

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For September 20, 2013

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

Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Executive Director will follow up with Jobaid Kabir on the CVP/IRP peer review possibility• The Executive Director will summarize the individual inputs of the Steering Committee members as to the future direction of CWEMF
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Moved to end of minutes.)
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A motion was made and seconded and passed unanimously to have the annual meeting on Feb. 24-26, 2014 overlapping one day with the IEP, at the Lake Natomas Inn,

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors report.
2. Financial Trial Balance
3. Proposed schedule for Planning 2014 Annual Meeting
4. Draft Strategic Plan for 2013-2014
5. Status of CWEMF workshops.
6. IWFM/C2VSim Training Survey form and results
7. Draft survey for Agricultural Production and Water Use Modeling work shop.

1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM – The meeting was opened with 16 persons in attendance and four persons on the phone. A quorum was declared.

2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT – The Executive Director reported that the Groundwater Peer Review has been completed. The general opinion of those present felt that this Review was performed in an excellent manner. The Director’s other comments are included in the appropriate topics discussed below.

3. SECRETARY’S REPORT –The minutes for the August 2, 2013 Steering Committee meeting passed unanimously today.

4. TREASURER’S REPORT – There is about \$85,300 in our River City Bank CD, and about \$61,400 in our River City Bank Checking Account. Within these amounts is our \$35,000 Operating (Rainy Day) Fund. Our budget subcommittee will be meeting soon. A review of our tax status will occur at the end of the month.

5. ANNUAL MEETING – Discussion begin with the idea of having our annual meeting in February at the Lake Natomas Inn, so that we can overlap with the IEP who will be meeting then

and there. Ben has contacted many in the Steering Committee over the email and has received favorable feedback on doing this. (The IEP can't meet in April, as occurred at the last annual meeting, because of conflict with the American Fishery Society meeting that month.) In our discussion today most felt there was a benefit in overlapping with the IEP. The IEP has been reaching out to us, and this is an excellent opportunity for both organizations to incorporate biological and ecological modeling into their tool chests. Our past overlap sessions has had good attendance. Some felt it would be good if the BDCP could arrange to share some of their information on their modeling and thoughts. The BDCP has workgroups doing multidimensional modeling on hydrodynamics and biological processes.

A motion was made and seconded to have the annual meeting on Feb. 24-26, overlapping one day with the IEP, at the Lake Natomas Inn, and the vote passed unanimously. Ben would like to use a new method of selecting session moderators and speakers. An interactive web site will be built up around moderators who volunteer to run sessions, and persons interested in speaking in those sessions can contact the moderators. Ben showed a PC screen that contained the information that would be put out to the membership. Persons interested in moderating can respond to Ben. The attempt here is to widen the base of moderators and speakers, thereby getting more members involved. The Delta Science Program obtains their moderators and speakers in a similar fashion. The question arose as to what happens if we get too many people volunteering to be moderators and speakers or too few. We may need a subcommittee to work on this if it becomes a problem.

The Executive Director will talk to the IEP to discuss what the joint overlap day will cover. Also, because we have moved the annual meeting up to February, we need to have nominations for the awards earlier. The awards committee (Marianne, Josue, Mike, and George) will need to get nominations together before the next Steering Committee meeting, and present the recommendations at that meeting. Then the Steering Committee can make their selection at the January meeting. Paul will send Marianne the sample letter to email out to request nominations.

Be thinking about how we can use Sudwerk's Restaurant at the annual meeting. The suggested theme selected for the annual meeting is "20 Years of Quantitative Analysis".

6. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –

- a. Integrated Regional Water Management – DWR/Ben
- b. C2VSim/IWFM – Get dates
- c. Real Time Modeling – Nigel/Delta Science Program
- d. Agricultural Modeling – Josue showed us the results of his survey: he will send out information on it.
- e. IWFM/IDC and C2VSim Training Survey – Tariq (DWR) sent out his survey, and based on the results presented the following information: Many persons were interested in both workshops. The C2VSim workshop will be held in Sacramento in November (or alternately in January), and a facility is needed. This workshop may also be held at CSU Fresno. For the

Sacramento location, Jobaid said he may be able to get the USBR training room, and Tariq will send Jobaid the dates that he would like to this training. Regarding the four-day IWFM/IDC workshop, Westfield Engineers in Davis would like to host this workshop, with a 2-day IDC workshop on Dec. 10-11, and a 2-day IWFM workshop on Jan. 7-8.

7. DELTA SCIENCE PROGRAM - This topic pertains to the upcoming "Modeling Summit" Workshop(s). In preparation for this workshop(s), get 8-10 top decision-makers/scientists (consisting of IEP people, policy people, 2-3 CWEMF people) together as an expert panel to determine what the emerging issues of the future are likely to be (later CWEMF workshops can address the part that modeling may play to address these issues, and what models would have to be available or developed to address these issues). The CWEMF members to participate in this group might be Nigel Quinn, Tara Smith, and Rich Satkowski. The Delta Science Program cannot hold this expert panel meeting in November, but suggested that it might be held during the annual IEP/CWEMF meeting.

Related to the above DSP workshop topic, it was mentioned that Peter Goodwin of the DSP has questioned how agency people and consultants can more formally be brought into the modeling planning process. The DSP has funding (through RFPs) that might be able to be used to bring consultants in. The question arose as to who would select the consultants. In another discussion, it was mentioned that modelers are good at using the current models for individual questions but model planning needs to engage more deeply into the DSP's co-equal goals of how to keep the native fish off of the endangered species list and furnish an adequate Delta water supply to statewide users. There is little integration of models, and the cascading effect that occurs to the co-equal goals when individual water management changes occur is often not addressed. We are not modeling just stage, velocity, and salinity anymore, but have to make better connections between the biological, ecological, and water quality changes occurring. We need to understand the linkages. We need to look at how model results affect policy.

More discussion of the above DSP topics occurred. Suggestions for the modeling summit workshop were as follows. Discuss linkages needed between models/ modeling efforts. Open with provocative talks, discuss conditions going on outside of our Delta system, pose a series of grand questions (i.e. how to model levee emergencies, other emergencies, real time water management needs, what can be done within 24 hour time frames, etc.).

The following suggestion was made. After the 8-10 people of the expert panel meet to discuss the larger questions, as mentioned above, then these same people would split up and be moderators of workshops in their areas of expertise which might contain 50-100 people. A hoped-for outcome of each of these workshops would be work plans, which would then be combined to bridge as best as possible the entire gap of Delta issues for the future. Putting these work plans together would help find commonality between issues, and also help in budgeting for future modeling efforts.

8. CVP/IRP MODEL PEER REVIEW – Jobaid has prepared a Scope of Work for this review and has sent it to Rich Juricich of DWR for his review. Jobaid said that the USBR might be able to come up with \$20,000 for their contribution for this review. In-kind contributions would be required from CWEMF, and possibly from DWR if they can jointly sponsor the review. Elaine

will follow up with Jobaid on this review, and Rich Juricich will see if any DWR funding can be obtained.

9. **MODEL USER GROUPS** – No action since the last Steering Committee meeting.

10. **CWEMF STRATEGIC PLAN** – We have been floundering a bit in reforming the Strategic Plan because CWEMF members have differing opinions as to what our mission and goals have become or should be at this point in time. This is a larger philosophical question that needs to be addressed before the Strategic Plan can be reformed. It appears that CWEMF has three options that have to be considered in this regard, and these are (1) Business as usual for our workshops, peer reviews, and annual meeting); (2) Strengthen our activities in workshops, peer reviews, and annual meeting; and (3) Strengthen our activities in workshops, peer reviews, and annual meeting, and also expand our sphere of influence in the modeling activities of the State.

We decided to go around the room and ask everyone what their desires would be for the future efforts of CWEMF, and to give a numeric score using the above scale of 1-3, assuming that funding was not a problem, and no holds barred. Where do we want to be in 20 years? What do we need to do to get there? What resources are needed? The responses are below (wall charts were used to summarize the information presented below, and to give the numerical score between 1-3 (corresponding to the above three groups) that each person gave for their score: The Executive Director will summarize this information and email it out later.):

- a. Person 1 -We don't need to define ourselves as either 1, 2, or 3 above, but just do what seems to be appropriate for the situation at hand at the time.
- b. Person 2 - Continue with what we have been doing. Stay a volunteer organization.
- c. Person 3 – What are the modeling voids that need to be filled. IS BDCP filling any of the voids? Who else can handle model disagreements? Water quality and biological modeling are in their infancy. We need to welcome the statistical modeling of the biologists.
- d. Person 4 – Consider expanding along the lines of the IEP (regarding personnel and funding availability). How do the Chesapeake Bay and the Great Lakes do modeling over-site?
- e. Person 5 –Mentioned that the CWEMF was formed about 20 years ago because of the confrontations occurring between modeling groups in the Delta water rights hearings of the SWRCB. An organization was needed where technical people could get together in a non-confrontational atmosphere and share technical ideas outside of any policy area. Paul would like to maintain this atmosphere, and perhaps strengthen the workshops, peer reviews, and annual meeting as needed. Use other forums for strategic thinking and policy development regarding modeling. Stay non-partisan.
- f. Person 6 – Pull in biological modeling to CWEMF. This is an emerging need. Stay apolitical. Have a higher profile. Become better known. Decision makers from the governor's office or the SWRCB may ask us if we have reviewed certain models. Strengthen our workshops, peer reviews, and annual meeting.
- g. Person 7 – We need to get more involved in biological modeling and water quality modeling. We need to link different types of models/modelers together.

- h. Person 8 – CWEMF should support the basics in modeling efforts. We need to have models that relate quantity to quality. Support the design of needed models.
- i. Person 9 – Think big, shape the future, but stay in the science area and don't get into the policy area. Be a Center of Excellence. Be a group of experts. Make modeling decisions. Advise the decision-makers. Encourage hydrodynamic, biological, and water quality modeling. Help bridge the gap between science and decisions. We would get support. We could be the decision-makers of scientific modeling efforts. We would need a staff. Agencies should consider funding CWEMF. CWEMF would consist of volunteers and a small paid staff. Efforts such as the above would assist modeling consultants in not working in silence.
- j. Person 10 – CWEMF changed its name from Bay-Delta Modeling Forum to California Water and Environmental Modeling Forum. Therefore do more in the modeling area. Everyone knows there is uncertainty in the modeling area. Get more people on board. Start in the universities.
- k. Person 11 – We need to focus on the problems. A massive water quality monitoring effort is needed in the Delta to support a modeling or other predictive effort. The Delta is polluted by urban storm water drainage and by excessive agricultural fertilization drainage. The urban storm water drainage has toxicity. No studies of these excesses has been done. Most Delta water quality criteria were designed for long term conditions such as for wastewater treatment plant discharges, and not for episodic exceedences of short term. Thus CWEMF should get involved in:
 - (1) Urban storm water drainage problem – we need to provide guidance on social, biological, and physical conditions affecting water quality in the Delta, and what co-equal goals means. We should advise on all of the modeling needed for this. Who else is doing it?
 - (2) Excessive agricultural fertilization drainage – Nutrients are the problem here. Massive amounts of money are being spent on this issue. Our past CWEMF workshop on Delta nutrients has been pretty much ignored. We need to get aggressively involved in suggesting solutions. We should take a position on what good science, engineering, and modeling is needed to address this problem. We need to go beyond just putting information onto our web site.

We just finished a peer review on groundwater models. How should we push this product for use in the Central Valley?

- l. Person 12 – We need to continue with education and outreach. We should address our workshops to the public rather than just modelers.
- m. Person 13 – We need to be more visible to decision makers. Relate more with policy makers. Reach out to consultants. In addition to workshops have more regular get-togethers. FMA has such get-togethers, and AWWA has monthly luncheons. Would like better outreach to academia to bring out new research. We need better communication. CWEMF could be the middle person between policy and modeling. We need clearly

defined sub-committees around themes. We could improve our efficiency with permanent sub-committees.

- n. Person 14 – We have additional money now. Give birth to sub-groups like currently being done with Peter Goodwin. Don't stay stagnant. There is a big need for modeling education, water quality modeling, biological modeling, and fish modeling. We need to get our ideas out to the data collectors. Let's use our extra dollars to reach out to policy makers, to get name recognition. We need more than workshops and the annual meeting. Modeling is now involving more groups. We need to get more involved in education, because education is not a part of a consultants duties. Modeling is growing. Present forums where people are comfortable with asking dumb questions.
- o. Person 15 – Strengthen our workshops, peer reviews, and annual meeting. Increase our audiences. Let policy makers know what we are good for.
- p. Person 16 – There is a new era of collaboration occurring. Combat science is not good. Best to stay advisory, such as when peer reviews are needed.
- q. Person 17 – Policy makers are consumers of modeling. We need scientifically credible input. We need to work with policy makers. Find out what questions they have. Help do translation between regulators and modelers. Do we want to facilitate modeling, or develop models, or ensure that any modeling was adequately done? We don't need to select models, but instead determine if it accounted for the issues and questions involved. Do we want to give stamps of approval, or direct modeling groups, or what? Modeling needs to do a better job of linking what constituents are in the rivers entering the Delta and the resulting water quality in the Delta. We are not following up with our previous presentation by Elaine to the State Water Board. Do we want to write suggestive letters to the State Water Board? We need to have more visibility. The State Water Board does not work on models. The State Water Board has asked the Delta Science Program for modeling support, and the Delta Science Program has asked us.
- r. Person 18 – If we say we are non-partisan we need to be non-partisan. Just strengthen our existing activities. If we expand, other things could suffer. When CWEMF started we shared ideas openly, which was good. We could provide more education for those who use the models. We could help in the communication between the modeler's results and the decision makers. Our past CWEMF reports were important products. Perhaps we could be involved in how to choose better models for use in the Delta.
- s. Person 19 – Peter Godwin thinks that the CWEMF is in a good position to help the Delta Science Program.

Following the above, some general discussion started. One big issue pertaining to the entire discussion above is whether CWEMF is to be a "Facilitation Organization" or an "Advocacy Organization". This is the issue we need to address before we can write the new strategic plan. Within each area we need to decide if we want to be active or passive. If we want recognition, we can't just wait for people to come to us (can't be completely passive). Based on today's discussions, it is seen that we want to be better. The question is what do we want to be better at.

11. **OTHER BUSINESS** – Everyone is to read the Mission Statement (Purpose) (in the By-Laws on the CWEMF web site) before the next Steering Committee meeting. At the next meeting discuss the Strategic Plan again and the annual meeting. Do the By-Law changes before the annual meeting. The By-Law sub-committee is Mike, Marianne, Stacy, Bori, George, and Ben. Stacy will send out an email arranging a By-Law subcommittee meeting.

12. **ADJOURN** – 1:30 pm. Next meeting is scheduled for November 15, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Ben Bray	Convener	EBMUD
Elaine Archibald	Executive Director	CWEMF
Marianne Guerin	Past-Convener	RMA
Josué Medellin	Vice-Convener	UCD
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engineers, Inc.
George Nichol	Secretary	Public Member
Paul Hutton		MWD
Eleanor Bartolomeo		SWRCB
Anne Huber		ICF
Thomas Pate		SCWA
Tariq Kadir		DWR
Bori Touray		Parsons Brinkerhoff
Chris Bowles		CBEC
Mitch Mysliwisc		LWA
Holly Canada		DWR
G. Fred Lee		GFL & Assoc.

Phone: Jobaid Kabir (USBR), Rich Satkowski (SWRCB), Tara Smith (DWR), Chris Enright Delta Stewardship Council)

Proxies: None

Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-Year Budget – Prepare a draft. • Peer Review Process - Development of peer review administrative process. • Investment Policy - Development of investment policy. • Financial Transparency – Determine how best to show our financial transparency to outsiders. • By-Law Changes – Develop a proposal for updating the By-Laws • Determine how much money can be accumulated as a non-profit organization
-------------------	---

--	--