



## **Modeling Lab Action Team Meeting**

**July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013 10:00AM – 3:00PM**

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/20830>

### **MINUTES**

#### **NEXT MLAT MEETING**

- The September MLAT Meeting will be a conference call.
  - Discussion Topic: Final review of the MLAT Report and Presentation to the Management Board.
  - Date and time: TBD – Amanda Pruzinsky has sent out a doodle poll to schedule the meeting.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

##### *MLAT REPORT*

- **The all sections of the draft report are due to Mark Bennett (cc Amanda Pruzinsky) by COB September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2013.**

- Incomplete sections by assignee:

##### **Mark Bennett**

- Summary – Will be drafted after all other sections are complete and turned in.
- Guiding Principles – The general principles were written up by MLAT, but Mark is working on a detailed description of each.
- Proposed functions.
- Governance – Reviewed during this meeting and Mark is completing the draft using this meeting's comments.

##### **Lewis Linker**

- Review of existing modeling laboratories.

- Once the full draft has been sent out, MLAT member edits/comments should be sent to Mark Bennett (cc Amanda Pruzinsky) before the September MLAT Conference Call. Edits will be incorporated and/or discussed at the September MLAT Conference Call.

##### *PRESENTATION TO MANAGEMENT BOARD*

- Mark Bennett will draft the presentation based on the outline discussed at the June and July Meetings and send it to MLAT Members for review before the September MLAT Conference Call. Edits will be incorporated and/or discussed at the September MLAT

Conference Call. Lewis Linker will also send the draft report to Region 3 for comment after the Management Board Meeting.

## **TIMELINE**

*(Note: The timeline is subject to change)*

### **SEPTEMBER 2013**

**DRAFT REPORT AND PRESENTATION** – Draft report and presentation will be sent out to members for internal review before the September MLAT Conference Call, 2013.

The report and presentation will be reviewed at the July meeting in preparation for the October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Management Board meeting.

### **OCTOBER 2013**

**DRAFT FINAL REPORT** – Deliverable fall 2013 – Draft final report will be presented to Management Board at October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Management Board Meeting.

## **RESEARCH AND OPERATIONAL RFP/RFS(s) DECISION**

- During the June Meeting, the decision ended with the recommendation for one governance structure, which manages a Research RFP/RFS and an optional Operational RFP/RFS (turn-key model). What are the group's thoughts about this?
  - If the Management Board decides not to use the optional Operational RFP/RFS, the calibration will stay with the Modeling Team at the CBPO.
    - One of the strengths of leaving the calibration of the model at CBPO is that the team that will be using the model learns through the calibration process (strengths and weaknesses of the model). This makes a difference of how the model should be run, parameterized, analyzed, and interpreted.
  - If both of these options are combined into one RFP/RFS, it will be hard for the universities and contractors to apply for it, since the contractors will be interested in the operational side and the universities will be interested in the research side.
- The purpose of the NRC recommendation was to create a lab that effectively updates the current model and explore the full range of models. Create a model institute to allow the larger community to explore a variety of different models and improve the credibility of the model.
  - The jurisdictions believe that having the Operational RFP/RFS will increase the credibility of the model.

- The Modeling Laboratory RFP/RFS(s) will be long term (5 years +) to ensure stability and a core dedicated staff.
  - How is a Modeling Laboratory with a long term staff different from what is currently at the CBPO?
    - The governance of the Modeling Laboratory and the RFP/RFS selection would increase the transparency of the selection process.
    - There is more flexibility in the funding when selecting an RFP/RFS versus a grantee.
    - Complete reorganization of the current modeling groups at the CBPO.
    - Entity to foster communication between the universities and the CBP.
      - The current structure does not have the resources to support an open source community.
        - Could use CMAS has an example, different groups to provide support.
          - Team to train and create a help desk.
          - Research team.
          - Governance structure to decide what is incorporated into the next models.
        - An open source code could create a more transparent and efficient process and increased confidence and familiarity with the models.
        - The people that are currently on the Modeling Team through universities are not as connected to the research community since they work at the CBPO and not at their university.
    - The Modeling Laboratory members will not necessarily have to work at the Chesapeake Bay Program Office.
- Supporting an open source community should be seen as a long term high priority goal of the Modeling Laboratory. Initial role of the modeling laboratory should be to make contributions to the models that address needs that have already been identified. The governance will have to decide the timeline.
  - Research could begin before 2017 and could affect the 2017 model.
- Funding for research RFP/RFS has been discussed. If MLAT is not going to recommend an amount for the operational RFP/RFS, it should be stated in the report.
- **DECISION:** MLAT will recommend to the Management Board the RFP/RFS for research and operations are separately.

## GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE OF THE MODELING LABORATORY

- Restructured Modeling Workgroup to include higher level decision makers and technical and scientific expertise.

- Crucial to have technical decision makers for all aspects of the modeling.
  - Higher level decision makers could appoint technical staff to make decisions.
    - Appointees must have a clear charge – “They are the technical expert with the authority to make the technical modeling decisions related to the Modeling at the Chesapeake Bay Program.”
- Must clearly state in the report that “keeping the modeling laboratory research orientated is highly contingent on this governance structure”
- MLAT was not tasked to restructure the current CBPO, but MLAT can point out these issues and state the how the Modeling Laboratory could resolve some of these issues, then turn the issue over to the Management Board who has the deciding power.

## **PRESENTATION TO THE MANAGEMENT BOARD**

- MLAT must review the charge give to them by NRC and CBP Management Board and make sure that all of these things are covered in the report.
  - In the report, for clarity MLAT will use the bullet points from the NRC and Management Board questions and include a response.
  - Gary Shenk will provide the information to response to the NRC comment that only 2 people know the model.
  - Address whether or not monitoring should be a part of the Modeling Laboratory:
    - Monitoring data that supports the modeling.
    - Optimization of monitoring scheme (OSSE).

## **PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Email</b>
Mark Bennett	USGS/MLAT Chair	<a href="mailto:mrbenet@usgs.gov">mrbenet@usgs.gov</a>
Amanda Pruzinsky	CRC/CBPO/MLAT Staffer	<a href="mailto:apruzinsky@chesapeakebay.net">apruzinsky@chesapeakebay.net</a>
David Montali	WV DEP	<a href="mailto:david.a.montali@wv.gov">david.a.montali@wv.gov</a>
Donald Weller	SERC/STAC	<a href="mailto:wellerd@si.edu">wellerd@si.edu</a>
Gary Shenk	EPA/CBPO	<a href="mailto:gshenk@chesapeakebay.net">gshenk@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Heather Cisar	USACE	<a href="mailto:Heather.R.Cisar@usace.army.mil">Heather.R.Cisar@usace.army.mil</a>
Larry Band	UNC	<a href="mailto:iband@email.unc.edu">iband@email.unc.edu</a>
Lee Currey	MDE	<a href="mailto:lcurrey@mde.state.md.us">lcurrey@mde.state.md.us</a>
Lewis Linker	EPA/CBPO	<a href="mailto:linker.lewis@epa.gov">linker.lewis@epa.gov</a>
Raleigh Hood	UMCES	<a href="mailto:rhodd@hpl.umces.edu">rhodd@hpl.umces.edu</a>
Theodore Tesler	PA DEP	<a href="mailto:thtesler@pa.gov">thtesler@pa.gov</a>