

---

**Minutes of the Subcommittee on Sedimentation**  
**March 17, 2003**  
**USGS National Center, Reston, Virginia**

The Subcommittee on Sedimentation (SOS) met from 8:45 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on March 17 at the U.S. Geological Survey National Center in Reston Virginia. The SOS last met on December 12-13, 2002 in Bay St. Louis and Slidell, MS. The following constitutes the approved meeting minutes.

**SYNOPSIS OF ACTION ITEMS AND RELATED INFORMATION**

1. **SOS-ACWI:** SOS will finalize the Terms of Reference (TOR) and other information to request formal membership in Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI). The SOS will draft a petition for inclusion in the ACWI. The Technical Committee would not be under SOS and ACWI but would still have a communication and coordination link. The proposed TOR's and petition will be circulated by EMAIL with a **response date by May 23**. **Jerry Bernard** will lead this effort and take advantage of resources in the USGS and other agencies as appropriate. Doug Glysson and John Gray, with Toni Johnson's support, will present the revised TOR's and the petition, to include a list of accomplishments of the SOS, to the ACWI at its next meeting.
2. **Concept of FISP Relocation:** The SOS agreed to the proposal to relocate the FISP warehousing/test/evaluation/sales functions to the USGS Hydrologic Instrumentation Facility in Bay St. Louis, MS, as indicated in item #1, Appendix A, to take place in FY03-FY04. The **Chairman, SOS**, will forward this to the Chairman, Technical Committee for their consideration.
3. **Completion of Selected FISP R&D Projects:** The SOS encourages the Technical Committee to arrange for completion of FISP projects that are near completion. The 1-liter bag sampler and the D-99 heavy bag sampler were specifically noted as being the focus of this recommendation. The **Chairman, SOS**, will forward this recommendation to the Chairman, Technical Committee.
4. **Preparation of an Action Plan for FISP R&D Activities:** The SOS recommends that the Technical Committee prepare an action plan to redefine the mission, function, requisite skills, and location for the R&D activities of the FISP within 1 year (no later than March 17, 2004), given the focus on new technologies as generally described in item #2, Appendix A. The **Chairman, SOS**, will forward this recommendation to the Chairman, Technical Committee.
5. **Workshop on Interagency Sediment Research and Development (R&D):** **Thad Pratt** agreed to explore the potential for holding an interagency workshop, sponsored by the SOS, to clarify sediment-related R&D among the SOS member agencies. Thad will report back to the SOS on this concept on or before **June 3**, 2003.
6. **SOS WebSite:** **Thad Pratt** will develop a dummy web site for review by the SOS by **May 30**, 2003, after coordinating plans with Doug Glysson and respective web managers in USGS and USACE. The purpose of the website is to increase and enhance information exchange on sediment issues of interest to the SOS. Doug Norton will act as an advisor on this project.
7. **RESIS-II:** **Jerry Bernard and Jerry Webb** will ascertain if serving the PDF version of the basic data sheets on-line is legal. If it is, Jerry Bernard will proceed to put the information on-line.
8. **8FISC:** **Doug Glysson** will report on results of his search for a conference venue at the **June 3**, 2003 SOS meeting. Agencies are encouraged to provide nominations for the Conference Chair, Program Chair, and Operations Chair on or before June 3, 2003.

---

**ATTENDEES:** The list of attendees at the meeting follow. An updated list of the full membership and associated contact information as confirmed by the attendees is on-line under the “subcommittee” heading at: <http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/sedmin.html> .

Subcommittee members (m), alternates (a), and guests (g):

- Jerry Bernard, USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service (m)
- Ted Yang, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (m)
- Chris Knopp, U.S. Forest Service (m)
- Jerry Webb, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (m)
- Thad Pratt, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (a)
- Doug Norton, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (m)
- Jim Robinson, International Boundary and Water Commission (m)
- Matt Römken, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (a)
- Mark Weltz, USDA-Agricultural Research Service (m)
- Jorge Pagán Ortiz, Federal Highway Administration (m)
- G. Doug Glysson, U.S. Geological Survey (a)
- John R. Gray, Chair, U.S. Geological Survey (m)
- Toni Johnson, U.S. Geological Survey, Executive Secretary, ACWI
- Stephen F. Blanchard, Chief of U.S. Geological Survey’s Office of Surface Water

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA:** The meeting opened with a welcome to the USGS National Center by Chairman John R. Gray. All attendees introduced themselves. Agenda topics were approved.

**NEXT SOS MEETING:** June 3, 2003, at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers office at 441 G. St., Washington, D.C. Host Jerry Webb will provide details in time for the meeting.

**DECEMBER 12-13, 2002, SOS MEETING MINUTES:** The minutes were approved as presented, and are on-line under the “subcommittee” heading at: <http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/sedmin.html> .

**OCTOBER 2001 SOS MEETING DRAFT MINUTES:** Comments on the draft minutes by at least two agencies (USGS and USBR, according to Christi Young) were incorporated, and the minutes placed on-line at <http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/sedmin.html> . John Gray reported that the principal recommendations from that meeting (dealing with the concept of the FISP move; the Prospectus; SOS committee parentage; RESIS-II; Turbidity Workshop; and the SOS web site) have been addressed in the two subsequent meetings.

**MAY 2, 2002 SOS AD HOC MEETING MINUTES**

No formal minutes were taken by the acting SOS chief during an evening ad hoc meeting of the SOS immediately following the SOS-sponsored Turbidity and Other Sediment Surrogates Workshop, Reno, April 30-May 2, 2002. The outcomes of the workshop will be presented at the June 3, 2003, SOS meeting. See entry on “Turbidity and Other Sediment Surrogates Workshop.”

**COMMUNICATION:** Reminder: Jerry Bernard has formed a closed EMAIL group to facilitate SOS internal communications:

[sedimentation@yahooogroups.com](mailto:sedimentation@yahooogroups.com).

Only members of the group can send email to the group. Any response to a message goes to the entire group, which includes the Chief, Technical Committee (currently the Forest Service’s John Potyondy). The group is not publicly known or searchable. All members at this meeting are currently set as members of the group. Contact Jerry Bernard for changes or if additional members need to be added.

---

**PERSPECTIVES FROM THE CHIEF, OFFICE OF SURFACE WATER (OSW):** Stephen (Steve) F. Blanchard, OSW Chief since December 9, 2002, opted to spend less time presenting his views on the importance of Federal fluvial sediment activities – which were summarized in the minutes of the December 12-13, 2002, SOS meeting – and more on issues that may directly affect the SOS, Technical Committee, and Federal Interagency Sedimentation Project (FISP) in the coming months and years.

The backdrop for Steve’s perspectives includes the fact that the OSW has incurred an across-the-board 10% cut in operating expenses. The 10% cut has been applied to all OSW-funded operations, including the FISP, resulting in a FY03 FISP support level of \$217K from the OSW. The tight fiscal times require an evaluation of OSW priorities and expenditures to ensure that our increasingly limited resources are allocated in the wisest manner. These and other considerations led to five “guiding principles” and other information provided in appendix A and his PowerPoint presentation (available on request), and to several SOS decisions described herein.

## **TOPICAL DISCUSSIONS**

### **□ SOS Relationship to the Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI):**

Jerry Bernard, having previously developed draft terms of reference, opened the discussion. Considerable discussion took place regarding the need for, pros, and cons of the SOS’s petitioning for membership under the ACWI. Those considerations deemed to be most important are provided below in bullet format with principal attribution:

- **Thad Pratt:** Membership in ACWI must have clear benefits to SOS; membership must overcome creation of additional government layers; what is the need for an ACWI-SOS, considering the existence of the Technical Committee and the FISP? If the purpose of the SOS is to simply increase communication between the member agencies, it is not sufficient reason to seek inclusion under the ACWI. The question I must ask, “will my (USACE) District profit from this?” I don’t like Big Government. There appears to be a need to “isolate” the Technical Committee and FISP from the SOS if it is included under the ACWI.
- **John Gray:** SOS is parentless and, other than putting on the highly successful Federal Interagency Sedimentation Conference series on 5-year intervals, the current SOS membership implicitly concurred that it has not been a particularly effective committee in the last ~7 years. The focus of the Technical Committee remains largely limited to the technical aspects of the FISP, as indicated by Technical Committee Chairman John Potyondy in November 2002. The Technical Committee represents a subset of the SOS membership. The SOS’s purview is and must be broader than that for the Technical Committee.
- **Doug Glysson:** SOS does more than form a focal point for communication. It has provided funds for a recent modeling conference and turbidity workshop, and it has potential to raise the profile of critical sedimentation issues that would result in ACWI-member agencies reassessing priorities and perhaps allocating resources to the more pressing sediment issues. One option to “isolate” the FISP is not to mention it in the Terms of Reference.

The SOS Charter and Terms of Reference (albeit with some ambiguity) only allow the SOS to make recommendations to the Technical Committee, and not to set policy for the Technical Committee.

---

The linkage between the SOS and Technical Committee will have to be dealt with so that those not contributing significant funding to the FISP will not be able to exert control over FISP.

- **Doug Norton:** The current SOS lacks clout. There is a strong need for an SOS, but an effective one.
- **Jerry Webb:** Interagency collaboration is becoming more critical as resources decline; for example, the USACE has lost most of its expertise in fluvial-sediment analysis in the last few years. We must pool resources where appropriate.
- **Toni Johnson:** Things to think about in considering the SOS-ACWI Issue (reminder: the ACWI will vote on whether or not they seek to have the SOS as its Subcommittee if so petitioned by the SOS):
  1. **SOS UNDER THE ACWI:** Take advantage of the formal structure of ACWI, chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), without the SOS itself having to spend time and energy on the formal FACA process itself. This could have several benefits to the SOS:
    - a. Recommendations made by the SOS as a subgroup of ACWI – if accepted by ACWI – would carry more weight with the Federal agencies who are members of and participants in ACWI. Although ACWI does not have a regulatory, legal or congressional mandate that forces agencies to take a particular position, they do seriously consider recommendations that come out of a FACA committee.
    - b. Active participation by SOS in ACWI would provide the opportunity for regular communication, through an existing multi-agency structure (which includes many of the same Federal players), and help further coordination and collaboration on sedimentation issues of common interest.
    - c. Recommendations and other products from the SOS could be broadly distributed beyond the Federal agencies through the Regional/State/Local/University and non-government associations that are members of ACWI. This might provide some additional visibility and understanding to the Sedimentation Community and its issues.
    - d. Notice how many of the statements regarding the mission and vision of the SOS are already consistent and compatible with those of ACWI and its other sub-groups:
      - i. Standards...new technologies...calibrations – very similar to the goals of the Methods and Data Comparability Board of the National Water Quality Monitoring Council.
      - ii. Communication...R&D...collaboration...web site – very similar to key elements of all of ACWI and its subcommittees.
    - e. ACWI provides the opportunity to bring non-Federal groups and associations to the SOS table, if SOS seeks their input and assistance (in-kind support, conference contributions, information networking).
  2. **SOS UNAFFILIATED WITH THE ACWI:** Continue SOS as an independent Federal Inter-Agency committee, and share your information and activities as appropriate with ACWI via web-links (already exist), email dialog, and a presentation about the SOS, the FISP and/or the Conference at the annual ACWI meeting (this would be required as a member of ACWI).

- 
- **Stated, Attribution Unknown:** Benefits of an SOS-ACWI include broadening the SOS agenda, elevating the agenda to the Assistant Secretary level, the greater potential to obtain funding, and the potential to obtain useful feedback from the ACWI.

**\*\*\*Action\*\*\*: A motion was passed unanimously for the SOS to finalize the Terms of Reference (Terms) and other information to request formal membership in the ACWI. Additionally, the SOS will draft a petition for inclusion in the ACWI. The proposed Terms and petition will be circulated by EMAIL with a response date by May 23. Jerry Bernard will lead this effort and take advantage of resources in the USGS and other agencies as appropriate. Doug Glysson and John Gray, with Toni Johnson's support, will present the revised Terms and the petition, to include a list of accomplishments of the SOS, to the ACWI at its next meeting, now rescheduled for September 9-10, 2003.**

□ **Concept of Relocation of the Federal Interagency Sedimentation Project**

The term "R&D" refers to the "Research and Development" activities of the FISP as differentiated from the FISP's fabrication, testing, calibrating, warehousing, sales, and customer support functions related to approved FISP products. The sum of these activities is considered to represent essentially the full scope of FISP activities/functions.

A written perspective on this subject was provided in absentia by BLM SOS representative Bill Carey on March 13, 2003, and is provided in this section.

Steve Blanchard presented a USGS proposal related to the potential move of the FISP to the HIF. Steve opened the discussion with a statement of five guiding principals, on which he sought comment/concurrence:

**OSW Chief Steve Blanchard's Guiding Principles Related to the Concept of Relocating the FISP:**

1. Based on current knowledge, the era of designing new isokinetic samplers is essentially over;
2. The Federal Gov't needs to focus on new technologies (i.e. acoustics, optics, lasers, etc.);
3. Fed Gov't should be, in general, testing and evaluating and NOT designing and building;
4. Fabrication, testing, calibrating, warehousing, and sales of existing samplers can stand alone and be self sufficient
5. We need a staff for R&D that has the knowledge and ability to pursue new technologies

**Some of the Perspectives Offered in the Ensuing Discussion (not all captured):**

**Guiding Principles #1 & #2:**

**John Gray:** Described parallels between the circumstances existing when the FISP was formed in the late 1930's and today, primarily for the benefit of new SOS members. In the 1920's-30's, a plethora of devices were being used – many of them "home built" and not based on sound scientific principles – by the various agencies interested in sediment measurements. The FISP was formed to bring consistency and "good science" to sediment sampling, and to that end has been extremely successful. Today there are a plethora of sediment-surrogate technologies available to infer selected characteristics of fluvial sediment. Manufacturer's claims aside, there is considerable evidence that many of these devices cannot produce reliable data for all applications and at all times. The need for leadership, standardization, and quality control in sedimentation studies is as great today as it was in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Additionally, there is a need to advance those instruments that can collect sediment data as needed and at an acceptable accuracy to provide the Nation's fluvial data in a safer, continuous, more cost-effective and accurate manner.

---

**Thad Pratt:** Agrees 80% with this guiding principle #2. Urges that a clear synopsis of relevant sediment-related research and instrument development among the SOS agencies be developed, as this may have a bearing on how FISP operates.

**Mark Weltz:** We should be cognizant of the need to not only address “clean” sediments, but also concentrations of chemical constituents associated with those sediments. Wonders if the future R&D functions at the FISP can/will address upland processes? They now appear to primarily address riverine processes.

**Jerry Bernard:** The SOS historically has focused on the physical measurement of sediment quantitatively, since the prime issue of concern continues to be the adequacy and accuracy of collected data. Knowledge of sediment quantities, transport rates, and trends is the foundation for programmatic decisions by Federal agencies on how to best allocate limited resources for data collection, as well as for source area protection issues. The SOS is not restricted from addressing sediment-quality issues, although EPA and others have been active in this area.

### **Guiding Principle #3:**

**Thad Pratt:** Believes that the FISP could fulfill the role of an “Underwriter Laboratory” for the Federal Government by testing and evaluating products to measure properties of sediment, and that this perhaps could be used as an ancillary funding mechanism for the FISP by accepting a fee to perform these services.

**Doug Glysson:** The “Underwriter’s Laboratory” concept for the FISP is not without problems, such as if one private-sector firm receives benefits not extended to another.

**John Gray:** Noted that the “FISP as Underwriter Laboratory” concept was raised in the Technical Committee about 3 years ago, and was met with decidedly mixed opinion.

### **Guiding Principle #4:**

**Thad Pratt:** Considers the concept of moving part of FISP to be “a waste of time,” as “people are still needed to do the work.” Is concerned that a source of income to R&D, the subsidy from sales, will be lost if the non-R&D part of FISP is relocated to the FISP. Believes that this is micromanaging a FISP “that is working now.” “The question is on efficiency.”

**John Gray:** The Technical Committee has resolved to continue to focus its attention on technical matters related to guiding and setting priorities for the FISP. This does not include consideration of some broader issues related to the efficiency and management of the FISP (nor presumably to the location of the FISP, although not specifically stated at that time; based on late 2002 communications with the Technical Committee Chairman).

**Steve Blanchard:** It may be contrary to Gov’t policy to use sampler sales to subsidize R&D. There is a precedent in USGS for recovering costs of some services (calibration of cameras for use by private sector in aerial photography) but only the actual costs and not a “profit”. One option, undoubtedly legal, is to reduce the cost of samplers to FISP customers. Notes the benefit of single focus for R&D if physically separated from non-R&D functions of FISP. The USGS should explore a way to continue the use of “profit” from the sales to promote R&D at the FISP

**Ted Yang:** Considers the benefits of moving the warehousing/test/evaluation/sales (non R&D) functions of the FISP to the HIF, noting that there would be a “tremendous savings” if housed at the HIF. There is a need to

---

operate like the private sector. When resources diminish, the private sector looks toward merging operations. Merging the FISP with the HIF makes sense for a number of reasons.

**Jerry Webb:** Believes that for this discussion we should focus on separating the concept of R&D from warehousing/test/evaluation/sales.

Wonders if it is possible to figure out a way to leave the sales surplus with the R&D function, perhaps as a “royalty.” Steve Blanchard indicates that he is amenable to this “if the auditors will go along with it.”

Notes that that there seems to be a fundamental mission change taking place with respect to the FISP. John Gray concurs and expands on that observation. Jerry Webb noted that “if there is a different mission in the FISP’s future, all is different; let’s move on (with the change in mission).”

**Unattributed:** Proposes that the potential for HIF rental of FISP equipment be explored.

**Guiding Principle #5:**

**Matt Römken:** There is a different emphasis required for the type of work the FISP may be doing in the near future. There will be more of a need for different expertise, including telecommunications, electronics, and other skills.

**Doug Glysson:** Current FISP personnel lack operational field experience. Such experience would be valuable when evaluating the usefulness of a given technology in a range of field settings.

**Ted Yang:** The FISP has not been doing a very effective job for a number of years, particularly with respect to their highest priority for the last half-decade, emerging sediment technologies. The USBR can’t justify continued contributions to the FISP under those circumstances. To continue USBR support, there must be fundamental changes in the FISP. The SOS should set policy and let the Technical Committee (and the supervisors of FISP personnel) attend to details. Tough choices have to be made.

**Chris Knopp:** Wonders why we are belaboring the discussion. There is concurrence that a change is needed. The USGS oversees the USGS employees at the FISP; the USGS should decide how to best manage human resources. Mark Weltz concurs, indicating that it is (primarily) up to the USGS to address this.

**Unattributed:** Two SOS members have heard of interest of other facilities (federal, universities) that may have interest in hosting the FISP for R+D activities.

**All:** The SOS concurred on the 5 guiding principles, with EPA inserting a caveat regarding principle #2 that it apply less to long-term research than to an effort to get products to the States in the short-term. The Chair, SOS, was asked to relay the next three action items to the Technical Committee Chair.

**Perspectives (by EMAIL) from SOS BLM representative Bill Carey, absent from the March 17 meeting, regarding the “concept of the FISP relocation” provided to the SOS Chairman on March 13, 2003:**

John [Gray, Chairman, SOS],

I only have a strong opinion about the FISP moving issue. Moving the FISP to HIF may, in time, be appropriate. However there is no immediate need for a move. A move in the near future would serve no purpose but to disrupt the lives of long-time employees in the latter stages of their careers. I strongly disagree with my colleagues on the SOS who say that humanitarian concerns should not be taken into account. A move

at this time would not provide these employees with a new career path nor would it even provide for a salary increase. A move would offer these employees absolutely nothing but misery and disruption. It is simply the wrong thing to do. I believe that the move issue should be tabled until we begin to see some retirements at the FISP. At that time it would be appropriate to consider long-term options for the FISP. Until that time I have a standing vote against moving the FISP.

BC [Bill Carey]

**\*\*\*Action\*\*\* The SOS agreed with the Corps sole dissent that the FISP sales/warehousing should be moved to the HIF as per item #1, appendix A, to take place in FY03-FY04. The SOS recommends the TC accept the SOS decision.**

**\*\*\*Action\*\*\* A motion was passed unanimously to encourage the Technical Committee to arrange finish in the most expeditious manner those FISP projects that are near completion. The 1-liter bag sampler and the D-99 heavy bag sampler were specifically noted as being the focus of this recommendation.**

**\*\*\*Action\*\*\* A motion was passed with the Corps sole dissent to recommend to the Technical Committee to prepare an action plan to redefine the mission, function, requisite skills, and location for the R&D activities of the FISP within 1 year (no later than March 17, 2004), given the focus on new technologies.**

**\*\*\*Action\*\*\* Thad Pratt agreed to explore the potential for holding an interagency workshop, sponsored by the SOS, to clarify sediment-related R&D among the SOS member agencies. Thad will report back to the SOS on this concept on or before June 3, 2003.**

□ **SOS WebSite**

**Thad Pratt:** Presented his vision of the contents of an SOS website, to include links to information sources that will in part provide the information that was previously available through the “Sedimentation Notes” series that was discontinued in 1992. Thad considers this an ideal mechanism to share agency sedimentation information. Suggests that it should include hypertexted titles of selected reports with a PDF format report available by clicking on the titles.

Proposes developing a “dummy SOS website” for consideration by the SOS.

**Doug Glysson:** Noted that the SOS Instrumentation Notes series focused on data collection and not on sediment R&D. Indicates that an appropriate site would be on the ACWI web page under “Sedimentation” at: <http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/sedmin.html> . Reiterated from last meeting that the USGS is publishing USGS data and information about sedimentation activities through its numerous web sites. The SOS website could provide links to other agency websites for sedimentation data and activities.

**John Gray:** Wanted to note that there is such a report database that the USGS developed for the Federal Highway Administration Road Runoff Quality program. The web site for that program is: <http://ma.water.usgs.gov/FHWA/NDAMSP1.html> .

**Jerry Bernard:** Proposes that web masters from USGS (Lorna Schmidt) and USACE (to be named) communicate with Thad Pratt and Doug Glysson within earshot to ensure that the joint project initiates with their full knowledge and insights.



**\*\*\*Action\*\*\* Thad Pratt will develop a dummy web site for viewing by the SOS by May 30, 2003, after coordinating plans with Doug Glysson and respective web managers in USGS and USACE. Doug Norton will act as an advisor on this project.**

□ **8<sup>th</sup> Federal Interagency Sedimentation Conference**

Doug Glysson noted that RFP's for venues to hold the 8<sup>th</sup> FISC circa March 2006 have been sent out. He will provide a summary of responses at the next SOS meeting before making site visits.

Doug proposes that someone other than him signs the contract with the venue for the conference. He noted that selection of a Conference Chair, Program Chair, and Operations Chair should be made soon, as concerted conference planning normally initiates three full years in advance of the conference. Gray noted that the FISC series has been held every five years since 1981, and that the 8FISC, if it is to be held on that schedule, would take place in 2006. In that event, a site should be selected by summer 2003.

**\*\*\*Action\*\*\* Doug Glysson will report on results of his search for a conference venue at the June 3, 2003 SOS meeting. Agencies are encouraged to provide nominations for the Conference Chair, Program Chair, and Operations Chair on or before June 3, 2003. Agencies are asked to consider nominations for the key 8FISC positions, and present those at the next SOS meeting.**

□ **Turbidity and Other Sediment Surrogates Workshop**

Doug Glysson and John Gray reported that the workshop report is in draft stage, and should be in full review in April. It will be forwarded to the SOS after it has been through initial review but before publication.

□ **Reservoir Information System II (RESIS-II) Update**

Jerry Bernard provided a brief history of the development of the database, both the paper copies collected through the SOS, and the digital database. See previous minutes.

Jerry reported that David Mixon, a graduate student at the University of Colorado, has been working on RESIS for his thesis (on March 28, 2003, USBR SOS alternate Christi Young wrote that USBR has a copy of David Mixon's M.S. thesis, "Automatic Watershed Location and Characterization with GIS for an Analysis of Reservoir Sedimentation Patterns"). The SCS Form-34 data collection sheets have been scanned as binary files, which can be converted to TIF images or as PDFs. Access could be provided to these forms on-line through the Internet. This would represent compliance, if minimal, to the need to render this information publically available per the decision in the December 2002 SOS meeting to, "...post on-line all RESIS-related information that can be done legally."

It was noted that the forms include the latitude and longitude of the reservoirs. He has consulted Bill Irwin, NRCS, who is part of USCOLD and has knowledge of the Dams Data base. Bill noted that the latitude and longitude information is not as sensitive as the "nearest town." He suggested the following courses of action: Post what we can now, and continue development of the on-line relational database.

No decision, nor suggestions, were put forth regarding a permanent location and proprietor for RESIS-II.

The working group (led by Jerry Bernard and including Christi Young, Matt Römken, Thad Pratt and John Gray), charged with addressing the issues of RESIS-II completion and location of a permanent proprietor for

---

the database was not disbanded. John Gray agreed to communicate one more time with Bob Stallard, USGS, to get his up-to-date recommendations on completion of RESIS-II.

**\*\*\*Action\*\*\* Jerry Bernard and Jerry Webb will ascertain if serving the PDF version of the basic data sheets on-line is legal. If it is, Jerry Bernard will proceed to put the information on-line.**

□ **SOS International Activities**

Ted Yang, who agreed to take over this subgroup, gave three reasons for the SOS to become involved in international activities:

1. Funding problems: Combining resources is “the name of the game” in declining budgets.
2. Protocols: USGS, USBR, ARS, and others have formal agreements enabling international collaboration.
3. Some foreign organizations can cooperate in a fully reimbursable manner, but they expect products for their funds.

Ted proposes that the SOS communicate and perhaps collaborate with other organizations, perhaps including:

1. The International Commission on Large Dams,
2. International Association of Hydraulic Research, Fluvial Hydraulics Committee,
3. International Research and Training Centre for Erosion and Sedimentation,
4. Yellow River Conservancy Commission, China, and
5. International Atomic Energy Agency.

Ted noted that several agencies (USBR, USGS, ARS) have on-going involvement to varying degrees with foreign partners. Ted asked the SOS what it would like him to do.

Mark Wertz noted formation of a second “Center,” on Grazinglands, with China (the first, the Centers for Soil and Water Conservation and Environmental Protection was formed in concert with China, ARS, USGS, and the University of Arizona in May 2002; see <http://www.ispe.arizona.edu/sino/> )

John Gray noted two USGS-led international proposals: Formation of an International Watershed Research Network, and an International Bedload Observatory.

The committee indicated a willingness to address international collaboration on a case-by-case bases as presented to it, but indicated no willingness to become committed to international activities in a broad-scale and continuous way.

---

**Appendix A: Guiding Principles and Recommendation regarding the operation of the Federal Interagency Sedimentation Project presented to the Subcommittee on Sedimentation on March 17, 2003, by Stephen F. Blanchard, Chief, USGS Office of Surface Water:**

**FISP Operation and Potential Move, Guiding Principles:**

- Based on our current knowledge, the era of designing new isokinetic samplers is essentially over
- We need to focus on new technologies (i.e. acoustics, optics, lasers, etc.)
- Fed Government should be, in general, testing and evaluating and NOT designing and building
- Fabrication/repair/warehousing/sales of existing samplers can stand alone and be self sufficient
- We need a staff for R+D that has the knowledge and ability to pursue new technologies

**Recommendation:**

1. FY03/FY04 – move the FISP warehousing and sales function to the HIF
  - a. The current HIF staff would assume this work and thus, FISP staff would be reduced by 2 FTE (1-admin; 1-fabrication/sales); USGS takes responsibility for finding homes for the 2 employees.
  - b. HIF sales of FISP equipment will be separated from the FISP. No income from sales will be sent back to the FISP.
  - c. USGS will pay for all costs
  
2. FY04 – refocus efforts of FISP R+D staff toward new technologies
  - a. Evaluate current staff's ability to focus on new technologies (3 FTE – 1 COE, 2-USGS)
  - b. Evaluate possible alternate location for R+D activity (universities, other Federal labs, etc)
  - c. Evaluate possible alternate method for accomplishing R+D activity, such as grants, contracts, etc