



**CUAHSI Board of Directors Meeting
October 12, 2005
Minutes**

NOTE: We have a number of large items to discuss, but their resolution cannot happen during the course of the phone call. We would like to limit the discussion to the time noted on the agenda. We would like to appoint small groups to work with the staff on resolving these issues and presenting a plan to the ExCom for action of the next few weeks.

Present: Jeff Dozier, Kevin Dressler, Jon Duncan, Jay Famiglietti, Efi Foufoula, Wendy Graham, Rick Hooper, Praveen Kumar, Fred Scatena, Christine Shoemaker, David Tarboton, Laura Toran, Rich Vogel, Claire Welty, Chunmiao Zheng

Call to Order: 3:05 pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

From June 14-15 meeting in Chicago.

Motion to Approve the June 14-15 Minutes: Jeff Dozier

Second: Efi Foufoula

Approval: Yes

ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Wilson has resigned from the Board, effective August 8, 2005, to lead the Science Advisory Team. His resignation was necessary to avoid a conflict of interest, because he is received salary to perform this task.

The NSF Audit of CUAHSI remains unresolved after 2 years. The Auditor is not being given sufficient time to complete the work. We believe the major deficiencies in the accounting system have been addressed, but we still have no formal determination of that. CUAHSI remains on various restrictions on the receipt and expenditure of funds from NSF.

- No official date of completion as of yet: Not cleared to receive large funds from NSF until this is complete
- Rick Hooper assumes that there will be findings of some unallowable charges

REPORTS

HydroView Phase 2: Facing the financial realities (20 minutes)

All four HydroView elements have been presented to NSF for evaluation with mixed results.

- HIS is the most advanced and is progressing well. A recent status report by the HIS team (on CUAHSI web site, <http://www.cuahsi.org>) was well received by NSF management and is seen as forming the basis for follow-on activities.
 - NSF would like proposals for the Geoinformatics call in February 2006 for the IF panel
 - 5-yr cooperative agreement for as much as \$900K/yr
 - This must be advertised to everyone by CUAHSI
 - • CUAHSI must come up with a strategy by which CUAHSI can be a partner on multiple proposals
 - Must vet a strategy or protocol here
 - Also more PI-level grants that are funded as community level activities
- The HMF pilot is just underway. Investment is being made in bringing shallow geophysics tools to hydrology, in starting a handbook (Durant) of field methods, designing an operational facility, and brokering equipment leasing arrangements.
- Prototype HOs, as conceived during 2004, were stopped dead in their tracks, primarily due to lack of funds. We have been directed by Geosciences to work with Engineering Directorate in a joint CLEANER/HO science plan for an MREFC with a projected start date of 2011. At the same time, limited funds have been made available to address some of the questions surrounding HO operation.

The establishment of CUAHSI has brought an additional \$3M/yr to the Hydrologic Sciences Program at NSF. While the NSF budget remains flat, these are the funds that CUAHSI can use for community-building and infrastructure planning efforts.

ACTION ITEM: CUAHSI needs to develop a multi-year plan for disposition of these funds to advise Doug James. Read the "Interim Science and Implementation Plan" on the CUAHSI web site as a starting point.

- The proposed NCHS at Berkeley has been declined by NSF through a confluence of unfortunate circumstances. A pilot facility is still desired by NSF, but it will be at reduced scale (order of \$500K/yr for 4 years). Details of the solicitation for this facility are still being decided at NSF.
 - Current feeling is to do a competition with multiple proposals as opposed to a resubmission of the original Berkeley proposal
 - At the very least CUAHSI would like to see a Cyber Seminar from Doug James regarding NSF wishes for a Synthesis Center
 - Must make the comments of the reviewers visible so that the community knows how to better respond – Shoemaker
 - Discussion on the process to review in selection at CUAHSI through the panel review at NSF
 - Discussion was leading from understanding how a disconnect could have occurred
 - Where should we go with this?
 - If a Berkeley proposal is submitted with an RFP or whatever, Yoram cannot be director due to the appearance at NSF – Foufoula
 - If we go with an RFP we should be prepared for less proposals and maybe at a slightly narrower vision
 - Do a formal solicitation but that CUAHSI would partner if the proposers could send them a draft say, 3 months ahead of time – Shoemaker
 - May be hard not cross-fertilize accidentally – Toran
 - Do a formal solicitation that CUAHSI would partner with everyone – Hooper
 - Is the Board willing to tolerate a 6-9 month delay and wait for a solicitation?
 - Respect for Hydrology may not necessarily come with a solicitation – Foufoula
 - A way to get respect is to get back to NSF with a second chance or site visit
 - Not convinced to go for the RFP

- Interim Synthesis Center run by CUAHSI until such time NSF will create a bigger solicitation – Vogel
 - Maybe we are better off to go ahead and submit a smaller synthesis run by CUAHSI – Tarboton
 - We can place groups at NCEAS as the most pragmatic way – Hooper
 - Was discussed at ExCom that this would not be attractive – Shows no sense of evolution or profile
 - Yet if we look at the alternative, it is tough in a smaller budget
 - We have already put a lot of effort into the unsolicited approach and why not let the original groups or others resubmit and let it sift out – Shoemaker
 - Tarboton said that he may reconsider but would have to consider very carefully
 - Dozier does not know the feeling of the Irvine group
 - Something to be said about CUAHSI taking over for now due to the funding scarcity – Zheng
 - One of the things that would be useful for the groups that already submitted is to have robust scoring criteria so that things like being away from a major airport does not shake down a proposal without the proposers knowing ahead of time – Dozier
 - Reason being is that you are going to get very similar proposals
 - So, there are probably more specific criteria that are at least originally somewhat implicit

Below are three options to move forward with Synthesis and an informal discussion vote related to those options

1. CUAHSI writes a proposal to manage the center at NCEAS
2. Unsolicited proposal from multiple groups to do a pilot facility – reviewed by NSF (deadline approximately February 1, 2006; with a Cyberseminar from James at NSF)
3. Urge James to do an RFP which will take 6-9 months to be released

Dozier – 1 transitioning to 3; get started with 1 and see a solicitation later from NSF

Foufoula – 2, but only if NSF agrees to have a meeting at which the NSF people are convinced for the cause: If not, 3 is the way to go

Graham – 1 transitioning to 3 b/c no faith of a guaranteed answer from NSF

Kumar – NSF must be involved more closely, so votes for 2, or 3 if necessary; need to make sure we are headed in partnership with NSF

Shoemaker – 2, the statement must be clear about what the conditions it is judged upon (does geography limit you, etc?)

Tarboton – 3, with synthesis starting with 1 as soon as possible: need a synthesis committee for oversight

Toran – 0, would spend the money on HOs and HMF

Vogel – most powerful things have happened b/c of CUAHSI itself, so they would do the best job in short term: Therefore, 1 transitioning to 3

Welty – would go for 3 if we need a proposal submission; would agree to go with CUAHSI, though (1) to get things started

Zheng – Support 1 transitioning to 3

Hooper – Concern with 2 or 3 is Doug's want for control of the Science Advisory Board; partial to 1 transitioning to 3, based on the pilot conceived by Doug that has little power for the PIs

- Dozier to send a link to papers written through NCEAS. This could assuage some fears of the “zero” vote above relating to Toran's comment

GOVERNANCE

Revisions to By-Laws (15 minutes)

With the move to a 15-member Board of Directors, the by-laws are being streamlined to remove language concerning the original large Board. Beyond those changes, there are a number of substantive issues that are being considered:

1. Adding a corporate class of membership. This change is necessary if we want to have members who could potentially pay annual dues.
2. Rotational scheme. The original by-laws did not deal with the problems of having a 15-member rotational board and a 5-member executive

committee and officers, who also rotate. Furthermore, the original by-laws had both the chair and the vice-chair elected to three-year terms at the same time. Thus, both complete their term at the same time. This approach hurts continuity of corporate leadership.

Here is a suggested solution:

- a. Maintain strict rotation on the Board of Directors. Every year, 5 directors are elected by membership to a 3-year term. Relax rotational requirements for at-large Executive Committee members. *Rationale:* With 15-member Board, the Executive Committee is not solely in control of corporation as it was with the large Board. It is important that the election process from the full membership be simple and predictable.
 - b. A 3-year cycle is established for the Chair. A person will serve 1 year as Chair-Elect, one year as Chair, and one year as Past-Chair. Every year a Chair-Elect is chosen by the Board from the incoming class of 5 Directors. *Rationale:* This was the most difficult decision to make. If we allow the Chair-Elect to be chosen from the full Board, we influence the rotational structure of the Board. One approach would be to automatically prolong the term of whoever is elected as Chair-Elect by three years, but that overrides the sovereignty of the membership. Alternately, that person could automatically be placed on the ballot, but what happens if he/she is not re-elected? It is cleanest to reduce the choice for Chair-Elect to the incoming class of Directors. This means that people know that 1 of this class will be chosen as Chair-Elect and we must get people on the ballot with sufficient experience to handle this position.
 - c. The two at-large members of the Executive Committee can be elected from the entire Board of Directors and will serve the remainder of their term as Director on the ExCom. As vacancies arise, they are filled.
3. "Floating" Annual Board of Directors meeting. The Annual Directors meeting shall take place within 60 days of the Membership meeting (which is still required to be held in November or December).

Discussion:

- Add the stipulation that they must have previously served on the board
- Delete the past chair, gives you a class of ten to vote from (that is, reducing to 2 year rotation)
- *Hooper to Send the options to the Board to consider*

POLICY ISSUES

1. *Endorsement Policy (15 minutes)*.

Our current policy notes that CUAHSI can endorse proposals for "Community Facilities." As originally conceived, CUAHSI would operate as we did for NCHS—running a competition and presenting a single proposal to NSF for consideration. However, because we are in a more opportunistic funding environment, it is likely that we will wish to have multiple proposals responding to open solicitations, such as the upcoming Instrumentation Facilities call that contains a Geoinformatics theme. We may have multiple universities responding to host a large long-term informatics center (i.e., the CHI as originally conceived) and other universities responding with proposal for "thematic development centers." How should CUAHSI respond to this situation? Do we require proposers to request letters of support and provide us with proposals in advance of the due date? Who decides whether we support and/or collaborate on the proposals when many members may be in conflict?

STRATEGY ISSUES

1. *MREFC Strategy (10 minutes)*.

Our current strategy to pursue Hydrologic Observatories at NSF is to join with CLEANER in a bid for the MREFC. This is a longer term (~5 yrs) relatively high risk strategy, which will inevitably be impacted by NEON and to some extent OOI. We have also been told that the funding at NSF will not increase this year or next. Therefore, there will be no new pot of money for CUAHSI activities to compete for until the NSF budget starts to increase. The question is: do we substantively engage in this planning exercise? By only playing along with CLEANER, we could end up either sacrificing some things or gaining additional money to do what we want. The alternate/non-MREFC approach is to, in lieu of the big top down science questions, request a relatively small amount of money from EAR to construct a research platform consisting of the communications/cyberinfrastructure backbone for observatories that will enable us to collect the transformational data in ways to be determined by the winning sites. Is this sufficient for our community or do we need more than this? Additionally, because of the indefinite flat budget environment at NSF, there is no concrete timetable for this alternate approach.

Three options:

1. Shadow committee
2. Parallel committees
3. Populate some of the CLEANER committees

Kumar – Important to recognize that CLEANER office is defining their focus: once that is done, then a joint committee for MREFC is appropriate

Getting people newly mobilized may be difficult – Hooper, Graham

Let the CLEANER groups write their document and we can respond for those areas we don't have strength in (e.g. Sensors)

- We can then suggest additional things in the process during the review

Therefore we would have a two tiered approach in which we are active on some committees for which we already have strength and passive on the ones for which we have less strength

- Hooper to send these delineations to the ExCom

Adjourned: 5:05 pm