

Jan 8, 2002

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

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For December 7, 2001

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

I. SUMMARY

A. ACTION ITEMS.

1. Rich Satkowski – Convene officer nomination committee.
2. Lloyd Peterson and Rob Tull – Obtain nominations for Hugo Fisher Award
3. John Williams and George Nichol – Obtain additional information on the peer review process of math modeling.

B. MOTIONS PASSED OR TABLED

1. A motion was passed to open our bank account under our new 501c corporation status.

C. REFERENCES HANDED OUT

1. Executive Director's report.
-

II. MINUTES

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 9:30 AM. Ten members present, and 8 proxies held.

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

3. **TREASURER'S REPORT** –

- a. General Fund – The current balance is \$31,211.
- b. Peer Review Fund – Several peer review activities have been completed, and reports on these are being published. The Forum will need to raise some funds before new peer review activities are started.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT - Invoices have been sent out for organizational memberships. Asilomar registrations are coming in, so the general fund is increasing. The USBR is contributing \$12,000 to the Peer Review Fund. The IGSM peer review is proceeding, and the next meeting is on December 17.

A report is being written on agreements made up to now regarding carriage water. Carriage water is being modeled with DSM-2. The CALVIN workshop was held on November 29, with about 40 persons in attendance. The Instream Flow Model Workshop is still planned. Nothing has happened yet on the Geomorphic Modeling Workshop or TMDL Workshop. There is interest on a Watershed Modeling Workshop (possibly including the rainfall runoff model). A workshop on stochastic hydrology has not yet been decided on.

Asilomar breakout sessions were discussed.

5. CORPORATION AUTHORIZATION RESOLUTION – A resolution needs to be passed for signatures. The bank has a boiler plate resolution we need to sign. A motion was made and seconded to pass the resolution for the signatures. This will allow us our own bank account. This will release our bank account from SFEI to us. The motion passed unanimously.

6. 2001 VISION/GOALS UPDATE –

- a. A goal is to better define the peer review process. What is peer review? Peer review protocols are needed. See how NAS defines peer review. Run a search engine. Look under model certification. John Williams and George Nichol will gather some information on the modeling peer review process. Peer review is not a thumbs up or down procedure. Maybe peer review involves making a list of questions to ask when making a decision. Let's see what others have done. Models need more disclosure, and users can decide. Should we put more focus on process: what to agree on before use. Should there be different levels of review for different situations?
- b. A discussion ensued as to how one would know if an existing given model (not those used in the Delta, that we are familiar with, but those used in California for other water quality studies) could be classed as a peer reviewed model. For example, if the model was developed by a federal agency, would the Forum have to do a peer review on it before it was used, or could it be simply be assumed that by being developed by assumed recognized experts on the federal payroll with lots of time and staff support and money that the model passes peer review? Would this be fair to models which have been develop by small companies whose modeling expertise is unknown outside of their area and whose models presumably will have to undergo peer review at some point? These are practical questions today because all such models are being used in TMDL and other studies on lakes and rivers throughout the State, but how does one respond when asked the question on whether the model has been peer reviewed and can be used for a given study? Is the EPA's QUAL-2E a peer reviewed model? Or the Corps HEC-2 model? Is it the model or the application of that model that should be peer reviewed?

7. PEER REVIEW

- a. Phase II 1-D Hydrodynamic Report – The IEP web group is using DSM-2 to account for the wide range of conditions in the Delta. Several agencies are doing this. Chris Enright is documenting this. A conference call was made by John Williams and KT Shum to Sam Luoma to see what CALFED needs from DSM-2. The IEP seems to be satisfied with the DSM-2 results, and this could be considered a peer review by external reviewers.
- b. IGSM Review – Discussion postponed until Nigel returns.
- c. Carriage Water Review – Write a report on what is agreed upon between agencies. The best way to determine the amount of carriage water is with a numerical model (i.e. DSM-2 or Fisher Delta Model). Funding is needed for this review. Who at the State Water Board would be interested in this now that Jerry Johns is gone (Dave Beringer?)? K.T. Shum will look at DWR's artificial neural network (ANN) model output. There box plots were made of various results. There are two tasks required here: (1) setting up report, and (2) looking at output data.

8. TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS

- a. Climate Change – Done
- b. CALVIN – Done
- c. Classification of Ground Water – Maybe later, based on Joe Sax's (UC Law Prof.) report.
- d. Instream Flow Modeling – In the planning phase.
- e. Watershed Modeling – For watersheds without stream-flow gages.
- f. TMDL – We're trying to separate that out into various possible topics.
- g. Remote sensing for land based model/GIS/Demand modeling – For identifying crop coverage for model inputs. Cover Landsat Technology, which is almost real time. Cover putting probability distributions on modeling output.
- h. Power Generation –
- i. Stochastic Hydrology -

9. ANNUAL MEETING –

- a. Rich Satkowski will convene an officer nomination committee for 2002.
- b. Business Meeting – Pete Smith will discuss the 1-D report, Nigel Quinn will discuss the IGSM report, Mike Deas will discuss the Water Temperature Effects report, and John Williams will discuss the Biological Review.
- c. Fisher Award – Lloyd Peterson and Rob Tull will work on selecting nominees for this award.
- d. Featured Speaker – Still to be selected. Possible choices are Norris Hundley (history prof and author of the Great Thirst), Lester Snow (future of CALFED), Lyle Hoag (How and why Forum was started), and Tom Mumley (TMDL lead for State Water Board).
- e. Future annual meetings may not always be at Asilomar. The next annual meeting may be in Sacramento.

10. **OTHER BUSINESS** – Should we organize workshops on biological training, population dynamics, statistical model relating fish production in inland waters to fish population in the ocean, certification of models.

11. **SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING** – Feb. 1, 9:30 – 12 noon, in Sacramento.

Respectfully Submitted,
George Nichol, Secretary, CWEMF

ATTENDANCE

Rich Satkowski
John Williams
Lloyd Peterson
Kevin Long
George Nichol
Mike Deas
Paul Hutton
Peter Baker
Kyracos Kyriacou
K.T. Shum

Convenor, SWRCB
Executive Director
Vice-Convenor, USBR
Treasurer, SWRCB
Secretary, SWRCB
Consulting Engineer
DWR
Stillwater Sciences
SWRCB
CCWD