



CALSIM II in California's Water Community: Musings on a Model

Inês C. Ferreira, Stacy K. Tanaka,
Sarah P. Hollinshead & Jay R. Lund

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
University of California, Davis

Prepared for the CALFED Science Program

Overview

- Project Intent
- Interview Process
- Report Write-Up Process
- Uses of CALSIM II
- Interviewee Thoughts and Suggestions
- Most Prominent Impressions

Project Intent

- To collect feedback on the CALSIM II model from the broad water community.
- Not UC Davis comments on the model.

Interview Process

- Email Contact (95 People)
- In-Person or Phone Interviews
- Note-Taking by Interview Team
- Summary of the Interview
 - "For Attribution"
 - "Not For Attribution"
- Finalized Summary

Report Write-Up Process

- 65 Interview Summaries for 89 Individuals
- Discussion of Model Uses
- Categorization of Comments
 - 5 Major Categories
 - 36 Sub-Categories
- Documenting Spreadsheet Databases

Uses of CALSIM II

- Planning Studies
- Proposed Facilities
- Operations
- Regulatory Analysis and Compliance
- Evaluation of Management Options
- Other

A scenic view of a large lake with mountains in the background and a forested shoreline. The text is centered over the image.

Interviewee Thoughts and Suggestions

CALSIM II Comment Categories

- I. Mission
- II. Administration
- III. Implementation
- IV. Inputs
- V. Software

I. Mission

- A. General Comments
- B. Uses of the Model
- C. Model Scope
- D. Consensus Model
- E. Comparative vs. Absolute Applications
- F. Geographic Scope and Scale
- G. Other

I. Mission

- A. General Comments
- B. Uses of the Model
- C. Model Scope
- D. Consensus Model
- E. Comparative vs. Absolute Applications
- F. Geographic Scope and Scale
- G. Other

II. Administration

- A. Support
- B. Documentation
- C. Management of Model Development
- D. Credibility
- E. Revisions and Updates
- F. Calibration
- G. Benchmark Study

II. Administration

A. Support

B. Documentation

C. Management of Model Development

D. Credibility

E. Revisions and Updates

F. Calibration

G. Benchmark Study

III. Implementation

- A. Mathematical Formulation
- B. Operations Representation
- C. Model Complexity
- D. Time Step
- E. Model Flexibility
- F. Representation of Management Options
- G. Stability/Sensitivity of Model Results
- H. Geographic Representation
- I. Run Time
- J. Other

III. Implementation

- A. Mathematical Formulation
- B. Operations Representation
- C. Model Complexity
- D. Time Step
- E. Model Flexibility
- F. Representation of Management Options
- G. Stability/Sensitivity of Model Results
- H. Geographic Representation
- I. Run Time
- J. Other

IV. Inputs

- A. General Comments
- B. Demands
- C. Hydrology

IV. Inputs

A. General Comments

B. Demands

C. Hydrology

V. Software

- A. Solver
- B. GUI (Graphical User Interface)
- C. Output/Post-Processor
- D. Database/Data Management Software
- E. DSS (Data Storage System)
- F. WRESL (Water Resources Simulation Language)
- G. Transparency
- H. Simulation vs. Optimization
- I. Other

V. Software

- A. Solver
- B. GUI (Graphical User Interface)
- C. Output/Post-Processor
- D. Database/Data Management Software
- E. DSS (Data Storage System)
- F. WRESL (Water Resources Simulation Language)
- G. Transparency
- H. Simulation vs. Optimization
- I. Other



Most Prominent Impressions

Most Prominent Impressions

- CALSIM II is widely seen as an improvement over previous models, but needs further improvements.
- More individuals, both inside and outside of the agencies, who can run and understand the model are needed.
- Given the problems facing California, widespread demand exists for broader modeling capabilities.

Questions?

http://www.science.calwater.ca.gov/pdf/CALSIM_II_103103.pdf