

## CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

# MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For May 15, 2015

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

Decisions	
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Send out a survey asking who is interested in the USGS Modflow One Water workshop - Tariq</li><li>• Find a location for the Remote Sensing and Consumptive Use workshop – Tariq and Josue</li><li>• Restructure the Action Plan table and send it out to the Steering Committee for review – Executive Director</li><li>• Develop a Power Point presentation of varying durations of CWEMFs mission and activities that can be used as outreach to various institutions – Ben Bray and volunteers</li></ul>
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• (Located at end of minutes.)</li></ul>
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>

### REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Director's report.
2. Minutes of the Jan. 23, 2015 Steering Committee meeting.
3. Treasurer's Trial Balance
4. Financial Status
5. Workshop Status Report
6. Annual Meeting Survey Results
7. Final Strategic Plan
8. Draft Action Plan
9. Delta Stewardship Council National Science Foundation Grant Info.

**1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – The meeting was opened by Josue with 11 persons in attendance, 3 persons on the phone, and 3 proxies. A quorum was declared.

**2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT** – The highlights of the very successful recent annual meeting were presented. Other information on the annual meeting is presented below. Other accomplishments of the Director are included in the Executive Director's Report and in the items below.

**3. SECRETARY'S REPORT** - The minutes for the January 23, 2015 Steering Committee meeting need some changes, as follows. The Treasurer's Report should say there is about \$186,900 in the CWEMF combined accounts, of which \$130,700 is in the general fund, \$16,100 is in the peer review fund, and \$40,100 is in the operational reserve fund. The acronym for the American Geophysical Union is AGU, not IGU. With these changes the minutes were passed with no opposition or abstentions.

4. **TREASURER'S REPORT** – Now, after the annual meeting (our major fund raiser of the year), there is \$228,800 total in the accounts, with \$172,600 in the general fund, \$16,100 in the peer review fund, and \$40,100 in the operating reserve. After July 1 we can decide if we want to move more money into the operating reserve.

5. **TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS** –

a. IDC Workshop – This 2-day workshop finished yesterday. Had 18 attendees, representing a good cross-section of users. Their responses to the survey questionnaire were between 4-5 on a scale of 5.

b. IWFM Model – The flyers announcing the 3-day workshop have been sent out. This workshop will be July 7-9.

c. Modflow One-Water – This will be a 3-day workshop from Oct. 27-29 taught by Randy Hanson of the USGS. West-Yost Associates will host the workshop. Tariq will send out a flyer asking who is interested. There are 8-10 people anticipated to attend.

d. Remote Sensing and Consumptive Use (Using Satellite Imagery) Method – A workshop on METRIC (Mapping Evapotranspiration at High Resolution with Internalized Calibration) is being coordinated with Dr. Rick Allen of the University of Idaho. This method processes images from satellites, determines vegetation indices, and then estimates evapotranspiration to a 30 meter by 30 meter resolution. Agronomists have helped develop this method. The method requires ground-truth calibration. This will be a 4 or 5 day workshop. The workshop may be held during the last week of August, or the first two weeks of September. An ERDAS license is required. . Tariq explained our cost limits to Rick Allen. The cost may be \$900 per attendee. Of this amount CWEMF will take \$100 and the rest will go to the University of Idaho. DWR has about 6-7 people currently interested. The Delta Water Master has 4-5 interested. There are 15 people anticipated to attend, plus consultants who want to attend. Tariq and Josue are looking for a meeting site. Tariq will check with the State Water Board's UCD Training Center and Josue on the UCD Watershed Center for their availability for the workshop and desktop or server computer capabilities. A strong desktop computer will be needed for each participant, or laptops may be used if remote access to a server is available.

e. CalLite/CALSIM Model –

f. Flood Management – Samson Haile-Selassie said they are not yet ready to have this workshop.

G. Integrated Environmental Modeling – This workshop is being supported by a Delta Stewardship Council National Science Foundation Grant. The ultimate goal of this workshop will be to develop a white paper on future modeling needs in integrating water, economic, and social needs, especially those for the Delta. This workshop is coming up on May 21-23, to be held at UCD. On the evening of May 20 an ice-breaker meet-and-greet meeting will be held. The first day will be a series of presentations for all attendees on modeling problems, the second day with a smaller group will be workgroups and panels devoted to determining ways to address the

questions and ideas that arise during the first day, and the third day with an even smaller group will be for development of a draft of the white paper. Lots of expertise from national and international modelers and related professionals is being brought together here. Dr. Peter Goodwin has prepared a lead-in video that can be reviewed on-line.

**6. ANNUAL MEETING** – The annual meeting had a total income of \$80,790 and expenses of \$27,214, so we had a net revenue of \$53,576. The Executive Director is still collecting registration fees for this event. We made about \$7,000 more than last year. This is good, as this is our major funding event. There were 232 people in attendance (25 more people than last year), which makes this our largest annual meeting held. Our attendance could grow larger and we could still use the Lake Natoma Inn, as it has a second larger room that we could use if needed. There were no known complaints on the meeting rooms used. We had more food and coffee this year, although there were still the usual complaints about food and refreshments. A smaller percentage of people answered the meeting evaluation questionnaire this year than last year. We purchased Survey Monkey for one month for the purpose of our evaluations. We discussed as to whether we should have our future evaluation questionnaire filled out at the meeting, with some kind of an enticement to fill it out. Should it be included in the registration packet? It seemed like most people liked the 3-day meeting. We had no drawing this year.

The pop-up session again was popular. Should we have two pop-up sessions? There are too many other sessions to allow for this. We had some other sessions we could not fit in. Should we have shorter sessions that would then allow for more sessions? For next year think on how we should do our third day.

There was some discussion that the poster presenters cannot interact because they are manning their poster stations. Two possible solutions presented were to have a co-author to help man the station, and to leave a note as to when you will return to your poster if you leave your station to interact.

The business meeting and social at the Sudwerk Pub went well. Some people at the back of the room said they could not hear the Officer's presentations due to the noise. We discussed how to correct this situation and decided we either need a microphone or that our Officers should move to the center of the room.

It was mentioned that the Career Development luncheon with the students and mentors went well, with about 20 people attending, but more time was needed for it. The students were able to say what their goals were, and the mentors said what they are looking for. The Q and A session got cut short due to not enough time available. A discussion ensued as to whether next year we should have a regular session devoted to this that would give more time than just a luncheon would. We need to have enough time so that the students can learn as much as possible from the valuable knowledge that the mentors have. This adds value to our student members. There was a good mix of mentors present, representing federal and state agencies and consultants, thereby representing different paths into the future. The seating was in a circle which seemed to allow better communication among all. It was mentioned that a potential future goal is to build long-term relationships between senior modelers and the younger modelers. It was mentioned that the Water Education Foundation (WEF) has a student program where mentors and students meet

one-on-one. This WEF program is more structured in that the students are given projects to work on which keeps them in contact longer with their mentors. CWEMF should show how much it is giving to the student for this annual meeting, in that we are giving them the \$400 registration fee, while they only have to pay \$10. If we give awards to students make them meaningful, such as with signatures of prominent judges. A suggestion was made to extend this program beyond just students to include young professionals and post-docs. Perhaps the cost for young professionals and post-docs should be a little higher than the \$10 for students. This is a good program for outreach. Should we have more stipends for this, or fellowships, or travel grants? When we give out these stipends we should expect the students and others to present something. Should we have them compete, like IEP does? Should such a competition be a session itself? Can we expect the students to be able to get matching grants from their professors? Let's discuss this topic further in September and October when we are preparing for the next annual meeting. Let's put this as an action item.

Two persons asked the Executive Director to certify their attendance for credit for their Professional Development Hours (PDH). The meeting registration form has a box to check if anyone wants credit for PDH hours. The PDH hours may become more important in the future.

Ben Bray spoke at the IEP meeting. He highlighted our workshops and peer reviews, and how they can relate to IEP topics. His topic was on the upcoming Integrated Environmental Modeling workshop, and this talk went well. At the end of the talk several IEP attendees expressed their interest in attending the upcoming Integrated Environmental Modeling workshop.

There was some discussion on having a Proceedings of the annual meeting for papers submitted, or of putting such papers onto our web site. This could be for speakers who want to submit a paper, but others don't have to. The advantage of this is that it could be in advance of submittal to a refereed journal and thus would be dated, in case of later question of originality. Power-points from the annual meeting will be posted in three weeks.

**7. MODEL USER'S GROUP** – Postponed until the next meeting.

**8. PROPOSED CWEMF SOCIAL** – A tentative time for a social is in June or the early summer.

**9. STRATEGIC PLAN (and Action Plan)**– The Strategic Plan was passed by the general membership at the annual meeting, with the one change being to change the wording to say the Executive Director is a paid position rather than a part-time position. The draft Action Plan in table form was presented by the Executive Director and discussed today. Estimated priorities were shown.

After some initial discussion it was suggested to re-structure the table and show our action items as the main headings, and then list the strategy that each action item applies to. It was suggested to add a column to the table to handle the time frame and resources needed, and not to show vendor opportunities on the table. It was suggested to add in our action items each May just for each upcoming fiscal year, then determine the budget needed to carry these out. We should keep a running list of other salient action items as we think about them, but will do at later times.

There was some discussion on whether our action items have to be just on modeling topics only or can they also be on related activities, such as the biological opinion topics of the past. It was mentioned that the topics could be on water problems or other related issues as well.

There was some discussion on hot and timely topics as action items. What are the areas that we would like to attract issues on? How do we find out what the hot and timely issues are for California modeling and water issues, beyond just the Delta area that we are familiar with? It was suggested that before annual meetings we ask the general membership what they consider the hot and timely topics to be. Besides the annual meeting or workshops, these topics could be the subject of evening dinners held in the area. An evening dinner could even be held at the annual meeting to cover a hot or timely topic.

The Executive Director will restructure the table showing the above items and send it out to the Steering Committee in a week for review. The action items will be separated into “standing items” that we have to do each year, and a handful of “new” items for the upcoming fiscal year that can be voted on by the Steering Committee. The Action Item Plan will show the members how we are spending their money, and give us transparency. It was suggested that we should have a handful of topics that we can work on in the upcoming year. The revised Action Plan will be presented at the next Steering Committee meeting.

#### 10. **OTHER BUSINESS –**

a. **University Outreach** - It was discussed whether CWEMF should develop a presentation that could be shown to universities to explain CWEMF’s mission and activities. There seemed to be much interest in this. A suggestion was made that perhaps this could be a post-convenor duty. Ben said he would be glad to take a shot at it, and hopefully get some volunteers to help. We should make a power-point presentation that any member can use for this purpose. Make versions of different lengths that could range from a 5-10 minute introduction to a longer-duration symposium-type presentation. This can promote our activities and also increase our visibility.

b. **Great Lakes Annual Meeting** – Over the past two years we have developed a link of some sort with the Great Lakes Modeling Group. Several persons from that Group have attended our annual meeting over the past couple of years. They have invited us to attend their meeting. A suggestion was made today that if we think this is a good idea then we ought to start thinking on how we can send someone there to their annual meeting. We might present a talk there or a session. This would promote CWEMF activities outside of California. The Great Lakes Modeling Group has members from the U.S. and Canada. We should find out how they operate. What budget do they have? The same question arose for Chesapeake Bay. Getting ideas from both the Great Lakes and Chesapeake Bay modeling groups would be a benefit to CWEMF. How do they deal with the problems that we are facing? What is their purpose? How do they prepare their Strategic Plans? Perhaps after learning about the activities and methods of these groups we can have a session at our annual meeting on this.

#### 11. **ADJOURN – 12:15 pm**

Respectfully Submitted  
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Josue Medellin	Convener	UCD
Elaine Archibald	Executive Director	CWEMF
Ben Bray	Past Convener	EBMUD
Tariq Kadir	Vice Convener	DWR
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Inc.
George Nichol	Secretary	Retired (Corps/SWRCB)
Anne Huber		ICF
Eleanor Bartolomeo		SWRCB
Hubert Morel-Seytoux		Hydroprose C.I.
Mike Deas		Watercourse Inc.
Holly Canada		David Ford

Proxies: Paul Hutton (MWD), Marianne Guerin (RMA), Yuan Lee (CCWD)

On Phone: Fred Lee (GFLA), Jobaid Kabir (USBR), Chris Bowles (CBEC)

Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Multi-Year Budget – Prepare a draft.</li><li>• Peer Review Process - Development of peer review administrative process.</li><li>• Investment Policy - Development of investment policy.</li><li>• Financial Transparency – Determine how best to show our financial transparency to outsiders.</li><li>• Bylaw Changes – Develop a proposal for updating the Bylaws</li><li>• Determine how much money can be accumulated as a non-profit organization.</li></ul>
-------------------	---