

CUAHSI Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
June 14-15, 2005
Wyndham O'Hare
Chicago, IL

Notes: Taken by CUAHSI secretary, as is, with no interpretation of meaning

Tuesday, June 14

Present: Jeff Dozier, Kevin Dressler, Jon Duncan, Jay Famiglietti, Vonetta Faulkner, Wendy Graham, Rick Hooper, Praveen Kumar, Fred Ogden, Laura Toran, John Selker, Christine Shoemaker, Richard Vogel, Claire Welty, John Wilson

Call to order: 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Goals (Hooper/Graham)

1. Review financial position of corporation
2. Determine strategy for integration with CLEANER.
3. Evaluate sufficiency of HydroView to community's needs
4. Review management of HydroView elements
 - a. Standing Committee activities
 - b. CUAHSI staff activities
5. Evaluate corporate activities (BoD/ExCom/Staff)

CUAHSI Status (Hooper)

- **Financial Review**
 - Initial program – mutually supportive elements (observatories, informatics, instrumentation, synthesis)
 - Working off NSF core award
 - Money set aside by Doug James from EAR developmental funds
 - Some year-to year variation in funding based on sub-awards made by CUAHSI
 - Core costs are now (2nd-yr of 5-yr award) virtually all operations and governance with no large sub-awards (e.g. NEUSE)

- Approximately \$6-\$8K/yr is spent on non-NSF allowable meetings/discussion
- Approximately \$240K left over to spend for 2005 (HO Design?) – Discretionary resources
 - Need to discuss what to do with this
 - Demands are: HO Design/Development and NCHS start-up
- NSF audit complete and waiting for report
- NCHS – Berkeley cost-sharing predicated on the full \$7M budget (currently slated for \$4M)
 - Discussion on whether to try getting \$2M from Doug’s EAR pot in the out years which were slated to be cut
 - Should we be discussing matching funds related to NCHS when NSF does not ask for matching any more?
 - How do we decide where to put the funds? That is, is it more appropriate to make sure NCHS is fully funded or spread it out over NCHS, HIS and HMF
- Proposals
 - Field Camp – declined, will re-submit
 - CI-TEAM (1 yr, \$2.5M): In review
 - CI-Environmental Observatories (Meacham proposal)
 - Imminent release anticipated
- Doug will release a “Declaration” on or about July 22nd in the hydro-sciences website (Due date 90 days after, October 22nd)
 - 12-18 mo duration for about \$300K
 - Reviews by Doug James and Pat Brezonik

- **Status of HydroView with HO Delay – Programmatic review**
 - HIS – gaining momentum
 - Gaining momentum
 - PI Change
 - Standing committee appointed and operational (Lettenmaier-chair)
 - IRIS – to make all their facilities work together they have a standing committee made of up members from each committee (so more intricate communication).....is this a good example???
 - HMF
 - Underway under reduced budget
 - PhD scientist hired by Knight at Stanford
 - NCHS
 - Award imminent (slated for \$4M, trying for \$6M)
 - Must decide on how to proceed with the extra funding they (NCHS) are requesting
 - HOs – Reasons for Delay
 - Inadequate definition of science to be achieved
 - Fuzzy definition of what an observatory is
 - Constrained budgets for R&RA and push for MREFC
 - Competing, ill-defined environmental observatories
 - Role of CUAHSI
 - Must stake our turf
 - Decide whether we are making a meaningful effort towards MREFC

- Continued development of community science agenda

Adjourned: 6:30 p.m.

Wednesday, June 15

Present: Jeff Dozier, Kevin Dressler, Jon Duncan, Jay Famiglietti, Vonetta Faulkner, Wendy Graham, Rick Hooper, Praveen Kumar, Fred Ogden, Laura Toran, John Selker, Christine Shoemaker, David Tarboton, Richard Vogel, Claire Welty, John Wilson

Call to order: 8:10 a.m.

1. Strategic Mix of Hydroview program elements given \$3M/yr budget

Selker – may not be the core for the community, so it may be excessive commitment

Wilson – is excessive but is still a good investment, go for other money elsewhere

Ogden – agrees with Wilson, but should steer the organization conservatively

Tarboton – in favor of getting as much commitment in near-term from NSF, maybe should not put all our resources in one location.....maybe have Berkeley write the renewal proposal one year earlier; Might CLEANER be interested in providing funds out of their awards

Kumar – Need the \$3M for it to be successful, but need to fund a core set of activities, not just one; should not consider match or cost-sharing on this issue b/c it may be mis-perceived by the community; CUAHSI must have resources for alternative plans in the future

Toran – Compromise where it is not the full extra \$2M in the out years; OR you can have certain monies but it has to be spent a certain way

Graham – If all we have is \$3M, the synthesis center is essential to help us grow; Knowing that, what will the current budgets for HIS and HMF do for us?

Dozier – agrees with Wendy, but would like to see the discussion talk about what can be done with \$4M; we must make the commitment that it is essential to have HIS and HMF activities funded; therefore, not in favor of committing the extra \$2M

Duncan – AGU comments from the community showed surprise that NCHS would go forward without HOs

Famiglietti – NCHS is running for CUAHSI so we can have it what we (CUAHSI) wants it to be; feels likelihood that HIS and HMF could be funded elsewhere; NCHS would give us a success story and an identity

Shoemaker – too much risk to commit full amounts, so should be closer to slated \$4M; having only one operating facility would reduce the community

Welty – everything they ask for in the first 4 years.....seek out this idea

Vogel – should be seen as a core-type activity; need to show evidence of securable funding; should be the center of the hydroview to integrate the separate activities; contingency to make the fifth year contingent upon success of HMF, HIS and HOs.....would draw in NCHS to help push them forward

Support of 5th year is contingent upon HIS, HMF, and HOs.....

NCHS Groups

Instrumentation – Witold K.

HO – Hornberger

Global Water Cycle – Vorosmarty

Vote: -

- a. \$2M yr 4 and 5
- b. \$1M yr 4 and 5
- c. Tentatively award \$6M, but there is a performance review at end of year 3 and a proposal for funding after the 4th yr (i.e. 5th yr funding is not secure)

i. Part of the performance evaluation is the success of the HIS, HMF, and HOs pertaining to the role of NCHS in that success

ii. Difference between effort and accomplishment (future is solidified for the several arms).....can give great effort and have no accomplishment

Vote:

Motion by Dozier: Board of directors writing to Doug James to recommend an award at \$6M five-year cooperative agreement to Berkeley with a thorough performance review at end of 3rd year.

Second: Vogel

Approved: Yes

3 abstained

Motion by Dozier: Board of directors write a letter to NCHS PI Yoram Rubin describing the directors' criteria for the performance review with a copy to the standing committee.

Second: Wilson

Approval: Yes

Discussion: Primary criteria for an evaluation should include the contributions of NCHS towards success of CUAHSI corner stone activities, namely HIS, HMF and HOs

****Two Specific Actions – Graham:**

Write a letter to Yoram (by Wendy Graham on behalf of the BoD) saying what we expect and put in instructions to the standing committee.

Letter (by Wendy Graham on behalf of the board) to urge Doug to fund at \$6M level and as a cooperative agreement.....say what are expectations of success, as related to NCHS, are. That is evaluation criteria, funding level, etc.

**BoD requests that they have the opportunity to review the letters before sending them out

Potential Conflicts of Interest

Selker – PI of HMF, Co-PI PNWHO

Wilson – PI of Rio Grande HO

Ogden – None

Tarboton – PI GSL HO, collaborator on HIS, beginning working group on NCHS

Kumar – Co-PI HIS, PI on Illinois HO

Dressler – Co-PI Susquehanna HO

Toran – Potomac and Susquehanna HO

Graham – PI on Suwannee HO

Dozier – Co-PI on SNHO

Famiglietti – participant in SNHO

Shoemaker – participant in Susquehanna

Welty – Co-PI in Potomac HO, PI on CLEANER

Vogel – Co-PI on hydromorphology working group

2. Near-term HO Design (**Committee Action Item Within: Wilson and Graham**)

Do we take going for an MREFC seriously?

What funds do we depend on or allocate given the situation?

Potential direction is develop a national observatory design

Costs \$300K for Water Science and Technology Board Report: Possible way of getting science plan done

a. Core Grant \$500K

iii. Motion by Kumar: Course of action is to first devote adequate resources from the core grant to get the Hydroview science plan done well and second, to develop an implementation plan for a national HO network

iv. Second: Dozier

v. Approved: Yes

vi. How do we get this done?

1. Time-frame

a. Report to ExCom on June 30 teleconference

b. Populate committee in July 13

c. Convene in August

d. Draft by Fall AGU (December)

2. Budget (~\$150K)

- a. ~\$50K for meetings
- b. ~\$40K release time for chair
- c. Staffer full time over 6 months for ~\$60K

3. Content and context

Motion from Selker:

- a. One responsible person who has this as a priority and leads a committee/writing group
- b. Professional writer or technical writer/graphics person
 - i. Need a staffer/organizer assigned to lead

Second: Welty

Approved: Yes

Two Abstentions

- c. Possible Chairs: Bales, Moss, Vorosmarty, Duffy, Tarboton, Hornberger
 - i. Three BoD members to work out the chair and set the process forward (e.g. help chair populate the committee, “10-ish people”)
 - 1. Laura Toran, Praveen Kumar, John Wilson (chair)
 - 2. Reports back to ExCom on June 30
 - 3. Populate committee in July 13, reconvene in August for a all hands meeting
 - 4. Draft due at Fall AGU and final at February 1, 2006

3. Interim CUAHSI Budget

In the NCHS proposal there was an original \$100K amount to do an initial activity

NCHS has asked CUAHSI for \$142K to cover July through October. CUAHSI already has budgeted \$110K of that for year 3 which starts August 1, 2005

Vote:

Motion by Kumar: Offer the \$142K from the current CUAHSI budget contingent upon ExCom approving the scope of work

Second: Tarboton

Approved: Yes

Discussion: There are efforts we would like to see from NCHS that are not included in the proposal for \$142K. ExCom needs to iterate with Yoram what these needs are. Should do this before giving Yoram a final decision on funding.

Reference the action item earlier in this document

4. Proposal Endorsements

Vote:

a. Motion by Tarboton: Revise under Policy section 3(a) to “CUAHSI endorsement is a support of the proposed activity as a community resource and not primarily as judgement of the scientific merits of the proposal.”

b. Second: Dozier

c. Approved: Yes

Discussion: more than 1 proposal in a single competition; letter of endorsement criteria are not clear; field camp endorsement; by enhancing one effort does it hurt another and is that fair? We must (and will) document how each endorsement was done and why it was done. Conversely, and as important, why one was not granted.

5. By-Laws

a. Added corporate membership (affiliate)

b. Directors moving to another university

- c. Still unclear on how to do the election to have 5 people in each seniority category
 - i. Option 1: put principle in the by-laws and let the nominating committee adjust

6. Community Engagement

- a. How do we keep community support?
- b. More staff to do newsletters and so on?
- c. Funding opportunities (e.g. proposals to write to HMF)
- d. Workshops – e.g. call for instrumentation workshop similar to what Selker originally proposed in the HMF proposal (those funds were cut)
- e. Marketing/PR person at CUAHSI core office

7. CLEANER Engagement

- a. Need a mode of engagement, nothing decided here. The science plan must be in place before we can have effective dialogue
- b. In the same token should have a regular working relationship with NEON
 - ii. Science plan to be released October 1, PEP on March 2006
 - iii. Funding decision from NSF for FY07

8. BoD Role (**Action Items Within – Graham, Tarboton, Welty, Wilson**)

- a. Science Plan Committee Generators
- b. Strategic Plan – e.g. 5-yr plan
 - iv. Talk about the timeline at the January BoD meeting
 - v. CUAHSI is also independent of NSF funding and we should remember that (e.g. foundation funds to help us execute the strategic plan)
- c. Corporate policies and procedures – must be done by the end of 2005
 - i. Tarboton will read them but not develop them
- d. Need a finance and development committee
 - i. Welty tentatively volunteers to chair (Vorosmarty, Lyons, Wilson)

1. Strategy and opportunities for long-term funding sources (will want a report by January meeting)
 2. Define tiered structure of corporate members
 3. Investment of member fees
- e. Need an audit committee
- i. No material findings of the NSF audit except for sub-award monitoring issues
 - ii. Should be chaired by a non-board member, a member representative
 - iii. Appointed by finance committee? No
- f. Communications sub-committee
- i. Need to reconnect to the constituency (i.e. PR, newsletters), every day activities on the web and such
 - ii. Report in January from CUAHSI staff
- g. 2 face-to-face meetings a year (January and June)
- h. Current compensation committee: Welty, Wilson, Graham, Scatena (proposed new member in 2006)
- i. Proposed Nomination committee
- i. Ramirez, Potter, Burgess, Schwartz, Gooseff
- j. Want to be there if NEON does not get funded to pick up the pieces. Develop the connections and collaborate with the principals – (Hooper Comment)
- i. Informal role in the site selection process
- k. CLEANER involvement through a representative on their committee
- i. Kumar (lead) and Vogel volunteer, Hooper is ex-officio on a CLEANER committee

Multiple Actions:

*All committee members should be invited by the Chair (Wendy Graham)

Adjourned: 4:30 p.m.