

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For November 15, 2013

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

Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Check on the availability of a keynote speaker for the annual meeting – all• Email out information on benchmarking to the Steering Committee – Chris Bowles• Send out an email to past annual meeting sponsors reminding them what they get for their donation.
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Moved to end of minutes.)
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors report.
2. Minutes of the Sept. 20, 2013 Steering Committee meeting.
3. Treasurer's Trial Balance as of Oct. 31, 2013
4. CVP IRP Scope of Work
5. Draft Annual Meeting Program
6. List of Potential Annual Meeting Sponsors
7. CWEMF By-Law Options
8. Workshop Opportunities
9. Nominations for Fischer Award
10. Proposal for Technical Workshop: "Economic Modeling of Agricultural Water Use and Production"

1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM – The meeting was opened with 12 persons in attendance and six persons on the phone. A quorum was declared.

2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT – The ground water peer review has been completed and its finances closed. A review of our tax status was completed. Registration renewal is being done with the IRS. The Director's other comments are included in the topics discussed below.

3. SECRETARY'S REPORT –The minutes for the September 20, 2013 Steering Committee meeting were accepted today.

4. TREASURER'S REPORT – There is about \$98,000 in our general account, \$15,000 remaining in our peer review account, and \$35,000 in our operating reserve account, for a total of \$148,000. Our budget subcommittee will be meeting soon. Our tax forms have been submitted.

5. CVP/IRP MODEL PEER REVIEW – Jobaid said that he has the potential of applying \$20,000 of federal USBR funds toward this peer review, as long as it can be matched by others or from in-kind services. The DWR may not be able to support this effort, because CalLite may be different between USBR and DWR. Is version control needed? A peer review may result in a combination of the two versions. This will be an applications-based review. Kamiar and Tarik will let Elaine know if DWR can participate. Finish the review in one year. Special features within CalLite may be the differences within the USBR and DWR versions. A CalLite version is needed for the entire basin of Sacramento/San Joaquin/Tulare. The USBR CalLite platform and the DWR CalLite platform are different, but have many similarities. It is these two different platforms that are causing the difficulty.

The USBR would like everything integrated, and is waiting to hear from DWR and CWEMF. The question is, what will the USBR and DWR agree to? Possibly Nazrul will talk to Francis on this. Will a peer review suggest which way to go on this topic? Is the problem versions or platforms? Also, the proprietary issue is a problem. The above items should be resolved before going into a peer review. Possibly the above is more a policy issue than a technical issue. Would a technical review satisfy both platforms? The Model Coordination Group meets next week, and perhaps the USBR and DWR can discuss the above there. Jobaid will add this topic to that group's agenda. Also, CWEMF should add this topic to the agenda of our next Steering Committee meeting.

6. ANNUAL MEETING –

a. Sessions - Ben mentioned that the purpose of advertising the session openings to the entire membership over the past few months was to encourage participation of other members who in the past may have wanted to run a session. There are still two sessions open. Should we have a session on CalSim3? We may need to wait until it is officially released. Nigel offered a real-time water quality management session if needed to fill out the agenda. The joint overlap day with IEP is still under consideration with Inka. If we have Nigel's session and a Multi-Dimensional session, our sessions will be full. Chris suggested having a session (or possibly one speaker) on the modeling that is going on in Europe. This may be of interest to the IEP.

b. Mentoring - It was mentioned that the IEP has student lunches with mentors at their annual meeting. Sometimes 10 students are involved. Should CWEMF have this? Which CWEMF members would be interested in mentoring at such lunches at the annual meeting? It could be done one-on-one, or in small groups. Such mentoring may answer questions have such as "would I like to work at that organizations", or "what do you do". Or should we just go to universities to mentor? Ask the professors. Should we set up a subcommittee on this? Ben, Josue, Mike, and Eleanor volunteered to be on this subcommittee.

c. Keynote Speakers – No keynote speaker has been selected yet. Paul will check to see if Tim Quinn could be the speaker, as he lives in the nearby foothills. Elaine will check with Lyle Hogue. Peter Goodwin is another possibility. Other possibilities are also being sought.

d. Possible Field Trips – Several sites had been mentioned in the past, two of these being the Joint Operation Flood Center and Folsom Dam. However, it was decided for this year to focus on the student mentoring mentioned above.

e. Theme – The theme to have for the meeting was discussed. No decision was yet reached. An email will be sent out asking for suggestions.

f. Benchmarking - The topic of “benchmarking” of hydrodynamic modeling was brought up by Chris. This sparked a lot of interest in the steering committee. How are models selected in California, such as for flood plain modeling? Currently, a model is often selected in an ad-hoc manner. Chris mentioned that in England a recent extensive benchmarking study was undertaken on a range of 2D hydrodynamic models on the behalf of the Environment Agency in order for them to ascertain the merits of various models to be used in floodplain management studies. Chris suggested that this is desperately needed in California - should CWEMF get involved in this? The purpose would be to suggest which models would be best for each type of modeling needed. Benchmarking does not make any model look bad. Pete Smith wrote an ASCE paper on multi-dimensional hydrodynamic modeling needs in the Delta, but this falls short of benchmarking. Benchmarking is the process whereby a series of standard "test cases" are modeled using a variety of different models then the results are compared and contrasted, highlighting strengths and weaknesses of various models. Let's explore benchmarking further. Chris will email out information on benchmarking to the steering committee. Benchmarking is completely a technical issue.

g. Sponsors – These are still being sought. Elaine will send out an email to past sponsors reminding them what they get for their money.

7. AWARDS – The awards subcommittee consists of Tara, Mike, Josue, and Marianne. One name has been submitted for the Fischer Award. Nominations for the other awards are still under consideration. After discussion a motion was made to nominate this individual, seconded, and the motion carried with one abstention. Elaine said she will buy more Fischer award trophies, as we are running low. It was decided to bring up the Career Achievement Award and any potential candidates at the Dec. 9 Steering Committee (annual meeting planning) conference call.

8. BY-LAWS – The main topic of discussion here was how the Steering Committee should cast its votes in the future. The current method of voting, where whoever shows up at a Steering Committee meeting gets a vote, is not consistent with our By-Laws. This method of voting has worked in the past, but new concerns about the future direction of CWEMF are of sufficient concern that our method of voting and our by-laws have to be in sync. This is the topic of concern now. This topic will be discussed at the Dec. 9 Interim Steering Committee conference call. If anyone has any ideas on this send them to Stacy before the Dec. 9 phone call. The desire is to establish a voting method that the Steering Committee agrees to. The by-laws subcommittee will present their recommendations to the next Steering Committee meeting for action. The goal is then to present the Steering Committee's recommendation to the general membership at the annual meeting asking for their concurrence.

9. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS – Josue said the C2VSIM workshop was held yesterday, with 19 participants. He presented a list of other co-collaborative workshops coming up, which are as follows:

- Integrated Regional Water Management and Planning

- Delta Science Modeling Summit
- IWFM Workshop
- Agricultural Production and Water Use

10. DELTA SCIENCE PROGRAM – The Delta Science Program may participate with the IEP at the annual meeting.

11. MODEL USER GROUPS – A DSM-2 User Group meeting was held. The next meeting will be in January. A new version of DSM-2 has just been released.

12. STRATEGIC PLAN – This is on hold until after the By-Law Steering Committee voting procedure is defined.

13. OTHER BUSINESS – None.

14. ADJOURN – 12:00 noon. Next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2014.

Respectfully Submitted
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Ben Bray	Convener	EBMUD
Elaine Archibald	Executive Director	CWEMF
Marianne Guerin	Past-Convener	RMA
Josué Medellin	Vice-Convener	UCD
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engineers, Inc.
George Nichol	Secretary	Public Member
Paul Hutton		MWD
Eleanor Bartolomeo		SWRCB
Anne Huber		ICF
Tariq Kadir		DWR
Mike Deas		Watercourse Engineers, Inc.
Chris Bowles		CBEC

Phone: Jobaid Kabir (USBR), Fred Lee (GFLA), Tara Smith (DWR), Nigel Quinn (LBL/USBR), Hubert Morel Seytoux (Hydroprose, Inc.), Eric Reyes (DWR), Lucinda Shih (CCWD)

Proxies: None

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