

Oct. 4, 2001

BAY-DELTA MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For August 17, 2001

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

I. SUMMARY

A. ACTION ITEMS

1. Rich Satkowski – Will send out an email asking the steering committee to vote on the Forum's name change.
2. Peter Vorster, Rob Tull, John Williams, Rich Satkowski – Start a public relations committee.
3. John Williams – Call Spreck to see what mode the carriage water workshop might take.
4. Rob Tull and George Nichol – Look into having a TMDL workshop.
5. Nigel Quinn, Kevin Long, John Williams, Rich Satkowski – come up with recommendation for new web page layout.

B. MOTIONS PASSED OR TABLED

1. None

C. REFERENCES HANDED OUT

1. Steering Committee Roster.
2. SWRCB announcement of public meetings regarding the legal classification of groundwater.
3. Executive Director's Report

II. MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER – Quorum declared. Proxies held for Mike Deas, Wim Kimmerer, Spreck Rosekrans, Rachael Cayman, Jay Lund, Lloyd Peterson, and John Headlee.
2. SECRETARY'S REPORT – One change will be needed in the past minutes. Other portion of past minutes accepted unanimously.

3. **TREASURER'S REPORT** – We have taken over the handling of our books from SFEI, and we now have our own bank account. The SFEI accountant had our books in very good order, so making the transition is going well. Regarding the General Fund, organization dues are still due from several members. The current balance is \$37,814. The past Asilomar conference brought in a net balance of \$7,725, which is good. Regarding the Peer Review Fund, the balance is \$4,012, after paying the \$10,000 toward the IGSM review coming up. After the Water Temperature Model review is done, and money is received in from the USBR and paid out to the reviewers, the balance will be \$1,612. We need to raise money to match the USBR input to the Water Temperature Model. The CCWD has budgeted \$5,000 for the fund, and a fund raising effort will be needed to collect money from others as well.

4. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT** – Our application for 501c3 status was filed on June 7. Other comments from the Executive Director are added into the comments shown below.

5. **FORUM NAME CHANGE** – The choices for names have been narrowed down to two names, after the recent round of voting. The two choices are: (1) California Bay-Delta Modeling Forum, and (2) California Water and Environmental Modeling Forum. Rich Satkowski will send out an email asking for a vote to select the final name that is to be presented as a Steering Committee recommendation to the general membership.

6. **VISION/GOALS** – There was some discussion on how to increase membership, as follows:

- a. Encourage existing members to attend Steering committee meetings, workshops, and annual conference.
- b. We should increase public relations efforts. Possibly announce our activities in the California Water News of DWR. For example, send them an announcement that our Water Temperature Model review has just come out.
- c. Reference our web site in public relations releases. (Get our new web site running.)
- d. Send out announcements of our activities to the SFEI Newsletter and the IEP Newsletter.
- e. Peter Vorster, Rob Tull, John Williams, and Rich Satkowski will start a public relations committee. (Send them the names of any prospective organizations and individuals, and any ideas on getting public recognition.)

7. **PEER REVIEW** –

- a. **Hydrodynamic Model (Phase I)**- The Phase I work and report is done. Log onto www.swrcb.waterrights/bdmf to see the Phase I report. Now is the time to post responses. If any of our stakeholders have disagreements with the review results the Forum's By-Laws allow for a filing of a rebuttal that will be placed in the report itself. In the near future the Forum will be asked to vote on acceptance of the report.
- b. **Water Temperature Model** – The draft report is almost completed.

- c. **General Comments** - Some questions arose as to what are the peer review requirements of local agencies which are using models which have not yet been peer-reviewed. Do they have a requirement to have peer review done, or to do their own peer review? Who says what the peer review requirements have to be? What if it is necessary to use a model for purposes other than what it was reviewed for? Who says what is needed? Should the Forum be a location where agencies that need peer reviews of models come to and ask who can do it? Should we make a book for "Procedures on Model Peer Review"? Should we expand our Modeling Protocols document to cover these things? This could be a stakeholder service we could provide.
- d. **IGSM Model Review** – This review is underway. A description of the problems to be tested by the model are due by the end of July.
- e. **Secretary's Duty** – It was decided that it will be the Secretary's duty to provide for visibility within the Steering Committee in the future on what documents are up for review, and make such documents available for such reviews.

8. ANNUAL MEETING PLANNING –

- a. **Evening Speaker** - We need to start considering who we can ask to be our keynote evening speaker. Should be on the issues side of a topic rather than on the technical side. Some suggestions were the developer of the Imperial Irrigation District model for agricultural drainage, or an introduction to climate modeling. Or possibly David Freeman on the interface of water and energy, or power issues. Or John Eckart on the Colorado River, or natural history and water, or UCLA's Norris Huntley.
- b. **Tentative Sessions** – Colorado River use, salmon modeling, San Joaquin River and the Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan, modeling forecasts vs actual project operations in the Delta, hydropower, water reuse, irrigation efficiency, salt management, CALSIM, DSMII, IGSM, water plan update modeling (considering land use, etc.). Consider having three concurrent sessions, and add in Tuesday morning. (3 times, with 3 sessions, and Tuesday morning with 2 sessions, = 14 sessions.)

9. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS –

- a. **Geomorphic Modeling Workshop** – Nothing is definite yet. Perhaps it would be good to have it right before the AGU meeting to be held in San Francisco in December. Topics could include channel migration, landscape evolution, the San Joaquin River, the Danish Hydraulic Institute's MIKE 11 and 21 math models, etc. If the workshop was held immediately before the AGU meeting we might be able to get some of their speakers who are in the area. (Possibly hold the geomorphic modeling of the SJR topic until Asilomar.)

b. Carriage Water Workshop –

- (1) Goal: To improve carriage water estimate.
- (2) Going slowly. Not really a workshop, but rather a compilation of where we are at. A preceding workshop was held about 1 ½ years ago. The DWR and CCWD have communicated on this already. Spreck has written to the SWRCB. The SWRCB requires carriage water for water transfers. D1641 and Delta Standards are considerations. The DWR and CCWD charge for the carriage water as a cost of doing business. We don't want to retard the transfer of water.
- (3) The problem: how does one calculate what carriage water amount should be? Up to now, a value of 15% has been used to determine the additional amount of water needed to serve as carriage water. However, now one can use models to get better figures. At the same time, the models would show the transport circulation that was occurring.
- (4) Spreck Rosekrans, Paul Hutton, and Rich Satkowski to talk next week. What should be the Forum's role? Should the Forum take a position that the determination of carriage water should be a peer review effort (see Spreck's letter). John Williams will call Spreck next week to see what the intent is (workshop mode or peer review mode). What can the Forum do to advance the concept? (See our old workshop results of six years ago, in Vallejo.)

c. Instream Flow Modeling Workshop –

- (1). Objective: Come up with a document that describes instream modeling and the correct modeling processes, what should be considered, and how models are to be tested. What should the modeling protocols be? What are the flow requirements for fish? How are minimum flows to be established?
- (2). There is the possibility of receiving \$25,000 from CALFED for this workshop. The CFG is interested. Have it on Jan. 2-4, 2002. This will be a working workshop, and will be followed by a ½ day public workshop.

d. Climate Change Workshop – A workshop date has been set for October.

e. Interactive Modeling/Gaming Workshop – To be discussed in future.

f. TMDL Workshop – To be discussed in future. Rob Tull and George Nichol will be looking into this.

10. FORUM WEBPAGE HOSTING – We will be preparing a new web page. The webpage will cost about \$150/year. A committee of Nigel Quinn, Kevin Long, John Williams, and Rich Satkoski will work on setting up the new webpage, and present their results at the next meeting.

11. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING – Oct. 12, from 9:30-12 noon, at location to be determined in Sacramento. Rich Satkowski will get a room.

Respectfully Submitted;
George Nichol
Secretary, BDMF

ATTENDEES:

Richard Satkowski

John Williams

Rob Tull

Kevin Long

George Nichol

Paul Hutton

Judy Zavadil

K.T. Shum

Peter Baker

Peter Vorster

Ken Yokoyama

Convenor (SWRCB)

Executive Director

Past Convenor (CH2M-Hill)

Treasurer (SWRCB)

Secretary (CVRWQCB)

DWR

EBMUD

CCWD

Stillwater Sciences

Bay Institute

USBR

Six proxies held.