

## **RATINGS Team**

### **Minutes of Conference Call April 19, 2005**

#### Attendees

ABRFC – Lee Crowley, Janet McCormack, James Paul, and Jeff McMurphy

LMRFC – Ethan Jolly, Amanda Roberts, and Dave Reed

MARFC – Joe Ostrowski

MBRFC – Gene Derner

NCRFC – Mike Deweese and Dan Prokorny

NERFC – Rob Shedd

SERFC – Mark Fuchs

OHRFC – James Noel

ERH – George McKillop

1. Team Name – The group has adopted the name RATINGS (Ratings – USGS-NWS Sharing).
2. Review of Functional Requirements – There was a group discussion about the functional requirements. It was noted that access must be done to a http website and there may be some security issues in that method of access. The LDAD firewall is an option if this method is not acceptable. It was agreed that the functional requirements should include a statement about the need for easy access to the USGS site where the ratings are stored.

There was significant discussion about the way NWSRFS interpolates/extrapolates rating curves versus the methods used in WHFS/IHFS. Some offices would like to define the ratings based on observed points from the USGS and then let NWSRFS and WHFS/IHFS interpolate/extrapolate to intermediate points using the same procedures. This would also include using the USGS shift values. Since the methods were different, RFCs are using the expanded rating curve from the USGS instead of the observed points. It was the general consensus that WHFS/IHFS should be modified to be the same as NWSRFS. Though outside the scope of this team, the group felt it was important for this to be brought up to OCWWS and the HSDs. It was also agreed that the GUI to display the current NWSRFS and USGS ratings should be able to define the rating in NWSRFS based on observed values only.

The archive database team has setup the archive database to store ratings with a maximum of 100 pairs of points. Using the USGS expanded ratings at 0.1 ft. intervals would allow for a range of stage/discharge pairs of 10 feet. The group agreed that the Archive Database Team should remove that limitation.

Action 4/19/05-1 - Incorporate comments of group into next draft of functional requirements (Reed – due date 4/22/05)

## **RATINGS Team**

### **Minutes of March 21, 2005 Conference call**

#### **Page 1 of 3**

Action 4/19/05-2 – Coordinate needed change in Archive Database with Archive Database Team (Reed)

Action 4/19/05-3 – Notify HSDs and OCWWS about the need to utilize the same procedures to interpolate/extrapolate ratings in WHFS/IHFS as used in NWSRFS (Reed)

3. Review of Project Plan – ER had some questions about RUHT and implementation. They felt that there should be more detail in the implementation and has agreed to provide more details on milestones in this implementation.

Action 4/19/05-4 – Provide more detail on RUHT implementation for the project plan (McKillop)

4. Determine tasks to accomplish – It was agreed that there were two major programs/functions that had to be developed/implemented. These were the (1) retrieval/archival of USGS and NWSRFS ratings and (2) a graphical user interface (GUI) to display the USGS rating and current NWSRFS rating and then have the ability to drag-n-drop or point-n-click to create a new rating for NWSRFS. The remainder of the programs/scripts are relatively minor compared to these and will be developed later in this process. NCRFC agreed to work on the GUI described above in item 2. They will prepare a summary of the functionality and should have a prototype working in about a month. Since CBRFC initially developed the capability to archive ratings, they will be asked to document their procedures and incorporate any new features necessary.

There was also some discussion about RUHT and the possibility of needing additional functionality to implement. Joe Ostrowski agreed to review RUHT and provide comments.

Action 4/19/05-5 – Summarize capabilities of GUI program (NCRFC - due mid-May)

Action 4/19/05-6 – Prototype GUI program to process ratings (NCRFC – due mid-May)

Action 4/19/05-7 – Review RUHT for the need for additional capabilities (Ostrowski)

5. Other Items – There was some discussion about implementing these procedures and which locations should be included in this process. Should the RFC only provide ratings for official daily forecast locations? Flood sites? Data sites? Support points? Site-specific locations? These issues are policy issues that the HSDs and OCWWS must address. The team will develop the technical capabilities and the HSDs must address these issues.

Action 4/19/05-8 – Coordinate with HSDs and OCWWS on specific service implementation issues relating to this project (Reed)

6. Schedule next call – The consensus of the team was to have a call the week before Memorial Day (week of May 23).

**RATINGS Team**  
**Minutes of March 21, 2005 Conference call**  
**Page 3 of 3**