

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Draft

For June 1, 2007

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

Decisions	
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delta Vision & Overview Workshop – Rich to solicit ideas from people and write and circulate a draft letter on ideas for the panel-type workshop.• Modeling Protocols Revision – Rich to draft a letter to the larger State agencies and water districts that use modeling regarding their support for a protocols document.• Taxes – Rich and Lisa are checking over the forms that have to be submitted.• Taxes – KT is writing a letter of explanation to the IRS.
Parking Lot Items	
Motions	

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors Report
 2. Workshop Status Report.
 3. Final Letter on Strategic Planning Process to CalFed Science Program.
 4. Request For Proposals to “Revision of Protocols”
 5. Evaluation Summary from Data Workshop
-

MINUTES

1. **INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – The meeting was opened with 16 persons in attendance, and 2 proxies. A quorum was declared.
2. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT** – Much of the Executive Director’s report is incorporated into the minutes below by category.
3. **SECRETARY’S REPORT** – The minutes for the March 16, 2007, meeting were approved.
4. **TREASURER’S REPORT** – Lisa is working on updating the report.
5. **TAXES** –
 - a. Our tax-exempt status has been suspended, as we haven’t submitted payroll tax or tax-exempt status paperwork to the IRS, FTB, or California Secretary of State since November 2002. Rich and Lisa are working on this. K.T. is writing an explanation letter

to the IRS. We will be hiring an accountant. There is a “non-profit organization boot camp” to train tax-free organizations how to fill out their paperwork.

b. Our next steps are to:

(1) Take care of current taxes

(2) Determine how to handle our taxes in the future, to prevent reoccurrence.

6. STRATEGIC ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK LETTER TO CALFED SCIENCE

PROGRAM - The letter was sent out on March 21, 2007. We have not yet received a reply. A suggestion was made that perhaps someone from CWEMF should make a personal appearance on this topic before the CALFED Independent Science Board. An email was sent to Steve Culberson to see if he could look into the situation.

7. MODELING PROTOCOLS –

a. It was mentioned that perhaps we should hire a consultant to assist us in revising the protocols. A completed target date of June 2008 was suggested. A potential cost of \$20,000 to \$50,000 was mentioned. The CWEMF could possibly put up \$20,000, without matching funds. But it would be good to have financial support from another group. The big question is how to go about implementing the contract.

b. A question arose as to why another agency would want to put up funds to help revise the Protocols. That is, there is no requirement that anybody must follow the CWEMF modeling protocols in their work. In the future are agencies going to insert such a statement in their contracts to modelers? In order to have this potentially happen, the revised Protocols must be a professionally accepted document with a known author. So, before starting, get the backing of large agencies that do modeling and from other modeling groups. There was also concern by a couple of members of the Steering Committee that due to the current crisis issues in the Delta that the agencies would not be looking at the protocols as their highest priority and that it might be better to delay asking for the backing until a more opportune time.

c. But pursue with caution. Perhaps an RFP is not the tool to use. The best way to proceed on this is to get agencies to ask us to do it. Perhaps the CWEMF could propose that a group of the agencies that do modeling come together to support this effort.

d. Rich will draft a letter to these agencies to see if they are interested. Ask state agencies such as DWR and SWRCB: the federal agencies are too large to be able to support California-area protocols. First identify individuals in each state agency and ask them to see what their agency’s needs are in this area. Do the letter in the following two phases: (1) Solicit information from individuals within agencies, and (2) write the letter. Marianne, Rob, and Hubert volunteered to help.

8. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –

a. **Data Workshop** (completed) – There were 49 participants. Several participants indicated a desire to have more workshops on data sets. The evaluation form will be changed to state “if material was distributed ---“, as in many cases material is not distributed and it lowers the evaluation score.

b. **SJR Restoration Workshop**– Starting to gel. Peter said perhaps can be held in the Fall time frame.

c. **Hetch Hetchy Workshop**– Peter will check with Spreck on this.

- d. **Watershed and Urban Hydrology Modeling Workshop** – Set for June 22.
- e. **San Joaquin Valley Modeling II Workshop** – Set for September. Modeling will include long-term social and economic effects from salinity buildup in the rivers if salt export is not provided, and ground-water overdraft.
- f. **Delta Visions & Overview Workshop** (a preliminary discussion) –
 - Get a panel of 5-7 individuals who are going to be directly involved in providing information to the Delta Vision process to be used for Delta restoration. Get their insights. Have each person give a short talk summarizing their current preliminary thoughts on what will be needed. Have them address things like “here is what we think strategically and technically” and “here is what we think is needed to manage the Delta”. They should base their thoughts on technical work, not on feelings.
 - What we are looking for is them saying something like “here are some insights on the monumental decision that is going to have to be made in a few months”. What are their preliminary findings on the DRMS process and Vision process? For example, if you had something to say to the Delta Vision Task Force or Public Policy Institute of California, what would you say?
 - It will be good to get current thoughts out into the open, rather than wait and have desperation set in at the last minute. The purpose of this workshop is not to propose any solution, but to be synthetic. Lisa will send a related flow chart to Rich.
 - This panel would include people like Greg Gartrell, Richard Denton, Peter Moyle, Wim Kimmerer, Jon Burau, John deGeorge, etc. The panel should include biologists. Include conceptual models in the discussions.
 - Rich will list some possible items for this workshop in a few weeks, after bouncing ideas around with a few people first, and send a draft to the Steering Committee for their thoughts. Get BDCC involved. Peter Vorster volunteered to help.

9. **PEER REVIEW PROCESS** –

- a. **Primer** - Consider changing the photos.
- b. **IWFM** – The WRIME company suggested a peer review. This is still underway. C2V-SIM is an application of IWFM, as IWFM is the code for C2U-SIM. The IGSM peer review led to IWFM.
- c. **Particle Tracking Model (of DSM)** – The Science Advisory group of CALFED wants a peer review of this model. The CWEMF has not been asked to participate in this peer review.
- d. **REALM (River Estimating and Land Model)** – The contract started last February. This would be a good time for a peer review. Is a 1-2 D model. Will use new libraries and engines.
- e. **Delta Dimensionality Considerations** – Should there be a peer review of when 1-D and 2-D models apply in the Delta? Maybe even extend these same considerations not just to estuaries but also to rivers, lakes, and groundwater. It was suggested that good explanations be given when one dimensionality is chosen over the other. Perhaps this should be an issue paper. What are the pros and cons. When do you need more dimensionality and when can you combine. An example of when

1- D might apply in the Delta is when one is looking over a large area and a long time, and an example of when 2-D might apply is during low flows in certain reaches when gravitational circulation might be carrying more saline water and nutrients upstream along the channel bottom on a net tidal-cycle basis. Another example stated was for the Stockton dissolved oxygen condition, as to whether there was sufficient vertical variation of dissolved oxygen to justify a 2-D model or not.

10. MODEL USER GROUPS –

a. CALSIM Lite – (This is really a misnomer.) The USBR funded. Runs in 2 minutes, instead of the much longer time of CALSIM. It shortens the time by aggregating a bunch of items. The DWR has interest in it. It has its limitations, and can't apply to everything. It evolved from GOLD-SIM, which is a mining model. CALSIM Lites main benefit is that it shortens the computation time and is user friendly. It is very graphical, and does stochastic work. Uses lots of assumptions. It is out of the experimental stage. Has a simplified node network (50 nodes vs 600 nodes). Uses CALSIM-based hydrology. Runs monthly time steps.

b. DSM-2 Users Group -

11. OTHER BUSINESS – Next meeting on July 20. Location TBD.

12. ADJOURNED – 12:30 PM

Respectfully Submitted
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Tara Smith
Rich Satkowski
Paul Hutton
Lisa Holm
George Nichol
K.T. Shum
G. Fred Lee
Hubert Morel-Seytoux
Marianne Guerin
Michael Tansey
Peter Vorster
Diana Jenson
Rob Tull
John Headlee
Lloyd Peterson
Jay Lund

Convener, DWR
Executive Director, CWEMF
Vice-Convener, MWDSC
Treasurer, CALFED
Secretary, CWEMF
Past Convener, EBMUD
GFL & Associates
Hydrology Days/Consultant
CCWD
USBR
The Bay Institute
David Ford Consulting Engr
CH2M-Hill
USACE
USBR
UCD

Proxies: Dan, Mike