CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For May 30, 2014

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

Decisions	
Action Items	 Have a phone call to set up a Forecasting workshop - Peter Vorster, Josue, Ben, and Tariq. Have a phone call to follow up on next steps for benchmarking efforts – Chris Bowles, Josue, George, interested others. Follow up on Asilomar's proposal to us on having the 2015 annual meeting there - Elaine
Parking Lot Items	• (Located at end of minutes.)
Motions	 A motion was passed to have the Executive Director salary at \$35,000, starting on July 1, 2014. A motion was passed to accept the proposed 2014 budget of \$56,000. A motion passed to allocate up to \$16,000 for expenses consisting of compensation for the Executive Director plus ancillary expenses to focus on developing a Strategic Plan for CWEMF during the period of June 1 – September 30, 2014.

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

- 1. Executive Directors report.
- 2. Minutes of the March 21, 2014 Steering Committee meeting.
- 3. Treasurer's Trail Balance
- 4. Proposed Fiscal Year 2014 Budget
- 5. Workshop Opportunities
- 6. Preliminary Costs/Revenues for 3-day PEST Training Class for the fall.

1. **INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM** – The meeting was opened by Ben with 12 persons in attendance and 4 persons on the phone. A quorum was declared.

2. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT** – The web site has been moved to Blue Host, with a three-year subscription. This web site has a limit of 50 persons per email, so when the entire mail list is sent something this will take several submittals. The Director's other comments are included in the topics discussed below.

3. **SECRETARY'S REPORT** –The minutes for the March 21, 2014 Steering Committee meeting were accepted today.

4. TREASURER'S REPORT – There is \$175,000 total in the bank, of which \$123,000 is in the general fund, \$17,000 is in the peer review fund, and \$35,000 is in the operating reserve fund. The 2013 fiscal year ends June 30.

5. **PROPOSED BUDGET** – The total proposed budget for 2014 is \$56,000. The budget subcommittee has recommended an Executive Director compensation of \$35,000 for the Fiscal Year 2014 (starting July 1, 2014). This is about what the actual costs have been for the past several years, so the increase was approved. Any special projects that the Executive Director is asked to do beyond the normal tasks (which have been previously defined, such as supporting four workshops) would be at additional compensation. A motion was made, discussed, and seconded to have the Executive Director salary at \$35,000, starting on July 1, 2014, and with special projects at addition compensation to be determined. Passed unanimously. A second motion was made, discussed, and seconded to accept the proposed 2014 budget as shown in Attachment 5-1 of the Executive Director's report, which is set at \$56,000. Passed unanimously.

The budget subcommittee had also proposed allocating up to \$16,000 for expenses consisting of compensation for the Executive Director plus ancillary expenses to focus on developing a Strategic Plan for CWEMF during the period of June 1 – September 30, 2014. It was mentioned that if CWEMF wants to do specific projects in the future, it needs a Strategic Plan. The deliverable for this task would be a draft Strategic Plan to send to the General Membership for their comment before the next annual meeting, and then to have the Strategic Plan as a topic at the annual meeting. Someone mentioned to check out the Solano Irrigation District's Strategic Plan. A motion was made, discussed, and seconded to allocate up to \$16,000 for the development of the CWEMF draft Strategic Plan from June 1 – September 30, 2014. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

6. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS -

The C2VSIM workshop was held at CSU Fresno, with Charles Brush of DWR presiding. The PEST workshop will be held from September 16-18, 2014. The cost for the trainers will be \$8267. This will be a hands-on workshop. Try to keep the attendance at 20 persons max. Announce this workshop in late June. See the PEST website home page for a good article entitled "Use of Models in Environmental Decision Making". Tariq will put a link to the PEST website in his workshop notification. Set the registration deadline at July 25. It was decided to set the individual cost at \$600, to pay for the trainers.

Regarding the upcoming Forecasting Workshop, it was mentioned that forecasting methods vary widely between agencies, with big changes coming up. Hence the need for a workshop. Peter Vorster, Josue, Ben, and Tariq will have a phone call to discuss this workshop in more detail. This workshop will include natural vs impaired flows, forecasting methodologies, Bulletin 120, planning models, forecasting models, and other items. Current and in-development methodologies will be discussed.

7. **ANNUAL MEETING** – The Asilomar Conference Center in Pacific Grove is putting out feelers to CWEMF to see if they can get us back there for our annual meeting. They are solving one of the large problems that we had in the past, that being that we had to reserve lots of

individual cabins in order to get the desired chapel as our evening meeting place. In the past we could not reserve lots of individual cabins because lots of our people wanted to stay off-site where they could do work in the evenings on the Internet (however, the individual cabins at Asilomar now have Internet capabilities). However, Asilomar said that if we want to come the week of March 27-April 1 that we could have the chapel without the need to reserve lots of individual cabins (that is because the large quilting group is there at that time and reserves lots of individual cabins without wanting to use the chapel. Our second evening meeting room would be a room off of the dining hall (we used this room about 10 years ago). Elaine will check on the capacity of this dining hall room.

So, our discussion today was on whether we could get agency management support to go to Asilomar, say once every three years during these trying budget times. Since we went to Folsom for the past two years, this third year might be considered for Asilomar. Initial feedback at today's discussion and previous discussions was that the USBR, DWR, and SWRCB could send some people, such as presenters and poster presenters and maybe a few more, but could not send as many people as if the meeting was at Folsom. We had some discussion as to how many participants were needed in order to make the revenue that we would need to meet out expenses, but this issue was not resolved. Many at the Steering Committee today were in favor of this Asilomar possibility, because of the networking opportunity at the evening meetings that has not occurred to any large degree at Folsom. Elaine will talk further to Asilomar and bring back additional information at the July Steering Committee meeting.

8. **MODEL USER GROUPS** – Paul and Eli gave salinity discussions at the last DSM2 user group. A DSM2 newsletter will be coming out soon.

9. DELTA MODELING SUMMIT - Chris Enright of the Delta Science Panel gave us a briefing on the purpose of the upcoming Delta Modeling Summit workshop. The Delta Science Plan has a section on modeling. The Delta Modeling Summit workshop is still being planned for September 2014. This will build on the recent Delta Data Summit workshop. An emphasis is on how to better solve the Delta's problems. Connect the models with the data. The focus of the Modeling Summit will be on water supply modeling, emergency management modeling, and environmental modeling. One modeling concern is that the way modelers work together as groups needs to be improved. How will bathymetry changes and high friction changes in the Delta channels affect results? What if massive changes occur in the Delta? What will happen if ecosystems cascade? We have not made the leap yet on how physical, chemical, and biological changes will affect ecosystem responses. Engineers and biologists need to work together better. We need multi-disciplinary experts to come together on this. More efficient modeling sensitivity analyses are needed. How does the Biological Opinion affect all of this? It is envisioned that the Modeling Summit will consist of one-half day of talks and one-half day of discussion, followed by development of a business plan. (See what type of product results from the Data Summit workshop, and perhaps use that as a guide for the Modeling Summit workshop product.) Hopefully one result of the Modeling Summit workshop will be on how to develop interoperable models, and how to do the analyses for these models. Landscape-scale visioning is needed.

The upcoming National Environmental Engineering Conference on Modeling is coming to San Diego in June. The topics will cover shared models, parallel simulations, cloud usage, dealing with complexities, decision support systems, and other topics.

10. **NEXT STEPS IN BENCHMARKING** – Chris Bowles gave us an update on this topic. Chris was highly supportive of what Chris Enright had said above. Chris Bowles mentioned that a past problem in Delta modeling is that hydrodynamics modeling (necessarily having to be done first) is so expensive that frequently the money runs out, and so that follow-up ecosystem response modeling to the hydrodynamic scenario under consideration has not yet been done to any large extent. Chris mentioned that model selection processes in the Delta are frequently adhoc.

Chris mentioned that the FEMA/UCD report that was recently completed and mentioned at the last Steering Committee meeting was focused on determining the questions one needs to answer in a modeling study and on the types of questions that should be asked of two-dimensional models, and was not specifically addressing flood plain models.

Regarding the upcoming FEMA/UCD flood plain model study, the three model codes being reviewed are Tech Route 2-D, Flow 2-D, and CCHG. These are the codes that Chris is suggesting be used for the benchmarking study that CWEMF might get involved with, assuming that an agreement can be made between FEMA, UCD, and CWEMF. Once some benchmarking success has been achieved with the flood plain models then the benchmarking task can be expanded to the Delta.

The proposal, if it proceeds, is now a five step process, as follows:

(1). UCD will do project management and administration. Either UCD or CWEMF will do the design of the benchmarking.

(2). Form an expert panel. No vendors. Formulate the benchmarking tests needed. The flood plain models will include areas with high velocity and high friction. Have a levee breech scenario. Have the vendors perform the modeling needed. Review the results.

(3). UCD disseminate the results to the expert panel and other interested parties.

(4). The expert panel furnishes its draft report to UCD, and other comments from interested parties are returned to UCD.

(5). The expert panel reconvenes and gives out its final report. UCD disseminates this final report.

If FEMA and UCD proceed without the CWEMF benchmarking test, there would be no knowledge of the comparability between the codes for various flooding situations. So, where do we go from here? Is FEMA interested in teaming with CWEMF? We could put together a proposal and shop around for funding. See if some of the larger modeling agencies such as the USBR and DWR would be interested in providing some of the funding needed. The deliverable from this study would be the expert panel report. If we proceed we would need to get together the flooding conditions that the models would have to address. We could put this question onto our web site and ask for input on the conditions that people would like to have covered.

Regarding the length of time that such a benchmarking effort would take, in England Professor Nigel Wright did a benchmarking study that lasted about one year. It was decided today that our benchmarking subcommittee (Chris, Josue, George, who else?) would get together in a couple of weeks on the phone and decide how to proceed on this effort.

11. **OTHER BUSINESS** – None. We will proceed into the development of the Strategic Plan today after the lunch break.

12. **ADJOURN** – 12 noon.

Respectfully Submitted George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

<u>ATTENDANCE</u>		
Ben Bray	Convener	East Bay MUD
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
Tariq Kadir		DWR
Yuan Lin		CCWD
Eleanor Bartolomeo		SWRCB
Mike Deas		Watercourse Engineering

Phone: Chris Bowles (CBEC), Peter Vorster (TBI), Erik Reyes (DWR), Craig xxxx

Proxies: None

	• Multi-Year Budget – Prepare a draft.
Parking Lot Items	• 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.
	 Bylaw Changes – Develop a proposal for updating the Bylaws
	• Determine how much money can be accumulated as a non- profit organization
	• Strategic Plan - Revise