CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING 2006

General Membership Meeting of March 1, 2006

(Fred Farr Room, Asilomar Conference Grounds in Pacific Grove, California.)

Decisions	• The strengthening of the modeling peer review process was discussed as an objective of the group.
Motions	• A motion was made and accepted to elect the named persons running for office for 2006.
Action Items	• The Executive Director will look into updating our web page to show our Modeling Protocols document more prominently.
Parking Lot Items	• None
References Handed Out	• "A Strategic Analysis Framework for Managing Water in California", CWEMF Final Report 2005-1, September 2005.

8 AM

1. **WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER** – K.T. Shum opened the meeting. A quorum was declared, with 34 persons in attendance. The agenda was reviewed.

2. **SECRETARY'S REPORT** – The minutes of the 2005 CWEMF Annual Meeting passed unanimously.

3. **TREASURER'S REPORT** – The Treasurer announced that she is preparing an electronic format for the funding status.

4. **OFFICER'S ELECTION** – The following officers were elected for 2006:

K.T. Shum – Convener
Tara Smith – Vice-Convener
Lisa Holm – Treasurer
George Nichol – Secretary
Nigel Quinn - Past Convener

5. **SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES IN 2005** -

a. K.T. gave an overview of the year's activities, including the SWAN proposal.
b. Tara described the 2005-2006 workshops.
c. Nigel reported on the User's Groups.
d. The Executive Director reported on the following. A new annual dues structure of $500 for smaller companies was initiated. This year's attendance was 144 persons, from 43 separate

agencies, making this the largest attendance yet. The CWEMF's Strategic Analysis Framework for Managing Water in California has been completed and a report issued. The CWEMF's Peer Review Process for Models has been updated this past year.

6. **IDEAS FOR NEW WORKSHOPS** –

- Strategic Analysis Framework
- Data Management /QA/QC – This would include water chemistry data, toxicity data, fish tissue data, biological data, sediment quality data, etc. – (Peter Vorster expressed an interest in setting this up).
- State of future Delta modeling
- Modeling Protocols document usage – (The following discussion ensued)
    - We already have a list of improvements needed.
    - The question arose as to whether the SWRCB Water Rights Division requires that models be peer reviewed?
    - Build toward USGS-type model documentation.
    - Update our web page to show our Modeling Protocols documents more
    - Keep pushing documentation and peer reviews
    - How do we define peer reviews? At what level?
    - Suggestion – Put a link on our web page to link to model developers and peer reviewers.
    - We need to be consistent and persistent on how peer reviews are done.
    - How do we get to better documentation and peer reviews?
- WARMF Model – Where Carl Chen gives the training.
- DSM-2 – Updatal of calibration, as a working session. Possibly 2 days. First day introduction, and second day calibration details. Include uses.
- Forecasting – Flood, snow. How are these conducted, and what data is used?

7. **PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

a. The question is "how to make the peer review process more useful to stakeholders and model developers".

b. The goal is to increase the use of models.

c. The peer review must consider the model application.

d. Models are application-specific, and so we should not endorse any model.

e. Don't hesitate to spend money on documentation, because there is lots of money riding on the model results.

f. When should a peer review start?

g. Know the limitations of the model: it can't do everything.

h. How can outsiders meet the definition of "peers"?

i. Getting the stakeholders educated is more difficult and important than peer reviews.

j. Peer reviews need more stakeholder involvement.

k. A peer review must seek the questions to be answered, because these questions dictate the model to be used.

l. Future modeling work should set up funding for a peer review.

m. Watch out that the peer review does not contain too many people.

n. Identify the peer review of the model as one component of the milestone check-off.

o. Try to have the peer review conducted simultaneously with the development and application of the model.

p. The peer review process would benefit if done at the beginning in the following three parts:

- Identify areas of agreement or acceptance to all (AGREE)
- Identify areas of disagreement, and what can be done to address these (DISAGREE)
- Identify the grey zone, for an open discussion. (NEUTRAL)

q. A peer review panel needs guidance so they don't get lost.

r. There are two types of peer reviews:

(1) academic
(2) practitioner

s. Have the peer reviewers do the review as a group, and not have individual external reviewers in different locations (i.e. out-of-state).

t. A peer review should be a constructive process.

u. Watch out whom you select for a peer reviewer.

v. Important projects will draw controversy. Somebody has to endorse the model in these cases, and this is where the peer review will come in.

w. Someone asked whether the SWRCB Division of Water Rights requires peer reviews of models. The ED responded that such peer reviews are required for water quality models, but not for other types.

8. **ADJOURN** – 10 AM

Respectfully Submitted,
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ANNUAL MEETING ATTENDANCE (34 persons)

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Michael Deas	Watercourse Engineering
George Nichol	SWRCB
Nigel Quinn	LBNL/USBR
Walter Bourez	MGK
Stacy Tanaka	UCD/Watercourse Engineering
John Headlee	USACE
Michael Mierzwa	DWR
Tara Smith	DWR
Tracy Hinojosa	DWR
Lloyd Peterson	USBR
Francis Chung	DWR
Jay Lund	UCD
Lisa Holm	CBDA
Paul Hutton	MWD
K.T. Shum	EBMUD
Rich Satkowski	CWEMF
Les Grober	CVRWQCB-CVR
Marianne Guerin	CCWD

Messele Ejeta	DWR
David Sumi	Center for Collaborative Policy
Peter Vorster	Bay Institute
Robert Leaf	CH2M-Hill
Sushil Arora	DWR
Donghai Wang	WRIME, Inc.
Mike Dettinger	USGS
Glen Pearson	DWR
Ray Hoagland	DWR
Todd Hillaire	DWR
Ted Swift	DWR
Hubert Morel-Seytoux	Hydroprose
Richard Denton	CCWD
George Barnes	DWR Ret.
Geoff Schladow	UCD
Mike Archer	MBK Engineers
Lisa Holm	CBDA