

2001 Annual Meeting
Asilomar, 28 February 2001

Minutes

Plenary:

Rob Tull convened the plenary session, welcomed those present, and introduced Pete Smith. Pete reviewed the status of the review of one-dimensional hydrodynamic models, presented some thoughts on the reason for testing model "engines," and described some of the lessons learned during the review. Regarding the status of the review, Rod Sobey of UC Berkeley has finished a draft review, which focuses on the model engines. The modeling groups involved (DWR, RMA, and CCWD) have submitted comments on the draft or are in the process of doing so, after which we will meet with Sobey to review comments, and he will prepare a final report.

Pete began his discussion of the need to review model engines with distinctions between the "verification" and "validation" of models, as described by Patrick Roache verification concerns whether the model "solves the equations right," whereas validation concerns whether the model "solves the right equations;" verification is a matter of mathematics, whereas validation is a matter of science and engineering. In sequence, the steps are verification the code, verification of calculations for convergence, and the validation of the application of the code with field data. Sobey's review focused on the code.

As an example, Pete presented solutions to problem H-11 with the different models to show the effect of grid size. All the models can solve the problem, but the CCWD model, which is "first-order accurate," needs to use a small grid size and short time-steps. The other models, which are "second order accurate," could solve the problem with medium grids sizes and time-steps, but all models (as would be expected) had problems with a coarse grid. He described a study of New York harbor that was affected by such scale problems, so they are not just matters of academic esoterica.

For "lessons learned," Pete emphasized the need for all parties to agree on the design of the test problems in the beginning, and for the modelers to provide model output in the correct format and on time. In summary, Pete concluded that we are close to having good product that constitutes a verification of the models, although the draft needs to focus more on technical issues and delete some subjective points. At this point, we should start turning our attention to validation of the models, as they are actually applied to the Delta.

Mike Deas made a brief progress report on the temperature model review. This is a different kind of review, more like a user's guide. A draft is currently under review by the oversight committee. Mike described the contents of the review, which has chapters dealing with theoretical considerations; characteristics of different types of temperature studies; The review will also include a list of public domain models.

John Williams very briefly described the review of biological effects of water temperature on Central Valley salmonids, by Chris Myrick and Joe Cech. This is a literature review, which is

now complete. Assuming that the Steering Committee accepts the review at its next meeting, the review will soon be available on the Forum web site.

Nigel Quinn made a brief report on the IGSM review. A contract has recently been signed, and the work is now underway. Nigel also presented a list of Forum workshops, which was a bit scant in 2000. Probably there will be another CALSIM training workshop in May, but no others are scheduled at this time.

John Williams reported on the Forum's finances, which he summarized as not great but better than it looks. On the surface, our general fund went down about \$12,000 over the last calendar year, after holding steady over the previous calendar year. However, this mainly results from a decision to send out invoices for organizational dues in January instead of July, in order to fall within all the different fiscal years used by our institutional members. Additionally, Asilomar has moved forward the date for deposits for meetings, so we paid deposits of \$2,600 for both 2001 and 2002 in the last calendar. Also, the SWRCB still owes the Forum \$2,000 for services by the Executive Director on a review of the "Russian River protocol." Finally, the dues of those organizational members who are guaranteed seats on the Steering Committee has been increased to \$2,000, so our organizational dues income should increase from about \$17,000 to about \$27,000. Altogether, we are actually on the road to recovery with the General Fund. The Peer Review Fund, however, is now fully committed (if not over-committed), so no additional review activities can be undertaken unless we raise additional money. The Forum is on the verge of having products from its reviews, however, so it seems well situated to do so.

Regarding Forum activities, Williams emphasized that the power and legitimacy of the Forum depends on the active participation of its members. There is a danger that activity of the Executive Director may simply replace, rather than augment, activity by the members.

Business Meeting:

At 9:30 Convenor Rob Tull called the business meeting to order, and declared that a quorum was present. According to the by-laws (Sec. 4.10), "(T)he voting members present constitute a quorum."

Rob introduced Rich Satkowski, who reminded those assembled that the 2000 annual meeting directed the Steering Committee to make a recommendation to the 2001 meeting regarding changing the name of the Forum.. In presenting what was essentially the report of the Steering Committee on this matter, Rich reviewed the pro's and con's of changing the name, and presented the recommendation of the Steering Committee that the name be changed to the California Water Modeling Forum. The Steering Committee recommended this name to reflect the fact that the Forum's scope of interest now extends well beyond the Bay-Delta. Rich also presented a logo that had been selected by the Steering Committee after lengthy consideration and several modifications.

In the discussion following Rich's report Bruce Herbold rose to express violent objection to the proposed name, in particular to the phrase "water modeling," which he felt was exclusionary. Wim Kimmerer also objected to the depiction of a river as a finite-element grid in the logo.

After lengthy debate Wim made a three part motion, which was seconded and passed, although with decreasing majorities for each part. The parts were:

That the name be changed

That the new name include the word "California"

That the modifier of "modeling" be broader than "water."

In effect, the first two parts accepted the recommendation of the Steering Committee, while the last did not.

For the second and final item of business, Rob Tull presented the recommendation of the Nominating Committee that the officers for next year be Rich Satkowski as Convener, Lloyd Peterson as Vice-Convener, Kevin Long as Treasurer, and George Nichol as Secretary. There were no other nominations and the recommended slate was expeditiously confirmed, after which the meeting adjourned and the members retired to the back of the room for refreshments.

John Williams, for George Nichol.