith in members about paying membership dues.

If we do a personal appeal and remind them of our purpose and the value of membership, I would hope that folks would step up and pay.

A. Khan: Same thing with GRA as well. Members only pay when it is time for the annual meeting. ASCE is different where their membership is decoupled from an annual meeting.

S. Tanaka: What is the level of effort to reach out to members and seek payment?

P. Hutton: I certainly could, I have already sent out 2-3 reminders; would sending additional reminders be effective? Is there a way to turn off or deactivate member access to website services?

T. Kadir: Since webmaster must grant access, the webmaster should be able to limit access to the site. The SC or ED would need to provide him a list of names of members not in good standing. Before doing so, a notice should be sent out.

P. Hutton: If a member pays *after* January 31st, they could incur an administrative (*i.e.*, late) fee to re-activate to cover that administrative function.

N Johns: If you do send out a solicitation for memberships outside of the annual meeting, advises to make sure you include justification/reasons why they should renew their commitment. Remind them that the organization has ongoing (*i.e.*, operating expenses), listing what the organization provides, and indicate where we are funding studies.

T. Kadir (to ED (P. Hutton)): Do you have direction for going forward?

ED (P. Hutton): For historical perspective. A few years back we did some house cleaning with the SC. There were some members that were in arrears and were dropped from the SC. Looking for some guidance on what we would like ED (P. Hutton) to do under the current circumstances.

S. Tanka: I think we should send a reminder. Give people some time. If they have not paid by March, drop them.

R. Satkowski: I was looking at the bylaws, it says that you need to support the forum and pay dues to participate.

T. Kadir: I think we should individually target the individuals without identifying other individuals. Give them one warning, indicate the grace period, and state the consequences that they would be dropped.

ED (P. Hutton) will send a "blind carbon copy" or BCC email to all the SC mailing list to remind to pay dues to extend the grace period to the end of February and notify these people they will be dropped from the roster at the end of Feb if they have not paid (ACTION ITEM)

ED (P. Hutton) will not send anything to the general membership. Agrees with S. Tanaka, N. Johns and others, people are not going to join unless there is a carrot/stick. That is why we should explore the member access controls and procedure. Just a new reality that we must deal with now that they are decoupled. Further discussion tabled for now.

The USGS as an organizational member has been in arrears for some time, they will be removed from the roster. ED (P. Hutton) to let Mr. Jon Traum know and include any other USGS contact that we may have contact information for (ACTION ITEM).

## 5. WORKSHOP SCHOLARSHIP PROPOSAL (Satkowski): Attachment 5-1

R. Satkowski: Introduces item, there was a lot of discussion at the prior annual meeting on the scholarship proposal. Request was to clarify and send out the wording to the SC. The subcommittee responded accordingly; the document was sent out (see attachment 5-1 in your packets). The subcommittee received one set of comments. The subcommittee was going to have ED (P. Hutton) send out an online vote, but decided instead to wait for this current meeting for the vote. Recommendation is to provide incentives for people or organizations to that help organize technical workshop.

*[R. Satkowski quotes the text in Attachment 5-1 on the first page and reviews the procedure for organizing a CWEMF technical workshop included on the second page]*

T. Kadir: A question, if an individual works for an organization, and they are unable to accept gifts or something deemed to be of value, presumably that just means that they could not accept the benefit. This would be a case-by-case depending on the individual.

S. Tanaka: Should we add language that it could be declined or that it has no monetary value.

N. Sandhu: It could be added, however, it is true for any gift. In other words, the onus is on the person accepting it.

B. Bray: I don't think it needs to be explicit, I think it can be implied.

M. Deas: Is there a way to make it broader, *e.g.*, defray cost of travel for someone to attend a workshop?

R. Satkowski: Anything is possible if that's where we want to go. Broadening the scope of the benefit was discussed in the last meeting, and the proposal was narrowed based on that discussion. The SC can move forward with this proposal as a trial. If there is a request along the way for an individual perhaps the SC can consider it as they come up.

A. Constantine: It would be nice to move forward. Finalize the policy, recognizing that if there is a request to deviate from the policy, it could be considered then. This way the subcommittee could get back to core responsibility of organizing workshops.

ED (P. Hutton): The issue of transferring scholarships to other people could be problematic. Seems like the wording could be cleaned up a little bit. I propose that to clarify that the benefit is only transferrable within the individual's own organization.

R. Satkowski: That is a possibility. However, in the case of consultants that are a small firm or individuals, this would eliminate the value of this part of the benefit.

B. Bray: Defining what an organization is could complicate the issue. As I brought up before, the benefit could be in the form of a certificate with a wet signature then it can help manage the use of the scholarship.

R. Satkowski: The subcommittee discussed the designation of the benefit, and the subcommittee decided specifically to go with the language of **scholarship**. It can be changed, but I recommend the SC consider the recommendation as it stands.



T. Kadir: Can we add a comma and the phrase "conditions permitting" after the word "other" (at the end of the 3rd sentence) just to recognize the limitation of not being able to receive the scholarship?

R. Satkowski: Sure; that is easy we could do that.

T. Kadir: That would help as a reminder that organizational policies may limit or override the ability to receive the scholarship.

S. Tanka: I propose instead of adding additional text, I propose we tighten the language, I propose we modify to say, " is valid for up to two years and transferrable."

N. Sandhu: It should be understood, if the scholarship is transferred, we would need to know. It is not necessarily that the SC needs to approve it, but more for tracking purposes. Treasurer would need to keep a valid list as there will be overhead for tracking.

S. Tanka: This scholarship has no financial value; it can only be used in lieu of existing fees. There is no monetary value to the scholarship.

N. Sandhu: That makes sense, the benefit is defined so we can understand the value that it can be exchanged for those that need to file Form 700, however.

R. Satkowski: Propose modification to the third sentence as:  
"The scholarship is valid for up to two years and transferrable."  
Everything else stays the same in the proposal.

Motion made by R. Satkowski that the SC adopt this recommendation with the changes as just mentioned, seconded by B. Bray. Motion passes unanimously.

T. Kadir: We also note that the date needs to be updated from 2020 to 2021 (Attachment 5-1).  
Acknowledged by R. Satkowski.

## 6. CWEMF LOGO (Hutton)

ED (P. Hutton): CWEMF Logo, we have two versions floating around. T. Kadir requested we have a discussion standardizing the logo. If you look in the meeting packet, there is a 2-tone logo at the top of the packet. This is the older version of our logo. There is a newer version that has been developed with more coloration.

T. Kadir: The colored logo is on the CWEMF website. That logo was developed by the webmaster when the website was redeveloped recently. There is no reason why the newer logo can be used going forward, rather than the older two-tone logo. Which logo should be used or designated as the official logo? Recognizing there may be other changes worth considering. For example, if the white channel or aqueduct is colored light blue. Alternatively, adding something to indicate fishery or wildlife may be desirable also.

A. Huber: The older log also had a grid in the channel feature which may be attractive to some.

T. Kadir: Looking for the SC to agree on a path forward; should the SC consider changing it or go through a process to consider changing it, or table this discussion?

A. Huber: It may not be a high priority project but might be a nice thing to consider.

ED (P. Hutton): SC should form an ad-hoc subcommittee to consider whether to change the logo and develop alternatives and recommendations for a path forward for considering a new or revised logo.

A. Constatino: The SC could call for a logo redesign contest and get members input on the process as well.

T. Kadir: I like the idea; it can be considered along with considering whether it should be changed.

A. Khan: Recommends reviewing the mission statement as part of the consideration for re-thinking the logo.

T. Kadir: Considering changes to the mission statement would be another matter. However, agrees that there should be a connection between the logo and mission of the organization.

SC proposes a subcommittee to consider changing the logo. T. Kadir, A. Huber, and A. Khan join the ad-hoc subcommittee and T. Kadir volunteers to serve as chair. (ACTION ITEM)

## INFORMATION ITEMS

### 7. WEBSITE UPDATE (Sandhu)

N. Sandhu: The website subcommittee is now conducting monthly meetings on the second Friday of the month. The subcommittee had our first meeting in January. ED (P. Hutton) joined us to talk about revising and updating the website content. There was a good discussion of the review effort and are working through some action items that came out of the discussion. Also reports on the calendar feature on the website, let N. Sandhu know if you have any info to add to the calendar. N. Sandhu also created a Google account. This can help facilitate sharing of documents. Let him know if there's any documents that you want to share there, under the CWEMF account.

Reported on one last related item; improving our connection with social media. This topic was another point of discussion for the subcommittee.

Also not directly related to website, N. Sandhu relates that he has sent out many emails on seeking volunteers and will bring it up again. K. Heidel and N. Sandhu have been asking about the videos in terms of preparing and posting. Some of the videos have been processed and are ready to upload. The more we wait, the less relevant they will be. Those videos are either pre-recorded or are available. We do not have a process in place to proceed.

T. Kadir: You and others that have reached out and obtained approval, we should put the videos up that have been edited.

## 8. MODEL USER GROUPS (Sandhu)

T. Kadir: IWFM/IDC had virtual meeting in December. Over 40 people attended online. The meeting went well. There were several presentations included as part of the meeting that were well received.

N. Sandhu: Raises an issue. Do these workshops fall under the CWEMF umbrella or not? This relates to the nexus to the use of CWEMF resources such as the Zoom account and the posting of materials.

T. Kadir: The user groups are more organizationally administered. The IWFM/IDC was recorded but was not able to be posted on DWRs website. The question in this case would be can/should we post it on the CWEMF website. There is a role for CWEMF to encourage the user groups, however, whether CWEMF should be the administrator is another issue.

N. Sandhu: If it is just informational, I am not sure why it's there. If it is administered by an organization, why include it on the CWEMF agenda?

A. Huber: Acknowledge the point that there are other user groups. Maybe we address it as having a part on our website that lists user groups with links to the groups to help make the connections.

T. Kadir: I think it is beneficial to have an informational item on the agenda and spread relevant information to our organization.

N. Sandhu: Recently we changed the DSM2 user group to the Delta Modeling User Group. This was partly because I thought this user group was a part of CWEMF and we expanded the scope to be more accommodating. However, if DWR is the main supporter motivating the user group, I might go back to calling it DSM2 or SCHISM user group because that is more consistent with my organizational scope for the group. That said, other organizations such as the Delta Stewardship Council could also step in and fill the supporting role. I'm simply asking how the SC is encouraging them if we are just reporting out on information. A key question is also whether the SC wants to give support to any particular user groups.

T. Kadir: I would be reluctant to placing user groups under the CWEMF organization. Not necessarily opposed but we need to think through the merits. The user groups should continue to meet and function regardless of whether CWEMF is involved. The fact that we are reporting on it for five minutes every two months is just to let folks know the modeling efforts [e.g., modeling applications or model developments] ongoing.

A. Khan: At a minimum, in my view, it should be in the discussion in some form. But what should be the nature of involvement or support, that is something that should be considered at some later time. But it is good to be aware of what is going on. But whether CWEMF should take a bigger responsibility, that is a discussion CWEMF should have in the future.

## 9. INTEGRATED MODELING STEERING COMMITTEE (IMSC) UPDATE (Geske)

The IMSC most recently met in December 2020. The meeting welcomed many new members to the team, and the committee is becoming more well-rounded and representative of the Delta Modeling Community as a whole. The main goal as of late is to move into an implementation phase following the reports recently finalized with the help of Tetra Tech. The team discussed different strategies for implementing the suggestions from the report, and suggestions from recent subcommittee conversations. One of the first action items is to

create an online form (similar to Reddit) where we believe that we can start forming the conversations and questions necessary to build the foundations for our user-group focused virtual collaboration lab “Virtual Collaboratory”. The newly hired Delta Science Programs Lead Scientist has just started full-time work, and we are looking forward to working with her to accelerate our agenda and provide additional support where needed.

*–Submitted via email by Mr. Ben Geske to SC via ED P. Hutton on Tue 1/12/2021 11:00 AM.*

## 10. Modeling Protocols (Satkowski)

R. Satkowski: Since last SC meeting, modeling protocols subcommittee met. Revised draft sent out to the 13 members of the subcommittee, currently under review. The Subcommittee plans to go through a 3-draft review and revision process. The subcommittee plans to hold a public workshop to review the protocols and present the scope of what needs to be updated. Then the report would be finalized. Then the final report is presented to SC for acceptance. Then the final report would be posted on the website and presented at the annual meeting, which now has been postponed to the Fall of 2021.

There is one item the subcommittee needs SC approval on. The contract with Tetra Tech ran through the end of 2020. We need the SC to approve a no cost time extension through December 2021 so that Tetra Tech can be a part of the annual meeting report out on the modeling protocols report rollout process just outlined.

T. Kadir: Is Tetra Tech amenable with time extension?

R. Satkowski: Yes, they are.

Motion to propose that the SC approve a no cost time extension on the Contract with Tetra Tech to be extended through December 31, 2021, seconded by B. Bray, was carried with 1 abstention and otherwise all (19) affirmative votes.

## 11. Workshops (Kadir): Attachment 11-1

T. Kadir: CWEMF has not conducted any workshops since the last meeting. There is one additional workshop before others. The modeling protocols is the one exception; however, we will likely reconsider the timeframe for the public workshop on the protocols. With that there is nothing additional to report on under this item.

## 12. Other Business (All)

*(none)*

## 13. Next Steering Committee Meeting –

March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2021, online via Zoom with call-in/teleconference option.

## 14 Adjourn – 11:53 pm

Respectfully Submitted  
Ben Bray, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Tariq Kadir	Vice Convener	DWR
Paul Hutton	Executive Director	Tetra Tech
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engr.
Ben Bray	Secretary	EBMUD
Abdul Khan		DWR
Anna Constantino		FlowWest
Anne Huber		ICF
Chloe Liu		SWRCB
Chuching Wang		MWD
George Nichol		Public Member
Jesse Jankowski		SWRCB
John DeGeorge		RMA
Katherine Heidel		Tetra Tech
Kijin Nam		DWR
Mike Deas		Watercourse Engr.
Nicky Sandhu		DWR
Norman Johns		DWR
Rich Satkowski		Public Member
Samson Halie-Selassie		DWR
Tad Slawecki		LimnoTech
Will Anderson		CCWD

Proxies: S. Tanaka is designated as proxy for J. Medellin-Azura.

Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer Review Process - Development of peer review administrative process.</li> <li>• Equipment Inventory – Needs to be updated.</li> <li>• Storage of Documents – What and where needs to be formulated.</li> </ul>
-------------------	---