

*Board of Director Meeting Minutes
August 01, 2012*

Present: Diogo Bolster, David Freyberg, Carol Johnston, Witold Krajewski, Brian McGlynn, Jim McNamara, Larry Murdoch, Aaron Packman, Todd Rasmussen, Ying Fan Reinfelder, Peter Troch, Scott Tyler, Denice Wardrop, Rick Hooper, Jennifer Arrigo, Chris Graham, Jonathan Pollak

QUORUM

Meeting opens 11:00AM

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Hooper provided review of last year's priorities and activities as determined from Board survey and disposition
 - a. High Priority items
 - i. HIS
 - ii. Cyberseminars
 - iii. Survey of Practitioners
 - iv. Biennial
 - b. Year 4 approved budget from NSF contained funding for all items above.
 - c. All activities have moved forward
 - d. Participation in EarthCube recognized and appreciated by NSF
- 3) Potential Year 5 initiatives
 - a. *Background document: initial Year 5 budget request*
 - b. Requiring new or continued funding
 - i. Arrigo provided an overview of proposed "Year of Instrumentation" Activities.
 1. *Background documents: Instrumentation Activities briefing developed by Hooper, Arrigo and reviewed by Hannigan*
 2. Board considered requesting increased funding for Hands on Workshops based on the following:
 - a. Positive feedback obtained from surveys received from participants of previous workshops
 - b. Year 4 training workshop had over 50 applicants for 25 spots
 - c. Currently funded for one per year, Instrumentation Standing Committee report suggests that increasing the number per year may increase visibility and influence of the program
 3. Instrumentation Standing Committee (ISC) report to the Board suggested formalizing development of workshops, and actions including:
 - i. Soliciting instructors to develop workshops based on community desires

- ii. Increasing funding for workshop leaders to develop the materials
 - 1. Discussion that a month of salary support would be a reasonable level of funding given the effort required
 - iii. Efforts should be made to capture “legacy materials” such as powerpoints, videos and training materials that could be utilized by those unable to attend in person trainings
 - b. Board supports the recommendations made by the ISC
 - i. Hooper and Arrigo reported on possible training topics for Year 5. Possibilities include a number of topics for which membership survey from Nov. 2011 showed demand:
 - ii. Optical sensors
 - 1. Arrigo has had initial discussions with personnel at USGS and the University of Florida who are interested in leading this topic.
 - iii. Wireless networking and telemetry
 - iv. Stream – Groundwater exchange
 - 1. High demand from previous workshop
 - 2. Emphasis on phenomenon rather than specific technology
 - c. Hooper suggests that CUAHSI can informally contact professors who are prominent in instrumentation development on possible topics and potential workshop leaders.
4. Board considers a suggestion from Arrigo that Year 5 budget request include Separate funding for technical exchange workshops with USGS
 - a. One such joint workshop was held in Spring, 2012
 - b. These workshops are different than Hands-on Trainings; focus is technology that is not quite field ready
 - i. Goal is to bring together academic and agency scientists with instrument manufacturers and engineers to promote instrumentation development
 - c. Thus far, CUAHSI’s support of workshops of this type in 2011 and 2012 were funded using residual funds or funds that were originally intended for

hands-on training. CUAHSI would like to establish this as a separate activity from training.

- d. ISC generally supported this idea, but brought concerns that currently USGS brings topics to CUAHSI and CUAHSI finds academics to serve on the program committee. ISC would like to see CUAHSI community have a more active role in defining potential topics. Board agrees with this sentiment. Procedure for doing so needs further development by staff.
5. Hooper and Arrigo brief the Board on the idea of holding an in person Instrumentation Summit.
 - a. Rationale would be that the Hydro community struggles with instrumentation proposals;
 - i. John Selker suggested summit to assist with developing proposals
 - ii. Hooper suggests the summit could be a mechanism to determine community instrumentation priorities
 - iii. Bringing people together would be a way to harness “community expertise” in guiding CUAHSI’s instrumentation activities
 - b. Large workshop (\$35-40k)
 - c. Board comments
 - i. Possible difficulty to get whole community together
 - ii. Narrow focus might be more successful
 - iii. CZO instrumentation as possible emphasis
 - iv. Phenomenon-based
6. Support of CTEMPS (no additional funding required)
7. Continuation of HGP node
 - a. No cost extension
- ii. Regional meetings/ Regional Synthesis Centers (Hooper)
 1. Hooper suggests holding regional meetings for CUAHSI representatives, a few per year, around the idea of collaborative work or synthesis centers
 2. Hooper has drafted a map of proposed regions
 - a. Board input on this proposed definition of regions requested
 3. Philanthropies are a potential source of funding for Regional Synthesis Centers; discussions with Asa Johnson indicated an interest in linking citizens with scientists.
 4. This could be a way for CUAHSI to assist interaction between our member universities and with existing university-based water centers, such as the USGS-funded Water Resources Research Institutes

- a. 1 day meetings of regional stakeholders
 - b. CUAHSI would provide meeting location and small travel grants (~\$500)
 - c. Assist collaboration on larger scale NSF initiatives
 - d. Based on regional issues, rather than geographic location
 - 5. California, New England, Southeast have expressed interest
 - 6. \$45-65k likely cost
 - iii. Continued engagement with federal agencies on IWRSS National Water Model Initiative
 - 1. NSF program officers have been supportive of CUAHSI's participation in this effort and encouraged continued engagement
 - c. Requiring primarily staff time
 - i. Larry Murdoch asked for an update from CUAHSI staff on a CUAHSI effort at identifying online educational resources Jennifer Arrigo relayed statements from the Education and Outreach Standing Committee's report where they considered this effort.
 - 1. CUAHSI's role is poorly identified
 - 2. Low effort activity for potentially high value for community
 - 3. Hooper suggests that given the broad scope of activities that could be undertaken, uncertainties have resulted in little activity
 - a. Hooper suggests Berry acts and develops program for later Board approval
 - ii. CUAHSI continued participation in EarthCube (Hooper, Arrigo)
 - 1. NSF has recognized CUAHSI activity with EarthCube
 - 2. Hooper discussed that given the uncertainty in what the next steps of Earth Cube will be, it is difficult to project how much time CUAHSI staff will need to devote to EarthCube in Year 5
 - d. Fall 2012 priorities and action for Chairs (Krajewski)
 - i. Staff will proceed and develop specific package for vote during September Board meeting
- 4) NSF accounting changes
 - a. Changes to accounting of indirect costs
 - b. If indirect funds are unused, CUAHSI must negotiate with NSF on use of funds
 - i. Currently CUAHSI has overbilled NSF \$92k
 - c. If actual indirect costs exceed rate, CUAHSI must pay for them itself
 - d. For year 5, if Data Center is funded, overhead is likely to be much lower (40% vs. 65%; likely ~\$300k)
 - i. Accountant suggests billing lower projected rate, with some room for contingences

- ii. Uncertainty in funding Year 5 encourages billing at higher (pre-set) rate.
 - 1. Hooper believes that indirect rate can be accurately predicted after funding is determined
 - 5) **Approval of Minutes with amendments from 6/6/2012**
 - a. **Motion: Hannigan**
 - b. **Second: Tyler**
 - c. **Discussion: None**
 - d. **Approval: Yes**
 - 6) View of Minutes with 7/14-15/2012 (unofficial meeting)
 - 7) De-brief from July 14-15 meeting (Krajewski, Hooper, others)
 - a. *Background documents: Draft meeting minutes*
 - b. Highlights of July Board Meeting
 - i. CZO network office discussion (see below)
 - ii. CUAHSI Science Plan / Science Implementation Plan
 - 1. NSF senior management turnover results in expectation for scientific justification of CUAHSI
 - 2. CUAHSI does not have research agenda, so implementation plan may be more appropriate
 - a. Plan would likely be most useful if it could be ready by Fall AGU meeting (Dec 2012) or by when CUAHSI submits renewal proposal (Feb 2013) — [AGU/Renewal](#)
 - b. Draft by September
- 8) De-brief from Biennial
 - a. Scientific Program
 - b. Awards Banquet
 - i. High attendance (maxed out)
 - c. Water documentary
 - i. High attendance
 - d. Visit to NEON Calibration Facility
 - i. Krajewski, Hooper and Arrigo
 - ii. Impressed by professionalism, operation of facility
 - iii. Calibration of physical sensors is large component of facility
 - e. Attendance and reaction
 - i. Maximum attendance met
 - ii. Core meeting was well attended
 - iii. Tuesday afternoon workshops poorly attended
 - iv. Workshops held following the science meeting (CTEMPS training on Distributed temperature sensing (fiber optic) technology, using geoinformatics in education, graduate student program) were well attended
- 9) CZO Update: Applying for CZO office, CZO engagement (Hooper)
 - a. *Background document: CZO memo*
 - b. Hooper proposed drafting letter to NSF on community perspective on observatories to Observations Standing Committee

- i. When initial decision by NSF was made to change the renewal process to CZOs, CUAHSI concerns were expressed through a letter from the Board of Directors to Tim Killeen at NSF.
 - 1. Size of grants
 - 2. Community facilities
 - ii. Internal NSF politics resulted in current setup with renewals
 - iii. Killeen response to CUAHSI letter was brief. Board discussed that further CUAHSI involvement is likely unproductive at this point. Board agrees to wait for further information on solicitation before contacting NSF again. Consensus was that no letter to NSF should be developed at this time.
 - iv. Gordon Grant encourages Hooper to prepare report on observatory development
 - c. Network Office solicitation will be available before new CZOs identified
 - i. Prohibition on funded CZOs acting as network office
 - ii. Governance structure
 - 1. CZO network governing body different than CUAHSI Board of Directors
 - iii. Requirement for PI to be high profile scientist
 - 1. Some confusion on this issue (different information on this point for NSF officers)
 - 2. Question whether office is scientific lead or service
 - iv. Other potential leads on network office
 - 1. NEON
 - v. CUAHSI will need to communicate to members how CUAHSI acting as network office furthers hydrologic science
- 10) Discussion of NCAR Fleishmann Building vacancy (Krajewski, Hooper)
 - a. Krajewski looking for priorities for fall activities
 - i. Krajewski has bought out teaching fall term, is available for travel, CUAHSI activities
- 11) Discussion of NCAR Fleishmann Building vacancy (Krajewski, Hooper)
 - a. NCAR and UCAR have vacated Fleishmann Building, near lab in Boulder
 - i. NSF owned, previously occupied by president of UCAR
 - b. Multiple NCAR plans for building
 - i. Open to CUAHSI activities
 - c. Possible CUAHSI physical presence in Boulder

Meeting closed 1:01 PM