

July 20, 2000

BAY-DELTA MODELING FORUM

MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

For June 9, 2000

(This meeting was held at the USBR Office in Sacramento)

I. SUMMARY

A. ACTION ITEMS

1. Executive Director – Reformat the SFEI accountant's cash flow statement over to a form that will allow the Steering Committee to follow operational expenditures. Send a letter to organizational members describing the change in the dues structure and billing dates. See if one of the water temperature reviewers can be at the next Steering Committee meetings to describe progress to date.
2. Pete Smith – Summarize the additional problems sets that have been discussed with the peer review committee and Prof. Sobey, and forward these to the modeling groups for their hydrodynamic peer review runs.
3. DWR, CCWD, RMA, and USBR – Are requested to use their hydrodynamic models to run the new problem sets designed by the Forum's peer review committee (item 2 above). By July 15 have general comments on Professor Sobey's current draft report, and by August 1 have the new model problems sets done.
4. Prof. Sobey – Is requested to have the final draft Phase I report to the Forum by December, and final Phase I report finished before the Asilomar 2001 meeting.
5. DWR/CCWD – Continue with plans for the Forum's Carriage Water Workshop.
6. Hubert Morel-Seytoux – Prepare a proposal for a hydrology/operations workshop.

B. MOTIONS PASSED

1. Steering Committee Dues – A motion was passed to have dues at \$2,000 for those agencies which want a seat on the Steering Committee. Agencies with a seat on the Steering Committee will constitute the voting body.

C. REFERENCES HANDED OUT

1. Executive Director's Report (covering finances, dues, and peer reviews) (Williams)
 2. Cash Flow Statement, Covering July 1, 1999 to May 31, 2000 (Williams)
 3. Proposed Name Change for Forum (Satkowski)
-

II. MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER – Done by Rob Tull. Proxie held for John Headlee, Jay Lund, Grace Chan. A quorum was declared.

2. SECRETARY'S REPORT – The minutes of March 31, 2000 were approved.

3. TREASURER'S REPORT - The Executive Director handed out the "Cash-Flow Statement, July 1, 1999 – May 31, 2000", and his "Executive Director Report". Approximately \$38,000 is in the general fund, \$50,000 is in the peer review fund, and \$450 is in the Fisher Award fund. Basically for the year to date the Forum is breaking even on income and expenses. There was some discussion that the accountant's figures on the cash-flow statement (accrual accounting) are not in the best format for the Steering Committee use. The Executive Director will prepare a new form which will convert the accountant's cash flow statement over to show those numbers of importance to the Steering Committee. He will give this new form to the Steering Committee to review. The "Executive Director's Report" contains a discussion of the details.

Some discussion ensued on when the invoices are sent out. Various people present said they don't know when to expect the bill, and so they are not looking for it to husband it through their agency's paper mill. It was mentioned that the mailing of the dues is sporadic, depending upon the agency's anniversary date of when they joined. Some discussion ensued of the advisability of changing to one date for all agencies. One possibility discussed was to use January for the due date of all organizational dues. But then agencies that paid just prior to January would have to pay again too soon. It was decided to send bills to organizational members in January, to accommodate the various fiscal years used by different agencies, and to

send bills to individuals in July. The Executive Director will send a letter to organizational members describing the change.

4. PEER REVIEW ACTIVITIES (moved up because Pete Smith had to leave for a meeting) –

a. Hydrodynamic Models – An amended contract was issued to Prof. Sobey. The modeling groups (DWR, CCWD, RMA, USBR) will be requested to work on the new problems recently defined by Pete Smith, the Executive Director, and Rob Tull (the hydrodynamics peer review committee), and have been asked to be finished by the time that Prof. Sobey returns to Berkeley in July. Then the professor will prepare a draft report and present it to the following for their review: several copies to the Steering Committee; USBR; DWR; CCWD; RMA (especially including Hubert, Pete Smith, John deGeorge, KT Shum, Parvis Nadir, among others). However, the intent is to have a limited distribution at this first review.

The following comments were among those made during the discussion. Mass and momentum conservation are not enough to look at in the model review. One must also look at tides vs time, and slope of channels vs mass at nodes. One question arose as to whether the peer review is looking at the original models, or the revised models.

The hydrodynamic peer review committee recommended to the Steering Committee that Problems H-4 and H-5 be rerun, and to do a new hydrograph problem. Problem H-4 is a steady state problem, and H-5 is an unsteady flow problem. Rerun parts A, B, and C. The model geometries have been revised to rectangular channels. The lengths of channels and time steps have been changed. Three new problems, H-9, H-10, and H-11 have been added. It shouldn't be a big job to run two of the problems. Pete Smith of the hydrodynamic peer review committee will get the problem sets out next week. He will also summarize the additional work that is being done. The current new problems were formulated so that the models would have equitable input.

The main point is that the various models are now all running the same problems. The above runs will be done by DWR, CCWD, and RMA. Pete Smith will contact the above entities. Prof. Sobey will be back in July. So by July 15 the various modelers should have general comments on the current draft report, and by August 1 have the new model runs results and any additional comments, for submittal to the professor for his review. The professor will then work these review results into his draft report. Then the goal is for the professor to submit a final draft to the Forum by December, 2000. The ULTIMATE GOAL is to have a final finished report by the Asilomar 2001 meeting, for distribution to the general audience.

Hubert suggested the possibility of having the above Phase I peer review report published as a paper by the USGS, as papers by Sobey et al. Now it is time to start thinking about Phase II. Consider Prof. Sobey for one of the reviewers of Phase II, to provide continuity. It was suggested that documentation of future models being put up for peer reviews be issued to interested members of the Steering Committee, which would give them a better

foundation for knowing what the potential concerns and problems may be. Some aspects of the DWR's DSM-2 model appear on their website.

b. Water Temperature Models – The temperature review is being done by Mike Deas and Cindy Lowney, with an oversight committee of Jay Lund, John Bartholow, and John Williams. John will check to see if perhaps Cindy or Jay or Mike Deas can be at the next meeting to explain their progress to date. Some discussion ensued on how this review is really in two parts, one part being the water temperature review and one part being the water temperature effects on fish review. For the latter Chris Marek has sent John Williams a draft two weeks ago. Chris has presented lots of info: there are 50 pages of review so far, with more to be done. The EPA Region 10 TMDL for water temperature goals for fishery was mentioned. The fish review is back on track, with an anticipated completion date of late fall or early winter.

c. Carriage Water – The DWR and CCWD are making work plans for a Forum carriage water workshop. The Forum should develop a package from this workshop. The DWR and CCWD would be on the workshop panel. The SWRCB hearings are driving the schedule for the workshop, since the workshop is intended to clarify issues for the SWRCB. Phase 8 of the Water Rights hearings are scheduled to start on June 30. If the Forum has a workshop on carriage water by October, that could help out the SWRCB hearings in December. The CCWD uses the Fisher model for carriage water determinations, and DWR will use CALSIM (DSM-2 is involved in CALSIM). CALSIM2 is scheduled for completion in July. The above models will be used to determine the carriage water needed.

d. Integrated Ground Water – Surface Water Model (IGSM) Proposal – Nigel is still enroute from OUTCONUS and so not here to amplify on the efforts to date. The IGSM is a public model. There is an IGSM committee doing model verification, visual interfacing, and looking at the first phase model engine. Nigel may want to start on the engine review, with seed money.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT - The SWRCB wants a peer review on the water rights issue. This will not be out standard review. John Williams gave technical assistance during the preparation of the report. Peter Moyle is helping. The final report is out now. Our review will be helpful to the SWRCB. CALFED is going over the Decision Analysis process gained from a recent workshop. The Forum's tax-exempt status is being worked on.

6. BDMF DUES STRUCTURE - The Steering Committee was authorized to make changes to the dues structure by a by-laws amendment passed at Asilomar. It was moved and seconded to set the dues at \$2,000 for those organizational member's who have a seat on the Steering Committee. Dues will remain at \$1,000 for other organizational members, except for 501 © (3) organizations which will get a 50% discount. Those agencies having a seat on the Steering Committee will constitute the voting body.

7. WORKSHOPS – As mentioned Nigel was not yet back to make a presentation. Hubert Morel-Seytoux mentioned that he had just given a presentation at DWR, to what he thought would be a small audience. However, 26 persons turned up. This interest indicates the material he presented may be a good topic for a future workshop. The material he thinks would make a good workshop is interrelated and falls into the following groups: (1) flood routing in streams, with daily time steps; (2) interactions between streams and aquifers; (3) reservoir operations; and (4) water rights. The SWRCB has jurisdiction over surface water and subterranean streams. Hubert proposed a workshop with all above topics under one umbrella. It was suggested to Hubert that he write up a proposal for such a workshop, and get it to Nigel. This would be a training workshop, but would be tutorial in nature.

8. FORUM NAME CHANGE PROPOSAL – A paper was handed out with some suggestions. One comment made was just to include the whole State in the Forum's activities, but don't change the name. Because time was getting short it was decided to postpone further discussion until the next Steering Committee meeting.

9. NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING – Friday, August 25, 2000, 0930 – 1300, at CH2M-Hill offices in Oakland. Near 12th St. BART Station. Lunch will be served.

ATTENDANCE:

Richard Denton	CCWD
Kevin Long	SWRCB
John Williams	BDMF
Ed Pattison	Modesto ID
Spreck Rosekranz	Environ. Defense
Rob Tull	CH2M-Hill
Walter Bourez	MBK
Judith Garland	EBMUD
Rich Satkowski	SWRCB
George Nichol	CVRWQCB
Lenora Thomas	USBR
Peter Baker	Stillwater Sciences
Paul Hutton	DWR
Hubert Morel-Seytoux	Hydrology Days Pub.
Andrew Hamilton	USFWS
Pete Smith	USGS
Terry Erlewine	SWC

Respectfully Submitted,
George Nichol

Secretary, BDMF