

**NWS Hydrology Forecast Verification Team
Teleconference Notes
09/22/2009**

Agenda

- Presentation of the recommendations from the final team report and the future verification team activities by Julie Demargne

Questions, Comments and Actions

Slide #12: the definition of seasons for which to produce verification statistics needs to be explicit. All the RFCs should use primarily the standard season definition, except Alaska which would most likely use only 2 seasons. The RFCs can also define additional seasons that are user-oriented. For example, Julie Meyer at MBRFC mentioned the navigation seasons.

Slide #13: for the QPF horizon case study, Julie Meyer pointed out that the QPF horizons beyond 3 days are not made available to the RFCs at the same time. Therefore it will be required to use the QPF horizons until Day 3 and it will be highly recommended to include additional longer QPF horizons. It is recommended for NWRFC to select a few short QPF horizons and add a few longer horizons until Day 10 (which is used operationally). Such case study will produce objectively verification information to support the use of longer QPF horizon.

Slide #14: the definition of the a priori mods needs to be clarified in the final team report. The RFCs will share what they want to include in the a priori mods.

Slide #15: there might be an issue of running performance when using multiple scenarios within CHPS. HSEB and Deltares are currently working on this issue, so the performance is expected to improve in the next few months. Tom Adams describes the experience of running 7 different forecasting scenarios on a daily basis at OHRFC, with no significant performance issue. OHRFC imports the output from the 7 scenarios into the database after regular time periods. MBRFC took a different approach to daily ingest in the database the outputs from their 17 different scenarios (based on different QPFs), with no performance issue. They also ftp some of their forecasts to NCRFC for downstream forecast prediction. Julie Meyer will provide the information and scripts to the interested RFCs.

Slides #16 and 17: it is difficult to foresee how much resource will be needed at each RFC in the next months to complete the CHPS migration and set up parallel operations of NWSRFS and CHPS. In the team report, it needs to be clear that the first priority for the RFCs is the CHPS migration. Also there will be some effort needed to validate the new forcing inputs to be processed by CHPS since they may be different from the current forcing inputs used in NWSRFS.

The next team meeting will be scheduled for late November early December to share progress on the RFC verification case studies and get feedback on the EVS version 2.0 software.