

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For August 2, 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"> • Set up a budget subcommittee meeting on CWEMF’s budget - StacyTanaka. • Check on flexibility in changing the title of the groundwater peer review final report – Jobaid Kabir. • Finish review of groundwater peer review report – subcommittee. • See if funding is available for peer review of CVP/IRP models – Rich Juricich and Jobaid Kabir) • Develop a Scope of Work for the CVP/IRP model peer review – Jobaid Kabir and Rich Juricich. • Send the groundwater peer review Scope of Work and a link to the CWEMF peer review guidelines to Jobaid Kadir and Rich Juricich– Elaine Archibald • Send Elaine an electronic version of the survey he developed to determine if there is interest in doing a workshop on the IWFM/IDC model and another C2VSIM workshop – Tariq Kadir. • Send Tariq’s survey (above) to the CWEMF’s large email distribution list – Elaine Archibald. • Develop a survey to determine if there is interest in an agricultural water use modeling workshop – Josue Medellin. • Retain the “Calif. Water Plan related action to support CWEMF” recommendation in updating its Year 2000 Modeling Protocols document – Rich Juricich. • Review the Calif. Water Plan actions related to Data, Analysis, and Decision-Support Tools (Table 8-10) and Chapter 6 Integrated Data and Analysis and provide any comments to Rich Juricich by Aug. 16 – Steering Committee members. • Meet with Chris Enright to discuss plans for the Modeling Summit workshop that Chris and Peter Goodwin have proposed – Delta Science Plan sub-group. • Review the August 2 Steering Committee minutes ahead of time so we don’t have to devote a lot of time at the Sept. 20 meeting to discuss the minutes – Steering Committee.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay until 1:30 pm at the Sept. 20 Steering Committee meeting to discuss the Strategic Plan – Steering Committee. • Send out an email to see who wants to serve on the Modeling Summit workshop – Ben Bray
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Moved to end of minutes.)
Motions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Directors report.
2. Financial Trial Balance
3. End of Fiscal Year 2012 Treasurer’s Report.
4. Draft Strategic Plan for 2013-2014
5. Modeling for System Understanding and Investigating Alternative Delta Futures: A Draft Charge to CWEMF for Organizing a “Modeling Summit” (workshop) – from Enright.
6. Draft Chapter 6 of California Water Plan: Integrated Data and Analysis: Informed and Transparent Decision Making – from Juricich.
7. Table 8-10 from the California Water Plan – from Juricich..
8. Modeling in the Delta Science Plan: A Way Forward (developed from the Sudwerk’s special session)
9. CWEMF Survey on Facilitating IWFM/IDC and C2VSIM Workshops by DWR – from Kadir.
10. Status of CWEMF workshops.

1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM – The meeting was opened with 12 persons in attendance and eight persons on the phone. A quorum was declared.

2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT – The Executive Director said that all annual meeting sessions are posted. Her other comments are included in the appropriate topics discussed below.

3. SECRETARY’S REPORT –The minutes for the May 17, 2013 Steering Committee meeting passed unanimously today.

4. TREASURER’S REPORT – Our 2012 fiscal year (July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013), just ended. Revenues exceeded expenses during this period. The question arose as to how much money can be accumulated as a non-profit organization. This is something that should be determined. The finance subcommittee will meet soon. Stacy will start getting the tax forms ready soon.

5. GROUND WATER COMPARATIVE PEER REVIEW –

a. CVP/IRP Model - Before the groundwater peer review was discussed a side issue came up. There was some discussion of a potential peer review of model that is of current interest to both the USBR and DWR. This is the “CVP/IRP Model” for basin studies. The review should be done

within the next 6-12 months. A question arose as to the cost of such a peer review. The USBR said they might be able to come up with \$20,000 for their contribution to such a review. Rich Juricich said he will check and see if DWR can come up with some funding also. A question arose as to whether this would be an applications review. Apparently CH2M-Hill was primarily responsible for developing the model. In using the CVP/IRP Model the WEAP Model was used for hydrology and demand. The CVP/IRP Model is linked to Cal Lite. The CVP/IRP Model has been used to test management strategies, for power generation, for water temperature, and for management responses.

The WEAP/Cal Lite combination also needs an applications peer review. A simulation period of 2005-2100 was run for climate change scenarios. The capabilities of this model are hydro-power, water temperature, management scenarios, and economics.

It was mentioned that we need a hard copy proposal of what is being proposed above for a CVP/IRP review, in time for the next Steering Committee meeting. This should include the funds which might be available, and the time frame needed. Jobaid Kabir and Rich Juricich will work together on putting together this proposal.

b. Groundwater Peer Review - Back to the groundwater peer review, the final draft was submitted to the subcommittee last week. Some discussion ensued as to what the final title of the report should be. Jobaid will check with his USBR people on restrictions for the title. Ben will contact Jobaid and/or Mike Tansey with the subcommittee's recommendations for the title. During the next week or two the subcommittee will review the final draft report and have a conference call on any comments. Marianne will send out an email asking for a time when the subcommittee can participate in this conference call.

6. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –

a. IWFM/IDC and C2VSIM workshops – Tariq Kadir presented a handout he had prepared on these workshops. The DWR is interested in two workshops being facilitated by CWEMF, these being C2VSIM and IWFM/IDC. (IDC stands for IWFM demand calculator.) It was suggested that CWEMF do a survey to determine the interest in having these workshops, and if the time frame of mid-October to December is good. The IWFM/IDC workshop will be a four-day workshop (or two two-day workshops), most likely held in Sacramento. The C2VSIM workshop will be a two-day workshop (like the one last January), most likely held near Fresno or Merced. These models could be used to develop sub-regional models by some. Elaine will send out a questionnaire to the CWEMF large mailing list asking the above questions, along with other information contained in Tariq's handout.

b. Hobbes – Josue Medellin Azuara reported that he would like to do a CWEMF workshop on Hobbes next spring.

c. Agricultural Water Use Modeling – Josue will prepare a survey to determine if there is enough interest in a workshop on this topic.

d. Delta Water Quality Modeling – It was mentioned that at the last meeting of the BDCP it was stated that there were no plans for water quality modeling. An opinion expressed at today’s Steering Committee meeting is that the latest BDCP EIR does not adequately address water quality.

7. MODEL USERS GROUPS – The DSM2 newsletter came out yesterday, and was very well received. An IWF/IDC user’s group meeting was held on July 18 by webex, with 13 people participating.

8. CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN –

a. Table 8-10 - Rich Juricich and Kamyar Guivetchi presented this over the phone. The draft California Water Plan will be out on Sept. 1. They had two handouts which were discussed at the meeting. One handout was a Table 8-10 from the Water Plan, entitled “Related Actions and Performance Measures for Objective 10 (Improve Data, Analysis, and Decision-Support Tools). Item #3 of Table 8-10 lists the following action “*Support CWEMF in updating its Year 2000 modeling protocols and standards to provide more current guidance to water stakeholders and decision-makers, and their technical staff as models are developed and used to solve California’s water and environmental problems*”.

Rich Juricich and Kamyar would like any comments and suggested edits that CWEMF members may have on the above language of Item #3, and any of the other ten items listed in the table, and they asked whether CWEMF’s modeling protocols document is still current? Rich Satkowski said that CWEMF had tried to get CALFED grant funding in years past to expand our modeling protocols guidelines in the document, but the grant was not obtained. So this task still needs to be done, which will take time and funding. Someone at the meeting remembered an estimated sum of \$25,000 as being needed back when the CALFED grant was proposed. A CWEMF member suggested that this is still a worthwhile project, and recommended it be kept as a recommendation in the California Water Plan.

b. Chapter 6 - The second handout was Chapter 6 from the California Water Plan, entitled “Integrated Data and Analysis: Informed and Transparent Decision-Making”. A part of this handout discusses how to provide effective analytical tools, and establishing modeling protocols and standards. CWEMF was asked to comment on this as well, time permitting. Rich Juricich will send this chapter in WORD format to Elaine, and she will forward it to the Steering Committee for anyone to make comments as desired. Any comments here are also due by August 16. Send any comments to Rich Juricich.

9. DELTA SCIENCE PLAN – Eleanor described the document produced by a CWEMF sub-committee (Modeling in the Delta Science Plan: A Way Forward) that was produced from the meeting between CWEMF and DSP personnel at the annual meeting. At today’s meeting Chris Enright of the Delta Science Program expressed his appreciation for CWEMF’s work on this. Chris would like to follow this up with a workshop, with the possibility of producing a white paper for peer review on this topic. In his handout Chris stated that the DSP would like to partner with CWEMF to hold a “modeling summit” workshop to envision modeling systems that are

responsive to emerging science and management questions. The DSP can do a lot of the leg work in setting this workshop up.

The Delta Science Plan is in development, with the first draft out and two more drafts anticipated. The next draft will be out in December or January. Dr. Peter Goodwin would like an 8-hour modeling summit, as described above, prior to the next draft coming out. The DSP would fund this workshop. For this workshop it was suggested to have formative talks in the morning, going right to the problems in the Delta, and then in the afternoon do something creative such as rallying around actual questions but staying away from abstract theory. (A typical question might be “what do fish respond to: water temperature, velocity, and time schedule for each attribute.) Try to develop the questions as well as possible. Perhaps discuss what institutional arrangement is needed to address the questions and problems. In the afternoon perhaps break into three groups, with each group writing an outline for a program for model development and integration. For overarching questions, determine what modeling system is needed.

Chris mentioned the big divide between doing modeling and preparing the output graphs and the answers that decision makers need. Chris mentioned that we also need to work better across skill sets. We do too many things ad-hoc. We need a program that is not just modelers, but that includes operators, contract writers, biologists, decision-makers, etc. (Randy Fiorini and Kamyar Guivetchi were suggested as key policy people who should be invited.) So, for the above modeling summit, have these other disciplines come. We need to determine what is possible both technically and politically. Rich Juricich mentioned past shared vision modeling that was done that addressed some of these issues. Rich said the Corp of Engineer’s Institute for Water Resources has done work on shared-vision modeling, and perhaps they could be invited to speak at the morning session of the summit workshop.

Paul Hutton suggested categorizing the questions, describing the decision support system needed for each category, and then determining the decision-maker for each category of questions.

The DSP workshop subcommittee will work with DSP personnel in setting up this workshop. Ben will send out an email to see who else wants to be on the subcommittee.

10. CWEMF STRATEGIC PLAN – The following questions arose:

- Do we want to stay at the current level of activity;
- do we want the current level of volunteers;
- how can we get more volunteers;
- how can we get grant funding;
- should we try to join forces with the IEP to get funding;
- should we launch into larger efforts;
- do we want new activities beyond workshops and peer reviews;
- how can we be self-sufficient for funding;
- how can we expand;
- how should we use the funds we have accumulated in the last few years;
- should we develop a database of models;
- should we try to enter into a strategic partnership with the Water Education Foundation or Delta Science Program or others;

- what will be the Delta Science Program’s emphasis after Peter Goodwin leaves?
- Should we have special workshops by seeking collaboration, if it supports our mission;

The DSP is aware of some of our concerns above, and realizes that we are a volunteer organization. But if CWEMF does not fill the modeling needs of the DSP, then who would? The DSP has been attracted to CWEMF because of CWEMF’s past activities. The DSP feels that if the need is there, then funding will be there.

Tom Pate of SCWA said that the Solano County Water Agency has an Independent Science Panel that guides them on what activities to pursue, which serves to some extent as their strategic plan. Someone mentioned that perhaps we ought to strengthen our existing activities rather than develop new ones. Think back to why CWEMF was formed originally. While the annual meeting at Folsom seems to be working for most, it does not foster the networking atmosphere of Asilomar. How can we re-create the Asilomar atmosphere?

There was lots of discussion on what do we want CWEMF to be. Do we want CWEMF to be the “Go-To” group on modeling? Our mission statement does not say this. There was some discussion regarding the need to vote on accepting any new Strategic Plan, and that we need to update our bylaws before voting on a Strategic Plan. Who can vote will be very important. This presents us with a problem since the new bylaws have been tabled until the new Strategic Plan is completed. It was mentioned that agency managers look at our Strategic Plan and Mission Statement in determining whether to send people to CWEMF meetings.

We have a healthy bank balance which can be spent on new or existing projects – can we still claim to be a non-profit if we don’t use our “profits”? We’ve made money the last several years.

Tom Pate suggested that since the Strategic Plan took lots of time today and is such an important topic, why not have a separate session just on the new Strategic Plan? Or spend an extra hour at the next Steering Committee meeting.

11. **OTHER BUSINESS** – Marianne Guerin of RMA is developing a partnership with Jamie Anderson of DWR to develop educational videos on “How the Delta Works”, incorporating modeling and visualization. John de George of RMA will assist with data visualization videos.

12. **ADJOURN** – 12 noon. Next meeting is scheduled for September 20, 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
Paul Hutton
Eleanor Bartolomeo
Anne Huber
Thomas Pate
Tariq Kadir
Bori Touray

Secretary

Public Member
MWD
SWRCB
ICF
SCWA
DWR
Parsons Brinkerhoff

Phone: Jobaid Kabir (USBR), Lucinda Shih (CCWD), Rich Satkowski (SWRCB), Rich Juricich (DWR), Kamyar Guivetchi, (DWR), Fred Lee (GFLA), Erik Reyes (DWR), Chris Enright (DSP)

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
-------------------	--