

June 2, 2000

BAY-DELTA MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For March 31, 2000

(This meeting was held at the EBMUD Office in Oakland.)

I. ACTION ITEMS

1. Executive Director – to standardize the treasurer’s report.
2. Executive Director/Rob Tull/Pete Smith – to recommend to the Steering Committee what additional hydrodynamic model peer review work should be done by Prof. Sobey in completing his Phase 1 work.
3. Spreck Rosekranz – make up the agenda for the carriage water workshop.

II. MOTIONS PASSED

1. Steering Committee Minutes – The minutes will be put onto the Forum’s web page in PDF format.
2. Water Temperature Model Review – The due date was extended for two weeks.
3. Next Peer Review – The Integrated Ground Water / Surface Water Model (IGSM) will be the next model peer-reviewed.

III. REFERENCES HANDED OUT

1. Executive Director’s Report, by John Williams.
 2. Review Comments On The BDMF Peer Review Of 1-D Delta Hydrodynamic Models, by Pete Smith, March 30, 2000.
 3. Peer Review of Integrated Groundwater and Surface Water Simulation Model (IGSM), by Nigel Quinn.
 4. Table of Potential Upcoming Workshops, by Nigel Quinn.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER – Done by Rob Tull. Proxies were held for Lenora Thomas, Hubert Morel-Seytoux, Bud Abbott, Peter Vorster, Wim Kimmerer, Jay Lund, Francis Chung, and Andy Hamilton. 13 members were present. A quorum was declared.

2. SECRETARY’S REPORT – The report of Jan. 21, 2000 was approved. Some miscellaneous discussion ensued. It was decided to call our agency members “organizational” rather than “institutional”. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to put the Steering Committee minutes onto the web site with PDF, so that all could dial in to see at any time. It was decided that the minutes should be typed in WORD 95/6, and saved in PDF format. These would then be sent to Nigel Quinn, the webmaster, for web incorporation.

3. TREASURER’S REPORT - A new procedure was established for handling incoming bills, as follows:

- a. The new bill comes in to SFEI for payment.
- b. SFEI lets the Executive Director know that a new bill has come in. The Executive Director checks that the payment is due and informs SFEI to make the payment.
- c. SFEI makes up the check and sends it to Rob Tull for signature and forwarding to payee (with the Secretary of the BDMF as back-up for signature, if needed).

It was mentioned that the Steering Committee needs an accurate treasury account for each meeting, or at least an accurate summary of the amount in each account. The Executive Director will standardize the treasurer’s report to accomplish this.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’ S REPORT –

a. Asilomar - There was a room capacity problem at Asilomar. Next year see if the Fred Farr Forum room will be available. The Triton is also a larger room. If the BDMF members want to do a poster, tie into the IEP’s poster program for now.

There were two problems: (1) some Forum and non-Forum members attended without paying the off-site registration, and (2) some attendees got free lunches by telling the chow-hall staff to bill the BDMF. The attendance by non-members was discussed. Nigel suggested that on future sign-up sheets have a block for members to check, and a block for non-members to check. State on the sheet that membership is a requirement for attendance, and that for an additional \$30 the person can become a member. Also, on the sign-up sheet make it very clear whether lunch is covered or not. Clear up the sign-up sheet.

We need to get feedback on how well the Asilomar workshops went, and recommendations on how to make them better. We need to encourage the session facilitators to give us feedback on what would be good future topics. For future sessions it may be good to ask facilitators to give us a head-count of how many attended, and to put down appropriate comments.

b. Workshops - The Executive Director said it is important for Forum members to spread the word of future workshops within their own agencies, because many potentially interested persons do not see the announcements. It was also suggested that if non-members want to they can subscribe to our reflector to see when workshops are coming. It was also suggested that members get their agency's main web address and forward that to the Executive Director for inclusion onto our reflector. Thus each agency will receive advance notification of workshops, and can route that to appropriate individuals within the agency.

5. PEER REVIEW ACTIVITIES –

a. **Water Temperature Model** - A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to extend the water temperature model review by two weeks. This extension was necessary because the principle reviewer had to get resettled in Wyoming. The payment for these reviews is by the following parties: (1) BDMF - \$12,000; (2) USBR - \$12,000; and (3) DWR - \$12,000.

b. **Hydrodynamic Model** - Regarding the hydrodynamic peer review, the Executive Director, Rob Tull, and Pete Smith met with Prof. Sobey on March 9 and went over the results to date. A schedule for completing was developed. Prof. Sobey will be going to Europe by mid-May, and he will finish a draft before departing. He will send the draft to Hubert for review. Then when Prof. Sobey returns both he and Hubert will go to visit the modelers to present the draft. It is anticipated that the draft report will be about 200 pages long. Pete Smith has recommended running another problem on the models while Prof. Sobey is in Europe, and to incorporate its results into the report.

Prof. Sobey has spent more time than originally anticipated (see handout). It was mentioned that the original intent of this review was to have the basic engines of the models tested for correct physics. However, the above Forum members were enthusiastic that this phase of the work is coming to a satisfactory solution. Some additional work was recommended, by the above Forum members, prior to concluding this phase. This work will consist of having all of the models run the same problem. There was some discussion on how one model had trapezoidal channels, while another had rectangular channels, and they also had different time and distance steps. Nigel said that Pete Smith did an excellent job of setting up the additional problems that should be looked at in concluding this phase of the effort.

In yesterday's conference call Prof. Sobey committed to getting his product out. Yesterday's call included the Executive Director, Rob Tull, and Pete Smith. The call generated some interest in continuing a bit further with some of the Phase 1 testing, in order to accomplish some of the testing proposed by Pete Smith. The general feeling of the committee seemed to be positive for this further testing, and the above Forum members were to explore what additional work should be done, what the cost would be, and report their suggestions back by e-mail. The due date for completing the Phase 1 work was stated to be mid-July, 2000.

While the above feeling was positive for the additional Phase 1 work, it was cautioned to remember that money was also to be needed for the upcoming Phase 2 effort. It was mentioned that for continuity Prof. Sobey should be considered for retention in the Phase 2 effort.

There were several lessons-learned from this peer review that were mentioned, as follows:

- (1) future peer reviews should have everything being compared in the same format;
- (2) we need closer oversight of the peer review process in the future;
- (3) the Steering Committee needs to ask for status reports from its active sub-committees, such as the peer review committee, even if we are all volunteers.

c. Potential “Integrated Ground Water-Surface Water Model” (IGSM) Review – Nigel Quinn has proposed this as a potential peer review. See his handout. The model is being used by several agencies. Users have been the Northern District of DWR (Colusa Drain, Buttes area, Tim Durbin’s model), the USBR, Monterey County for the Salinas Valley, and consultants. CALFED is considering its use in the San Joaquin Valley, especially since surface water storage is limited. CALFED has proposed \$2 million for a conjunctive use study of the SJV, whether modeling is done or not. Possibly CALFED would give supporting peer review funding along with the BDMF. The model has never been peer-reviewed.

An interagency users group has been formed, and this is very beneficial in advancing the use of the model. The graphical users interface (GUI), model code, code stability, equations, formulations, applications, could be reviewed. The BDMF could spearhead this review. Nigel suggested that after the peer review is done then give the model developers a chance to fix up things. This would be important if CALFED wants to use the model. External reviewers might be Dr. Frind (a finite element person) from Waterloo U., Dr. Kanikow, and others. George Matanga of DWR might be an internal reviewer, as he is very knowledgeable of finite element methods and ground water modeling. There is a users manual. A prioritization of tasks was suggested, and determining what needs to be fixed. Make identifiable tasks with a schedule. It was suggested to be focused, prepare for the work in phases, and start small.

It was mentioned that the SWRCB would be interested in how well IGSM works, because of their need to know where the jurisdiction of the Board ends between “subterranean streams flowing through a known and definite channel” and ground water, to show where stream water originated from, and whether the water was locally developed.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to prepare for the peer review of the IGSM model. A cost was not voted on at this time for this peer review until the Steering Committee sees a proposal from Nigel and the IGSM group. At this point in time Nigel needs volunteers, and would like to tie into the IGSM Users Group. MWD

volunteered a person to help Nigel. This model would be a good one to start under the Forum's Protocols Manual.

d. **Carriage Water** – A letter has been sent to the SWRCB that the Forum is doing a series of workshops on carriage water in the Delta. Spreck will make up the agenda. The initial scoping workshop will be held on April 26

6. STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR 2000 – It was stated that some members are needed. More discussion was postponed until the next meeting.

7. WORKSHOPS FOR YEAR 2000 – A CALSIM user training workshop will be coming up. Nigel will possibly be sponsoring a Climate Change/Water Quality Impacts workshop, in the Fall. There seems to be lots of interest in having workshops devoted to “Instream Flow Modeling” or “Watershed Planning”. Other possible workshops are of TMDL's, Groundwater, San Joaquin Valley Water Recirculation (using Newman Wasteway to help Vernalis), and Gaming Theory for Water Management. Spreck tentatively proposed a workshop on Colorado River water. The Clear Creek draft workshop report is being formulated, and will go onto the Forum's web site.

8. BDMF DUES STRUCTURE – Postponed to next meeting.

9. FORUM NAME CHANGE PROPOSAL - It was mentioned to be careful in using the words Water and California in any proposed new name, because so many other groups have similar types of names. At Asilomar, the selection of the new name was passed back to the Steering Committee to come up with a recommendation. Some suggestions made today were:

- California Water Modeling Forum
- California/Bay-Delta Modeling Forum
- California and Bay-Delta Modeling Forum
- California Water and Environmental Forum

10. NEXT MEETING – June 9, at the USBR in Sacramento, at 0930.

ATTENDANCE:

Richard Denton
John Headlee
Kevin Long
Grace Chan
John Williams
Ed Pattison
Spreck Rosekranz

CCWD
COE
SWRCB
MWDSC
BDMF
Modesto ID
Environ. Defense

Rob Tull
Walter Bourez
Judith Garland
Nigel Quinn
Rich Satkowski
George Nichol

CH2M-Hill
MBK
EBMUD
LBL/UCB
SWRCB
CVRWQCB

Respectfully Submitted,
George Nichol
Secretary, BDMF