

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

# MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Draft

For January 18, 2008

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

Decisions	
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Steve Culberson to prepare some further amplifying information on how the CWEMF could possibly assist CALFED in their Delta hydrodynamic modeling and modeling primer considerations, and submit this to the Steering Committee.</li><li>• Steve Culberson to see if a CALFED person can come to the next Steering Committee meeting to give us a presentation on the above items.</li><li>• The ED to ask Tariq to prepare a 1-page proposal on the IWFM peer review and submit it to the Steering Committee.</li></ul>
Parking Lot Items	
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A motion was passed to provide \$10,000 to start the review of the IWFM Model.</li></ul>

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors Report
  2. Final sessions for the 2008 annual conference.
- 

## MINUTES

**1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – The meeting was opened with 14 persons in attendance, and 3 proxies. A quorum was declared.

**2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT** – Most items mentioned here were placed into the topics shown below. The number of contacts (27,000) made to our web site was presented.

**3. SECRETARY'S REPORT** – The minutes for the November 16, 2007 meeting were approved.

**4. TREASURER'S REPORT** – The Treasurer was absent. The ED reported that \$74,733 total was in our accounts.

5. **TAXES** – Tara, Lisa, and the ED attended a one-day workshop on small and medium sized non-profit organizations on Dec. 31, for the purpose of determining what paperwork needs to be submitted periodically to maintain our non-profit status in the future. Tara will follow-up with Lisa and Carol (our current book-keeper) next week on finishing the paperwork. The gross income to the CWEMF makes a difference in the paperwork. If gross income LT \$25,000 (excluding special funding like for the peer review fund), the paperwork is easy, and you just fill out a post card. We are close to this figure now annually.

6. **2008 ANNUAL MEETING -**

a. **Agenda** – The agenda will be sent out this week. The ED's report has a summary of the sessions. There are eight new sessions this year. Abstracts for each of the session's topics are now due from the speakers, so that they can be on the agenda and handed out at check-in time at Asilomar. There will be no keynote speaker on Tuesday, so we will have the Fischer Award, the Career Achievement Award, and the poster session that night. On Wednesday night we can participate with IEP in their keyspeaker address. There will be time for 12 short pop-up talks on Feb. 26, from 9-10 am. Contact Nigel if interested, so he can get your slides pre-loaded. The ED sent out student invitations to 21 colleges/universities. The CWEMF will provide scholarships to qualified students to pay their registration and lodging at the Monterey Hostel. The students are requested to participate by doing one of four things, these being presenting a poster, giving a short talk at Asilomar, writing a one-page paper on why they want to attend, or having a professor send an email recommending their attendance. Mike Deas will be sponsoring the poster session. If interested in presenting a poster, send an email to the ED and he will forward it to Mike, who will respond with the poster requirements.

b. **Fischer Award** – Nominations have been presented, a motion made and seconded and voted on, and a winner was selected today.

c. **Career Achievement Award** - Nominations have been presented. Four excellent names were put forth. There was a discussion as to whether to have one or two winners this year. A motion was made and seconded to have just one winner, and this was voted on with a vote of 7 for, 4 against, and 2 abstentions, for just having one winner this year. Another motion was then made and seconded and voted on for a candidate, and a winner was selected today. Because of the excellent names put forth this year, another motion was made and seconded to automatically carry-over the other three nominees to next year for consideration again, without the need to resubmit their names again. This passed unanimously. The Nominators will be notified that their Nominees will again be considered next year.

d. **2008 Officers** – The candidates are as follows:

Convenor – Tara Smith

Vice-Convenor – Paul Hutton

Treasurer – Lisa Holm

Secretary – Nichol

Other names can be presented at the annual meeting, before the vote occurs.

## 7. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –

- a. **Overview of Delta Nutrient Water Quality Problems: Nutrient Load – Water Quality Impact Modeling Workshop**– G. Fred Lee, March 25. George will ask the SWRCB to send flyer to all staff.
- b. **HEC-HMS Watershed Model Workshop**– George Nichol – Speakers selected. Set for April or May.
- c. **DRERIP (Delta Regional Ecosystems Restoration Implementation Plan) Workshop – Conceptual models.** – Has species-specific models.
- d. **Workshop or Interfacing of Support to the CALFED Science Program** – Steve Culberson.
  - (1) The Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) Group has approached CALFED and asked for technical advice on Delta hydrodynamic models. The BDCP is putting together a hydrodynamic modeling plan, covering what models exist, who uses them, how they are used, and what models might best be used to serve their purpose. The CWEMF could help CALFED to advise the BDCP on how to select the models they need. Also, the PPIC will have future input on hydrodynamic codes used in the Delta, and apparently all models will be run under the same conditions. Dr. Bombardelli of UCD will serve as the QA person for PPIC's own work.
  - (2) The CALFED management would like a primer made on Delta modeling. The CWEMF is requested to help on preparing this. It was mentioned that perhaps Paul Hutton's previous discussion on the need for a white paper to describe when 1, 2, and 3 dimensional modeling is needed in the Delta could tie into this primer.

Steve was asked to prepare a paragraph on each of the above two topics he just presented, and send to Tara. For the next CWEMF Steering Committee agenda put in an item to have someone from CALFED come in, if possible, to give us a presentation.

- e. **Shared Vision Planning Workshop**– Rich Juricich. The workshop is proposed for March 17, but the date may change. In the morning will be general topics, and the afternoon will be on details.
- f. **DSM-2** – Training will be held in March, two days each week, for two weeks.

## 8. IWFM PEER REVIEW –

- a. Nigel opened with a short status report of the funding situation. An amount of \$40K was discussed as possibly being needed to conduct the peer review. The prospects of obtaining this entire amount do not look too promising right now. We are trying for cost sharing with other entities. Our peer review fund now has about \$15K. How much of this do we want to contribute?
- b. The review of the code and theory will be relatively inexpensive. The review of the application, such as to the San Joaquin Valley, will be more expensive. The model already has a users manual. (IWFM is the code: C2VSIM is the actual application in the San Joaquin Valley.)
- c. Should we pursue a refereed journal article review? We need to discuss the level of effort we want for the review. Can we scale Tariq's approximately 12 objectives down?

d. It will probably be easiest to get funding for doing both the code review and the application review together as a package, as agencies interested in helping with the funding will be more interested in the application.

e. The question arose as to whether other groundwater models that are now being developed or used in the San Joaquin Valley should also be considered for peer review, along with IWFM. The USGS has the MODFLOW model, the DHI has a MIKE groundwater model, and the USBR has the HYDROGEOSPHERE model. We don't want to see conflicts between the models, so should we consider their peer reviews also?

f. So we need to look at the scope of what we want to do. What are we going to focus on? More discussion is needed.

g. In the meantime, a motion was made and seconded to ask Tariq to make a 1-page proposal stating what he expects from the IWFM peer review, what the approximate cost would be for the entire review, and what the priorities would be for each part of the review. The proposal would then come back to the Steering Committee for further considerations. The motion included the allotment of \$10,000 from our peer review funds to start the review of the model, beginning with the review of the model's code. In our presentation to other agencies where we ask for their participation and funding of the peer review, we would emphasize that the review of the code is just the first step of a two-step process that would include applications.

**9. MODEL USERS GROUPS** – The DSM-2 User's group has been meeting periodically. The IWFM User's Group has not met for a few months.

**10. OTHER BUSINESS** – Next meeting is March 21 at CCWD in Concord.

**11. ADJOURNED** – 12:15 PM

Respectfully Submitted  
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

**ATTENDANCE**

Tara Smith  
Rich Satkowski

Lucinda Shih  
K.T. Shum  
George Nichol  
G. Fred Lee  
Marianne Guerin  
Rob Tull  
Hubert Morel-Seytoux  
Nigel Quinn  
Steve Culberson  
Mike Deas

Convener, DWR  
Executive Director, CWEMF  
  
CCWD  
Past Convener, EBMUD  
Secretary, CWEMF  
GFL & Associates  
RMA  
CH2M-Hill  
Hydroprose Consultant  
LBL Berkeley/USBR  
CalFed  
Watercourse Inc.

Jay Lund  
Michael Tansey

UCD  
USBR

Proxies: John Williams, Peter Vorster, John Headlee