

Phase 6 Review Process

(formerly Fatal Flaw Review)

Presentation to Modeling Workgroup

April 4, 2017

Past activities

- White paper presented to MWG and WQGIT (January 2017)
 - “What is a fatal flaw?”
 - Schedule, with concerns
 - How comments will be cataloged and addressed
- WQGIT requests for enhancements (January and February 2017)
 - Need a detailed review plan
 - Want intro addressing what’s changed - p5 vs p6

What's happened since ...

- Schedule revision approved thru WQGIT
 - Review in June and July
 - Issue resolution in August
 - WQGIT to revisit remainder of MPA schedule in August
- New introduction drafted emphasizing P6 improvements
- Detailed review plan developed
 - Responsibilities for Partnership workgroups and Jurisdictions
 - Webinars planned
 - Enhanced review tools
- Documentation links page added
- Lew put it all together; MWG, WQGIT and CBPO leadership edited
- Sent to MWG 4/1/17

Today.....

- Make sure we (and the Modeling Team) are comfortable w/ MWG responsibilities
- Discuss any concerning issues
- MWG endorsement
- Presentation to WQGIT planned on 4/10/17

MWG Responsibilities by June 1, 2017

- Schedule/coordinate series of webinars explaining critical model components
 - Initial schedule for (5) webinars provided in document; different leads for each - Shenk, Linker, Sweeney, Johnston, Bhatt
 - Respond to webinar questions
 - Prepare and share info requested
- Publish comprehensive documentation of the Phase 6 Watershed and Airshed Models (Same for WQSTM by July 1)

MWG Prior to June 1, 2017 (cont.)

- Develop New Model Review Tools and Enhance Existing Tools
 - Calibration and Scenario output tool
 - Expand ability to compare WSM vs. WRTDS
 - Sensitivity Analysis via CAST
 - Visualization (mapping)
 - Develop, field test, and train
- Address key recommendations from STAC Uncertainty Workshop
 - List uncertainties
 - Identify most sensitive parameters
 - Automate calibration
 - Compile data and skill assessment results

MWG Responsibilities during Review period

- Review WSM Documentation (At least Chapters 1,2,4,7,9,10)
- Review WSM calibration
- Conduct and/or review workgroup –requested Sensitivity Analyses
- Air Deposition - ensure partnership decisions have been accommodated and compare wet and dry deposition loading rates - P5 vs P6
- WQSTM - Ensure partnership decisions have been accommodated and functions are consistent with current scientific understanding; also enhance MD approach for evaluating WQSTM calibration to generate results for all calibration station in all TMDL segments

MWG Responsibilities for Issue Resolution

- Catalog
- Gary lead for WSM, Lew for Air and WQSTM
- Assign to partnership workgroup or CBPO team as appropriate
- Document resolution

Concerns for discussion

- Dave - New Input review process April and May
- George – Building in useable scale for WSM
- Others