

**NWS Hydrology Forecast Verification Team  
Teleconference Notes  
12/18/2007**

**Agenda**

- Presentation of the slides by Julie Demargne
- Update on the Archive Database given by Julie Meyer
- Questions about IVP and the Archive Database answered by Hank Herr

**Questions and Comments**

**Slides #5-6:** the two slides present the archiving table to fill out, not the results yet since only 9 RFCs sent the survey back. The column for the number of locations should be labeled headwater and downstream, instead of upstream and downstream.

**Action:** for the 4 other RFCs, please send back the survey as soon as possible so that all the results can be presented to the team at the next meeting and integrated in the archiving requirement report.

**Slide #7:** Julie Meyer gave an update about the archive database and the RAX replacement hardware. The boxes delivery has been postponed although there is a clear need for the boxes right now at the RFCs before too many RAX failures occur.

**Action:** each RFC should make their region aware of that need. Julie D. and Mary M. will see with Randy Rieman and Donna Page what can be done to move forward.

The team discussed the data quality control issue. Jim Coe presented the issue at APRFC since the raw data is automatically archived in the Archive DB and then the data QC process in the Archive DB is very limited and extremely time consuming. Greg Waller will see how WGRFC could help with the QC tcl script developed by their DOH. Also, APRFC could try to use the processed tables for verification; but the current procedure for moving the processed tables doesn't work with stage.

**Action:** Julie Meyer and Jim Coe will develop a DR to be submitted to Randy Rieman for this issue with processed tables.

Hank Herr discussed the 4 issues raised by NCRFC about the interactions between RAX and IVP. Most of these issues are likely to come from a very slow database. Regarding the memory issue, the user should not try to process more than 400,000 points. For the time series plot, it's better to zoom in and define on the X axis a time window of 2 weeks to plot a reasonable amount of time series.

**Slide #10:** each RFC focal point presented the verification case study/studies that could be selected. The case studies are based on various forecasts (single-valued, ensemble) and analyze different issues (QPF from different sources, impact of MODs, ensemble prototypes, high events). For the 3 RFCs part of the WR verification team, they may want to expand their verification case studies by analyzing similar events or additional model

runs. The slide has been updated to integrate the information from 12 RFCs. NERFC may need to use EVS to verify their GFS-based hydrologic ensemble forecasts.

**Action:** All the RFCs will prepare 2 slides for the next meeting to present their case study, including the forecast data to be analyzed.

**Slide #11:** the schedule for the AWIPS ob8.2 installation for all the RFCs is still unclear. It's difficult to know if the team will be able to start working on IVP exercises in February. Also some RFCs have issues with the archive db, especially NWRFC who cannot archive anything right now. It may be necessary to postpone the meeting in February to give more time to CBRFC (and CNRFC potentially) to work on their verification case study and present it to the team, while the other RFCs get AWIPS ob8.2 installed.

**Action:** all the RFCs will check their schedule for the AWIPS ob8.2 installation. For the next meeting, they will give the date by which the new IVP will be installed. The team agenda will then be modified as necessary.

Next teleconference will be **Thursday, January 17, 2008 from 12pm to 1:30 pm EST.**