

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For March 21, 2014

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

Decisions	
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decide if CWEMF should participate with FEMA/UCD (if asked) in flood plain benchmarking studies – Steering Committee• Talk to Professor Fleenor to see if he could check with FEMA to see if they are interested in interacting with CWEMF on the flood plain benchmarking effort – Chris and Josue• Send an email to DWR asking for their thoughts on going to Asilomar – Elaine• Send out an email to the Steering Committee on By Law updating and then arrange for a phone call with whoever is participating on this. – Stacy
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Located at end of minutes.)
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Two motions passed, to increase the Executive Director’s salary by \$6,000 for the rest of the fiscal year.

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors report.
2. Minutes of the Jan. 17, 2014 Steering Committee meeting.
3. Treasurer’s Trial Balance
4. Six-page Annual Meeting 2014 Survey Results
5. Summary of Executive Director Hours for 2014.
6. Workshop Status Sheet
7. Workshop Survey Results

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

2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT – The IRS forms have been completed. The web site was moved from Earth Link to Blue Host, which has more band width and protection. A handout showing all expenses for the 2014 annual meeting was presented. The Director’s other comments are included in the topics discussed below.

3. SECRETARY’S REPORT –The minutes for the January 17, 2014 Steering Committee meeting were accepted today. The minutes needed some editorial changes, and these have been made.

4. TREASURER'S REPORT – There is \$188,000 total in our accounts, with \$134,000 in the general account, \$19,000 in the peer review account, and \$35,000 in our operating reserve account. A balance sheet showing all expenditures was handed out. A question arose as to what is to happen to the funds in the peer review account. The Executive Director is out of funds for her salary for the rest of the fiscal year (ending June 30). The Executive Director handed out a sheet showing how her hours had been spent during the fiscal year. Most of her time each year goes into preparing for and running the annual meeting. The Steering Committee officers have previously met and have recommended that \$5,000 be added to the Executive Director's salary for the rest of the fiscal year. A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve this \$5,000.

5. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS – A handout on workshop status was presented. Josue also presented a handout entitled "Workshop Survey Results" summarizing the attendee's comments on 13 items related to the C2VSIM, IWFM, IDC, and Ag Modeling Workshops. The workshops planned are as follows:

a. Integrated Regional Water Management – This workshop is being planned for early spring or summer.

b. Multi-dimensional Modeling –

c. PEST (Automatic Calibration of Generic Models) workshop – This is being planned for one workshop in Sacramento, and one in San Francisco. Tentative dates are for the fall.

d. C2VSIM – Planned for Fresno during May 8-9.

e. Agricultural Production – Has been completed.

6. CVP/IRP MODEL PEER REVIEW – Jobaid has been having discussions with DWR. The CVP/IRP model peer review will be deferred until 2017 or 2018. Jobaid will keep the discussions going in the interim.

7. MODEL USER GROUPS – (The Secretary has nothing in his notes on this.)

8. ANNUAL MEETING –

a. Financial Status – The net gain was \$47,596 (vs \$44,000 in 2013). 195 people registered. The Executive Director is tracking payments owed (about \$3200 is outstanding). We received \$4,900 from sponsors (vs \$3200 in 2013) that livened our events, so special thanks to them.

b. Food - There was some positive feedback on the lunches this year.

c. Needed Schedule Changes – The attendance at the Fischer Award ceremony was poor. The awarding of the Fischer Award, our premier event, needs to be changed so that more people attend. Perhaps have the award ceremony at the Monday luncheon, where luncheon is paid. For similar situations where we have a key note speaker make sure it is at a time when we know the

attendance will be good. Possibly have the speaker at the social session, where attendance is better and things are less formal. Have the poster session open at lunch on Tuesday.

d. Students – This event went well. Eleanor did a good job. We had seven students. To possibly improve on the event in the future get commitments from the students by giving them tasks. Possibly the students can get academic credit if they do a pop-up talk, present a poster, or fulfill a class assignment. One item noted in the mentoring between professional/student is that consultants can talk about the possibility of future jobs, whereas civil service agencies cannot (other than in general terms, especially in this economic climate).

e. Business Meeting – This was poorly attended. We need to change something. One possible suggestion was that if one attends the business meeting one can have free dinner and drinks. Perhaps try to link the business meeting with some event that has a lot of attraction.

f. Pop-Up Session – This had good attendance and lots of interest. Possibly in the future have the CWEMF annual achievements summarized in a pop-up talk, rather than at the business meeting.

g. Sessions with IEP - While we enjoy the joint session with IEP, this year's session could have been better. Next year we need to get more speakers to this session. Also, we need to better pin down what our financial commitments will be for this joint session. The problem seems to be that there are few CWEMF members at this joint session but lots of IEP members, and when the question comes to how to split the costs this becomes a question. A question arose as to whether we should have this joint session if few CWEMF members stick around. (As a reminder, this joint session is held so that modelers can learn of biologists concerns, and biologists can learn of modelers concerns. Also, biological modeling is growing in some areas, and so is of interest to CWEMF.)

h. Asilomar Discussion – The Executive Director and Nigel had a phone conversation with a staff person at Asilomar. Asilomar is interested in having us back. One past requirement of Asilomar that had caused us problems was that to be able to use the chapel in the evening an entity had to reserve 70 sleeping rooms, and to be able to use the Farr Room in the evening an entity had to reserve 50 sleeping rooms. We had trouble achieving this requirement in the past because we had attendees that wanted to stay off-site and not use an Asilomar sleeping room. During this phone conversion the Asilomar staff person suggested one thing we might try is to team up with another entity staying at Asilomar, where they would get the bulk of the sleeping rooms and we would get some sleeping rooms and the chapel. Or, it was mentioned at the Steering Committee meeting, we might want to go to Asilomar every third year. Someone today mentioned that we should send out an email to the membership seeing who would like to return to Asilomar. However, it was mentioned that the economy is still bad and attendance at Asilomar may be low. It was mentioned that we should sound out DWR and get their management's thoughts. Elaine will send an email to DWR asking for their thoughts on going to Asilomar, and have this as an agenda item at the next Steering Committee meeting.

9. DELTA MODELING SUMMIT – CWEMF had prepared an Action Plan with some suggestions for a summit. A meeting with some Delta Science Plan people and CWEMF people

occurred at the annual meeting. CWEMF is awaiting word from the DSP people on when they are ready to proceed with the summit.

10. NEXT STEPS IN BENCHMARKING –

a. Chris Bowles started by presenting results of his discussions on benchmarking with Professor Bill Fleenor of UCD at the recent CWEMF annual meeting. In any modeling application one must first scrutinize which models might fit an application. Then one can move into benchmarking considerations for those models. Professor Fleenor is preparing to do some benchmarking studies of models for FEMA (FEMA does flood plain mapping). At today's meeting it was discussed if it would be possible for CWEMF to interface with the UCD/FEMA effort in some manner on this study, and if so how? Perhaps a pilot study with UCD/FEMA/CWEMF could be done on benchmarking 2-D flood plain models.

b. If CWEMF was to get involved in the benchmarking effort on 2-D flood plain models, it would need funding from agencies that are involved in flood plain concerns. In this effort there would be administration costs, operational costs, developing the suite of case studies, etc. The vendors of the models would not be paid. One purpose of the benchmarking would be to test the vendor's claims for their models.

c. I think it was stated that Professor Fleenor would be asked to check with FEMA to see if they are interested in interacting with CWEMF on this effort, and CWEMF has to decide if it is interested and able in interacting with FEMA also. CWEMF has to determine if agencies are able to financially support CWEMF in this effort. If FEMA is interested in having CWEMF involved, and if agencies are able to financially support CWEMF, then a meeting should be arranged between UCD, FEMA, and CWEMF. It was stated that this benchmarking work would be about a one-year effort.

d. It was mentioned that CWEMF would need to form a sub-committee to identify funding sources, arrange for an expert panel to review the benchmark modeling results and to write up the report of findings, and get the payments paid to the panel. A question was raised as to whether FEMA could wait on their study until CWEMF finds out if it can get funding to participate or not. It is thought that the report of findings would be jointly published by UCD, FEMA, and CWEMF. It was mentioned that most likely a good symbiotic relationship exists between FEMA and CWEMF, as FEMA wants to ensure that the models used in flood plain mapping give reliable results (a purpose of CWEMF.)

e. A question arose as to whether the Corps of Engineer's HEC would have any interest in the benchmarking of the 2-D flood plain models that they have developed.

f. It would seem that if the benchmarking of 2-D flood plain models is done that the San Joaquin Restoration program would be very interested in the results. Such benchmarking would be of interest to other flood control agencies when they are presented with the claims of model vendors.

g. Most likely there would be two phases of the benchmarking work, as follows:

- a. Phase 1 – Put together the independent technical panel, formulate the structure of the benchmark tests, have the vendors run their models, and run the results past the technical panel.
- b. Phase 2 – Process the results, write the report, and disseminate the report.

h. The question now is are local agencies interested? Is DWR flood management interested, is HEC interested, is San Joaquin Valley Restoration interested, are regional flood management districts interested?

i. It was mentioned again to take a step back before any modeling work is done for any project to see if the models to be used are the correct types of models and dimensionality to answer the questions being asked. UCD has just completed a study for FEMA on this type of concern. CWEMF should look over this UCD report, and start from there in determining how to proceed on the benchmarking work.

j. The benchmarking for 2-D flood plain modeling could be a pilot. Benchmarking for other models could be done later.

k. Chris and Josue will talk to Professor Fleenor about some of the above items and report back to the Steering Committee. One big question is how will any delay caused by CWEMF becoming involved affect FEMA's schedule? CWEMF has to figure out how to target major agencies for funding. If FEMA is interested then CWEMF has to draft up a plan or strategy to present to the funding agencies.

l. So, some of the initial activities of CWEMF if it decides to proceed seem to be as follows:

- Professor Fleenor will be asked to check with FEMA to see if they are interested in interacting with CWEMF on this benchmarking effort.
- CWEMF has to decide if it is interested and able in interacting with FEMA.
- CWEMF has to determine if some agencies are able to financially support CWEMF in this effort.

If so, then a meeting should be arranged between UCD, FEMA, and CWEMF. Proceed from there.

11. CWEMF STRATEGIC PLAN AND BYLAWS –

a. Background - The final re-writing of these items have not yet been accomplished, mainly because CWEMF has not yet mapped out its goal for the future. This has proven to be a difficult task. At the past Steering Committee meeting in September 2013 an individual poll was taken of each member present on their thoughts on future goals, and the results varied widely. A large problem is that CWEMF is a volunteer agency without any agency funding (although dues are voluntarily given by some agencies, but are limited). Another problem is on who is eligible to vote on future goals. These problems have been bogging down the development of the new Strategic Plan and new By Laws.

b. By Laws – Stacy is chairing the development of the new By Laws. When we begin again on this topic, the past draft By Laws that Elaine and Paul developed will be used as a starting point. Stacy will send out an email to the Steering Committee and then arrange for a phone call with whoever is participating on this. (Note: a box was checked on the recent IRS form that was

submitted as part of our tax package that we changed our By Laws recently. This will have to be done again when we finalize our By Laws.)

c. Strategic Plan – We have a draft outline for our Strategic Plan. Last September the Steering Committee polled everyone in attendance on what our future goals should be. Past minutes of the Steering Committee may have other comments and ideas that were stated on this topic. These can be used as starting points on how to proceed with our plan. It was moved and seconded and passed to add another \$1,000 to the Executive Director’s contract for this fiscal year to begin drafting a Strategic Plan based on these past notes.

12. **OTHER BUSINESS** – The next Steering Committee meeting is on May 30 in Vacaville.

13. **ADJOURN** – 12:00 noon.

Respectfully Submitted
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Elaine Archibald	Executive Director	CWEMF
Marianne Guerin	Past-Convener	RMA
Josué Medellin	Vice-Convener	UCD
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engineering
George Nichol	Secretary	Public Member
Anne Huber		ICF
Fred Lee		GFLA
Paul Hutton		MWD

Phone: Jobaid Kabir (USBR), Lucinda Shih (CCWD), Chris Bowles (CBEC)

Proxies: Mike Deas (Watercourse Engineering)

<p>Parking Lot Items</p>	<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 • Strategic Plan - Develop
--------------------------	---

