

Nov. 30, 2000

BAY-DELTA MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For Nov. 16, 2000

(This meeting was held at the Contra Costa Water District Office in Concord)

I. SUMMARY

A. ACTION ITEMS

1. John Williams – Talk to the acting SFEI Director to ask for their continued support for Forum activities.
2. Rich Satkowski, Rob Tull, and Nigel Quinn – Will be the officer nominating committee for Year 2001 Officers.
3. Rob Tull, Spreck Rosekrans, Peter Vorster – Will look into expanding the Asilomar session on the Environmental Water Account.
4. Nigel Quinn – Will check into the possibility of expanding the “Modeling the San Joaquin River” Asilomar session into two sessions.
5. Lloyd Peterson, Nigel Quinn, and Rob Tull – Will be the Nominating Committee for the Hugo Fisher Award this year.
6. John Williams – Will contact Sam Luoma of the USGS in Menlo Park to see if he can come to the next Steering Committee meeting to tell of the objectives of the CALFED Science Process, and to hear of the Forum’s objectives.

B. MOTIONS PASSED

1. A By-Line for the California Water Modeling Forum was selected, for recommendation to the general membership at Asilomar.
2. A Logo for the California Water Modeling Forum was also selected.

C. REFERENCES HANDED OUT

1. “Work Statement For Technical Review Of The Integrated Groundwater And Surface Water Simulation Model (IGSM)” and proposed work schedule (4 sheets). Handed out by Nigel Quinn for Prof. Graham Fogg.
 2. Draft Asilomar 2001 Agenda (3 sheets). Handed out by John Williams, Executive Director.
 3. Proposed Byline Titles and Logos (2 sheets). Handed out by Rich Satkowski.
 4. Executive Director’s Report (2 pages). Handed out by John Williams.
-

II. MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER – Done by Rob Tull. Twelve persons in attendance. Peter Vorster was on the speaker phone. Proxies held for John Headlee, Jay Lund, Grace Chan. A quorum was declared.
2. SECRETARY’S REPORT – The minutes of October 10, 2000 were approved.
3. TREASURER’S REPORT & EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT – John Williams gave the Treasurer’s Report. The organizational dues are now due in January of each year. There was some discussion on who to send the organizational dues to (ie to the member within the organization who can walk it through or to the agency head office). There was some discussion on how to collect for the individual members who will be coming to Asilomar but who have not paid by then. The possibility of putting a check-mark on the Asilomar packets on who has not yet paid would facilitate the collection of dues there. No decision was made on this. It was mentioned that Margaret Johnston is leaving SFEI, and would not be able to remain as Treasurer. The Forum still wants to keep ties to SFEI, because of the support (moral support, book-keeping, web sites, etc) they have given us. Bruce Thompson will be the acting SFEI director, and John Williams will talk to him about how the Forum would still like to count on their support.

The next discussion was on the need for a nominating committee for future officers to elect at the Asilomar meeting. Rich Satkowski, Rob Tull, and Nigel Quinn volunteered to be on this committee. Kevin Long agreed to stand for election as Treasurer. There was discussion on the possibility of also coming up with some names for the science sub-committees prior to the Asilomar meeting. It was discussed that perhaps these science sub-committee members could help in putting on future workshops.

4. ASILOMAR 2001 PLANNING – A tentative agenda was handed out. At this point there is room for a few more sessions. The possibility of Fullerton or John de George putting on sessions was discussed. The possibility of splitting the ecosystem modeling session into two sessions was discussed. Expanding talks on the Environmental Water Account (EWA) may be a possibility. The EWA is a big function of CALFED. Perhaps Bruce Herbold could moderate a session on this. Modeling is a big part of EWA. Fullerton could potentially speak here. Now is good timing for this topic. Should the talks here be both specific and generic? There would also be lots of IEP interest in this topic, so make it at a time when their members will be present. Rob Tull, Spreck Rosekrans, and Peter Vorster volunteered to look into expanding the Asilomar session on the EWA.

For the session on modeling the San Joaquin River, Nigel Quinn will look into the potential of having two sessions instead of one. Potential additional talks might be on the TMDL Stakeholders Group Dissolved Oxygen Model of the San Joaquin River (potential speakers being Carl Chen or G.Fred Lee), or on the TMDL process itself. There was some discussion on a giant model that the Imperial Irrigation District is using, which has resolution down to individual fields. CH2M-Hill is involved in this modeling. For the Colorado River session, see if a talk might be added to include the Salton Sea. Monterey County has done a good job of putting their data onto GIS, and this might be a potential talk. There was mention of whether Curt Oldenberg could give a talk on the Cosumnes River as part of the ecosystem modeling session.

There was some discussion on whether to have the discussion on the status of the peer reviews before the general attendance at the Asilomar Plenary Session, or of having them only in the breakout sessions. The discussion centered around the complexity of the reviews and whether this would be of interest to the entire general membership. The decision was made that the overview of what went on would be of interest to the entire group, while the details could be saved for the breakout session. So the Plenary Session format will be to get the general business done first, then move into a summary of the accomplishments of the peer review processes. The intent here is to show the general audience that the Forum is accomplishing something in addition to the workshops, and what the next steps in these peer review processes are. This will show what they are getting for their dues money. So, the business meeting will give the general results of the peer reviews, and the breakout sessions will show in detail how the processes went.

Regarding the serving of adult beverages at the evening social event, it was announced that all purchases now have to go through Asilomar and their pricing structure for the beverages. Generally this means there will be an increase in cost for the merchandise. There was discussion on whether the Forum should still finance this effort. It was felt that this adult beverage session and social function was one of the highlights of the annual meeting, and the decision was made to continue funding the adult beverages. It was decided to put \$1,400 toward this endeavor. (It was mentioned that the IEP is a government entity, and thus is not allowed to kick in any funds for this event.)

For the Hugo Fisher Award, Rob Tull, Lloyd Peterson, and Nigel Quinn volunteered to be the nominating committee. They will review the official procedure on conducting this nomination. Nominations and voting are to be done over the next several months. There was some discussion on sending an email to the membership to solicit funds for this award, as the original funds are getting low. Spreck volunteered to give out the award at the Asilomar meeting.

5. FORUM BYLINE PROPOSAL – Rich Satkowski had 11 bylines to choose from. Discussion ensued. Then a motion was made for the byline entitled "Promoting Excellence and Consensus In Water and Environmental Modeling". This was seconded, and passed with a vote of 10 for and 2 against. Then Rich presented 8 logos to choose from. Logo 1A on the presented sheet was voted for unanimously to use on letterheads for the Forum (as it is blue and white in color and will reproduce well on black and white paper), and Logo 2B (blue and gold, but with a change in the color of the sun from blue to gold) was voted for unanimously to use on physical objects such as podium fronts and banners. (The selection of bylines and logos here is just the Steering Committee's recommendation to the general membership at Asilomar in the event that they approve the name change from the Bay-Delta Modeling Forum to the California Water Modeling Forum, and if so if they then agree on the above byline and logo recommendations.)

6. PEER REVIEW ACTIVITIES -

a. 1-D Hydrodynamic Peer Review – As pointed out in the Executive Director's report, Prof. Sobey has submitted a draft report, to which responses are being prepared. The professor will take these up at the end of the year, with the final report due at the end of January. The review is available on the web but because it is a draft the peer review committee has not publicized the address.

b. Biological Effects of Temperature Peer Review – As pointed out in the Executive Director's report, Chris Myrick is working on a revised draft. This process is being slowed a bit because the independent physiologist on our oversight panel is in the middle of an office move from Tiburon to Santa Cruz, and will not be able to put in any time on this project until the end of the year. Chris is therefore proceeding based on comments from Joe Cech and John Williams, and Bruce MacFarland will review the next version.

c. Water Temperature Modeling Peer Review – As pointed out in the Executive Director's report, Prof. Jay Lund and John Williams will meet with Mike Deas and Cindy Lowney tomorrow to discuss the draft. The tentative plan is to put more technical material (i.e., equations) back into it. Again, there is progress, but less rapid than originally anticipated.

d. Carriage Water Peer Review - Spreck Rosekrans reported that the Carriage Water

peer review is moving ahead, with the Forum's role yet to be defined. There will be some discussion with the SWRCB on this. More will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting. The DWR has three types of carriage water scenarios, these being salinity, EI ratio, and X2. The DWR uses CALSIM with neural network for carriage water determinations, while CCWD uses the Fisher Model. Kamiar of DWR has taken a different job position, so Speck is looking for someone else to help him in the carriage water peer review. The need for impartiality in this review was emphasized.

e. IGSM Model Peer Review – Nigel said the users group is having a periodic workshop on Dec. 7 at DWR, if anyone is interested. Nigel said if anyone was interested in working on this review, to contact him.

7. WORKSHOPS – The geomorphic model workshop is in the planning stages. John Williams is looking into the “Instream Flow Modeling” workshop. Nigel Quinn suggested a GIS workshop possibly next year.

8. CALFED Science Process – How the Forum might assist this process was discussed. There is an EIR on Bay Area blending, with CCWD and EBMUD as participants. Can the Forum help here? CALFED may not be involved with these projects, so perhaps the Forum may have a role here. Invite someone from CALFED to come to our next Steering Committee meeting to explain what CALFED is doing in these and other matters. Someone suggested Sam Luoma from the USGS in Menlo Park. The Forum helps in the educational sense, not in political sense. Let these other agencies know of the Forum's role. Perhaps Sam could come and give our Steering Committee a 20 minute session, and in turn we can tell him in 20 minutes what the Forum is set up for.

9. NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING – Possibly on Jan. 11, 18, or 25, depending upon when Sam Luoma could make it. We will be contacted as to the date and location selected. The location will be selected to accommodate Sam Luoma who must travel from Menlo Park. John Williams will check with Sam and get back to us.

ATTENDANCE:

K.T. Shum
Kevin Long
John Williams
Spreck Rosekrans
Rob Tull
Judy Zavadil
Rich Satkowski
George Nichol
Lloyd Peterson

CCWD
SWRCB
BDMF
Environ. Defense
CH2M-Hill
EBMUD
SWRCB
CVRWQCB
USBR

Peter Baker
Paul Hutton
Nigel Quinn
Peter Vorster (on phone)

Stillwater Sciences
DWR
LBL/USBR
Bay Institute

Respectfully Submitted,
George Nichol
Secretary, BDMF