

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

**MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

For July 18, 2014

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

Decisions	
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Elaine will send out an email to the Steering Committee members asking for their vote on going to Folsom or Asilomar.</li><li>• Ben will look into having a special event next summer or fall in the Sacramento area that could serve as a networking event.</li><li>• Elaine will set up an in-person meeting for the next Strategic Plan review.</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 March 21, 2014 Steering Committee meeting.
3. Treasurer's Trial Balance
4. Comparison of 2014 Folsom Revenue to Estimated 2015 Asilomar Revenue
5. Draft Strategic Plan
6. End of Fiscal Year 2013 Treasurer's Report

**1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – The meeting was opened by Ben with 8 persons in attendance, 3 persons on the phone, and 1 proxy. A quorum was declared.

**2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT** – The International Modeling Conference held in San Diego was reported to be excellent. CWEMF was a non-paying sponsor, and was represented at San Diego by Nigel Quinn. Elaine gave Nigel some CWEMF documents to have available at the conference for display. The question arose as to whether we should print up some of our documents to have as handouts at such conferences in the future. Or should we use our website for this? Rich Satkowski has had brochures in the past to hand out. Should we update these brochures? Should we have a CWEMF banner to display at conferences? No decision was made on these questions today. The Director's other comments are included in the topics discussed below.

**3. SECRETARY'S REPORT** –The minutes for the May 30, 2014 Steering Committee meeting were accepted today. There was some discussion on the audio recorder to be purchased by the Secretary to help in note taking. There was some concern on how it would be used, as some people may not speak freely if being recorded. The Steering Committee will make a policy on its use.

**4. TREASURER'S REPORT** – June 30 was the end of the fiscal year. We did well financially this past fiscal year, with a net revenue of \$27,223. At the end of the fiscal year the general fund had \$113,525, the peer review fund had \$16,889, and the operating reserve had \$40,068, for a total of \$170,482. Stacy will show these amounts in her Trail Balance spreadsheet in the future.

**5. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS** – It was reported that the Dutch have used models to determine which levees to repair. The Integrated Watershed Management workshop has been held by CWEMF at UCD. The PEST workshop will be on Sept. 16-18. A Forecasting workshop is being proposed by Peter Vorster and Tariq Qadir. A Multidimensional Modeling workshop is being considered. See Josue Medellin's schedule for more information.

The University of Idaho has done work on consumptive use determinations by remote sensing. They use satellite imagery for this. Can we possibly get their speaker here? The BDCP Delta report has its Chapter 8 on water quality. Modeling was used. See the DSP web site for the DSP integrated science board's comments on Chapter 8.

#### **6. ANNUAL MEETING -**

The question of going to Asilomar for the annual meeting was brought up again. While some look at going to Asilomar favorably, the travel funds of many agencies under the current economy will not allow the travel of the past. Elaine has prepared a chart showing the comparisons of the 2014 Folsom revenue to the estimated Asilomar revenue with its presumed reduced attendance. The bottom line is that we will get more people to come to Folsom and earn more revenue at Folsom. There was some discussion of the loss of networking during the evening socials that has occurred at Folsom as compared to Asilomar. It was mentioned that possibly this can be made up by having some periodic dinner socials in Sacramento for networking, possibly tied to specific problems that are occurring. Elaine was asked to send out an email to the Steering Committee members asking for their vote on going to Folsom or Asilomar for the next annual meeting. Ben will look into having a special event next summer or fall in the Sacramento area that could serve as a networking event. Volunteers will be needed to help.

**7. MODEL USER GROUPS** – There will be no DSM2 meeting during the summer. The DSM2 Newsletter will be prepared.

**8. DELTA MODELING SUMMIT** – Topic postponed.

#### **9. DELTA SCIENCE PROGRAM INTERVIEW**

Ben Bray participated in this interview. The following topics were discussed.

- a. Data Hub – This would be a central location where all modelers could go to get information, such as on channel bathymetry. This needs a lead agency. *(It was mentioned in today's meeting that the SWRCB's SWAMP program has developed data hubs whereby all participating agencies collecting water quality data have access to all data collected through the hubs, and the data is collected by agreed-upon field and lab methods so the data is usable and comparable statewide.)*

- b. Development of White Papers – White paper development is needed in many areas. For example, a white paper could be written to determine the criteria to be used to determine whether one-dimensional, two-dimensional, or three-dimensional modeling is needed.
- c. Bench-marking work – What are some of the situations where benchmarking of models could be done.
- d. Outreach – Have education on the use of technical tools. Perhaps we could partner with WEF on short videos of modeling topics. Perhaps have a newsletter of CWEMF’s activities.

10. **STRATEGIC PLAN** – Elaine has been working on a draft plan. It has undergone some preliminary review. Elaine will set up an in-person meeting for the next review.

11. **NEW BUSINESS** –

a. Ben mentioned that one of his colleagues at EBMUD asked him if CWEMF could do a peer review of her project. This would not be a typical peer review. It would be a dam break analysis, using the DHI’s Mike 11 model. An alternative to our doing a peer review would be for the EBMUD person to publish her work in a refereed ASCE Journal, which would serve as a sort of peer review. The question arose as to whether CWEMF could facilitate a peer review in six months. The peer review would not be of the model itself, but of whether it was used appropriately. What budget would CWEMF need? Most of the supporting work of the peer review would be done in-house by EBMUD. A hydrologic model would be used, then a dam model. The peer review would look for flaws in the modeling work after it was completed. This work is updating a 1990 modeling study of inundation from a dam break.

12. **ADJOURN** – 12 noon.

Respectfully Submitted  
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Ben Bray	Convener	East Bay MUD
Elaine Archibald	Executive Director	CWEMF
Josué Medellin	Vice-Convener	UCD
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engineering
George Nichol	Secretary	Public Member
Fred Lee		GFLA
Eleanor Bartolomeo		SWRCB
Paul Hutton		MWD

Phone: Rich Satkowski (SWRCB), Erik Reyes (DWR), Jobaid Kabir (USBR)

Proxies: Marianne Guerrin (RMA)

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>
-------------------	---