

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Draft

For August 10, 2007

(This meeting was held at the Solano Irrigation District Office in Vacaville.)

Decisions	
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tara will work on the Strategic Analysis Framework letter to Calfed.• The ED and Lisa working with tax accountant to clear up tax issue.• Tariq will send the IWFM peer review proposal to the Steering Committee
Parking Lot Items	
Motions	

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors Report
2. Workshop Status Report.

MINUTES

1. **INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – The meeting was opened with 11 persons in attendance, and 4 proxies. A quorum was declared.
2. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT** – The ED has reserved Asilomar for CWEMF for the years 2008, 2009, and 2010. Much of the Executive Director’s report is incorporated into the minutes below by category.
3. **SECRETARY’S REPORT** – The minutes for the June 1, 2007, meeting were approved.
4. **TREASURER’S REPORT** – The ED reported that the checking account has \$50,870, which includes the peer review funds.
5. **TAXES** –
 - a. The ED and Lisa are working with a tax accountant to clear up the tax question. The CWEMF books must be put into a standard format in order for the tax accountant to review them.
 - b. KT and Tara wrote a letter to the IRS explaining the situation.

6. 2008 ANNUAL MEETING

- a. The need for a theme was discussed. The question was asked as to whether we need a theme, in that CWEMF is different from a professional society that has papers written around a theme. In our case our papers for Asilomar are mostly what people are working on.
- b. The following possible themes were discussed:
 - Modeling a new Delta: how much modeling remains.
 - The role of modeling in decision-making (for water supply, water quality, habitat)
 - River restoration
 - Delta Vision
 - Successes and failures of past modeling (20/20 hindsight)
 - Modeling to prepare for the future
 - How to make the Delta sustainable
- c. Possibly as Lester Snow to come and say what he thinks of some of the above.
- d. No theme was selected yet.

7. STRATEGIC ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK LETTER TO CALFED SCIENCE PROGRAM - Development on this is awaiting the selection of a lead scientist for CALFED. Tara will follow up with Steve on this.

8. MODELING PROTOCOLS –

- a. There was previous mention of CWEMF seeing if the agencies that use modeling could ask us to refine the protocols. The ED reported that the SWRCB probably could not ask us because of concerns for conflicts of interest. CWEMF has three main documents, the protocols being one of them, and it was mentioned that we want to keep them at the same professional level, and this is the reason for updating the protocols document.
- b. The discussion seemed to indicate that there is no immediate need to update the protocols yet.
- c. The ED thus suggested that we accumulate comments regarding the protocols, keeping this open-ended for now, and decide what is needed at a later date. Perhaps a protocol-drafting session could be held at Asilomar (about 2 hours) to push ahead on this.

9. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –

- a. G.Fred Lee mentioned that he would like to see a link between water quality constituents and their criteria in a water body and toxicity. George mentioned that this is a concern at the SWRCB and the regulated community, where in cases water quality criteria are achieved by the water but the water fails toxicity tests, or vice versa. Fred would be interested in a workshop on this. If a workshop is held Fred said he could help put it on, and Marianne volunteered to help. Nutrient criteria also should be addressed. Fred mentioned that watershed models also need to incorporate water quality better. Also mentioned was how to relate model results to toxicity.

b. Paul described the other workshops coming up.

10. PEER REVIEW PROCESS –

a. **Primer**– The ED is getting photos to put into the primer.

b. **IWFM** –

(1) A review panel will be composed from persons from different groups. There are three focus areas: (1) technical, (2) accuracy, and (3) user friendliness. The review components are shown in the handout, and all do not have the same weight.

(2) Tariq wanted to know how long it would take to do the peer review, when could it get started, and would it be possible to have workshops on the review.

(3) The following was discussed:

(a) How to obtain the funding.

(b) How to receive input from other agencies

(c) Selecting the reviewers

(d) Defining the specific scopes of work

(4) This will be more intensive than was the past CalSim review: there are lots of processes and lots of codes to be reviewed.

(5) The conceptual model is completed. It can be googled up on the web, under IWFM.

(6) IWFM has a code and a user's manual, and a GUI is being developed.

(7) It was discussed to peer review both IWFM and C2VSIM, but do them separately. Do C2VSIM right after IWFM.

(8) Do the peer reviews through August 2008.

(9) Show some of the current applications, using IWFM 3.0.

(10) DWR has no budget right now for helping with the review. Get the stakeholders involved in the funding when the time comes.

(11) It is approximated that the peer review will take about two weeks, and utilize six persons. Should we advertise for and select these persons? Include travel and per diem.

(12) First determine how the peer review process should take place, then determine the budget.

(13) Tariq will send the Steering Committee the electronic version of the peer review proposal to review.

(14) It was mentioned that there was a previous peer review of the IGSM model. Is the current model that we are now discussing another version of the previous IGSM model, or is it different? It was mentioned that the current version is different, in that it has a different engine, and this is why the model was renamed from IGSM to IWFM. The IWFM should be treated as a completely different model. The upcoming peer review will thus be a peer review of a new model, and not the second peer review of the older IGSM model.

(15) A question arose as to how user-friendly the new model is, and what documentation is available. Is there technical support available (most critical). (For example, the USGS has no technical support for the popular Modflow model.)

(16) The peer review will be on the engine, and applications will be given as examples.

(17) Some discussion occurred on having a peer review on both IWFM and C2VSIM, but do separately. Do C2VSIM after.

(18) A subcommittee was previously established for this peer review. Additional persons are welcome (I didn't get the names of those who volunteered today.)

c. **Other Reviews** - The SCVWD is thinking of having a peer review of a salmon or smelt model (Steve Cramer model, or integrated framework model). There will be an August 28 meeting on this. CUWA is supporting this

11. **MODEL USER GROUPS** – The DSM2 group met yesterday. MIKE is temporarily inactive.

12. **OTHER BUSINESS** – Webinars were discussed. They are cost-effective, although they cut down on interactions. The ED will continue to check on webinars. Next meeting on Sept. 21, 2007. Location TBD.

13. **ADJOURNED** – 12:30 PM

Respectfully Submitted
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Tara Smith
Rich Satkowski
Paul Hutton
George Nichol
K.T. Shum
G. Fred Lee
Marianne Guerin
Tariq Kadir
Michael Tansey
Michael Taraszki

Convener, DWR
Executive Director, CWEMF
Vice-Convener, MWDSC
Secretary, CWEMF
Past Convener, EBMUD
GFL & Associates
CCWD
DWR
USBR

On Phone:
Proxies:

Gordon Thrupp
Nigel, Hubert, Peter, Jay