

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For May 17, 2019

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

Major Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine if our current Action Items are still relevant in achieving our Strategic Plan goals Rich and Ben G. • Check on the cost of additional facilities at LNI (such as a room for work, conversation networking, lunch sitting, etc.) for the annual meeting. – Paul • Check with Mike Anderson of DWR on how to prepare quality slides – Abdul • Develop or modify a Guideline for Presenter’s Package for the annual meeting – Josue and Abdul • Develop or modify a Guideline for Moderator’s Package for the annual meeting –Josue and Abdul • Send an email showing proposed alternate structures for having future annual meeting sessi (three track sessions, plenary session, etc.) – Paul • Write up a description to make it clearer in our annual meeting registration packet the relationship between and benefits of the registration fee and the membership fee – Stacy • Write up a suggestion on what the annual meeting registration costs should be for members NGOs, students, etc. - Stacy • Develop a scope of work, list of deliverables, and timeline for the work to be done on the Modeling Protocols revision by the UCD graduate students – Modeling Protocols revision subcommittee • Send an email on how the cost of living adjustments have changed over the past ten years to see how this could affect our contract with Tetra Tech for Paul’s Executive Director service Stacy • Renew Tetra Tech’s contract for Paul by June 30 – Shyamal and Stacy.
Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Located at end of minutes.)
Motions Passed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An amount of \$10,000 was granted for the UCD students to start work on the Modeling Protocols revision,

REFERENCES HANDED OUT:

1. Executive Director’s Report.
2. Initiatives/Relevance Standing Committee Report
3. Budget and Bylaws Standing Committee Report
4. Secretary’s Report (Draft Minutes of the March 15, 2019 meeting).

5. CWEMF Executive Director Recommendations for 2019-2020

1. INTRODUCTIONS/DESIGNATION OF QUORUM – Introductions were made. Sixteen persons are present, and four are on the phone. A quorum was declared.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Executive Director’s Report – The Executive Director reminded everyone to review the attachments to the agenda before the meeting, as this would save time during the meeting. He described his progress on collecting the dues from the member agencies. The Executive Director’s other comments for this meeting are included in the items below.

b. Secretary’s Report – A motion passed to accept the minutes for the March 15, 2019 Steering Committee meeting.

c. Treasurer’s Report – Reference was made to see Attachment 2.3 on our funding status.

d. Education/Peer Review Standing Committee Report – A scholarship is proposed for students and post-docs.. The scholarship would consist of three awards. The scholarship would be for \$3,000/year to start. Josue will have a full proposal to present at the next Steering Committee meeting. Josue is asking for volunteers to help on this.

e. Website Standing Committee Report – The website activities are discussed in Item 10 below.

f. Initiatives/Relevance Standing Committee Report – Our Standing Committees are aligned with our Strategic Plan. Let’s think about projects we want to undertake. Are our Action Items (to achieve the Strategic Plan goals) still relevant? Rich and Ben G. are working on this.

g. Budget/Bylaws Standing Committee Report – Work on the Parking Lot items. Let Anne know of any new items needing attention.

ACTION ITEMS

3. ANNUAL MEETING RECAP –

a. Attendance and Financial Overview – We had a record-breaking attendance of 240 persons (compared to 180 – 210 for past years). PayPal is helping in that there are less delinquents in paying the registration fees.

b. Survey Results – Survey Monkey was used, with 109 responses. Attendees are only luke-warm for having a hot lunch. But there were complaints on the contents of the box lunches, and lack of enough places to sit outside. Should we set up tables for eating outside in the future? The IEP uses three rooms for their annual conference, with two rooms for presentations and a third room for slide-checking and having private conversations. Should we rent the pavilion room to have as a third room? Paul will check on the costs of additional facilities at LNI (a room for

work, for conversation networking, lunch sitting, etc.) Because of size limits should we keep our annual meeting at LNI? If we linked with the IEPs annual meeting we would be pushing the size limits of the facilities there. In our recent annual meeting at LNI our presentation rooms were full to capacity.

c. Presentations –

(1). Quality of Slides - There was some discussion on the quality of speaker's presentations. There was too much information on some of the slides. How can we have previews of the slides and mentor the speakers on this? We need guidelines on this for moderators and presenters that we can send out ahead of time. In here perhaps have a picture of what a good slide looks like. The IEP has a set of speaker guidelines. Just show what is important on the slides. Should we have a workshop on preparing presentations, with facilitators? The presenters need to have the ability to communicate with both engineers and policy makers. Abdul will discuss this problem with Mike Anderson of DWR, who has communications training. Perhaps we should bring up this issue with the organizations who are sponsoring the presenters. Suggest mentoring within the organizations. Also consider having dry-runs of the presentations with feedback. Nicky mentioned that our new projectors cannot capture all of the detail on some of the slides. This can affect the quality of the screen castings. It was also suggested that we limit each session to four speakers, or the quality goes down.

(2) Abstracts - There was some discussion on the abstracts that we receive. Consider not accepting abstracts if there is not a message to get across. We're transitioning to open call for papers, rather than take any papers received. Be stricter on when abstracts are due, so our moderators have time to review them and report back (have a strict due date for abstracts). If speakers cannot get their abstracts in on time suggest that they do a pop-up talk. Let speakers know we have people who can help advise on slide preparation. Speakers usually bring their slides on their flash drives on the day of their presentations, and may have been updating the slides up to that day. Suggest to the agencies and consultant companies who are sending the speaker oversee the quality of the slides. The speaker could provide draft slides, and change them later if needed. The Moderator needs to be the police on this. Consider giving an award for the best Moderator. The function of the abstract is so the modeling sub-committee can determine which presentations should go to the full session or to the poster session. Josue's Education/Peer Review Standing Committee will consider how to handle the above considerations. Josue will work with Abdul in modifying the Guideline for Moderators Package and the Guidelines for Presenters Package. We discussed the possibility of having a session on how to make presentations. We also discussed the possibility of having a webinar on presentations for speakers. Someone mentioned that YouTube already has this. We could have a workshop and a webinar on how to do proper presentations. Nicky knows of how the Bay-Delta Science Conference manages presentations.

(3) Structure for Annual Meeting - There was some discussion on how many presentation tracks we should have, and on if and when to have plenary sessions (beginning and ending of annual meeting), welcome, awards, and the key speaker. Three tracks would allow us to expand into additional desired presentations (i.e. water quality, watersheds, agricultural models, etc.) Whereas before attendees could not attend all of their desired sessions in a three-track system, now with our screen casting, all of the sessions can be seen at a later date. The plenary sessions help in the sense of belonging. The Bay-Delta Science Conference has a call for sessions, as well

as for speakers. It was suggested that we put out a call for sessions. In addition to our typical sessions we could suggest economic modeling, agricultural modeling, watershed modeling, etc. Paul will put together an email showing alternate ways of having future annual meeting sessions considering the above (three track sessions, plenary session, etc.). Then the Steering Committee can vote on it at the next meeting.

(4) Registration Costs – It was mentioned that we need to make clearer in our annual meeting registration packet the relationship between the registration fee (\$400) and the membership fee (\$100). We also need to clarify the costs for attendance for NGOs and non-profits. Point out the benefits of membership, such as being able to log in to our web site and see the screen castings and recordings of speaker's presentations from the annual meeting and workshops. In our next survey, ask who is paying out of their own pocket for registration. Define what a student is. Stacy will write up what the registration costs are for members, NGOs, and students, and the Steering Committee will consider this at the next meeting.

d. Audio-Visual – This is being handled by Nicky. The annual meeting power points will be posted on our web site for all to see, but the recordings will only be on the member-only web site. Nicky has 90% of the presentations now and will post them and post the others later. Nicky is considering putting a link between the power points and recordings, but this would only be available to those with membership. For future annual meetings Nicky needs set-up time before the sessions start. The evening before would be best. This would require LNI to provide access. Otherwise there is too much interference and confusion by speakers as he gets started. The mic on the collar is working well. A motion was made and passed to provide Nicky with a hotel room for Sunday and Monday if needed to set up.

4. MODELING PROTOCOLS –

Rich went through the suggested calendar for updating the Protocols. He mentioned the funding discussion of the Steering Committee of several years ago for \$20,000 - \$50,000 for the updating. The potential use of UCD graduate students to help in the updating was mentioned (their work would start with doing literature reviews and interviewing modelers and their managers to address a list of items that the protocols subcommittee would like covered). An amount of \$10,000 is being asked for consideration now to fund the graduate students. The question arose as to why limit the use of grad students to UCD. It was mentioned this was because UCD has been active with CWEMF and the proximity of UCD to most modelers. Some desired results of the interviews would be on how models have solved problems in real examples, how the modeling study was designed, how the results were presented, how questions were formulated for the model study, what were the boundary conditions, and how the modeling team was set up.

The question arose as to how were our original Protocols used over the past years. They were used in some cases, but not referenced. Jay Lund used them in some of his classes at UCD. The State Water Board used them to understand the role of documentation. A revised Protocols document will be of benefit because of the expansion of modeling knowledge over the past years, the open sharing of models is increasing, and the desire for modeling transparency.

There was some discussion on making sure to include any new data and database requirements resulting from the new AB1755 Bill “Open and Transparent Water Data Act”. Our revised Protocols document will discuss model input data, and the Glossary will cover what data is. A motion was made to set up a contract with UCD to utilize the graduate students for the above beginning tasks. In the discussion the question was asked where is our scope of work for this task, and what are our deliverables and time line. Also discussed was how the CWEMF revised Protocols document and the DSP’s protocols documents currently being formulated by Tetra Tech are different. The CWEMF document would cover general modeling, while the DSP document would cover integrated modeling. The Steering Committee stipulated that we would take a vote on this \$10,000 expenditure now but that the protocols subcommittee should develop a one-page scope of work and list of deliverables and time line soon for the Steering Committee so that they know more of the details. The vote passed unanimously.

6. PROPOSAL FOR CWEMF STUDENT SCHOLARSHIPS – See Item 2(d) above.

7. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2019-2020.

a. Web Site - Paul would like to do a comprehensive review of our web site. A consultant would be hired to do this. We need to think of how users interact with the web site. Where are our deficiencies? We need to increase our visibility. We need a web site subcommittee. Look at the DSPs web site for a good example. Have a consultant develop our web site, then have the web site subcommittee maintain it.

b. CWEMF History – Write up our history and put it on the web site.

c. Administrative Policies – Paul would like to have clearly defined policies related to membership, the annual meeting, and workshops. Put these into writing. We can then take these to our individual agencies in case they ask.

d. Change banking from River City to Golden One – It is easier to get to Golden One’s many branches to conduct our business.

e. Consider modifying Annual Meeting format - There was some discussion on changing the format of the annual meeting. This would possibly include a plenary session and a three-track presentation structure. This was discussed above

8. PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH STANDING WORKSHOP SUBCOMMITTEE

In the past the overall organization of workshops was the task of the Vice-Convener. Workshops take a lot of work. Running the audio-visual takes work. We would like to have more workshops. We need more ideas on workshops. A standing workshop committee would help in this regard. It was suggested to provide a stipend for running a workshop. We will discuss this more at the next Steering Committee meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

9. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS - The IDC workshop was completed on May 1. The IWFM workshop is scheduled for June 7. Workshops scheduled for the fall are C2VSIM and Leadership and Communication. A Bulletin 74 (Well Standards) workshop is coming up, which may be of interest to some.

10. WEBSITE UPDATE - The screen castings of the annual meeting have been edited and posted onto the website.

11. MODEL USER GROUPS – A Delta Model Users Group was held 2 weeks ago, for 3 hours. There were 25 people present.

12. OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Action Plan – It was suggested that we review our Action Plan to see if it is still current.
- b. Executive Director Contract – It was suggested that we consider hourly rates in our contract with Tetra Tech rather than having a lump sum contract. Also, it was suggested that we make a cost of living adjustment to the contract, as that has not been done for years (estimated to be since 2003). The number of hours that we have for Paul’s time are OK, it is just the cost of living adjustment that needs consideration. Stacy will send an email to the Steering Committee with information on cost of living adjustments used by others. Shyamal and Stacy will work on this together with Paul. The Steering Committee is to select a cost of living adjustment to use (by email) by June 30.

10. NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING – July 19, 2019

11. ADJOURN – 12:30 pm

Respectfully Submitted
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Shyamal Chowdhury	Convener	Corps of Engineers
Paul Hutton	Executive Director	Tetra Tech
Tariq Kadir	Past Convener	DWR
Stacy Tanaka	Treasurer	Watercourse Engineers
George Nichol	Secretary	Public Member
Ben Bray		EBMUD
Nicky Sandhu		DWR
Anne Huber		ICF
Chuching Wang		MWD
Will Anderson		SWRCB
Jon Traum		USGS
Ben Geske		DSP
John DeGeorge		RMA
Rich Satkowski		Public Member

Derek Roberts
Hubert Morel-Seytoux

CCWD
Hydroprose

On Phone: Abdul Khan (DWR), Josue Medellin (UCM), Mike Deas (Watercourse Engineering), Kijin Nam (DWR)

Parking Lot Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Multi-Year Budget – Prepare a draft.• Peer Review Process - Development of peer review administrative process.• Financial Transparency – Determine how best to show our financial transparency to outsiders.• Operating Reserve – determine how much we should keep in this Reserve.• Equipment Inventory – Needs to be updated.
-------------------	--