

CUAHSI BoD meeting
Boulder, CO July 2008

Minutes: ~9AM Mountain time

Rick makes a request that a motion be made for Brian Waldron to act as secretary for the meeting. Venkat moves and Juan seconds, motion carries with no objections.

Efi made suggested changes to the BoD meeting agenda. The new agenda was handed out to members. CUAHSI is at a unique point in time to convey to Tim Killeen CUAHSI's mission and importance in the hydrologic and broader community.

The upcoming Geo Sciences GeoVision 2010 report does not have an *organized* hydrology component. This has been raised as a concern. Tim Killeen is not completely pleased with the report which to date has not been approved. The report is to be completed by October 2008.

- Efi suggests that we need to keep an eye out for making a strong case for compelling examples that illustrate lack of data and predictions that would help to justify our mission and presence in the community.
- We need to continue engaging the community, reconnecting the communities, including those who may have become disconnected from CUAHSI.

Question raised on how connect the community to the decision makers on the Hill. Rick has had discussions with a firm who, for a relatively cheap rate, would be watchdogs on the Hill to look for bills/opportunities for CUAHSI to be a voice for the hydrologic community. How will the Hill request advice from the hydrologic community? Would they come to CUAHSI or go another route? Should CUAHSI engage those other routes? It is suggested that AGU would be very receptive to incorporating CUAHSI's desire to be a sounding board on hydrologic science to the Hill. This avenue should be explored further.

Venkat made a point that other agencies should be brought into CUAHSI. Discussion on this point will be addressed later in the data per the agenda.

Rick is running through his panel review presentation.

- NSF wants to know the overall strategy to address water issues. We need to be able to layout for these big science questions that have continued to be developed/refined the strategy to link the science to the action needed and why it should be supported.
- We need a very tight purpose for our justification for needed facilities. We are competition with a number of other programs who require facilities.
- CUAHSI design plan should include four steps: Conceptual → pilot → developmental → operational

- Question raised: Should CUAHSI become the managing agency for hosting the hydrologic community metadata repository? This pertains to HIS.
- Funding for components under HMF is unknown. We are still trying to find a funding home and competition is high for equipment centers.
- Hydrologic observatory effort, as originally conceptualized, is dead
- WATERS is not an easy fit in a MRFC. We should not use NEON as a gage for NSF potential support for MRFC funding under GeoSciences.
- Jun stated to Rick that CUAHSI does not have a NSF sanctioned role in providing anything toward the CZO effort. CUAHSI should simply see itself as a user.
- WATERS 2: we need to inform the community on the status of this effort. NSF requested a fast turnaround on the proposal that in part hampered communication to the community. However, now that it is in CUAHSI should make an effort to inform the community.

Efi is requesting feedback from the BoD on an outline for presenting to someone like Tim Killeen about what is CUAHSI. Generally, discuss the mission of CUAHSI, big picture plan, make very compelling case that there are unknowns across scales with complex couplings that need addressing, and illustrate those CUAHSI programs (HIS, HMF, etc.) and outreach efforts that can help the hydrologic community further hydrologic science.

- Praveen: CUAHSI needs to be relevant to the community and not just a voice. We have no projects to claim as our own, they are all PI-based. There is no required feedback mechanism for PI's to connect their effort to CUAHSI. CUAHSI needs to move beyond being a facilitator.
- Fred Scatena: It may be as easy as having NSF RFP's require data be placed into the CUAHSI HIS system (require some kind of feedback)

A lively discussion began on the renewal proposal status and WATERS 2 proposal. NSF is conducting a new external review and panel review for CUAHSI's renewal proposal. The proposal is not under Doug but under the program director under education. Doug will still be over HIS and HMF. Panel review should begin in Oct. NSF has awarded supplemental funding to keep CUAHSI going until January 2009.

CHyMP: Oct. 9-10 workshop tentatively planned in Memphis. Doug has offered more money via a submitted proposal, but would require moving the workshop to Nov. A subsequent workshop will be held in the spring.

Closed session minutes emailed to Efi

Invite Ana Barros to be the chair of CSDMS with Jay Famiglietti as co-chair.

Rick's 2008 goals:

Strategic Planning task 2: Writing the plan

- Making the linkages (broad themes to regional application) a critical piece to the plan

- Whitepaper documents have this information, but this info will need to be compressed into something a program officer will read.
- Have the Executive Summary of science plan (different than the implementation plan) completed by AGU ready to be read by NSF management.
- Need to have NSF say what infrastructure they are willing to support. This will help to guide the development of linkages.
- This document goes beyond the program officer, but be sold to the program director and AD for the purpose of focusing monies into hydrologic science research
- Where does the directory tree begin from which subordinate program initiatives spawn: the overarching science questions or the National Water Model?
- Would like to have a draft implementation plan by the January meeting.

Science meeting idea to be held as a town hall meeting during AGU, then have the group attend the reception afterwards. If we have a science meeting, should we pay for a university member and one young, upcoming scientist (tenure-track?) from each member university to attend? There are recollections of the Logan meeting. We need to identify persons to be the Program Committee. BOD needs to be on the lookout for people from the Biennial Colloquium to serve on this committee.

Kumar will send out emails for the Cyberseminar Series. Request made of David 2 months prior to block dates for fall meeting. Dates not blocked yet due to preparing for the Boulder meeting/colloquium so there is concern that we may be out of luck. Four speakers have been identified for both the fall and spring cyberseminar series.

CHyMP meeting: We have \$30K in residual funds for the conference. Doug would entertain a proposal for additional money for the meeting. We expect ~80-100 people attending. Nov. would be the earliest award date for funding. Plan to have it at the FedEx Institute of Technology in Memphis. Looking to change the dates from Oct. 9-10 to sometime in Nov.

There is discussion on the continued funding for CUAHSI by NSF. Should we begin to entertain other agencies to assist in funding components of CUAHSI? It is suggested that we wait until the January to invite them to the annual CUAHSI meeting. We may be in a unique opportunity to act on this. We would not ask for funding on the outset, but simply provide information about CUAHSI.

UMRB SGER

Ken stated that the Upper Mississippi flooding is related to unprecedented high ground-water levels. Factors to this fact may be ET, increased precipitation, and improve land management. GW levels in the Iowa basin are primarily control by the drainage tiles. This area does not have a good handle on snow melt quantities, suspecting that much of

the recent record snow melt infiltrated rather than running off. Mountain/hill interflow is keeping valley floors flooded. LIDAR will help them get critical data such as identifying outlet flow points and depression storage more accurately. Science questions pertaining to snow melt, ice forming, tilling practices need to be formed. How will the role of gw/sw interactions impact land use change? Why are gw levels rising in the mid-west flood area? Is there a reason for CUAHSI to be involved to put in a proposal or just have the PI's submit to NSF? Under a CUAHSI umbrella, we would be able to look beyond just the gw/sw interaction and look at nutrient loading, retention, land use impact, a large integrated model. Someone should submit a proposal that looks at how a physical model of a system (tile drain structure) became something opposite than what was expected. This approach may be too much of an individual investigator project and less something CUAHSI can handle. CUAHSI could host workshops that would look at this flooding situation that would result in assisting scientists to submitting proposals to address the various integrated components. Use SGER money to pay for the workshops. Submit another SGER to hire HIS to synthesize data in the region for a rather special hydrologic situation (possibly get one of David M. grad students to perform this task). Modeling the system will aid researchers in recognizing what the data gaps are (physical and mental). Let this process show how CUAHSI can act in a timely manner to address a time-sensitive hydrologic issue, and from this exercise CUAHSI can make determine any necessary improvements. Synthesizing of the data by CUAHSI would be low hanging fruit to showcase the organization's capabilities. If requests by the hydrologic community came through CUAHSI for the purpose of approaching NSF for funding (e.g., SGER), project requests would appear to be more organized and coordinated.

- Develop a poster to promote a Upper MS flooding discussion forum for Monday evening to interested parties.
- Rick sent email to David M. to see if the relevant data in the upper mid-west on the flood could be pooled together and showcased via the web.
- We can watch to see if people actually use the website to view/download data.

Science plan to implementation

We need to move from these broad topics to an actual implementation plan. NSF says we are doing to many things and that what we're doing don't seem to relate to one another. This is more so a perception. We need to change how we package our science to show the interrelationships. NSF doesn't understand that we can answer the numerous science questions posed with the current products of CUAHSI (HIS, HMF, community integration, etc.). We have said in the past, "if we have this [observatory/equipment], we can answer all of these questions." We need to invert this thinking. We do not need to waste our time on how to phrase the overarching science question (singular). We need to spend our time on how to express implementation of the plan. Where would we be if we had not submitted our summary of function to Tim Killeen? More than likely we would not have to redefine our science plan to include science questions. Having science questions is not enough, we need the community to buy into *and* reference the questions ("That question is relevant to my research.") Is

NSF looking for questions that are general with regard to application location, or can our questions be provided as *examples* and thus be site specific?

- Let's take advantage of the EarthScope effort to collocate instrumentation with the permanent sites. Good way to show CUAHSI taking advantage of other NSF funded effort including also NEON and NCAR.

Preparation for SAC meeting on Sunday

Efi covered the Charge to the Council as stated on the Advisory Council Charter document.

- Engage them positively
- Let them know what is happening
- Listen to their advice to enhancing CUAHSI's success.

The SAC has the Killeen briefing document plus his comments, CUAHSI BoD purpose and bi-laws, Advisory Council Charter, and the renewal proposal. Develop PP slides stating the science questions. Have Cindy from UCAR to talk about how they engage with the Hill. We will focus on what HIS has done, its accomplishments, and any PR venues that have stemmed from the effort. Rick will cover HIS and HMF with interjections by the PI's/co-PI's. David M. will not be in Boulder until late Sunday afternoon/early evening. David F. suggested that the presentation slides remain very concrete and not acronym heavy. Don't just state what the project is, but be sure to clearly define what is *does*. By engaging the SAC, they become vested in CUAHSI and will fight for its success. Venkat suggested that we request a report on suggestions for moving ahead by the SAC to be provided in four weeks. This will afford an opportunity for the missing SAC members to get engaged. Some questions should be posed to the SAC to address in their report: how do we proceed forward, how do we better engage the community, what gaps exist in the science plan, should we involve other agencies in CUAHSI's basic functions (help in maintaining base funding), how do we capitalize on the Upper MS flooding to illustrate CUAHSI's effectiveness in the hydrologic community, what projects should CUAHSI pursue versus PI's pursue. Rick suggested reserving a table for the SAC at the Tuesday banquet to encourage further discussion and to engage Wilfried Brutsaert.

January meeting in DC set for January 8-9, 2009. We will invite other agency members to attend. Rick will entertain pertinent people from these agencies about what CUAHSI is. Suggested use of AGU's large meeting room, NSF meeting room, or other nice space in DC.

Specific questions for the SAC to address follow:

1. How do we better communicate our science with NSF?
2. Should we engage other federal agencies and/or other partners (e.g., private sector, state agencies)? Which should be invited to January Board meeting? Suggest specific people.

3. How can CUAHSI use events, such as the Midwest floods, to advance opportunities in hydrologic science? What is the role of CUAHSI versus individual investigators?
4. How should CUAHSI grow and evolve to better serve the “community”? How should CUAHSI help you and your colleagues to pursue research?
5. How should CUAHSI help to increase the visibility of hydrologic science in public policy debates?

Motion to adjourn

Fred Ogden made the motion to adjourn

Praveen Kumar seconded

Meeting adjourned at 5:18 Mountain time

Attendance

Rick Hooper

Claire Welty

Juan Valdes

David Freyberg

Ken Potter

Jim McNamara

Fred Ogden

Praveen Kumar

Venkat Lakshmi

Jay Famiglietti

David Kirschtel

Brian Waldron

Fred Scatena

Efi Foufoula-Georgiou

Larry Murdoch

John Selker