

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For November 19, 2021

(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">• Secretary B. Bray to provide final approved minutes for July and September CWEMF Steering Committee meetings to CWEMF’s webmaster for posting on the organization’s website.• ED (P. Hutton) to send out a second, reminder solicitation for CWEMF Annual meeting session submissions no later than Monday November 22nd with deadline to respond set for Thursday December 9th.• K. Nam to update the deadline for submissions to reflect the December 9th deadline on the CWEMF website.• T. Kadir will follow-up with A. Khan, S. Chowdhury, N. Sandhu, and J. Jankowski to sort out custody of CWEMF’s equipment and update the tracking spreadsheet.• ED (P. Hutton) to work with T. Kadir on a message to send to our membership to request submissions for members that would like to honor and acknowledge a colleague that has passed away as part of the CWEMF 2022 annual meeting.
Motions Passed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N. Johns makes a motion to adopt the July and September SC minutes, seconded by J. Medellin-Azuara, carries by unanimous vote (14-0-0).• Motion to cancel the call for nominations for 2021 CWEMF awards for inclusion in the 2022 Annual Meeting Program by J. Medellin-Azuara, seconded by N. Johns carries (13-3-1).• T. Slawecki makes a motion to adopt theme proposal #5 “Building a Water Resilient California” for the annual meeting, seconded by J. DeGeorge, motion carries by unanimous vote (17-0-0).• R. Satkoski moves that the SC accept the report entitled "Modeling Protocols for Water and Environmental Modeling" with final report date of November 19, 2021, seconded by B. Geske carries (16-0-1).

REFERENCES INCLUDED IN THE MEETING PACKET:

1. Attachment 2-1: Executive Director’s Report for the November 19, 2021 Steering Committee Meeting. 1p.
2. Attachment 2-2: Minutes of the Steering Committee, July 16, 2021. 11p.
3. Attachment 2-3: Minutes of the Steering Committee, September 17, 2021. 9p.
4. Attachment 2-4: Treasurer’s Report, FY 2021, SC Meeting: November 19, 2021. 1p.
5. Attachment 3-1: 2022 Annual Meeting Sponsors. 1p.
6. Attachment 10-1: CWEMF Steering Committee Meeting November 19, 2021, Subcommittee on Workshops. 1p.

1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM

At 9:03 T. Kadir declared a quorum with 12 participants the executive director, and the following proxies; B. Bray has S. Tanaka's proxy. K. Nam has N. Sandhu's proxy. Convener T. Kadir welcomed the SC and introductions were made by members in attendance. T. Kadir displayed the meeting agenda via screenshare and asked for assistance in monitoring the chat window given the difficulty in doing so while screen sharing.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

- Executive Director's Report (P. Hutton) Attachment 2-1

ED (P. Hutton) refers to Attachment 2-1 noting all organization members are paid up for 2021. In early January, ED (P. Hutton) will send invoices out for 2022. ED (P. Hutton) reminds the SC that individual members will want to renew their membership in January. The cwemf.org website is set up for members to renew their membership for 2022.

- Secretary's Report (B. Bray) Attachment 2-2, 2-3

N. Johns makes a motion to adopt the July and September SC minutes, seconded by J. Medellin-Azuara, carries by unanimous vote (14-0-0).

ED (P. Hutton) requests that Secretary B. Bray work with the webmaster to post the approved minutes on the CWEMF website. (ACTION ITEM)

- Treasurer's Report (S. Tanaka) Attachment 2-4

B. Bray notes that the Treasurer's Report is found in Attachment 2-4. Unfortunately, S. Tanaka was unable to attend the meeting this morning. If there are questions, CWEMF SC members may email Treasurer S. Tanaka and she can respond when she returns from vacation leave.

ACTION ITEMS

3. 2022 ANNUAL MEETING — APRIL 4-5

- Sessions Subcommittee (T. Kadir)

T. Kadir asks whether folks at DWR can access the Google forms to submit session proposals for the Annual Meeting (AM). There were no SC members in attendance indicating any technical issues accessing the submission forms. W. Anderson responds that he has received session proposals from members at DWR. Astonishingly, there was very little response to the call for submissions with approximately four to six session proposals submitted. J. Medellin-Azuara requests that the link to the form be copied to the meeting chat window for SC members to access. T. Kadir estimates there may be as much as about 10 sessions under discussion where all may not have been formally submitted, this represents about half the number we are looking for to fill a program. W. Anderson and T. Kadir agree that CWEMF should send out a second request for submitting sessions or talks to solicit more responses. ED (P. Hutton) is listed as the

contact for anyone having access issues. ED (P. Hutton) notes he received no communications indicating access issues.

Convener T. Kadir solicits input for the deadline for submissions. ED (P. Hutton) responds that CWEMF SC typically works to finalize the AM agenda in January. T. Kadir proposes December 2nd or 3rd as the deadline. If the response to this second call for submissions is insufficient to fill the program, then subcommittee members can pursue individual outreach to targeted members to try and fill in the remainder of the program.

J. Medellin-Azuara agrees and recommends Thursday, December 2nd. He also recommends that the reminder be sent out today (November 19th) or as soon as possible following this meeting. ED (P. Hutton) responds that it may not be feasible on that day (November 19) but could be sent by the following Monday November 22nd. After additional discussion, it was decided to extend the deadline for responding to December 9th. A. Huber comments that the subcommittee should also start the personal outreach sooner, there is no reason to wait. There was general agreement to start outreach by SC members. J. Medellin-Azuara will post a copy of the request to his social media once the official notice is sent. The SC agreed that the reminder solicitation for submissions would be sent out by Monday, November 22nd at the latest by ED (P. Hutton) with deadline to respond set as Thursday, December 9th. (ACTION ITEM)

N. Johns notes the website states November 19th is the current deadline and that this deadline will need to be changed on the website. K. Nam replies that he is willing to make this minor change to update the website. (ACTION ITEM). There was a question whether the google forms would be locked after today's deadline? W. Anderson responds that the forms are not locked and remain open.

- Awards Subcommittee (S. Chowdhury)

S. Chowdhury proposes that the SC send out a request for nominations due December 15th. The timeline was discussed, regarding feasibility for providing a recommendation for the January SC meeting as the timing will be tight. ED (P. Hutton) expresses concern that the December 15th deadline may not provide enough time for submitting complete and thoughtful nominations.

T. Kadir asks J. Medellin-Azuara and others with experience with the awards subcommittee whether a month is enough time to review the nominations and make an informed recommendation. J. Medellin-Azuara responds that it is possible that there may be some correspondence with the nominators for a given award to clarify information or the particular type of award submission. SC members discussed the possibility of delaying the next SC meeting to as late in January as possible to allow for more time for the awards and annual meeting subcommittees to meet and prepare recommendations ahead of the SC meeting. ED (P. Hutton) reminded the SC that it takes time to produce

the award materials used for the ceremony (the physical awards and plaques). Also, that CWEMF intends to honor the 2020 award recipients at the 2022 annual meeting ceremony. Ultimately, the SC decided not to delay the next SC meeting.

J. Medellin-Azuara makes a motion to cancel the call for nominations for CWEMF AM awards for the 2022 AM, seconded by N. Johns. The motion is passed by vote 13 affirmative, 3 nays, and one abstention. CWEMF will not solicit for awards for the 2022 AM, however, CWEMF intends to carry forward the awards session from 2020 for the recipients for the 2022 AM program.

- Venue – Required Conference Rooms (P. Hutton)

ED (P. Hutton) must respond to LNI regarding how many rooms CWEMF intends to reserve for the annual meeting. ED (P. Hutton) recommends CWEMF reserve the two rooms for a dual track conference rather than pursue a three-track program based on the response received to the initial call for proposals.

T. Kadir requests that ED (P. Hutton) delay responding to notify LNI for a few more weeks to keep the option of the pavilion open until after December 9th, when the subcommittee planning the AM will have an updated estimate on the number of session proposals. The reservations with LNI are a necessary step to finalizing the planning for the AM. This decision might be dictated by not only the number of sessions but also attendance. CWEMF should not expect increasing trend in AM attendance in recent pre-pandemic years will hold in 2022; record attendance will be unlikely. Social distancing requirements will be yet another consideration for those in attendance.

- January Outreach/Registration (P. Hutton)

Typically, the CWEMF SC will finalize the agenda and send an email to the membership announcing the meeting program and that registration has been opened. The outreach would occur after the SC meeting in January where the draft program is approved for dissemination with the announcement for registration for the 2022 annual meeting.

- Potential Sponsors (P. Hutton)

ED (P. Hutton) refers to Attachment 3-1 where the second column in the table is labeled **2020 rollover** indicating the firms that have opted to rollover their sponsorships from the 2020 meeting to *the next* AM. ED (P. Hutton) reached out to some *not* on the rollover list to ask if there was any interest in sponsorships and has not received any affirmative responses. ED (P. Hutton) has not received a report from M. Deas on his inquiries. J. DeGeorge reported that he contacted Jeffrey Twitchell with GEI Consultants and did not receive an affirmative response back. J. Medellin-Azuara (Pacific Agroecology) reaffirms his firm's commitment.

T. Slawewski shared that he had a breakthrough infection, where the most likely vector was a conference. Hence, he can understand why folks may be reluctant to attend the CWEMF AM in person. T. Slawewski would like to follow-up with ED (P. Hutton) to work out the AM commitment. ED (P. Hutton) responds that he will reach out and follow-up the following week. T. Slawewski states that he intends to also renew his membership for 2022.

T. Kadir asks whether there would be an update on this report in the next SC meeting. ED (P. Hutton) responded that a report on sponsorship status is generally ongoing until the AM occurs and plans to continue to provide any status updates. An SC member noted that GEI and HDR did not have contacts listed; would these be assigned to volunteers or dropped from the list. J. DeGeorge reiterated his earlier report that he reached out to Jeffrey Twitchell with GEI but didn't receive an affirmative response. T. Slawewski responds that he can reach out to his contact with HDR, Mr. Michael Falk, and will see if the firm is interested in a sponsorship for the 2022 AM.

- Screencast Recording Volunteers (N. Sandhu)

T. Kadir reports in N. Sandhu's absence on a discussion they had regarding custody and status of CWEMF recording equipment. T. Kadir inquires on the status of CWEMF technical equipment (laptop, projector, recording equipment, *et cetera*). A. Khan and S. Chowdhury both respond that they are in possession of some of the equipment.

There was a question of the designated custodian of the equipment. B. Bray responds that traditionally the Vice Convener had been the keeper of the equipment. Vice Convener J. Jankowski was not in attendance, however. T. Kadir commits to follow-up with A. Khan, S. Chowdhury, N. Sandhu, and J. Jankowski to sort out the CWEMF equipment before the next CWEMF SC meeting and update the tracking spreadsheet accordingly. (ACTION ITEM)

- Keynote Speaker (T. Kadir)

T. Kadir reports that Mr. Mark Arax is still committed to being keynote speaker in April. No change in status.

- Theme (R. Satkowski)

R. Satkowski recalls that a set of five possible themes was sent out to the SC earlier in 2021 that were related to the concept of resilience (*R. Satkowski re-sends the information to the SC originally sent September 17th, the message includes an attachment with five different themes reproduced below*). R. Satkowski introduces the following five theme proposals.

1. Water Resilience: Developing a Comprehensive Strategy to Meet the Water Supply Needs of California Communities, Economy, and the Environment.

2. Water Resilience: Developing a Comprehensive Strategy to meet California's Water Supply Needs.
3. Water Resilience: Developing a Reliable Water Supply that can Adapt and Respond to Change.
4. Water Resilience: Developing a Water Resilience Portfolio to Address California's Present and Future Water Challenges
5. Building a Water Resilient California

T. Slawewski makes a motion to adopt proposal #5 as the theme for the annual meeting, seconded by J. DeGeorge, motion carries by unanimous vote (17-0-0).

T. Slawewski provides the following information via chat for SC consideration:

From <https://www.fluencecorp.com/what-is-water-resilience/>

... resilience is the ability of social-ecological systems to weather and recover from shocks while remaining adaptable to an uncertain future, and "water resilience" refers to those characteristics in a water system.

T. Kadir states that we will also need an image to use for the cover of the program.

T. Kadir notes that there have been several key figures in CA water that have passed away since the last AM. T. Kadir asks if there are any objections to honoring these folks in the 2022 AM. A. Khan and J. Medellin-Azuara express their support. No objections to the proposal were expressed. In the past, individuals have been commemorated by poster or through acknowledgement during the business meeting. A. Khan suggests a top line or title, "remembering our water (and environmental) leaders." T. Kadir reiterates that we can acknowledge our past leaders through a poster and through the business meeting with a slide.

ED (P. Hutton) asks to clarify how one determines who a "water leaders" is, would these be water leaders that have been involved in the modeling? T. Kadir responds that these would be colleagues in our field with a relationship to CWEMF, such as the passing of David Ford to provide an example where he was heavily involved in modeling in California. R. Satkowski also voices his support and shares his experience in doing something via the poster session in the past. ED (P. Hutton) advises a third option could be a page or two in the meeting program as another way to honor colleagues that have passed on.

ED (P. Hutton) to reach out to the membership to request submissions for anyone that would like to be remembered as part of the CWEMF 2022 AM with T. Kadir to assist in crafting the language for the email. (ACTION ITEM)

4. Communications Officer Proposal (P. Hutton)

ED (P. Hutton) has been attending the website subcommittee meetings. It has become clear that the subcommittee format for managing the website hasn't been effective. The format seems too bureaucratic to be functional. In the last subcommittee meeting, ED (P. Hutton) proposed the concept of a new CWEMF officer position, a Communication Officer. That officer would have the responsibility of maintaining the website and their responsibilities

could be expanded under the umbrella of communications for the organization. This officer would have the specific responsibility for maintenance and management of the website.

T. Kadir asks to clarify the responsibilities of the officer; are some responsibilities from the webmaster or the CWEMF executive director being moved to a new officer role?

ED (P. Hutton) responds that this is not necessarily his proposal, if the title is distracting, it can be set it aside. The focus here would be to centralize responsibilities for the maintenance of the website, making decisions about what needs to be changed, and taking actions to update the website or potentially other lines communications.

T. Kadir seeks to clarify further; is the proposal for a new officer to maintain the details of the website content although the actual technical function of updating the website may be delegated to others such as the webmaster?

ED (P. Hutton) responds that the focus of the proposal is to have a single officer that is clearly responsible for the website. They may delegate tasks to webmaster or to the executive director, or look for assistance from other SC members. The website subcommittee is not functioning with respect to timely management of the website, hence the recommendation that the responsibility be elevated to the officer level.

Additional discussion was focused on clarifying the proposal, understanding the role and responsibilities of the proposed officer, how the officer responsibilities relate to responsibilities of other officers, and the role of the website subcommittee.

B. Geske commented that had attended a few website subcommittee meetings and feels there is a role for the subcommittee to play. However, if N. Sandhu doesn't feel like he has the authority to take on these responsibilities, could the SC clearly delegate this responsibility to the chair of the website subcommittee to clarify the issue?

T. Kadir responds that it doesn't seem to be an authority issue, more of a responsibility issue.

K. Nam responds, that N. Sandhu feels like edits to the website needed to go through ED for approval. Also, the question of whether the responsibility could be delegated to others in the subcommittee was unclear. If organization communications are extended to social media, responding to posts and interacting on social media would clearly be a new, expanded role for the website subcommittee. Maintaining the website is yet a third issue.

T. Kadir boils the discussion down to three things: (1) ensuring that the website is up to date, (2) an administrator or convenor for administering blogs or social media (SM), and (3) authority for making changes directly to the website when one is deemed necessary.

B. Bray relays a comment from S. Tanaka on this subject. Recall that any new officer position will require a modification of the bylaws (Article 5). The bylaws would need to be amended by a full vote of the CWEMF membership. If one assumes that we would seek the approval at the 2022 annual meeting in April, the proposed bylaw amendment will need to be submitted to the Convenor at least 30-days in advance (or by the January SC meeting) if the

SC wants to review or approve the amendment before it goes to the membership. This is not a deterrence against proceeding, just intended as a commentary about the process and timeline. Regarding financial impacts, the only significant impact S. Tanaka anticipates is covering an additional officer's accommodations during the annual meeting.

Further discussion was tabled for additional discussion at the website subcommittee and to take up at a future SC meeting. In the meantime, bringing the website up to date using volunteers should be the focus of the subcommittee in the absence of an officer.

ED (P. Hutton) reiterates his view that this is enough of an ongoing effort, a significant time commitment for an office role. A person could commit to take on the responsibility for two years at a time. SC members cannot speak for absent members, but he feels that the commitment is a bigger responsibility and more a sustained effort than can be handled by the website subcommittee.

T. Slaweki relays his experience that at his company there is a committee that is responsible for the company SM. SM might be more appropriate a title for people to work with whereas "communications officer" connotes public relations. A committee may be appropriate for a solution and wouldn't require a change in bylaws. T. Slaweki commits to better understanding the social media subcommittee role within his company to inform future discussions.

Further discussion on this agenda item was tabled for a future SC meeting.

5. CWEMF LOGO (T. KADIR)

A. Khan opens by reminding the SC that the last discussion on the CWEMF logo left off on the topic of branding. The topic of branding can be cast with the rhetorical question; how do we see CWEMF? This is broken down into two questions.

First, how do our members see CWEMF? The role of CWEMF? The impact of CWEMF? Secondly, how do our stakeholders see CWEMF? A. Kahn breaks down stakeholders into two potentially overlapping categories: (1) institutional characteristic (for example State, federal, academia, and consultant groups) and (2) job responsibility. Many CWEMF members might be classified more as technical specialists, but there are two additional important stakeholder categories: resource managers and policy makers.

The fundamental question related to branding is what impact or influence do we want the modeling community — represented by CWEMF — to make to make on water planning decision making activities in California. Therefore, how do we brand ourselves to effectively communicate, or message, or showcase that goal. In terms of branding, there is a need to revisit three things. First, we need to revisit and home in on the target audience of CWEMF among stakeholders. Second is how do we strategize in terms of message building with our stakeholders. Third, how do we communicate a consistent message with regards to

CWEMF's mission and purpose. A. Kahn closes stating he was energized by the prior agenda item discussion on SM; a SM strategy ties in nicely with the topic of branding.

T. Kadir takes a step back and provides additional background on the logo subcommittee's charge and work to date. The design of the CWEMF logo is intimately tied with the question of branding. The subcommittee wants to make sure the logo ties into the mission of the organization. That's the focus of the branding topic. Graphic artist Paul Vega advises that CWEMF spend a bit more time thinking through the issues associated with branding discussed above before hiring a graphic artist to proceed with different logo design concepts.

A. Huber remarked that the last meeting of the logo subcommittee with graphic artist Paul Vega involved an exercise to understand mission and vision as is done with other clients. This exercise seemed to be an expansion in scope on what the logo subcommittee's charge was. Subcommittee members understood that revising the logo will be a more involved process, would require more time than initially thought, and may require revisiting the organization's mission to carry out the task. The graphic artist Paul Vega is not a member of CWEMF, serving as an unpaid volunteer, the subcommittee believed that we should come back to the SC to seek direction with proceeding along a more involved process.

A. Huber recaps the key questions for the SC to consider. First do we proceed with the branding process with the graphic designer. Second, should we consider compensating the graphic designer Paul Vega for his time. Third, would be a request for any additional volunteers to participate in the process.

N. Johns seeks to clarify whether the graphic artist is seeking compensation or not. T. Kadir responds that the graphic artist Paul Vega has indicated he is willing to volunteer his time, however, T. Kadir asks whether the SC is comfortable retaining an unpaid consultant. T. Kadir believes the graphic artist Paul Vargas seems interested in being more involved with CWEMF especially if we decide to pursue the branding exercise. Paul Vargas is willing to help our non-profit and donate some of his time to support the effort. The subcommittee is seeking SC input on how to proceed where another option may be a quick update process to the logo as originally envisioned and defer the more involved branding exercise.

A. Khan elaborates on their discussion with Paul Vega. The organization logo is the most critical element of branding. A consideration of revising the logo goes hand in hand with a discussion of branding; these things go together. A. Kahn believes that bringing in the graphic artist Paul Vega to the SC to go through a discussion of branding would be a valuable exercise for a future meeting.

B. Geske chimes in that the branding discussion is very valuable especially if we are moving forward with a SM officer or committee effort. The exercise is also valuable to engage with our organization's stakeholders. B. Geske supports the effort sees value of bringing in some outside experts that can help us avoid pitfalls or hiccups in moving forward with the branding discussion and aligning with the organization's mission. In the Delta Stewardship Council,

there is a whole branch of the organization dedicated to communication including professionals with more than a decade of experience and training in social media. Bottom line is that continuing these discussions are worthwhile and B. Geske can bring in some of the experts from his organizations communications team to give some advice and guidance going into a more involved process. These subjects can get very involved, but they are also very important as communication and messaging is a very important part of any organization.

The Logo Subcommittee will continue to work with graphic artist Paul Vega to look for the best way to develop a logo and discuss having him join us at a future SC meeting. T. Kadir thanks B. Geske and takes his offer under advisement as well. B. Geske confirms that he would like to join the list for the logo subcommittee to assist in planning the next steps. A. Huber recommends that a member of the website subcommittee also participate in planning the next steps forward.

6. MODELING PROTOCOLS (R. SATKOWSKI)

R. Satkowski begins reminding the SC that he and Dr. Sujoy Roy had presented the final report Modeling Protocols for Water and Environmental Modeling in the prior SC meeting (September 17th). R. Satkowski presented an overview of the process to update the document and acknowledge the members of the subcommittee that worked on the effort. Dr. Sujoy Roy, the main consultant for the project, provided an overview of the report content. Several SC members requested more time to review and submit comments at that time. R. Satkowski reports that no comments have been received to date and seeks any comments or questions on the report from SC members in attendance. None were provided.

R. Satkowski moves that the SC accept the report entitled "Modeling Protocols for Water and Environmental Modeling" with today's date (November 19th) as the final date, seconded by B. Geske. With no further discussion the motion carries with 16 affirmative votes and one abstention.

R. Satkowski notes that there will be a "TED talk" style oral presentation report planned for the AM for the general membership. T. Kadir thanks R. Satkowski, Dr. Sujoy Roy, Dr. Paul Hutton and Katherine Heidel with Tetra Tech, all the members of the subcommittee that participated in the effort, and thanks all of those who took the time to provide input, comments, and feedback on the draft to get it to the final form.

INFORMATION ITEMS

7. WEBSITE UPDATE (N. SANDHU)

K. Nam reports that the website subcommittee has not met since the last SC meeting. However, the subcommittee received approval from the Delta Stewardship Council to link to the modeling wiki. This issue will be taken up at a future website subcommittee meeting.

8. MODEL USER GROUPS (N. SANDHU)

K. Nam report that December 7 is the next The Delta Modeling Users Group meeting. T. Kadir comments that the next IWFMI/IDC user's group is also coming up in December.

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

B. Geske reports that the IMSC was focused on building an online forum and was planning to use the software Discourse as the basis for developing the online forum. Seeking the approvals and securing funding was an administrative challenge within his agency. Near the end of the process, he was unable to finalize the agreements necessary to ultimately move forward. Unfortunately, this represents a set-back delaying the development, however, the IMSC is seeking an alternative platform that will allow the project to move forward.

The IMSC is working with the new lead scientist on planning another workshop or modeling summit. The plan is to build on the work by Tetra Tech and others completed already. The plan for the workshop is to bring in some experts that have pulled together collaborative modeling efforts that can advise on the next steps toward building the community. B. Geske closes his report noting more to come this summer.

G. Nichol asks whether the Tetra Tech reports were made available to the public. B. Geske responded that there may have been a printed set made available to the workshop attendees, but DSC did not do a printing and distribution effort although the report may be available on the web.

10. WORKSHOPS (T. KADIR)

T. Kadir refers to attachment 10-1 noting there hasn't been any workshops since the ethics workshop discussed at the last SC. No new report on any workshops in the planning stage.

11. OTHER BUSINESS (ALL)

An SC member reported that they received a complaint from Senior staff at DWR that was unhappy with the policy of putting workshop materials behind the members login firewall. Three options were noted in response: (1) keep it as it is (keep materials posted behind membership wall), (2) split the content (recordings behind the membership wall with powerpoint slides public), and (3) make everything available to the public (how it was previously). B. Bray notes the move to putting material behind the firewall was a means of incentivizing members to renew their membership in a timely manner given that membership renewal has been decoupled from the Annual Meeting and is now running on a calendar year basis. ED (P. Hutton) reiterates the call for renewing membership going into the new year, certainly before the next Steering Committee meeting. Further discussion was tabled for a future SC meeting in the interest of time.

12. NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

The next SC meeting is set for January 21st, 2022, online via Zoom with call-in/teleconference option.

12. ADJOURN – 12:03 pm

Respectfully Submitted
Ben Bray, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Tariq Kadir	Convener	DWR
Paul Hutton	Executive Director	Tetra Tech
Ben Bray	Secretary	EBMUD
Shyamal Chowdhury	Past Convener	US Army Corps of Engineers
Anne Huber		ICF
Kijin Nam		DWR
John DeGeorge		RMA
Rich Satkowski		Public Member
Norman Johns		DWR
Chloe Liu		SWRCB
Will Anderson*		CCWD
Tad Slawecki		LimnoTech
Katherine Heidel		TetraTech
Josue Medellin-Azuara		UC Merced
Jon Traum		USGS
Ben Geske		DSC DSP
Abdul Khan		DWR
George Nichol		Public Member

*W. Anderson noted he may need to leave the meeting at around 11 am.

Proxies: K. Nam is designated as proxy for N. Sandhu. B. Bray is designated as proxy for S. Tanaka.