

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For January 21, 2022

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

Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Treasurer S. Tanaka will create a new budget category to track website expenses for transparent tracking of website expenses in future treasurer reports.• ED (P. Hutton) and S. Tanaka to review revenue and expense categories for budget report and assess whether there should be any changes in categories to more clearly reflect business expenses, how they break down, and for tracking purposes and provide a category to track all expenses related to the website in future treasurer reports.• An ad-hoc subcommittee was formed by S. Tanaka, R. Satkowski, A. Huber, and T. Slawecki to draft language and implementation details for an AM survey that ED (P. Hutton) will send to CWMEF members by February 1st with responses from members due February 4th. [Note: Subsequent to the meeting K. Heidel also joined the ad-hoc subcommittee.]• Ad-hoc subcommittee will compile poll results and send to ED (P. Hutton) for review and distribution to the full CWEMF SC.• ED (P. Hutton) to review information provided by T. Slawecki to see if waiver language can be adapted for CWEMF's use.• S. Tanaka will schedule the Zoom online meeting for the next SC to meet on February 18th from 9 to 10:30am and will provide the link to ED (P. Hutton).• ED (P. Hutton) to reach out to all sponsoring organizations to ensure he has all the latest logos to include in the annual meeting program.• Secretary B. Bray to send out an email to communicate SC action items from this SC meeting via email no later than next Tuesday 25th.• M. Deas to provide information from HDR contact regarding their commitment for a 2022 Annual Meeting sponsorship to ED (P. Hutton).• T. Kadir to confirm with Andy Draper (Stantec) to clarify 2022 CWEMF Annual Meeting sponsorship level of \$1000.• ED (P. Hutton) to will sent out another sponsorship inquiry Geosyntech, West Yost, and Hydropose.• ED (P. Hutton) to review his membership roster, and if he has an active GEI member contact, P. Hutton will reach out to them regarding a sponsorship.• Awards committee chair S. Chowdhury will provide ED (P. Hutton) language for the certificate and presentation materials for the award ceremony.• S. Chowdhury will take on being the lead contact for David Ford's poster. He will coordinate with David Ford's group and reach out to Jay Lund and his colleagues to get input.
--------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T. Kadir will take on being the lead contact George Mantanga's Poster. • S. Halie-Selasie will take on being the lead contact for Tom Christensen's poster. • ED (P. Hutton) will work with N. Sandhu to verify that equipment can be set-up the April 3rd and have the room locked down overnight. • R. Satkowski to find photo(s) or image(s) for the program cover and welcomes any submissions from the membership.
Motions Passed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N. Johns moves to accept November 19 CWEMF Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, seconded by S. Tanaka, motion carries by unanimous vote (23-0-0).

REFERENCES INCLUDED IN THE MEETING PACKET:

1. Attachment 2-1: Executive Director’s Report for the January 21, 2022 Steering Committee Meeting. 1p.
2. Attachment 2-2: Minutes of the Steering Committee, November 19, 2021. 12p.
3. Attachment 2-3: Treasurer’s Report, FY 2021, SC Meeting: January 21, 2022. 1p.
4. Attachment 3-1: 2022 Annual Meeting Program, Steering Committee Review Draft. 31p.
5. Attachment 3-2: 2022 Annual Meeting Sponsors, 1p.
6. Attachment 8-1: CWEMF Steering Committee Meeting November 19, 2021, Subcommittee on Workshops. 1p.

1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM

At 9:06 T. Kadir declared a quorum with 21 participants the executive director, and the following proxies; C. Liu has J. Jankowski’s proxy and T. Kadir has J. Medellin-Azura’s proxy.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Executive Director’s Report

Organizational dues invoices sent out. Individual membership renewals are in progress. ED (P Hutton) has received some payments already. Much like last year, with the switch to a calendar year for the membership year, individual memberships are lagging; there have been fewer than a dozen members that have renewed. ED (P. Hutton) reminds individual CWEMF members that participate in the SC to please renew. CWEMF members that participate in the SC that have not renewed their individual memberships by March should expect to be dropped from the CWEMF SC roster.

N. Johns asks whether CWEMF ED (P. Hutton) should send out stern reminders. ED (P. Hutton) responds that he has sent out some reminders already. ED (P. Hutton) recommends the SC consider adopting a formal policy regarding members in arrears. T. Kadir acknowledges asking for this to be tabled for a future agenda item for the next CWEMF SC.

b. Secretary’s Report

B. Bray refers to Attachment 2-2 and clarifies that an updated, revised minutes draft was sent out Wednesday January 19th, 2022 for final review and approval. ED (P. Hutton) shares his screen to display the revised minutes for the November SC meeting. There was

no additional discussion on the minutes. N. Johns moves to accept changes and approve the November 19th CWEMF SC Minutes, seconded by S. Tanaka, passes by unanimous vote.

c. Treasurer's Report

S. Tanaka refers to Attachment 2-3 in the meeting packet representing the Treasurer's report as of December 31, 2021. There is a combined balance of \$325,741 in across all bank accounts. Not a lot of revenue has come in since November. CWEMF is up to date with respect to the charitable trust registration with the State of CA until next fiscal year.

N. Sandhu requests breaking out the website fees into a line item on the Treasurer's Report. S. Tanaka will develop a new category called "technology" where website fees and associated costs can be clearly reported and tracked. (ACTION ITEM)

ED (P. Hutton) and S. Tanaka to review revenue and expense categories for budget report and assess whether there should be any changes in categories to more clearly reflect business expenses, how they break down, and for tracking purposes. (ACTION ITEM)

ACTION ITEMS

3. 2022 ANNUAL MEETING — APRIL 4-5

- Thoughts Regarding On-Site Meeting (Open Discussion)

T. Kadir opens the discussion. As of this date, CWEMF is planning on holding an in-person meeting at Lake Natomas Inn on April 4th to the 6th. Given the COVID pandemic, the situation is still fluid and is changing. Unless there are some dramatic changes in the pandemic situation, there will not be any more certainty on the feasibility of holding an in-person meeting until mid-February. ED (P. Hutton) sent out an email to members affiliated with different agencies and organizations to seek input on whether their employers would permit them to attend the meeting in-person. T. Kadir expects to that CWEMF should have a better sense of the projected attendance in the next 30 days. However, projections with the omicron variant have infections decreasing rapidly by the end of January; although it cannot be known with certainty what will occur with the pandemic, T. Kadir is hopeful the annual meeting will be proceed as planned.

The SC discussed whether CWEMF should require proof of vaccination or proof of a negative test as a requirement for the annual meeting as has been typical in the case of group gatherings. SC members shared their experience attending recent conferences and other organizations' plans for upcoming meetings and conferences in the next year. SC members discussed the need for some language to go with the call for registration that requests proof of vaccination and/or a proof of a recent negative COVID test. There was additional discussion regarding whether a certain type of test may be required, how CWEMF would verify or check compliance with testing and other health policies.

CWEMF will also want to be clear that our organization will follow State and County health requirements that apply at the annual meeting (such as mask wearing policy). N.

Sandhu reviewed CDPH website¹ and reported that the Annual Meeting (AM) would not fall under the definition of a large gathering defined as 500 or more people where negative test or proof of vaccination is a requirement by CDPH.

Based on the need for gathering more input and the need to continue monitoring infection rates over the coming weeks against projected declines, T. Kadir asks whether any SC decision on formal COVID policy can wait until 30 days later in mid-February. ED (P. Hutton) responded that decision on COVID policy and associated language to include with registration information could wait but will need to be finalized by mid-February before the call for registration goes out. A. Huber proposes that the SC could adopt a formal policy consistent with CDPH requirements for a large gathering, or any other State requirement—whichever is more stringent—going forward. The SC can firm up the policy via email as part of the decision to initiate registration and move forward with the meeting later in February. If necessary, adjustments could be made as conditions change.

T. Slawecki expresses his concern about possible liability, where if someone gets sick at the conference, they may choose to blame CWEMF. If CWEMF doesn't have a COVID policy, our organization may be facing a liability risk. At a minimum clearly CWEMF should be consistent with County and State guidelines, and if CWEMF wants to add an additional layer of policy protection that should be helpful in managing the liability risk, however, T. Slawecki clarifies that he is not an attorney and is only providing his opinion on the matter².

There was also general agreement in additional discussion that policy enforcement is also unclear; if CWMEF implements a COVID policy, how would it be enforced at the AM? This discussion raised several important considerations. Is a test result shown *before* the meeting or checked at the meeting such as at the registration desk? Would proof of a negative test be shown at the registration desk to get conference materials, or would CWEMF use an email address that attendees are asked to submit their results to ahead of time? How long is a test valid? Should there be some standardization on how you report a negative test or what type of test is acceptable? Should all attendees test regardless of vaccination status? Would CWEMF want to have some rapid tests on-site for people that show up without a test?

T. Slawecki asks whether ED (P. Hutton) or AM subcommittee representative should reach out to LNI and ask about any COVID health restrictions they are requiring (and

¹ Via chat: <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx>.

² Via chat, T. Slawecki also comments the following:

Per CDC ... Organizers may consider testing all unvaccinated attendees and staff for the virus that causes COVID-19 (or requiring proof of a negative viral test 1-3 days before the event) before allowing them to enter an event. Such entry testing at event venues could identify infected people and reduce risk of person-to-person transmission. Organizers may consider exempting fully vaccinated attendees and staff from this screening testing requirement, as the risk of fully vaccinated individuals being infected is significantly reduced.

presumably enforcing) independent of CWEMF. ED (P. Hutton) responds that he has not had that conversation with an LNI representative, although he can have that discussion as CWEMF works with them to finalize the planning for the AM. COVID health restrictions did not come up in the last conversation ED (P. Hutton) had with the LNI representative, they may not have any restrictions above and beyond County or State requirements.

One SC member asks if use of a release from future liability waiver requirement to attend the AM might be adequate to address the liability issue? There was general agreement among the SC that CWEMF should still understand and track County and State health requirements as part of the planning from the AM. If CWEMF decides to use a waiver, it would not excuse CWEMF from following the County and State requirements but could help lessen the risk of litigation exposure. Also, SC members generally agreed that CWEMF should not be performing testing or any screening function at the venue, that should be the responsibility of a third party independent of CWEMF with expertise in healthcare.

N. Johns asks whether some general indication that CWEMF is cognizant of the COVID pandemic and may include additional requirements as part of meeting attendance given the uncertainty that we will likely not know in mid-February, specifically, what may be required in April. CWEMF could provide the specifics of the policy later, closer to the AM when there is more certainty, then perhaps the SC could finalize language at the next meeting in March.

ED (P. Hutton) reacts to the discussion and wonders what CWEMF membership would feel comfortable with in order to attend the AM agreeing that we should communicate our thinking on the topic with the membership. Membership comfort level is important as it is related to what CWEMF would expect regarding attendance; a poll of the membership may be helpful. B. Geske adds that a poll can provide an important piece of data to inform the SC's decision regarding COVID policy for the AM.

T. Kadir asks if the SC should direct ED (P. Hutton) to send out email to general membership that CWEMF will follow State, County, and LNI venue COVID health restrictions recognizing that the situation is changing over time.

N. Sandhu recommends that CWEMF should have a clear policy and make sure there isn't a grey area that people fall under. It would be good if CWEMF can provide information on what the rules are ahead of time so people can weigh the information as part of their registration decision.

A. Kahn summarizes that CWEMF should send an email as part of the CWEMF 2022 AM announcement that CWEMF will follow all applicable public health criteria, take the best precaution as possible under the law, and CWEMF should take action to limit its liability to the extent possible.

T. Kadir comments that he likes the concept of a legal release from liability waiver as part of the program. Unfortunately, however CWEMF doesn't have an attorney on retainer. If CWEMF would need help with an attorney to develop the release from liability, it would likely cost thousands of dollars to consult with an attorney. A. Huber notes that another possibility is to find an example release from liability that would be similar to what CWEMF might need and adapt it to suit our purposes. A. Huber has been involved in seeking a release from liability for a bike club and based on her experience the waiver is not absolute protection. Though a waiver is nice to have, its standing would vary from one state to another. An advantage, to consider in pursuing the waiver is that it encourages folks to more carefully consider their actions. CWEMF would likely not be faulted for pursuing a waiver (with an example provided from CA chapter of Social Workers that are holding events around CA³).

R. Satkowski reviewed at GRA website, and the language they used on their website is as follows, "...all in person GRA events will follow local, county, and CDC guidelines to ensure the return to [in-person] meetings is safe and responsible..." where the website continues on. This is another example of some wording that could be adopted, revised accordingly, and included with the AM registration notice.

N. Johns brings the discussion back to the question of ED (P. Hutton) polling the membership, and the logistics of conducting the poll. ED (P. Hutton) responds that he has used some software to schedule meetings and he could use the platform to conduct the poll⁴. He expects 200 to 300 folks responding to the poll at most. R. Satkowski responds, that the poll would be a good idea. B. Geske adds that his agency sends out a lot of polls and surveys. He provides some additional thoughts on how the survey could be structured where additional questions or follow-ups can be used depending on the user responses. N. Sandhu comments that Google forms allows for the kind of survey structure under discussion. The sooner the poll is put out, the sooner our planners would know whether to move forward.

T. Kadir asks whether the poll would be used to probe the in-person versus online meeting format with the membership. Would we use the poll to probe the question of an in-person meeting decision? T. Kadir asks whether a majority of members indicates that they would not attend, would we reconsider an in-person meeting?

ED (P. Hutton) responds that depending on how the survey is worded, it could provide information on the circumstances individual would want to attend (in-person), and what health precautions would provide an appropriate level of comfort as a pre-requisite to attending. B. Geske adds that if a majority of the session chairs or presenters wouldn't be

³ Example waiver language provided by T. Slawecki via chat:

https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.naswca.org/resource/resmgr/leadership_docs/nasw-ca_event_waiver_covid_r.pdf

⁴ S. Tanaka comments via chat regarding the software tool to conduct a poll:

There is also SurveyMonkey, which we've used for the AM surveys in the past.

comfortable attending, then there wouldn't be enough content to hold the meeting. T. Kadir reminded the SC that all of the session and talk proposals were submitted under the premise of moving forward with the in-person meeting format in April. M. Deas responds that he recommends the SC take the opportunity to ask again because things are so dynamic, and our colleagues may have been optimistic in their planning particularly before this most recent variant outbreak. J. DeGeorge offers his insight that depending on how the survey is worded, and the responses received, one could deduce an updated comfort level regarding the in-person format.

Upon further discussion the SC finds that the specific wording of the poll should be carefully considered to ensure the appropriate information is collected. N. Johns proposes forming an ad-hoc subcommittee to develop the poll including structuring of the specific poll language and thinking through the distribution platform⁵. An ad-hoc subcommittee was formed by S. Tanaka, R. Satkowski, A. Huber, and T. Slaweki to draft language and implementation details for an AM survey that ED (P. Hutton) will send to CWEMF members by February 1st with responses from members due February 4th. (ACTION ITEM) Subcommittee will compile poll results and send to ED (P. Hutton) for review and distribution to the full CWEMF SC. (ACTION ITEM)

At T. Kadir's direction, ED (P. Hutton) to review information provided by T. Slaweki to see if waiver language can be adapted for CWEM's use. (ACTION ITEM)

ED (P. Hutton) recommends SC consider scheduling a meeting on February 18th to discuss the poll and evaluate the path forward. SC members discussed and reached consensus on conducting our next meeting February 18th from 9 to 10:30am. S. Tanaka will schedule the Zoom online meeting for the next SC to meet on February 18th from 9 to 10:30am and will provide the link to ED (P. Hutton). (ACTION ITEM)

- Sessions Subcommittee (Kadir): Attachment 3-1

T. Kadir reports that the sessions subcommittee has been meeting weekly since the last SC meeting on November 19th. T. Kadir refers to Attachment 3-1 that reflects the subcommittee's effort to develop a full program for the annual meeting in collaboration with ED (P. Hutton). T. Kadir highlights the attached draft program. The subcommittee is planning for a two-track annual meeting program over three days. The format and program layout are similar to previous years with two tracks including a pop-up talk session, a keynote speaker with lunch on the second day, and socials at the end of the first two days. T. Kadir comments that the sessions in the draft program have been confirmed.

T. Kadir points out that the draft schedule shows the Keynote address with M. Arax on Tuesday April 5th. There was also panel discussion that included M. Arax and others

⁵ Via chat, T. Slaweki comments:

Primarily for Stacy to use to coordinate poll subcommittee meeting, but also of possible interest to everyone as a useful tool -- <https://when2meet.com/>

(Josue Medellin-Azura, Francis Chung, Kamear Guivechi, and Helen Dhalke) that has been set for the morning, 8am on Tuesday April 5th as part of Session 12 (with moderator J. Medellin-Azura). After discussing, the SC generally agreed that a panel session would best follow the keynote speaker on the second day in the program. This could be accomplished, for example, by switching sessions 11 and 12 with 15 and 16, which would allow pop-ups to remain a standalone session (*i.e.* without a competing, parallel session). ED (P. Hutton) states that the SC can defer the pop-up talk session decision as a standalone session to February when the SC will finalize the AM program. ED (P. Hutton) reminds SC that the program represents a first draft on order and placement on the three-day schedule. In February, the planning subcommittee should work with participants to lock down the schedule and make any adjustments if there are any conflicts or clashes in the content can be accommodated, for example if some sessions need to be moved around during the day or on different days.

T. Kadir asks ED (P. Hutton) if there is a deadline for the abstract submissions? ED (P. Hutton) responds that the deadline has not been set, rather to obtain them as soon as possible as the abstract submissions are usually the final component of the program needed to finalize and print it before the AM. Ideally, all draft abstracts are submitted to the ED (P. Hutton) before the registration opens and the draft program is posted to the CWEMF website. ED (P. Hutton) states that registration is usually started in mid-January. T. Kadir responds that we can ask for draft abstracts now.

N. Johns notes that there have been a few additional talks, or presentation proposals, that have been submitted but are not reflected in the draft program. N. Johns believes all of them should fit into the sessions laid out in the draft program (Attachment 3-1).

T. Kadir reports out on the “In Memoriam” effort or call to remember colleagues that have passed away as part of the AM. The thinking is to remember colleagues and their contributions as part of the AM. T. Kadir reports that there have been at more than three submissions received to date: David Ford, Byron Clark, Tom Christensen, and George Mantanga. While there is not enough room in the program to hold a special session on the subject, CWEMF plans to honor the individuals as part of the program. R. Satkowski comments that in previous years, members have developed a poster that would be displayed as part of the poster session which commemorates passed colleagues. Also, there was agreement to include a slide and brief acknowledgement as part of the business meeting.

S. Chowdhury will take the lead in being the David Ford contact, to reach out with his colleagues, Jay Lund, and others to get input and develop a poster. (ACTION ITEM)

T. Kadir will be the lead contact for George Mantanga. (ACTION ITEM)

S. Halie-Selasie will be the lead contact for Tom Christensen. (ACTION ITEM).

Regarding the awards ceremony for the AM, ED (P. Hutton) has the statue ready for the Career Achievement award ceremony. However, awards committee chair S. Chowdhury will need to provide ED (P. Hutton) language for the certificate and presentation materials for the award ceremony. (ACTION ITEM)

- Venue – Required Conference Rooms (Hutton)

Rather than reserving the Folsom/Natoma and Sierra rooms, ED (P. Hutton) has reserved the Pavilion and entire Sierra Ball Room (*i.e.* without divider) to ensure there is more space and attendees can safely distance during the meeting. Both are under reservation with LNI.

LNI has communicated that they will allow CWEMF one more opportunity to roll over the deposit forward if CWEMF decides to reschedule one last time. ED (P. Hutton) reports he has made a reservation with \$100 deposit to reserve the Cliff House of Folsom for the CWEMF social on Monday April 4, 2022.

- January outreach/registration (Hutton)

T. Kadir reiterates that CWEMF is not planning to send out a registration solicitation email until February (*see previous agenda item*).

- Potential Sponsors (Hutton): Attachment 3-2

ED (P. Hutton) responds that he has received payment for the LimnoTech sponsorship. M. Deas asks whether he provided the follow-up from HDR to ED (P. Hutton). ED (P. Hutton) responds that he didn't receive the follow-up from M. Deas. M. Deas responds that he received follow-up that they would offer some support and will follow-up providing that communication to ED (P. Hutton). (ACTION ITEM)

T. Kadir asks about any follow-up with Stantec. ED (P. Hutton) notes that a CWEMF representative will still need to follow-up with Stantec contact Andy Draper to clarify the intent of the sponsorship for Stantec (*e.g.* towards the social, or a combination of things) as the firm's commitment is enough to cover two sponsorship levels offered at \$500 each. T. Kadir agreed to reach out to Stantec contact and clarify sponsorship. (ACTION ITEM)

ED (P. Hutton) states that yellow highlights on the attachment (Attachment 3-2) indicate various follow-ups are needed on a particular line item. For example, ED (P. Hutton) has not received payment from Pacific Agroecology, hence the amount (\$300) is highlighted. ED (P. Hutton) to will sent out another sponsorship inquiry to firms Geosyntech, West Yost, and Hydropose. (ACTION ITEM)

ED (P. Hutton) to review his membership roster, and if he has an active GEI member contact, P. Hutton will reach out to them regarding a sponsorship. (ACTION ITEM)

ED (P. Hutton) to reach out to all sponsoring organizations to ensure he has all the latest logos to include in the annual meeting program. (ACTION ITEM)

At T. Kadir's request, Secretary B. Bray to send out an email to communicate SC action items from this SC meeting via email by next Tuesday January 25th. (ACTION ITEM)

- Screencast Recording Volunteers (Sandhu)

N. Sandhu is still looking for volunteers to help with screen casting. Volunteer would help set-up on first day and would monitor one of the two rooms. Best if the volunteer is in the room attending the session to ensure recording is occurring and troubleshoot any issues that may come up. N. Sandhu typically gives a one- or two-minute show and tell for the moderator regarding the equipment which would be done by the volunteer this year. N. Sandhu requests one or two volunteers to help with screen casting the AM.

Regarding the equipment, N. Sandhu clarifies that he has the recording equipment but does not have any CWEMF laptop or projector(s). The recording equipment captures the video between the laptop and the projector.

ED (P. Hutton) comments that he will be at LNI on Sunday before the first day of the AM. ED (P. Hutton) will work with N. Sandhu to verify that equipment can be set-up the day before on April 3rd and have the room locked down overnight. (ACTION ITEM)

- Keynote Speaker (Kadir)

T. Kadir notes Mark Arax has been confirmed as keynote speaker. Mr. Arax is an author of a book titled The Dreamt Land: Chasing Water and Dust Across California covering key topics in California water. Mr. Arax will also participate in a panel discussion and will have a table setup for signing copies of his book.

- Theme (Satkowski)

R. Satkowski reminds the SC that the theme has been set: to Building a Water Resilient California. R. Satkowski is to find photo(s) or image(s) for the program cover art and welcomes any submissions from the membership. (ACTION ITEM)

T. Slawewski requests a hyphen be added between the words "Water" and "Resilient" in the theme title.

4. CWEMF Logo (T. Kadir)

No Report. Subcommittee has not met since the November 19th SC meeting. Next step is for the Logo Subcommittee to re-engage with Paul Vega. Chair T. Kadir comments that he plans to re-establish regular subcommittee meetings and re-engage with Paul Vega. It was noted that the firm Woodard and Curran rebranded and included discussion regarding their decision to rebrand and describing their new logo design in their press release that may be of interest to members.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

5. WEBSITE UPDATE (N. SANDHU)

No updates. Review of website content is ongoing.

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. MODEL USER GROUPS (N. SANDHU) (*No Report*)

Delta Modeling Users Group meeting was conducted in December. There were several DWR staff that provided presentations. Presentation can be made available upon request. The DMUG is making an effort to outreach to the modeling community to present their Delta modeling work. N. Sandhu is getting the sense that colleagues have seem to have Zoom fatigue and a little less willing to present online.

T. Kadir reports that there was an IWFm user's group meeting in December with about 65 attendees. T. Kadir adds that the user groups plans on hosting user group presentation online in the future.

7. INTEGRATED MODELING STEERING COMMITTEE (IMSC) UPDATE (B. GESKE)

IMSC has been focused on planning a modeling summit. Planning has been pushed back to late summer because of other competing conferences and meetings in spring. Putting together a short list of folks to outreach to invite to planning committee. By the end of January, the planning committee will be formed to iron out the summit details over the next couple of months. The objective of the summit effort is to take the work from TetraTech and our last integrated modeling workshop and identify the actions to follow-up to implement the recommendations made thus far.

A. Khan asks what is the entity or organization for advancing and implementing the recommendations? B. Geske responds that this is one of the goals of the summit; how do we fund it, which agency might lead the effort, and which agencies might participate. Idea is Delta Science Program (DSP) would help build the roadmap, however their agency did not intend to be long-term lead for the project effort. The Lead Scientist is engaging with groups in other parts of the country to bring in their perspective on these and other focused questions that get us to building the virtual co-laboratory. The DSP is committed to kickstarting the effort and helping organize in this startup phase. The question of what agencies will fund, partner, and lead the effort is part of the goal of the summit.

A. Khan asks whether IMSC has taken a deep dive in the water resilience portfolio and see if there is some alignment or connection in terms of implementation and advancing California. Looking at water resilience portfolio and identifying a suite of actions that can lend credibility and support for the modeling summit. B. Geske wonders whether agencies involved in water resilience portfolio could be identified as potential partners and could be made to understand the benefits in engaging in the effort. A. Khan responds affirmatively; that this might be a way to identify agencies that are aligning funding sources with advancing the water resilience portfolio.

8. WORKSHOPS (T. KADIR)

T. Kadir refers to attachment 8-1 and responds that there's nothing new to report on workshops.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

R. Satkowski requests to have copies of the modeling protocols report printed out for the committee, the steering committee, and some extra copies available for members to handle.
R. Satkowski envisions providing hard copies to the committee and having copies available when connecting with others or to have available at the annual meeting for people to look at.
R. Satkowski asks for 25 copies of the report, 100 color pages in length, in a spiral bound notebook format. The SC agreed to table further discussion noting that these hardcopies could be printed with the physical printing of the AM program by ED (P. Hutton).

10. NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Special SC Meeting for AM Planning: Friday Feb. 18th, 2022.

Full SC Meeting: Friday, March 18, 2022.

11. ADJOURN – 12:05 pm

Respectfully Submitted
Ben Bray, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Tariq Kadir	Convener	DWR
Paul Hutton	Executive Director	TetraTech
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engr.
Ben Bray	Secretary	EBMUD
Shyamal Chowdhury	Past Convener	US Army Corps of Engineers
Anne Huber		ICF
Abdul Khan		DWR
Kijin Nam		DWR
John DeGeorge		RMA
Nicky Sandhu		DWR
Rich Satkowski		Public Member
Mike Deas		Watercourse Engr.
Norman Johns		DWR
Chloe Liu		SWRCB
Samson Haile-Selassie		DWR
Nicky Sandhu		DWR
Tad Slawecki		LimnoTech
Katherine Heidel		TetraTech
Ben Geske		Delta Science Program
Greg Reis		Bay Institute
Jon Traum		USGS
Will Anderson		CCWD

Proxies: T. Kadir is designated as proxy for J. Medellin-Azura C. Liu is designated as proxy for J. Jankowski.