

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

# MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

(Draft)

For March 18, 2011

(This meeting was held at Contra Costa Water District in Concord.)

Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Strategic Plan</b> - Prepare thoughts and an outline for the new Strategic Plan – Elaine, Mike, Stacy, and Marianne. Elaine will then send it to the Steering Committee.</li><li>• <b>Modeling Benchmarks</b> - Email Art Baggett’s SWRCB “Hydrologic Benchmarks for Modeling” publication to the Steering Committee – Ben</li><li>• <b>SWRCB Peer Reviews</b> - Find out the SWRCB requirements for (modeling) peer reviews – George</li><li>• <b>Funding Sources and Grants</b> – See how to pursue funding sources and grants that might be available to CWEMF – Paul</li><li>• <b>Cost Letter</b> - Send a letter (in July) to our 700-member address list telling why costs went up, and include a summary of our current finances - Marianne</li></ul>
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors Report.
2. CWEMF Workshop Status
3. Annual Meeting 2011 Fiscal Report
4. Annual Meeting 2011 Evaluation Summary
5. Notes from March 1, 2011 Groundwater Peer Review Meeting during lunch.

---

1. **INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – The meeting was opened with 13 persons in attendance and one person on the phone. A quorum was declared. Marianne, the new Convener, mentioned her appreciation to all in getting the financial end of things in order, and now we can focus on new things.

2. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT** – Sent 2011 invoices to organizational members and to annual meeting participants who did not pay in advance. Elaine worked with the IRS on Federal tax identification and non-profit status, sent a thank-you note to Art Baggett for being our key-note speaker, and contacted Solano Irrigation District on our 2011 meetings. The Executive Director’s other comments have been included in the comments below, where applicable.

3. **SECRETARY’S REPORT** –Passed unanimously, with a revision needed.

#### **4. TREASURER'S REPORT –**

a. There is \$57,500 total, with \$39,200 in the general fund and \$18,300 in the peer review fund. Our income to date is \$48,000, and our expenses to date are \$27,200, for a net profit of \$20,800 to date.

b. We need to get a good handle on what a year's expenses are, and hold some money in reserve beyond those expenses. This will allow us to obligate for Asilomar.

c. Training workshops can help us to generate some income. For example, there are upcoming Callite peer review workshops and the groundwater comparative peer review workshops, and we can hopefully generate some income from these.

d. The Finance Subcommittee (Marianne, Stacy, Paul, Mark, and George) and the Executive Director will meet again in July.

#### **5. 2011 ANNUAL MEETING –**

a. There were 170 participants in attendance, and things went well. Income is up due to our increase in registration dues, and the payment convenience afforded by the use of Pay Pal. \$45,315 was taken in from registration. Some attendees are in arrears in making their Asilomar registration payment and lodging payment. In order to keep tabs on these arrears we should think about making up a membership list and show who has paid their Asilomar registration and lodging and who has not.

b. The refreshment costs for the sessions and two social events were covered by the consulting firms of CH2M-Hill, MWH, HDR, ICF International, Malcome-Pirnie/ARCADIS, MBK, and Systech Engineers. The cost of the poster-board session was covered by Watercourse Engineering. We cut our refreshment amounts down for the sessions as compared to past years, and took some flak for it. Most complaints came in for a lack of sufficient coffee and cookies at the morning sessions and soft drinks at the afternoon sessions. It was mentioned that we can be fined by Asilomar if we bring in our own food items such as cookies, as Asilomar management generates some of their income from their sales of these items. Adult refreshments for our two socials cost close to \$2,000, which is a hefty fee, as the beer, wine, and bottled water are marked up pretty high. In the future, tickets may be better for us for the adult refreshments, because then CWEMF would only have to pay for two tickets per head and anyone having more drinks than that would have to pay for those drinks themselves.

c. In order to have more coffee and cookies in the future, and other refreshments for the sessions, let's ask for continued consultant sponsors or consider paying a little more from our funds. (Lesson learned this year: don't run out of coffee!) Keep the people happy with the refreshments (depending on the Asilomar charges for them), as the annual meeting is our major fundraiser of the year. (It was mentioned that since we raised the dues, can't we provide more refreshments?)

d. For next year, see if we can get a sponsor for the first day lunches. This year the meal tickets were undated, which was good because then we could give our unused ones to people who had

none on the next day. An idea was to have the consultant sponsors have one of the lunches with the students, to answer their questions about modeling (this year there were 14 students).

e. Let's send an email to the students thanking them for their help this year, and an email to the consultant's thanking them for their sponsorship. In the future see if we can have the students put the speaker's Power Points onto a hard drive at Asilomar (so that we can have them immediately without having to bug the speakers for them later) for later posting onto the CWEMF web site by Kevin Long of the SWRCB (Kevin puts about 2 hours per month into CWEMF web work, or 24 hours per year, and at \$100 per hour this comes up to the SWRCB's in-kind dues contribution to CWEMF).

f. It was felt that we still need to explain the off-site cost situation to the general membership, that the size of the conference rooms that we are assigned is dependent upon how many persons we have staying on-site. Some have said that they stayed off-site because Asilomar was too costly, or that they don't like to share a room, or that Asilomar's food was bad.

g. We couldn't have our raffle because Survey Monkey did not give the names of those who responded. Some complained that there was not sufficient time to see the posters in the one evening. So consider setting up the posters at noon next year. Many said that they liked the pop-up talks and posters.

h. There was a general feeling of well-being today as CWEMF's financial situation has improved with the raising of the membership dues and the Asilomar registration costs. Now we can focus our efforts on other things that CWEMF should be doing.

## **6. AWARDS –**

a. It was mentioned that considerations of the award nominees should be handled a little earlier in the year so it leaves time in case clarifying questions need to be sent back to the sponsor of the nominee. There was some discussion on whether the qualifications for each of the three awards need to be delineated in more detail, as there seems to be some overlap between the requirements for each award. Some thought that it might be best to let the award committee have some latitude in selecting the nominees each year, rather than tighten up on the definitions of each award.

b. It was agreed that each nominee must have a complete packet of information submitted to the committee, which would include that person's resume and the product that the nominee produced to be considered for the award, because some on the committee may not know the background of the nominee. Regarding the Fischer Award, the nominee can be either a developer of a new model or user of an existing model.

**7. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –** There was discussion of the following potential workshops: multi-dimensional modeling; consumptive use in the Delta; Delta water quality model workshop, biological modeling from the USBR Denver Service Center; groundwater modeling peer-review comparative workshop; and process models for nutrient dynamics.

## **8. PEER REVIEWS -**

a. **CalLite Model** - A CalLite peer-review workshop is tentatively set for July.

**b. Groundwater Models Comparative Peer Review** - The first groundwater comparative peer review workshop (for information-gathering) may start the first week in July, pending development and acceptance of the sponsorship between CWEMF and the USBR. A luncheon meeting was held at Asilomar on March 1 to discuss details of this groundwater workshop. In order to select the peer reviewers for this task, we should start thinking of questions to ask them. In our planning for this first workshop we will secure a room and date, notify members, review the presentations to be made, and organize the presenters. The Executive Director will keep a separate invoice for her time for this peer review. Also, the CWEMF members who are helping put on the workshops or other related activities are to keep track of their hours, as we are using in-kind efforts to pay for some of our obligations to match the \$20,000 being put forth by the USBR grant.

**9. MODEL USER GROUPS** – No report for today’s meeting.

**10. CWEMF STRATEGIC PLAN** –

a. This report will be looking ahead 2-3 years. A subcommittee is needed to help the Executive Director. Marianne, Stacy and Mike agreed to be on this subcommittee. Items which may be considered are:

- How to increase value of CWEMF to the water and modeling community
- How to interact with Decision-Makers
- Preparing an information packet for decision-makers
- How to use retired people more
- Opportunities for grant funding
- Define the target audiences
- Consider how to use You-Tube/video (advantage of this is so that people can go back many times to review it)
- Ideas from IEP
- Using modern media
- Preparation of white papers (in several areas)
- Dimensionality needs in Delta modeling

b. A subcommittee was formed (Marianne, Mike, Stacy) to work with Elaine and prepare thoughts and an outline for the Strategic Plan for the next Steering Committee meeting. Then Elaine will send the outline to the Steering Committee for review.

c. Ben will send Art Baggett’s SWRCB “Hydrologic Benchmarks for Modeling” to the Steering Committee.

d. Find out the SWRCB requirements for (modeling) peer reviews? George will check into this.

e. Regarding grants, Paul volunteered to see how to pursue funding sources and grants that might be available to CWEMF. He would like another person to help on this.

11. **OTHER BUSINESS** – The Convener will send a letter to our 700-member address list telling why costs went up. The letter will include a financial summary of our current finances, and a link to the Asilomar talks. Make it a one-pager, and say it is in response to some Asilomar comments.

12. **ADJOURN** – 1:30 PM. Next meeting March 18, 9:30 – 1:30 pm, location TBD.

Respectfully Submitted  
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Marianne Guerin	Convener
Elaine Archibald	Executive Director
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer
Paul Hutton	Past Convener
George Nichol	Secretary
Nigel Quinn	
Rich Satkowski	
Lisa Holm	
Ben Bray	
Lucinda Shih	
Peter Baker	

RMA
CWEMF
Watercourse Engr. Inc.
MWD
SWRCB
LBNL/USBR
Public Member
USBR
EBMUD
CCWD
Stillwater Sciences

On Phone: Tara Smith

Proxies: Hubert Morel-Seytoux, Mike Deas