

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

**MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

For May 17, 2013

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

Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Financial subcommittee meeting – Stacy set up a date for this meeting.</li><li>• DSP Sudwerk notes - Polish the notes down to several key ideas – Eleanor/DSP subcommittee.</li><li>• Strategic Plan draft – Elaine to email this out to the Steering Committee for review.</li></ul>
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>• By-Law Changes – Develop a proposal for updating the By-Laws.</li></ul>
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors report.
2. Financial Trial Balance
3. Annual Meeting Income and Expenses

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

2. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT** – The Executive Director said that the Power Points from the annual meeting are being put onto the web. Her other comments are included in the appropriate topics discussed below.

3. **SECRETARY’S REPORT** –The minutes for the March 15, 2013 Steering Committee meeting passed unanimously today.

4. **TREASURER’S REPORT** – There is about \$136,000 total in our accounts. Our current ground water comparative peer review will be receiving some funds coming in from the USBR. Because of the recent officer election the signature lists of CWEMF officers who can sign checks must be changed. Ben and Josue will be added, and Tara and Paul taken off. We still need to draft up a multi-year budget. Stacy will send out an email asking who wants to be on the financial subcommittee, and select a date for a meeting. So far Paul and George have volunteered (they are continuing members of the subcommittee). A question arose as to whether we should

get financial need input from the Steering Committee first before the financial subcommittee meets.

**5. GROUND WATER COMPARATIVE PEER REVIEW** – The second one-half day workshop on this peer review was held on April 17, with 30-35 people in attendance. It was stated that review comments have been received from the DWR, USGS, USBR, and UC Merced. The draft report will be modified to incorporate these comments. The final report is due at the end of July. Michael Tansey of the USBR requested that the peer reviewers prepare some kind of a one-page summary of their findings to put into their report, as this may be all that some of the decision makers will read. It was stated that the USBR has incorporated a new payment system, requiring new forms, and this will affect how the funding is received from the USBR for this peer review.

#### **6. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –**

a. **Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Workshop** – To cover modeling tools, and how to get regional studies funded. Possibly have workshop in mid-summer. Ben Bray is working with Rich Juricich on this.

b. **C2V-SIM** – Possibly a second workshop on this model at UC Merced this summer.

c. **Ecosystem Services** – In conceptual phase. Potential workshop with Mike Deas and Chris Bowles helping set up.

d. **Hobbe's Project workshop** – Calvin Model user's succession. Cover its purpose and how to use it. Possibly on June 12. Have a fee requirement. Data management and document system. One-half day.

e. **Agricultural Modeling** – Cal Lite, economic models, ET.

f. **Delta Water Quality Modeling** – Try to link with BDCP. Fred Lee may be involved. Update from the last Delta Nutrient workshop of several years ago.

g. **Central Valley Pre-Gold Rush Hydrology, Hydrodynamics, and Salinity** – All day workshop. Potential speakers are Paul Hudson and Peter Vorster.

h. **Water Forecasting for the Central Valley (to include Unimpaired Flow Calculations at Rim Stations)** – What is being done now for forecasting by the different agencies. Many agencies do it differently. Possibly include RFC and NOAA. Peter Vorster and Paul Hudson may be involved. Possibly next winter. This has been an issue in SWRCB hearings since 1987. It is still an issue. Flow and timing are important. Compare and contrast the new forecasting methods with the old methods. This will show us how to design our current works. Phyllis Fox has researched this. What was the ET of vegetation in the old days? MWH, RMA (digital elevation model), UCD, DWR, SFEI, TBI, MET, Andy Draper (steady state model) have worked on this. Ecologists will be needed at the workshop to describe how the system functions. Getting unimpaired flow to calibrate the modeling of historic conditions is important.

**7. MODEL USERS GROUPS** – No report at this time.

**8. CHANGES TO BY-LAWS** – A new By-Law subcommittee was formed today. The needed by-laws changes have been a parking lot item for several months. The volunteers are Stacy, Marianne, and George. Rich has volunteered to provide information as needed due to his long association with the by-laws. (Note: below it is stated that the steering committee decided to table the By-Law changes for now, in order to finish the strategic plan before the end of the year.

It was also stated that CWEMF should update the by-laws before the next annual meeting, especially if they are contentious.)

**9. DELTA SCIENCE PLAN** – CWEMF had the brainstorming session at Sudwerk’s Restaurant during the annual meeting in April. The session, attended by both CWEMF modelers and 5-6 Delta Science Program scientists and engineers, was directed at determining how the new Delta Science Plan (DSP) might best incorporate modeling needs. Seven key subject areas were covered at the session. After the meeting a CWEMF subcommittee (Ben, Eleanor, Chris, Mike, Anne, and George) wrote up what they thought they heard. These notes were compiled together and came out to five pages. The desire now is to polish these five pages down to about one page, containing three to five proposals, and then presenting this to Chris Enright of the Delta Science Program. Eleanor Bartolomeo will chair the subcommittee in polishing up the notes. A question arose as to how CWEMF might be involved in later helping to implement the modeling aspects of the DSP. Will there be funding?

Some discussion ensued as to how the CWEMF should incorporate its potential role in the DSP modeling efforts into the new CWEMF strategic plan being developed. How should we define our role in the strategic plan, when we don’t know what it will be? Much depends on whether there will be funding, not for CWEMF volunteer members but for contracts issued for modeling-related work. It may turn out that Dr. Goodwin will define what he needs in the modeling area, and CWEMF will respond as to what it can perform for those needs. The topic arose as to whether CWEMF wants to be “responsive” to requests from DSP, or does CWEMF want to be “pro-active” in dealing with the DSP modeling needs. It was mentioned that CWEMF needs to be careful and stay out of the policy area.

It was mentioned that it seems logical for CWEMF to advise the DSP on modeling, because who else will do it? A compromise was suggested: put in some minimal effort. Should we make a scope of work defining what CWEMF will do? Approach the DSP with what we think we can logically and financially do. Say we can do a little, but would need funding for more. There is lots of stuff in the DSP that we cannot help them on. We cannot force our desires onto agencies regarding their modeling efforts. Should we fund Elaine more to work on these efforts? Perhaps we should prepare a work product of how we can help the DSP (after we determine what that is), and post that onto our web site.

Back to our strategic plan. We need to get going on it and get it finished. If we have it finished by the end of the year, it will be useful to Dr. Goodwin. Let’s table the By-Laws for now, and get the strategic plan finished. For the strategic plan it was suggested to just make it up of headers and not details, as it will change over time. Elaine will email out the latest strategic plan draft for the steering committee to review.

**10. ANNUAL MEETING** – Elaine was applauded for doing an excellent job on the annual meeting. Thanks to DWR for the use of their projector and laptops. The number attending the annual meeting was about the same as last year. However, some only came for one day instead of three days, so the take was about \$6,000 less. The sponsors were about the same, and Tetra Tech became a sponsor. The expenses were about like last year. The social was off-site. This produced a few complaints, as about 15-20 people could not get in because of size constraints of

the social's room. We are waiting on the survey results to come in to see how the general membership felt about the meeting. Elaine had checked and we cannot reserve the entire restaurant. The consensus was that the food and drink were better at Sudwerks. In order to expedite the posting of session topics after the annual meeting, from now on let's get all session presentations onto flash drives at the meeting.

For future poster sessions, we should try to reach out to students and universities more. Have a student award for the best poster. Students can show their research results, or their graduate work, even beyond the Delta. There were good posters on the southern California groundwater modeling and the Trinity project. Should we reimburse students for their travel costs? Their registration is free, as is their food. Peter Vorster volunteered to outreach to the universities for the next annual meeting. The annual meeting announcement should be sent to more universities. Who are the key professors to contact? It was mentioned that the IEP gets students by having a one-on-one mentoring lunch with IEP volunteers. Ben volunteered to do a focused student outreach next year.

For the business meeting, don't have it right adjacent to lunch or people will leave early or come back from lunch late. Having the on-site lunch saves time. The future annual meeting location will have to be at Folsom if we want to be with the IEP. The IEP may move their annual meeting to the end of March. While some of our sessions were hard-core model tracks, some sessions were softer tracks, such as water quality, and many liked these softer tracks. Both rooms were of adequate size this year for all possibilities of room use.

Some discussion ensued as to how to handle the third day in the future. Should we have a half-day field trip on Monday morning or Wednesday afternoon? This may be attractive to students. We could go to the flood control Joint Operation Center. Or visit the American River gravel spawning beds in town, some of which were designed by modeling efforts. Peter Vorster would be interested in being involved in some of these trips. Chris might be able to organize the gravel viewing trip. Another possibility discussed was to have field trips outside of our annual meeting. Or perhaps have a workshop/field trip combination, such as was done by the SWRCB on channel geomorphology. One suggestion was to have a fisheries impact modeling workshop on the American River in the morning, followed by a kayak trip down the river looking at river attributes that were involved in the modeling.

It was suggested to have the IEP put our Wednesday morning sessions onto their agenda, as some of their members may be interested in topics we are presenting then. The guest speaker we had from the Great Lakes Modeling Group extended an invitation for one CWEMF member to attend their annual meeting in June at Purdue U. free of charge. Paul said his MWD training plan may allow his to do this, and he will let us know.

**11. OTHER BUSINESS** – We need to extend Elaine's contract to July 1. The question arose as to whether the hours we had for Elaine for this year were sufficient. Is the \$30,000 annual recompense sufficient? Elaine said that the next two months will be donated time. Her pay for her ground water peer review time comes out of the USBR peer review funds.

Use model simulation movies to educate people about the Delta. Use Adobe Professional, as it can handle big file sizes. Link to Bay-Delta Live, and link to videos. See how Kevin does it. Let's explore this.

12. **ADJOURN** – 12 noon. Next meeting is scheduled for May 17, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted  
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Ben Bray	Convener	EBMUD
Elaine Archibald	Executive Director	CWEMF
Josue Medellin	Vice-Convener	UCD
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engineers, Inc.
George Nichol	Secretary	Public Member
Paul Hutton		MWD
Mike Deas		Watercourse Engineers, Inc.
Eleanor Bartolomeo		SWRCB
Eric Reyes		DWR
Anne Huber		ICF
Chris Bowles		CBA

Phone: Jobaid Kabir (USBR), Lucinda Shiu (CCWD), Peter Vorster (TBI), Tara Smith (DWR), Rich Satkowski (SWRCB)

Proxies: None