

## CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

**MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

For May 20, 2022

(This meeting was held at the Resources Management Associates Conference Room 1756 Picasso Ave., Suite G, Davis, CA 95618 with an online meeting option via Zoom)

Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S. Chowdhury to bring invoices for the awards certificates to next Steering Committee meeting (July 15, 2022) for reimbursement.</li> <li>• Executive Director P. Hutton and Secretary B. Bray to meet and agree on a software platform (<i>e.g.</i> Sharepoint or Google drive) and start organizing a CWEMF digital file archive needed for steering committee and subcommittees to share and archive documents.</li> <li>• Executive Director P. Hutton to check availability and is authorized to make a reservation for Lake Natoma Inn facilities on the dates of April 17-19 or 24-26, 2023 for the CWEMF 2023 Annual Meeting.</li> <li>• S. Tanaka forms an ad hoc subcommittee with B. Geske, N. Sandhu, S. Tanaka, T. Slawecki, and B. Bray to further develop and refine new officer role proposal that is responsible for real-time website maintenance and potentially other lines of communication for consideration at a future steering committee meeting.</li> <li>• Executive Director P. Hutton to revise Attachment 8-1 Exhibit I to the ED annual contract and resend to the SC for a final review before Convener signs prior to July 1, 2022.</li> </ul>
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on re-evaluation of CWEMF rates and/or compensation (<i>e.g.</i> to executive director and webmaster) due adjust to recent inflation.</li> <li>• Discussion regarding nature of content provided behind members login portal on website.</li> <li>• CWEMF Steering Committee Comments and Recommendations for 2023.</li> </ul>
Motions Passed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N. Johns moves to approve the February 18, 2022 Steering Committee meeting minutes seconded by S. Tanaka, 0 nays, 0 abstain, 16 ayes, motion carries by unanimous affirmative vote.</li> <li>• J. DeGeorge makes a motion that CWEMF require that annual meeting speakers are registered for at least one day unless the steering committee invites a speaker for a particular purpose, seconded by B. Bray. 0 nays, 0 abstain, 16 ayes: motion carries by unanimous affirmative vote.</li> <li>• J. DeGeorge moves to accept the proposed changes to bylaws reflected in attachment 4-1, seconded by A. Khan., 0 nays, 0 abstain, 16 ayes, motion carries by unanimous affirmative vote.</li> </ul>

## REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. **Attachment 2-1:** Executive Director's Report For the May 20, 2022 Steering Committee Meeting. 2p.
2. **Attachment 2-2:** Secretary's Report Draft Minutes of the February 18, 2022 meeting. 14p.
3. **Attachment 2-3:** Treasurer's Report, FY2021 SC Meeting May 20, 2022. 1p.

4. **Attachment 3-1:** 2022 CWEMF Annual Meeting Attendance & Financial Overview. 1p.
5. **Attachment 3-2:** Annual Meeting 2022 Survey Results. 7p.
6. **Attachment 4-1:** Proposal for Minor CWEMF By-Law Changes. 2p.
7. **Attachment 6-1:** Executive Director Recommendations. 1p.
8. **Attachment 8-1:** Agreement Between California Water and Environmental Modeling Forum and Tetra Tech for Executive Director Services FY21. 2p.  
Exhibit I Authority and Essential Duties of the Executive Director (July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022) 1p.  
Exhibit II Fees for Services. 2p.  
Exhibit III Insurance. 1p.
9. **Attachment 10-1:** Journal Club Proposal. 1p.
10. **Attachment 15-1:** Workshops Status. 1p.

---

1. **INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – Meeting was called to order by S. Chowdhury (Past Convener/Acting Convener) at 9:45. Introductions were made. There were six persons in attendance with the Executive Director (P. Hutton) and nine were on the phone, and 2 proxies held<sup>1</sup>; A quorum was declared.

## 2. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Executive Director’s Report (P. Hutton Attachment 2-1) – The Executive Director (ED P. Hutton) highlighted that all payment for the annual meeting has been received this week. He reported that there are some organizational dues payments still coming due. The annual meeting was a success, which will be elaborated upon in later agenda items. S. Chowdhury to bring invoices for reimbursement for the awards certificates. (ACTION ITEM).

b. Secretary’s Report (B. Bray Attachment 2-2) – B. Bray provides a brief summary of the February Steering Committee minutes in the meeting agenda packet (Attachment 2-2). There was no additional discussion. N. Johns moves to approve the February 18, 2022 Steering Committee meeting minutes seconded by S. Tanaka, motion passes unanimously (16-0-0).

c. Treasurer’s Report (S. Tanaka Attachment 2-3) – S. Tanaka provides a brief summary of the Treasures report (Attachment 2-3). The report reflects revenue received from the annual meeting. She reports there has been no unexpected expenses or revenue since the last SC meeting.

There is a question asked to clarify the last two numbers listed in the report under expenses. S. Tanaka responds that as of May 3, \$48,125 has been paid in compensation which would be disbursements to the webmaster and the Executive Director. The other line item is \$36,993 that includes all other expenses such as other expenses associated with the annual meeting or insurance. ED (P. Hutton) adds that most of the latter category would have been disbursements associated with the Tetra Tech report and annual meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Khan joins the meeting shortly after the meeting is started at 9:48 A.M. and is designated as T. Kadir's proxy. R. Satkowski joins the meeting at 9:50 A.M and is designated as W. Anderson's proxy.

Another question is raised regarding net revenue from the annual meeting. ED (P. Hutton) responds that this will be covered as part of his report under agenda item 3.

S. Chowdhury asks how we compared to 2021? S. Tanaka responds that last year, in 2021, CWEMF had very little net revenue. This year CWEMF will do better because of the annual meeting revenue. N. Johns responds that CWEMF had two years with negative net revenue and asks is there any concern regarding the trend and our account balance?

S. Tanaka responds that overall, no, there is not an overall concern where she expects the net revenue from the annual meeting this year should be in line with past years. ED (P. Hutton) adds that after making the annual reconciliation of expenses versus revenues for the annual meeting, there will still be a surplus from the meeting this year. With revenue accumulating in our accounts in recent years prior to the pandemic, the discussion has been what kind of projects should the organization pursue? Another longer-term consideration, how long will inflation persist in the economy? Our organization may want to revisit fee structure to balance out expenses. While this may not be an immediate concern, rather, something to think about in the next few years. S. Tanaka adds that fee structure is something our organization should revisit on a fairly regular basis every couple of years to make sure the fee structure still makes sense.

S. Chowdhury asks whether the organizational members continued to pay dues in the past few years? ED (P. Hutton) responds that some smaller organizations have had turnover and have been more dynamic whereas the larger organizations have been more static or consistent in continuing with their organizational memberships. That is another significant source of revenue. The organizational contributions were sustained during the COVID pandemic where other sources of revenue like the annual meeting were cut off due to the health restrictions.

N. Sandhu states that CWEMF has some surplus revenue from past years, and so we should take that into account as well. We would continue to expect our account to inflate under normal conditions when all revenue sources are back up. J. DeGeorge asks whether there is a tax issue with having too much revenue accrue? S. Tanaka responds that CWEMF would need to get into the higher tier of 1M or over in annual revenue for tax concerns to start to come into play.

B. Geske adds that, there are a number of efforts going on, e.g. the branding and logo subcommittee. The CWEMF Annual Meeting, is the core event we all organize around and spend a lot of time on. However, on a future SC meeting agenda it would be good to revisit the strategic plan and action plan companion document. That may help inform us on funding decisions going forward.

ED (P. Hutton) recalls that this was done back when Elaine was serving as ED. The SC went through the strategic planning exercise which took a lot of time away from SC meetings. He recommends most of any work to update the strategic plan be done at a subcommittee level as possible. The purpose of the SC is to make decisions; the bi-monthly meetings don't allow for a lot of deliberative time during the meetings that can be spent on strategic planning exercises. B. Geske understands and underscores that it would be good to pull in some other folks that may be interested in revisiting the strategic plan outside of the individuals engaged in the branding and logo subcommittee effort, but that it could still be done outside of regular SC meetings.

ED (P. Hutton) provides further update on several additional items. After several ongoing attempts, he has not been able to connect with SID to reinstate our prior in-person meeting location. If CWEMF is not able to reestablish this prior in-person meeting location, hopefully we

can find a new meeting location place at no cost. Additionally, CWEMF may need to revisit the webmaster and ED compensation. Right now CWEMF has an amazing agreement with the webmaster. The fee that the webmaster charges us given the excellent service provided is far below market rate. The SC should consider that this arrangement is short-term and should prepare for an increase in compensation for webmaster services. Furthermore, ED compensation has not kept up with cost of living adjustments.

J. DeGeorge offers that CWEMF can continue to come and meet in the RMA offices in the interim until the SC returns to SID or finds an alternate location. With the amount of folks on the call, it would be really cozy to host everyone on the SC in-person, but doable. SC members express their appreciation and heap their thanks on John DeGeorge. S. Chowdhury asks if there is any additional discussion and asks that we table the consideration around future discussion on revising ED and webmaster compensation.

A. Khan takes a moment to thank Treasurer (S. Tanka) for doing an excellent job and providing clear reports to the SC.

## ACTION ITEMS

### 3. Annual Meeting Recap (P. Hutton)

- o Attendance & Financial Overview (P. Hutton Attachment 3-1) – ED (P. Hutton) reports that the number of attendees for 2022 was 179. The Annual Meeting in 2019 had been our biggest year regarding attendance at 220. This year, 2022, has been similar to the 2018 turnout; he was generally happy with the turnout coming out of the COVID19 pandemic.

On the topic of the membership year moved to a calendar year basis. In practice most people do not renew their membership until they come into the annual meeting. That's where most of our new memberships came in (56 new). Gross revenue was roughly \$66,800 from registrations, memberships, and sponsorships. Gross expenses were estimated at about \$34,800. So net revenue was about ~\$30,000. The deposit of a few thousand to hold the facility was carried forward from 2020 as well as some of the sponsorship commitments that were rolled forward to the 2022 meeting.

There was a question about additional expenses such as for the new audio video equipment, how did that influence the cost. ED (P. Hutton) responded that the additional expense was not just for the AV equipment, that there were additional expenses associated with the additional rooms rented at the venue as well (*e.g.* Pavilion). S. Tanaka reported the breakdown was roughly about \$6k for AV rental, \$6k for the room rentals, and the rest was food, internet, drink, rental *et cetera*.

S. Chowdhury asks if CWEMF is happy with LNI AV equipment? N. Sandhu responded that he was not aware of any issues and did not hear complaints about audio. A few SC members shared their experience that the audio and visuals were adequate from the back of the rooms. N. Sandhu heard some feedback about the lanyard and he has ideas on how to make this equipment less cumbersome in the future.

Further discussion on plans for 2023 were tabled for a later item on the agenda.

- o Survey Results (Tanaka Attachment 3-2) – As was done in the past CWEMF sent a survey to all registrants; 46 individuals responded. Survey monkey price increased a lot, so this

year Google forms was used to conduct the survey. ED (P. Hutton) sent email to get responses. S. Tanaka compiled the survey results and refers to Attachment 3-2.

A. Khan, wonders whether the respondents are heavily over-represented by SC members. Out of a concern for self-selection bias, perhaps, the survey should be better promoted and more members encouraged to fill it out. Often those responses from non-SC members can offer very valuable input.

N. Sandhu adds that it would be a good idea to have a survey link up as part of the session(s) during the annual meeting. The idea is that it is better to get the feedback as soon as possible from the attendees, almost real-time Session moderators can provide that link at the end of the session.

B. Geske adds that an additional question could be included in the survey to ask whether the individual is a participant in the SC. There was additional discussion regarding approaches for executing the 2023 survey. The survey will be prepared in advance and promoted during the meeting such as via a link in the annual meeting printed packet and during session slide shows. T. Slawewski adds that folks could be incentivized through a prize, though this may be more difficult to administer if we want to maintain anonymity of responders, especially if we are using a digital format for sending out and receiving surveys. R. Satkowski comments that CWEMF had a raffle for folks that turned the survey in where a ticket was drawn at the next meeting for a prize or gift certificate in the past, although the surveys were hard copy that were exchanged for a ticket. There may be a technical solution to resolving the named entry to a raffle versus the survey responses, there is some time to resolve this technical issue. The SC could consider how to incentivize the survey responses. Another idea was to exclude the SC from entering the raffle as part of the proposal.

Regarding the second survey question (*Please rate the following aspects of the Annual Meeting...*). The aspect that received the most negative responses (*i.e. Neutral or Disagree*) was the statement that there was enough time for questions and responses. ED (P. Hutton) comments that this feedback—lack of adequate time for questions and answers—has come up often in prior surveys. ED (P. Hutton) continues that five speakers in a session is too many, the result of too many speakers in sessions is the problem that causes a lack of adequate time for question and answers (Q&A). His recommendation is to hold firm to enforcing a rule that limits the number of speakers within a session to ensure there will be enough time for Q&A. This criticism has been consistent over time and the best way to ensure there is enough time is to make sure there are not too many speakers in each session.

B. Geske comments that he has seen it both ways; where there are no questions after a given talk and the time between speakers isn't necessary, and others times where there wasn't enough time between speakers to get to all the questions. However, he appreciates that the information in the annual meeting packet includes the contact information for the speakers; hence if an individual is unable to ask their question or wants to follow-up outside of a given session, they can find the speaker's contact information in the meeting packet and follow-up with them.

N. Sandhu shares that he has struggled with the idea of cutting the questions out of the video recordings during editing. Sometimes the questions help clarify the information

from the talk or highlights certain information. N. Sandhu feels that the Q&A portion of the session can add value to the talk recording, but he is struggling with how to capture it as part of the video editing process especially since the audio is often bad for this portion of the recording.

S. Chowdhury comments that he thinks that moderators may not be enforcing time limits. He feels some speakers could do a better job of being more concise. Some speakers may not be doing dry runs which can also tighten up the presentation timing. Although he believes moderators could do a better job of enforcing time limits as well.

J. DeGeorge relays his experience attending the meeting where the Q&A fell into three types of categories. First, there are times where there is little to no Q&A. Then there are times where the Q&A is very productive and insightful. Sometimes the Q&A is almost like a conversation between a few people on a narrow subject. In his opinion, the amount of time generally is appropriate to allow for a few questions that could then lead to further conversations offline. However, he doesn't believe making more time for Q&A is the right solution; folks can use the break to get into extended Q&A with presenters if there is not enough time in the session.

ED (P. Hutton) responds that he generally agrees with S. Chowdhury that encouraging speakers to do a dry run would be helpful, but notes that CWEMF does not have control over this, however, he also agrees that part of the moderator role is tracking time during the session and staying on schedule. ED (P. Hutton) wonders if it might be a good idea to ask that sessions be organized such that there is a block of time reserved at the end of each session for Q&A rather than between speakers. B. Bray responds that there is typically a transition between speakers where a question or two can be asked as presentations are switched over; however, that doesn't mean that 10 minutes, for example, can't be set aside at the end of a session for extended Q&A.

B. Geske adds that the Delta Science Program has had a similar implementation in some of their workshops; holding questions for the end and having all the speakers come back up front where they interact and respond to questions as a panel. However, this type of structure would make it harder to go between sessions during the annual meeting and engage with speakers.

N. Sandhu responds that this type of format could be added to moderator guidelines to as a way to achieve more interaction in their session.

S. Halie-Selasie comments as follows regarding the sessions organized as a panel discussion. This was a format they had considered in planning for the flood modeling session at the annual meeting. Ultimately, the session organizers decided to go with a more traditional format of speakers and Q&A between speakers. However, a format where speakers would come up and give a short two to five minute presentation and interact together in a panel format is something under consideration for future flood modeling sessions.

The final question that was new for the survey gauged responder interest in participating in an extracurricular activity where an early morning run was the example provided. Based on the responses, it seems like there was a slight majority interest in an

extracurricular activity, but not sure what that would look like or how it would be integrated into the annual meeting itinerary. Something to consider for next year.

- o Presentation Files (N. Sandhu) – N. Sandhu reports that there are lots of offloading of presentations at this time. Some presenters wanted to do videos and were told to use \*.mp4 files and that worked out OK. Moderators managed those transitions well between live speaker and video. He felt it was nice to have a live speakers generally. Some folks couldn't make it to the meeting in person and had recorded talks.

N. Sandhu notes, however, that there was an issue with the DWR laptops. Unfortunately, a DWR employee had to provide his login and password via post it notes to ensure access to the equipment was maintained throughout the meeting. This is not an acceptable way to proceed in the future. This comes back to the bigger issue of CWEMF owned equipment. Laptops are currently fairly inexpensive. CWEMF should consider purchasing at least three laptops for future meetings and workshops. S. Tanaka asks if there is a budget or cost estimate associated with this recommendation. There is not a budget developed at this time.

ED (P. Hutton) comments that CWEMF needs to be more disciplined about our asset inventory, especially if the organization is considering adding additional equipment. The Vice Convener has traditionally been in charge of the equipment in the past. ED (P. Hutton) states that there needs to be a transparent way to track the organization's equipment, that can be regularly reported on and tracked real-time. N. Sandhu responds that T. Kadir has started a spreadsheet. However, CWEMF should set up a way that the file can be accessed and shared by multiple users. Perhaps the SC could set up a Google drive or Sharepoint site for documents that can be shared and access is controlled. ED (P. Hutton) agrees that it would be a good idea. ED (P. Hutton) has records going back to R. Satkowski's time serving as CWEMF's executive director. A Google drive could be used to store non public documents or "in progress" drafts as well as subcommittee documents. Sharepoint may be an alternative solution. The software can serve multiple needs. Setting the archive would require some forethought regarding permissions. For organizing the archive, the SC will look to ED (P. Hutton) to come up with the setup and organization. May need to consider how different groups of subcommittees may need access to different parts of the archive as part of the design or software features. However, mostly comes down to archiving records which sounds like an executive director activity.

There was more discussion on the concept of a shared storage area for electronic files and procedures around the sharing, editing, and finalizing of electronic documents using software like Onedrive/Sharepoint or Google Docs. Secretary B. Bray volunteers to work with ED (P. Hutton) on this important initiative. J. DeGeorge recommends starting with a small meeting to talk with some folks that have had experience with setting up a Sharepoint site and/or Google docs drive to understand the software.

N. Johns revisits the question of purchasing equipment. He agrees that CWEMF should purchase equipment that the organization can use to facilitate annual meetings and workshops although it raises a question regarding maintaining equipment; laptops unlike extension cords, need constant care and updating. Hence purchasing this equipment also brings some additional responsibilities or perhaps creates a new role within the organization. CWEMF will need to designate someone the responsibility of technology

chief, for lack of a better title. It would fall on this individual to make sure equipment is maintained and ready to go when it is needed. This role fell on N. Johns for the annual meeting and was non-trivial. Maintaining laptops and the installed software takes time and effort. For example setting up individual session folders for storage of session presentations, then ensuring the presentations are loaded on the laptops, and then ensuring the presentations are uploaded to a web-portal for archiving and the laptops are cleared *et cetera*. This brings an additional consideration to the decision and that's the role or responsibilities of maintaining the equipment.

S. Tanaka proposes that action items to address this topic be broken up into three areas. There is (1) purchasing the laptops, (2) selecting the appropriate software needed for file sharing and archiving purposes, and then (3) implementing which is the building or use of the software and maintaining the equipment. It seems that the first and second tasks could be done in parallel; the decision around the archival software platform and initial setup could be done independently of the selection and purchasing of the hardware.

N. Sandhu proposes a smaller meeting to follow-up and continue the discussion on the equipment and software involving the Convener T. Kadir and any other members that want to participate. The ad hoc meeting can be used to flesh out the recommendations and come back to the SC with a proposal for the equipment and associated software purchase. ED (P. Hutton) and B. Bray can also start meeting and making plans for the archival software, consider the options and start moving forward on that part of the initiative. (ACTION ITEM)

- o Audio-Video Recordings (N. Sandhu) – K. Nam and N. Sandhu went through 92 different recorded talks from the 2022 Annual Meeting. They have been transferred to Youtube and arranged into different playlists. They are linked now to the CWEMF members only website. ED (P. Hutton) sent out an email reminder with links to get access to the content.

N. Sandhu was hoping to demo the archive from the members only site, but had a technical issue. The website didn't seem to be sending out automatic emails for access. N. Sandhu, found the ability to listen to the talks as functioning and useful. N. Sandhu closes noting that they have focused only on the presentation audio files and refers to N. Johns to report on the presentation files and discussion about posting those on the website. There is an item 11 on the agenda to discuss the question of file access to public and members only. Finally N. Sandhu notes that some of the presentation files that were left on the laptop are not pdf files but are mp4 format (*i.e.* video or motion picture). He recommends that whatever file format was left on the laptops is what gets posted to minimize the time needed for volunteers to process and potentially convert files from one format to another. N. Sandhu notes that there were a few individuals that did not give permission to post their materials and he needs to verify that those have been removed before posting.

ED (P. Hutton) clarifies that slides (*i.e.* Powerpoint presentations often in pdf file format) historically have been made available to the public and that the video recordings that are on Youtube are not public. N. Sandhu confirms noting that the presentation files can and will show up in a Google search whereas the Youtube videos can only be viewed via access to the file link and will not show up in online searches.



- S. Tanaka reports that she is on the cwemf.org website and finds that past presentation files are actually not always publicly available where some years have been placed behind the members only firewall. Further discussion on this item is tabled for agenda item 11.
- o Date(s) for 2023 AM (P. Hutton) – ED (P. Hutton) to check on LNI availability Monday through Wednesday last two weeks of April, the 17-19 or 24-26. (ACTION ITEM) The SC does not object to ED (P. Hutton) putting a deposit down if one of these sets of dates are available. ED (P. Hutton) to report back at the next SC meeting July 15.
  - o Sessions Format for 2023 AM (P. Hutton) – ED (P Hutton) opens the topic noting he received a lot of positive input regarding the Pavilion that was rented out this year but not in prior years. Also, before the COVID19 pandemic in 2020, CWEMF was planning for a three track session format for the annual meeting. Does CWEMF want to continue to rent the Pavilion, and continue with a two track session format?
    - A. Khan recommends CWEMF continues to rent the Pavilion and strongly recommends that we continue to rent both the Pavilion and larger Sierra room. On the second question of how many session tracks, A. Khan asks if we can hold off on the decision until we know more about how many session submissions members put forth. ED (P Hutton) responds that we would need to make the decision in advance to make the reservation.
    - J. DeGeorge asks whether we have a hard time squeezing all the sessions into two tracks. ED (P. Hutton) responds that it was getting close to the point where there were enough session proposals pre-pandemic before 2020 to fill in a three track program. Given the uncertainty with the ongoing COVID19 pandemic, ED (P. Hutton) recommends staying with two tracks for now. B. Geske agrees with the recommendation to commit for two tracks and continue to rent the Pavilion. Next year can be a pilot test; if planners get overwhelmed with proposals, that can be the basis to expand to three tracks in the following year, 2024.
    - N. Johns comments that the more tracks there are, the more diverse content; however, the more tracks, the more content one can miss out on as well. In his opinion, the smaller number of tracks the better. B. Geske thinks the planning subcommittee would probably agree noting they are the ones that need to cut sessions if there are too many submissions.
    - J. DeGeorge recommends giving some additional guidance regarding visibility of slides with these long narrow rooms. ED (P. Hutton) replies that this could be added to moderator guidelines, although it is hit and miss regarding their familiarity and enforcement. Our annual meeting allows a lot of younger professionals to get up and give presentations in front of a professional audience. It is a good thing from an educational standpoint that we allow for more junior staff to get up and give presentations, which may lead to less polished presentations at times. J. DeGeorge adds that it is good to have guidelines but also be lenient on implementation for this reason.
    - B. Geske considers the idea of a workshop, planned strategically before the annual meeting, where CWEMF could bring in a professional to do training on verbal presentations. J. DeGeorge builds on the idea stating it could be widened out; an environmental workshop that is focused on how to effectively communicate related

subject matter. B. Geske agrees adding it could be done at a time where participants could implement some of the concepts from the workshop into their annual meeting talk.

N. Sandhu adds that for Delta Science Meeting, there was a discussion about giving effective scientific or technical presentations, although a talk might not be as effective as a workshop. He agrees that this could be an effective workshop if conducted before the Annual Meeting. B. Geske responds that moderators can recommend attending the workshop to their speakers. Such a workshop would be helpful for CWEMF, consistent with the organization's strategic plan and mission, keeps the organization relevant, and offers a service to members. N. Sandhu states that maybe a pre-meeting to the annual meeting that could reinforce some of these ideas and also allow for dry runs or review of content might also be a good idea.

A. Khan suggests what J. DeGeorge and others presented on the protocol as a model for how to present the information in a succinct way and present the info clearly. That report gives a good sense of how the information should be presented. While the report was hundreds of pages, the content was distilled to 15 slides. This could be used as an example in the workshop from how you go from a complex detailed report to a summary presentation that is effectively communicated to an audience. R. Satkowski interjects that this idea will be added to the list of CWEMF workshops in the planning and/or conceptual stages.

There was some additional discussion regarding different ways of arranging the Sierra room where multiple monitors could be used to improve the visibility to the audience. This was done by IEP in past years but might require more equipment to configure a room in this way *e.g.* additional projectors, screens, *et cetera*.. J. DeGeorge recalls that the main room from the Bay Delta Science Conference was set up the same way.

J. DeGeorge comments that at this year's business meeting, he was seated in such a way that it was difficult to see the slide presentation and hear the speakers. Can the audio visual experience be improved at the Cliff House venue for folks attending the business meeting? The lack of a PA system is a limitation. S. Chowdhury adds that his review of the survey revealed that attendees had expressed more dissatisfaction with the annual business meeting than in past years. Perhaps relocating the screen and a PA system could help improve the experience. S. Tanaka reminds the SC that CWEMF cannot block the nearby exit door located on the far wall, hence we are unable to setup a screen in front of the door in the corner of the room. S. Chowdhury reiterates the feedback that the audience needs better access to the information presented at the annual business meeting.

ED (P. Hutton) agrees that we are limited in terms of time and space for the annual business meeting. The business meeting is conducted as a part of the social event. The business meeting portion is a brief part of the scheduled event. He feels that individuals can adjust their location if they are having trouble hearing or engaging in the meeting. It may not be straightforward to rearrange the presentation slides to be near to or over top of the buffet as we are unable to hang anything from the walls at the venue. If folks want to hear everything, it may be practically difficult to easily accommodate everyone in the room depending on the attendance.

J. DeGeorge suggest that handouts of the slides could be provided to attendees. B. Bray replies that he had handouts and it was helpful for getting the feedback needed for

attendance and approval of the 2021 business meeting minutes. More can be added to a handout as needed. B. Geske asks about the choice of venue. ED (P. Hutton) responded that CWEMF has always had the business meeting at the Cliff House since our annual meeting has been moved to Folsom. He adds that the smart planning move was to combine the business meeting and the social, which has increased attendance and made it more inclusive since implementation several years ago. The only reason to move to another venue is that the venue may become too small, we seem to have reached capacity for the space reserved in the back of the restaurant before COVID19 and came close this year. It is also good that the venue is walking distance from LNI.

R. Satkowski comments that it would be nice for LNI to setup a few additional tables outside, perhaps five to seven tables for folks during the lunch breaks. Now that CWEMF is including the Pavilion as part of our rental, if there is bad weather, perhaps we can have the tables setup there. S. Tanaka added her recollection of a comment from the survey asking that there be more standing tables in the back of the meeting rooms. S. Tanaka adds a final comment to ensure the water containers remain filled in the meeting rooms.

N. Sandhu recalls that there were a lot of issues with the slide clicker this year, which was not usually a problem. There were a couple of times the laptops got stuck and needed to be rebooted. Also, we will need to work with LNI to ensure there are spare batteries readily available. He had problems getting fresh 9V batteries that were supplied by LNI staff. Batteries often died during the lunch break. N. Sandhu believes the issues with the clicker and microphones can be worked out before next year. In the lanyard were two devices; a recorder and the wifi device that projected to the speakers. The problem with the handheld microphone is the sound signal can vary with the speaker position if they move or look away, for example. For next year, He plans to tape the microphone to a fixed position. He plans to take the recorder out of the lanyard and take the signal from their equipment. That way regardless of the microphone used, they would be recorded the same. If we were to have more hybrid sessions or speakers that gave their presentation real-time virtually through Zoom or MS Teams, we would need to learn how to execute this with their system. It may be possible, but we have not attempted to do so as part of any past annual meeting. A. Khan notes that this was another comment received, to allow for an online participation option. N. Sandhu reiterates that it may be possible though even more difficult to do. He had envisioned a keynote like John Doherty that may be based in Australia, for example, where it is difficult to travel, but as a "one off" that could be accommodated as an online live talk for the individual.

ED (P. Hutton) recommends that speakers are required to attend the conference at least for one day. J. DeGeorge generally agrees that, going forward, speaker presentations should be attendees. B. Geske asks if it could be framed as a prioritization over a restriction. ED (P. Hutton) believes that may be difficult to implement. It may be more straightforward to simply require that anyone that is to present be registered for the conference for a minimum of one day with some obvious exceptions for invited speakers. In fact CWEMF has worked to at least partially subsidize the expenses of past keynote speakers. J. DeGeorge comments that no one has ever paid him to come to an annual meeting or conference to present. He doesn't see any reason to relax the registration requirement to be a speaker. A. Huber suggests that one option could be to use the

Google forms to survey potential speakers whether they plan to attend at least one day of the Annual Meeting. That planned attendance can be used to prioritize speakers. ED (P. Hutton) replies that his recommendation is that if someone is applying or volunteering to give a presentation, they need to be registered. However if the SC is reaching out to bring someone in, that would be outside of the application process where such an exception to the rule would clearly apply.

J. DeGeorge makes a motion that we require individuals speaking or giving presentations at the annual meeting to be registered for at least one day unless the steering committee invites a speaker for a particular purpose, seconded by B. Bray. 0 nays, 0 abstain, 16 ayes: motion carries by unanimous affirmative vote.

o SC Comments & Recommendations for 2023 (Open Discussion) – (*tabled*)

4. Proposal for Minor By-Law Changes (S. Tanaka Attachment 4-1) – S. Tanaka refers to agenda packet attachment 4-1 minor bylaws update proposal. The changes are mostly typographical corrections or clarifications. For example the first set is adding some parenthetical notation. Other changes include a clarification regarding the business meeting and that the past convener is not an elected position. Pending approval by the SC these changes will be provided to Convener for final approval by the membership at the next business meeting with the general membership. There was no additional discussion. J. DeGeorge moves to accept the proposed changes to bylaws, seconded by A. Khan. R. Satkowski asks about section IV. S. Tanaka notes that she made this language consistent with the updated information on the members. Motion is carried unanimously (16-0-0). S. Chowdhury thanks S. Tanaka for taking the time for the updates.

5. Proposal for New Officer Position (S. Tanaka Attachment 5-1) – Communication tools like the website are very important to CWEMF to communicate with the members and the public. This proposal is an outgrowth of the need to have a designated individual responsible for communications and/or technology engaged with maintaining the website content and potentially other forms of digital communication. S. Tanaka developed a straw man proposal for a new officer position in Attachment 5-1 for the SC to consider and discuss.

T. Slaweki offers his vision of the role as sort of a public affairs officer or social media officer, however he thinks the title of communications officer is a good fit for the role. Based on titles of the other officers of the Board perhaps "outreacher" or "communicator" would fit well with the other roles. S. Tanaka agrees and is open to the moniker for the position.

B. Geske comments that the duties for the new officer seem to be too much for one individual volunteer. The officer would need authority to delegate. May need some expertise as well to be effective in the role with availability for other folks on their team. S. Tanaka responds that perhaps they can have a subcommittee or consultant working with them, however, the need for a chair or a designated individual that is responsible for tracking and updating organizational communications real-time. We would look to the individual to speak to actions, issues, tasks *i.e.* be responsible. T. Slaweki adds that the proposal should be tabled to an ad hoc subcommittee and volunteers to be a part of that group.

ED (P. Hutton) agrees that the new officer will need to be able to delegate given the scope of the effort. In terms of importance, this proposal is as important as the other officers. So while tasks

can and should be delegated, it is still the responsibility of the designated officer to be completed. S. Tanaka used the moniker of communications officer but is reluctant to limit the scope, however, the immediate need is related to the website, specifically website maintenance real-time. This is something that is sorely needed at an equivalent commitment level to the level of Secretary and Treasurer to ensure the website is maintained real-time.

S. Chowdhury acknowledges a need for the position, but seems like more time is needed to develop the responsibilities before the SC can consider the proposal. ED (P. Hutton) replies that this new officer proposal was originally proposed last year and was hung up on the issue of title as a communications officer and characterizing the basic responsibilities now and down the road.

If the SC likes the idea of a new officer, the SC should define and clearly limit the scope of the duties of the position and ensure that the term is limited like the Convener and Vice Convener roles. It is likely that a lot of the tasking would get delegated with the ED and webmaster. This is potentially a bylaws change. ED (P. Hutton) recommends the SC make a decision as soon as possible with constraints on bylaws changes in terms of timeline for membership approval at the next annual meeting. Potentially there would need to also be additional responsibilities spelled out as part of the ED contract as well.

N. Sandhu comments that the communications role can be huge especially with the social media, the mission, *et cetera*. It can touch on the branding effort, with identity of the organization, and relevance going forward. CWEMF led by the SC needs to be able to march in that direction. The role should be communication and should be bigger than just the website. B. Geske agrees with this sentiment. R. Satkowski thinks that the role may be like a second Vice Convener.

ED (P. Hutton) believes that the SC may need to have an officer to take over the website issue, narrowly, as a first, second, and third priority. Maybe initially the SC should narrow this proposal down to managing the website, and then down the road the officer role and responsibilities can be expanded. Our organization needs to manage the website well before we expand into communications via social media.

S. Tanaka asks to form an ad hoc subcommittee with one representative from the website subcommittee one representative from the logo subcommittee and branding subcommittee, B. Geske, N. Sandhu, S. Tanaka, T. Slawewski, and B. Bray volunteer to help flesh out the proposal before the next SC meeting July 15.

ED (P. Hutton) asks what is the timeline for this effort. S. Tanaka, replies that the proposal needs to be completed before March of 2023. The SC should recruit in parallel. In an ideal world the bylaws would be approved with time for Convener review and approval then final approval by membership vote at the 2023 business meeting. There is no focus on the website issue until this role can be filled. N. Sandhu comments that the website subcommittee setting up for the new officer role to take up and make improvements. It connects to the branding, who CWEMF is as an organization, how the organization is represented as a brand. The ad hoc subcommittee will focus on a revised proposal for the next SC meeting July 15.

In closing, ED (P. Hutton) distinguishes the role of the proposed communications officer from the organizational face which is the executive director. The SCs general view of the proposed communications officer is more of a technological role for the organization.

6. Exec Director Recommendations for 2022-23 (ED P. Hutton): Attachment 6-1 – ED (P. Hutton) refers to Attachment 6-1 which provides the CWEMF Executive Director Recommendations for 2022-23. ED (P. Hutton) relays his view that these are simply recommendations for potential actions or initiatives. If a member or group of members from the steering committee agree that any of these recommendations are important, he would expect them to take up the item and move forward with the recommendation. The top priority recommendation is to act on the new officer proposal (the previous agenda item).

CWEMF is a mature organization now. The technical achievement award is named after Professor Hugo B. Fisher. ED (P. Hutton) recommends CWEMF consider naming the other awards, the Career Achievement and Distinguished Life Member awards. Such an action puts a face to the award and adds a little more character to the award recognition. A. Khan responds that there are two things that would happen if this is moved forward. CWEMF would be acknowledging two people in California that have a tremendous impact on overall modeling, water management, or water resources planning and management in California. At the same time, because of the name recognition, the people who would receive the recognition would have added value to their careers. A. Khan suggests that the two names be selected with rigor as it would not be an easy selection and should be afforded the time and consideration necessary to reach a consensus decision. ED (P. Hutton) replies that he agrees. His thinking was if the name selected was a controversial selection, then there may be more cons than pros. A. Khan adds that it would be an interesting exercise for the SC to submit names anonymously as a first exercise and see if there are any common names that are submitted. ED (P. Hutton) asks R. Satkowski, and long-time CWEMF member, if he recalls how the Fisher award was named. R. Satkowski responds that his recollection was that Lyle Hoag, a founding member of CWEMF, knew Professor Hugo Fisher well and originally proposed the award.

The third recommendation is to invest some resources into chronicling CWEMF's history. Given the organization's maturity, it would be good to have the history written down somewhere, perhaps it could be posted on the website. Such information concerning why the organization was formed, how it was formed. This could be done on a subcommittee basis, or someone could be hired to do the work. Photos can be integrated into the document. We could try to collect historical copies of the annual meeting programs back to 1995.

J. DeGeorge reacts that it could be very useful to have a summary of the history that is one or two pages in length that describes the origins of the organization and the evolution to today. This document would be concise. Then there is another approach to developing a more detailed history, providing year by year highlights with photos and graphics that could be really valuable as well. A. Huber adds that we could definitely use the short form history; she recently had to give a short presentation about CWEMF at work. She comments that she went to the webpage and clicked on the history tab and it read "text" (meaning there was no content yet on the website). B. Geske comments that he really likes the idea. He builds on the proposal wondering if we couldn't hire someone to help develop a mini documentary that could be posted somewhere like Youtube that could include interviews. The history could be shown in a visual way, integrating some short stories and historical photos and agendas into it. If this were done really well it could be really beneficial especially to young professionals that want to learn about CWEMF. B. Geske is not sure how CWEMF might go about producing the mini documentary but can envision this being a part of the website.

A. Khan comments that the logo subcommittee has already invested some time into branding as they have been working over the past year. Communicating through video is a really effective way to message. Especially the younger generation of professionals; it is posited that they would be much more willing to watch a short video than read a document on the same subject.

ED (P. Hutton) adds that coverage of the question for why CWEMF was formed would be really valuable. CWEMF would certainly want to interview a few of the long-standing members. ED (P. Hutton) notes that he started participating in the SC in 1999. From an organizational or institutional side, he is only familiar with the early history second hand.

R. Satkowski chimes in his understanding is that the organization was born out of all the technical issues and the State Board hearings in the late 1980s and early 1990s. A. Khan and ED (P. Hutton) respond that another good thing to address would be the early name change; the original name of the organization was the Bay Delta Modeling Forum and was later changed to the California and Environmental Modeling Forum.

A key part of the project that SC members agreed upon was interviews of some of the founding or early members. Some names that were put forth were Richard Denton, Greg Gartrell, Rob Tull, Jay Lund, and Lyle Hoag. Additional names of some early members were KT Shum, Nigel Quinn, and Wim Kimmerer. R. Satkowski notes that 2025 is the 30th anniversary. Perhaps it would be good to have something completed in time for the anniversary. R. Satkowski recalls that CWEMF invited all the past Conveners and Vice Conveners to (the annual meeting at) Asilomar and had a reunion for the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Perhaps CWEMF could do something similar for 30<sup>th</sup> year.

N. Sandhu adds a final comment. As part of the effort, he feels it will be very important to clearly document the reason for forming this organization. He believes it would be good to revisit and revive that aspect with the stakeholders. On the one hand, CWEMF is internal looking, providing value to its members. Then there is an external part also; what value is CWEMF providing for outside stakeholders, for decision makers or policy makers? Perhaps revisiting the mission statement would be timely given the ongoing logo subcommittee work.

A. Khan responds that the fundamental question we should ask ourselves; is CWEMF having an impact in water and environmental modeling? If we are inward looking it gets us away from our mission.

## 7. Lunch

8. Exec Director Contract Renewal for 2022-23 (P. Hutton Attachment 8-1) – Several revisions to Attachment 8-1 Exhibit I were noted. Specifically, the third bulleted list item that reads, “Coordinate with the Steering Committee (and IEP if applicable).” The words “IEP” to be struck and replaced with “other organizations.” Under the 10<sup>th</sup> bullet that reads, “Maintain Accounting Records in QuickBooks.” The words “in QuickBooks” to be struck. ED (P. Hutton) to revise Exhibit I to the ED annual contract making the changes described above and some additional edits to add something about assisting with the website and revise the language regarding the support of, “up to four workshops.” ED (P. Hutton) to revise and resend Exhibit I to the SC for a final review before Convener signs by July 1, 2022. (ACTION ITEM)

No change in compensation recommended at this time. For FY23, ED (P Hutton) states that the compensation rate is not an issue because Tetra Tech is paying the full rate, hence Tetra Tech is

providing a major subsidy. When looking to the next ED down the road, the SC may need to consider a higher hourly rate to keep the position competitive. Once P. Hutton assumed the ED position, the contract was based on a specified lumped sum estimated from a typical reasonable number of billable hours expected per year. Nominally the estimate was about 350 hours, so the \$38,500 breaks down to about \$110 an hour. Roughly half that ED time commitment is dedicated to tasks associated with the annual meeting. In the past we have had major initiatives, and we have augmented the duties and increased compensation for the ED accordingly. This has not happened in recent years especially where CWEMF's ability to hold meetings and workshops was curtailed due to the COVID19 pandemic.

N. Sandhu comments that Convener T. Kadir's input on the contract would be valuable.

Executive Director P. Hutton to work with Convener T. Kadir to extend/renew CWEMF Executive director contract for July 1, 2022 through June 30 2023. (ACTION ITEM)

9. CWEMF Logo (A. Huber and B. Geske) – B. Geske reports that the subcommittee has met approximately bi-weekly and has had three to four meetings since the last SC meeting in March. The latest task the subcommittee is working on is target audience. Specifically who it is that CWEMF wants to prioritize as our target audience moving forward. A. Khan reported that T. Kadir went back and researched participation level over time. State and Federal agencies have been dominant in terms of their participation. The subcommittee is discussing whether to explore or expand beyond state and federal agencies and some consultants that have been engaged historically.

P. Vega continues to work on concept development and an internal schedule with the team. Branding is woven into all these topics, just about everything the SC has talked about today. When it comes to audience identification it comes back to strategic planning. Branding works most effectively if it is supporting the strategic plan. Is CWEMF in a growth mode, who is CWEMF looking to attract, how much, and how much the organization can actually support. Also, from an internal branding relationship, how well CWEMF is satisfying the membership. What branding objectives need to be put in place to support your members' satisfaction. One of the things P. Vega picked up on during the meeting was developing a document that can be seen by everybody. He really supports transparency. P. Vega will continue to document the subcommittee progress and perhaps the document can be loaded into a CWEMF archive that can be accessible to the SC so that folks can see where the subcommittee is as they continue to make progress on branding. The goal is to generally do what is possible to help. If the subcommittee's work can be reviewed by other folks or other members, and we can continue to add to that, it will contribute to the overall health of the organization. P. Vega has a ton of helpful notes he plans to bring to the next subcommittee meeting.

J. DeGeorge notes that participation may be dominated by agency people, however a lot of consultants participate as well. Participation by students and academics is also really critical as well. They are a primary target for what we are trying to do even though they may not be a large slice of the membership pie.

B. Geske replies that this comment is echoing the discussion they are having in the subcommittee. Who should CWEMF be engaging with and why. If we can have folks get involved with CWEMF while they are in college, that could give them a head start in their professional career as a modeler. Again, the subcommittee is carefully considering the audience



we are targeting, and what actions are needed to do to get there. ED (P. Hutton) adds that funding tends to be a challenge that limits non-profit organization involvement in CWEMF.

S. Chowdhury asks if the subcommittee has a timeline for the project. A. Khan responds that the subcommittee would like to have the project finalized by the next annual meeting in 2023 in the long-term with some project milestones to be met in the short term. A. Khan comments that it is a really interesting exercise where they are learning about some things they may have intuitively known, but now they are seeing the numbers or data behind it. B. Geske adds that for him, it has been really important for the active members on the subcommittee to get on the same page regarding what we should be focusing on in the coming years like revisiting the strategic plan and achieving a consensus view on what we look like to the outside community.

**10. Journal Club Proposal (N. Sandhu Attachment 10-1)** – N. Sandhu reports that this agenda item represents a recent idea he wanted to discuss with the SC. Attachment 10-1 doesn't represent a final proposal for the SC, rather lays out the concept of a Journal Club that would meet regularly to discuss journal articles similar to a book club. Journal articles could be selected around a given topic or subject matter. The idea would be to discuss an article. There would be individuals that drive a particular conversation. Perhaps they know the most about the subject matter or they are skilled at providing a synopsis of an article. What would CWEMF's role be? N. Sandhu acknowledges that this is an open question, hence the proposal. It is not a meeting to present the work. Rather, the journal club setting is more of an educational space, to bring along and educate colleagues in a particular field or subject matter. To discuss the state of art and things people are exploring. Perhaps the club can engage with students from academia and young professionals to bringing in fresher, entry level folks all the way to the experienced experts and convey the message that science is never done. The journal club can be a good to place for healthy debate of scientific ideas. Maybe it would inspire some folks to want to do something to move things forward on their project or an initiative they are involved with.

A. Khan adds that this is an emerging concept in the training program (California Innovation Playbook for Government Change Agents or Cal-IPGCA) he is currently involved where the concept is called wisdom circles. Extending the concept here, this would be wisdom circles for modelers. Participants discuss commonalities and points of disagreement. This is an emerging concept in many social dimensions. It can work out really well if there is a collegial and collaborative atmosphere and there is no tension, or reaction, or a showcase of an individual achievement. It is a fantastic idea from his point of view.

B. Geske replies that he likes the concept a lot. This harkens back to conversations within the IMSC about a "collaboratory." The concept is to create a forum to have these discussions; however there is no bait there to bring in the folks to the forum. Whereas a journal article on a knowledge based wiki, for example, gives them a starting point, a reason for the target audience to get together and want to participate. B. Geske thinks this concept could be a good idea to engage and produce those sparks in a forum. If there is a really interesting journal article and people together that have read the article, they will want to talk about what they liked about the article, what they thought was interesting, *et cetera*. Then all of a sudden that grows organically. You gain insight about what the community is thirsty for. The discussion sparks new ideas, and then you can create the forum and build around that. You put the pizza and beer there and let the community form and build around it. A. Khan responds that this could serve another purpose of bringing in young professionals to get involved with CWEMF as a side benefit.

N. Sandhu comments that it will take someone in the leadership or an expert to help facilitate or moderate and start the conversation.

J. DeGeorge asks about the vision for the Journal Club, how would it work. N. Sandhu refers to the second paragraph of Attachment 10-1 (*excerpted below*).

It is envisioned that a leader or expert in the community of modelers would help facilitate and moderate the discussion. It would add value if the journal club attempted to synthesize similar papers and discuss results of the paper(s) and identify further useful areas of research or applications. It would also be valuable to identify the areas of disagreement and contradictions and encourage constructive ways to address those issues.

This middle paragraph is what N. Sandhu envisions the club to do as the science is never finished. What do the experts think are the next things to add value to move the science forward.

J. DeGeorge asks how many individuals would be in the club. After some discussion, perhaps 5 or 10 individuals would be a minimum, but 30 might be too many.

B. Geske continues noting that the value can then be multiplied if you can have a member of the group synthesize and broadcast to a wider audience.

J. DeGeorge asks about access, how would members of the club get access the journals? N. Sandhu responds by turning to the ED (P. Hutton) noting that he has published many papers about individual efforts, but there is a line of reasoning that runs through them. By showcasing one of his papers he can speak to ideas for how to extend the research or ideas that follow from his paper that perhaps he has not pursued. This might spark some interest by others to pursue that idea after it is considered, debated, critiqued by the members of the club.

ED (P. Hutton) really likes the idea. He notes that when he read the proposal, he also thought of a "collaboratory" discussion with B. Geske. ED (P. Hutton) has thought perhaps the "collaboratory" could form out of modeling user groups. In a user group setting, you have a group of people that are trying to do the same thing. It doesn't have to be a model or a group of models though you have a common, focused interest. However, some of the articles are really esoteric in nature. They may be difficult to comprehend. To make it work it may have to be a group that shares a common focus or interest. In larger forums, groups get together, they coalesce and write a paper about the state of art in a certain focused area of their field. That is something in our community where there is an idea that is controversial or unsolved. You get the community together and they eventually write something about it. ED (P. Hutton) sees the proposal almost as a subset of the "collaboratory" effort. He wonder if perhaps the idea could be implemented in an existing model user group.

B. Geske appreciates the discussion and volunteers to table the subject and take further discussion offline with N. Sandhu and others.

ED (P. Hutton) comments that the IMFSC will have a pot of money to pursue things that CWEMF couldn't ever do. But as a non-profit is there is a role for CWEMF.

A. Khan adds a final note; in the Department of Water Resources currently there is an initiative called, "alignment of tools and data across DWR planning and activities." At some point in the future he is hoping to share more information publicly. The effort is focused on this notion; how do we come together and understand each other. There is a lot of interest and a lot being done on this topic, and there is a clear role to play as an NGO to advance that conversation.

11. Discussion on Website "Members Only" Firewall (N. Sandhu) – N. Sandhu tabled discussion on this item for next SC meeting when Convener T. Kadir will also be present.

## INFORMATION ITEMS

12. Website Update (N. Sandhu) – Website subcommittee meeting was held the prior week in May. All the videos are edited and posting has been completed. Next the subcommittee will pivot to working on the website. Looking to tackle some of the things ED (P. Hutton) cited in his review. It is a big task. Next meeting is to see if we can break that down for volunteers.

However, the subcommittee will only be tinkering around the edges. The subcommittee is not doing a full restructure, rather, they are continuing to chip away at the smaller issues like links not working.

13. Model User Groups (N. Sandhu) – No major report.

14. DSC Integrated Modeling Steering Committee (IMSC) Update (B. Geske) –The IMSC is Planning a modeling summit for early November. The kickoff planning meeting was held recently, the second meeting will be in just a few days (in the end of May, 2022). A draft program has been created. B. Geske modeled his program format after the CWEMF annual meeting packet because it is such a good resource serving as a good template for what they are trying to do with the summit. The planning committee is comprised of a group of about a dozen professionals from all over to work through what we are trying to accomplish in the summit. The planning committee is developing a priority list of topics to cover on the program side. Then expanding the topics into plans, talks, panels, presentation ideas. They are making progress. The planning committee will be meeting once a month until November. A few ad hoc subcommittees may be convened as well. Hopefully all of the SC can attend the summit and hopefully some individuals can contribute in some fashion as well.

R. Satkowski asks if there is something on the web that describes the modeling summit? B. Geske replies that they have not yet posted until the dates were locked in and they had a draft program they could publicly distribute. More information on the website will be coming soon.

A. Khan asks what is the overarching intended outcome of the summit and could B. Geske expand on the phrase "modeling summit" in terms of being Delta focused or more broadly focused. B. Geske responds that it will be Delta focused but reminds that the Delta is connected to everything else so there will be more broader facets. The IMSC has done a lot of work to show where we've been, highlight different levels of efforts, and what we can expect to get out each representative level of effort. A key objective for the summit is where can we get funding; short-term funding for the initial building and creating of this "collaboratory" and what is the long-term funding mechanism to sustain the "collaboratory" moving forward. But also what is a "collaboratory" in practice, what are some of the work products, what are services that can be provided to decision makers, what are some test run or pilot projects we can use to demonstrate the capability. What are the problems or answers resource managers are thirsty for and why is the use of "collaboratory" better than what is currently being done without it.

A. Khan asks B. Geske what professionals are involved in the effort.

B. Geske responds that there are some State and Federal agency representatives, some private consultants and others. There are some additional Delta groups that the IMSC planning committee would like to fold into the process.

S. Chowdhury asks what types of models? B. Geske answers all of those types of models that are used to support decision making. The planning committee is bringing in professionals from Chesapeake bay and other arenas. Individuals that have some experience in multi-disciplinary collaborative arenas. They are asking what are some lessons learned, what are speed bumps or roadblocks. They recognize implementation will be tough out here because of some unique challenges with Delta. In other places the EPA is very involved however, the EPA is not as involved in this part effort.

ED (P. Hutton) asks whether the DSC would be a partner or a primary funder of the "collaboratory." B. Geske replies that the DSC could not fund it with current funding levels, but there can always be an option to seek additional general fund dollars to fund a program and positions. The IMSC was not designed to fund and permanently run the "collaboratory" but, rather, was really looking to develop the idea and provide some initial funding. The vision is it is for the community by the community, staffed by the community. The Delta Science Program has a unique role in the Delta to assist in starting up the program and keeping a leadership role, but all the funding is still being worked out. There are ideas about what collaborative commitments look like as well as academic funding for graduate work, but all yet to be determined.

A. Khan suggests that this is a recurring thing that comes up with the State government. In DWR they are trying to align some of the efforts. A. Khan asks how does the effort help or inform the Governor's water resilience portfolio. There is an interagency climate change strategy resiliency group also. If you can connect the summit to these two topic areas that keep coming up at DWR, that may help secure some funding or resources for the "collaboratory" effort. These two aspects are very important to the current governor. On the other hand, one governor's initiative can have funding fall off after they leave the office. A. Khan responds that the way the water resilience portfolio is written, it is very broad and forward looking. The way it was crafted is likely very much designed that way. Similarly for the climate resilience portfolio, it was designed to have long term traction and circumvent that issue. It would be worthwhile for SC members to read those two documents. A. Khan acknowledges that if the governor is elected from a different party, there will certainly be a change in priorities. B. Geske agrees that including them in the conversation is powerful, but is not foundationally based on these two items. Get these folks that write these types of proposals and getting them into the conversation for when they need to draft the proposal is an important consideration.

15. Workshops (R. Satkowski Attachment 15-1) – R. Satkowski reports that the subcommittee has met since the 2022 annual meeting in April and have a prioritized list of workshops to move forward with. R. Satkowski refers to the list on Attachment 15-1. R. Satkowski reports that the subcommittee has been in discussions with Jay Lund and Sujoy Roy, regarding a half-day workshop to present the DSC Science Program's water supply reliability report with a panel discussion format. The second part of the morning section would be used to highlight the modeling protocols report. The workshop could conclude with a round table discussion on where to go next. Hopefully we could capture some ideas from the participants.

B. Geske asks how would that workshop be advertised or promoted. R. Satkowski responds that it would go out using CWEMF's members list and Jay's network via email. R. Satkowski continues noting the water supply reliability report is not out yet. J. Lund just sent an email; August will be too early, however, October will work better. They are hoping to have the workshop in person and maybe have an online component but it is not yet settled in terms of format. They'd prefer in person to get the interaction.

16. Other Business (All) – ED (P. Hutton) asks will CWEMF take on a new project now that modeling protocols is done. S. Chowdhury responds that the CWEMF history may be the next initiative and also working on the website.

A. Khan believes that learning from the logo and branding process will help inform an update of the strategic plan. There will be a written document that describes the connection.

The SC takes time to thank J. DeGeorge for hosting the CWEMF SC.

17. NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING –  
Next Steering Committee Meeting – July 15, 2022

18. ADJOURN – 2:34 pm

Respectfully Submitted  
Ben Bray, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Shyamal Chowdhury	Past Convener/Acting Convener	Army Corps of Engineers
Paul Hutton	Executive Director	Tetra Tech
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engr.
Ben Bray	Secretary	EBMUD
Rich Satkowski		Public Member
Abdul Khan		DWR
John DeGeorge		RMA
Nicky Sandhu		DWR
Ben Geske		DSC DSP

Online via Zoom meeting: Anne Huber (ICF), Kijin Nam (DWR), Tad Slawewski (LimnoTech), Jon Traum (USGS), Samson Haile-Selassie (DWR), Caroline Hackett (State Water Board), Katherine Heidel (Tetra Tech), Paul Vega, Norman Johns (DWR)

Proxies: A. Khan has T. Kadir's proxy and R. Satkowski has W. Anderson's proxy.