

May 14, 2002

CALIFORNIA WATER AND ENVIRONMENT FORUM  
(BAY-DELTA MODELING FORUM)

## MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For March 22, 2002

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

### I. SUMMARY

#### A. ACTION ITEMS.

1. Water Temperature Funding – John Williams will check on this.
2. Bulletin 160 – Rob Tull will check on the current status of its formulation
3. Advertise Asilomar Sessions – Kaylea White, Lisa Holm (and perhaps Hubert Morel-Seytoux) could check with some national organizations.

#### B. MOTIONS PASSED OR TABLED

1. 2003 Annual Conference – Will be at Asilomar. Have it for two nights if IEP doesn't go.

#### C. REFERENCES HANDED OUT

1. Advance Workshop Notice on "Streamflow and Water Availability Estimates in Ungaged Streams."

---

### II. MINUTES

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 9:30 AM. Twelve members present, and 5 proxies held. A quorum was declared.

2. **SECRETARY'S REPORT** – Passed unanimously.

3. **TREASURER'S REPORT** – There was some discussion on dues collections. How could we improve the collection of organizational dues. Should we make up a standard letter for payment from those Asilomar attendees who were not up in their dues? Speakers are free for one day's attendance, but if they stay for two-three days then they should pay. There was discussion on what is the best way of collecting dues. We signed the Certificate of Amendment today to change the Forum's name at the bank.

4. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT** – John William's will follow up with the USBR on the funding for water temperature modeling. There is nothing set up yet for the Carriage Water

workshop. The Instream Flow Workshop is waiting on CALFED and ABAG to complete their contracting arrangements. Other topics will be discussed below.

## 5. ASILOMAR RETROSPECTIVE –

a. **Year 2003 Location** - Most people seem to want to have the conference next year at Asilomar. We've already paid our deposit there (one night (Tuesday night) is booked). How many days do we want our annual conference to be? We won't know what IEP decides on until July/August. We'll use IEP's night if they don't go to Asilomar. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to have the annual conference at Asilomar, and to have it for two nights if IEP doesn't go.

b. **Year 2003 Topics** - If we go to Asilomar on our own, we can have less concurrent sessions because we will have an extra day. Perhaps we can have model User's Groups (IGSM, BASINS, CALSIM II) meetings then, and mini-training sessions, such as by the Danish Hydraulic Institute, etc. Do we also want to have a Poster Session, and if so on what night? What time do we want to start on Tuesday? Do we want to have our meeting on Tuesday and Wednesday, and go home on Thursday; or on Wednesday and Thursday, and go home on Friday? Shall we register on Tuesday from 11 AM–1 PM, and start the program at 1 PM?

Would cutting down on concurrent sessions be good? Would this eliminate too many desirable lectures. Two-thirds of our recurring topics seem to be standard, while one-third seem to be on who volunteers. Perhaps add a session on sediment modeling. Or, give more time to speakers and discussion, so they don't get cut short? Try to put sessions containing similar material physically close together, so people can get to subsequent sessions on time. It has been seen that the Forum's annual conference has helped to improve communications between agencies.

c. **Rigor of Asilomar Presentations** - A question arose as to whether some of the modeling sessions are becoming somewhat like a trade show, and whether presentations need to remain more grounded in peer review, modeling theory, and the principals of calibration, validation, and verification. Some discussion ensued. Most present felt that the presentations were normally well-grounded in science. (As an aside, there was some discussion that perhaps we could help our funding situation by having consultants make fund contributions to set up at the Poster Session at Asilomar to show some of their products and modeling projects underway.)

d. **Publication of Presentations** - The question again arose as to whether we could publish our Asilomar presentations, and even publish them before the conference occurs. Or, publish all of our presentations, once a year. Can we get abstracts before the meetings, and put them on the web? Can we get Power Point copies? Can we give hard copies to people as they register at Asilomar. Can we get extended (1 page) abstracts? Should session chairmen bug speakers for abstracts. A question arose as to whether there are persons who want to speak at Asilomar but can't. If some speakers are reluctant to give presentations because of copyright concerns, they could put a footnote to protect.

e. **Presentations of More Models** - There was some discussion on having presentations on other models being used in California. The USBR is putting together what models are available, and what they do. Should the Forum get knowledgeable of what all models do: should this be a Forum mission? There was mention made of possibly having a restoration theme session at Asilomar.

f. **Announcement in Professional Publications** - Should we advertise our Asilomar speaker sessions with (or solicit speakers from) such national organizations as ASCE, AGU, and AWRA? Perhaps John Williams and Hubert Morel-Seytoux could check into this. Perhaps Kaylea White could do AWRA, Lisa Holm could do ASCE, and Hubert could do ASCE and AGU? Asilomar sessions we will normally always have are CALSIM, DSM-2, hydrodynamics, and groundwater. Should we try for a broader audience? Should we have contributed vs invited speakers; inside or outside speakers? The chairmen of sessions can tell their speakers what questions need to be answered.

6. **TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS** – There are three types of workshops: (1) training, (2) educational, and (3) resolving problems. Potential workshops are as follows:

- a. Streamflow and Water Availability Estimates In Ungaged Streams – will discuss current methods without gages, but forecasters input is needed.
- b. Instream Flows – Waiting on availability of funding. Will be a working workshop, to produce a protocols document. It will be a working session with invited participants, followed by a public session.
- c. Watershed modeling – on hold.
- d. Geomorphic modeling – with AGU, on hold.
- e. The five Asilomar workshops suggested (see Asilomar minutes: (1) San Joaquin River Restoration Project, (2) Gaming in the San Joaquin River, (3) How To Design an Integrated Model, (4) Interchange of Research Ideas between Water Users and University, and (5) Lessons Learned in Past Modeling for River Restoration.)
- f. DSM-2 User's Group
- g. CALSIM User's Group – for persons outside of DWR. Put on outside of DWR, such as by the Forum. Or, have the User's Group do. We would need a facilitator and documentation. Teach from the bottom up. DWR could furnish staff to serve as speakers. Have a consultant to update DSM-2, then keep updating. Our goal is to have 1-2 training workshops per year. DWR plans on no formal training on DSM-2 over the next 6-12 months, but maybe on CALSIM.
- h. Stream/Aquifer Interaction – Hubert and Kaylea, to cover theory and application. Impacts of water transfers. Concepts vs models.

- i. MIKE SHE and HEC-HMS – Hubert, Kaylea, and George Matranga. AWRA conference in August. Tentative in July or August.
- j. Underflow/Water Law – Give more thought.
- k. Modeling Input to Permits – Jeff Mount. Works for Reclamation Board.
- l. Benefit/Cost Analysis – linkage between technical analysis and economics.
- m. Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin Comprehensive Model – How does CALFED want to support the ROD? CALVIN is a subpart. Chuching wants to think it over, and come back with more information.

7. **WEBSITE** – Kevin did a great job of setting the web site up. Can we have web links? We could. Who can be our webmaster? Should we have a news bulletin, and articles of interest?

#### 8. **OTHER BUSINESS** –

a. **Best Paper Award?** - In addition to the Fisher Award, should we have an award for the best paper? We could put competitive papers onto the website, for review and a vote for the winner by the members.

b. **Phase 2 Hydrodynamic Review** - At Asilomar there was a comment pertaining to the hydrodynamic model peer review. It was mentioned that the Phase 1 study didn't fully accomplish the original intent of the study and didn't completely cover the transport problem, and that perhaps these items should be addressed in the Phase 2 study. The DWR feels that their use of DSM-2 for the recent IEP studies, and IEP's review and comment on the runs made, constitute a Phase 2 peer review of sorts. The DWR would like to see the other two models come up to where DSM-2 is now, after the IEP use and comments, before spending more money for more peer review efforts. Chris Enright of DWR is documenting the use of DSM-2 for the IEP studies, and the results will be put onto the DWR web site. The general consensus seems to be that the peer reviews for the hydrodynamic models have gone far enough for now, as a lot of time and effort have been expended by several agencies in Phase 1, especially by DWR and CCWD. The publication of the Phase 1 report is a good accomplishment for the Forum. If an independent future Phase 2 study is to be done, the Forum needs to establish a group of peer review experts (possibly including IEP persons) to determine what runs should be made, and this study should test the models under extreme events.

c. **Comprehensive Basin Model** - John Williams will get information of the Corps of Engineers/California Reclamation Boards Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Comprehensive Basin Model. This model runs on UNIC. Rich Satkowski mentioned that we need funds for any new peer reviews. It was suggested that the Forum write letters to such agencies as DWR and MET, pointing out our successes and having specific proposal for projects they might contribute to.

d. **Bulletin 160** - For the Bulletin 160 work, consider sending a letter saying what we could do to help in the review. (This may be too late.) There are lots of needs for models here. How do we determine those needs? One needs to take the technical problems and break them down into

identifiable parts, and then find out which parts need modeling work done. We need to form communication between modelers and advisory groups, and between modelers and managers. Rob will check and see if we can play a role. Peer review of Bulletin 160 will be complex.

e. **Miscellaneous** - See the CALFED web site on the groundwater management strategy. We need members of advisory groups in our Forum.

9. **NEXT MEETING** – May 17, 2002, at USBR in Sacramento.

Respectfully Submitted,  
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

---

#### ATTENDANCE

Nigel Quinn	Convenor, LBNL/USBR
Rich Satkowski	Past Convenor, SWRCB
John Williams	Executive Director
Ken Yokoyama	USBR
Rob Tull	CH2M-Hill
George Nichol	Secretary, SWRCB
Paul Hutton	DWR
Edward Chang	EBMUD
Lisa Holm	CCWD
Hubert Morel-Seytoux	Hydrology Days
Chuching Wang	MWD
Kaylea White	S.S. Papadopoulos & Assoc.