

AGENDA

INTER-AGENCY MEETING BETWEEN THE GEORGIA PORTS AUTHORITY (GPA) & FEDERAL AGENCIES TO DISCUSS THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT HYDRODYNAMIC NUMERICAL MODEL

THURSDAY, 28 JUNE 2001

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, Region IV
Savannah Room - 3rd floor EPA Conference Center
61 Forsyth Street, Atlanta, Georgia**

- | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|---|-------------------|
| 1 | 0930 | - OPENING REMARKS
(Goals and Objectives of Meeting) | Plachy |
| 2 | 0940 | - Introduction of participants | ALL |
| 3 | 0945 | - Opening Remarks by the GPA | Keegan |
| 4 | 0955 | - Views of Federal Agencies on Hydro Model
(Technical adequacy of the model, i.e., ability to
predict changes in water levels, salinity, etc., in the
ecosystem) | Plachy |
| | 1000 | • USGS | Conrads |
| | 1030 | • USGS/Wetland Research | Kitchens |
| | 1040 | • EPA | Greenfield |
| | 1050 | • Fish & Wildlife Service | Eudaly |
| | 1100 | • USACE | Bailey |
| 5 | 1115 | - Break for Lunch (45 Minutes)* | ALL |
| 6 | 1200 | - Reconvene / Recap of Morning Session | Plachy |
| 7 | 1215 | - Access to the Model & '99 Dataset | Greenfield |
| 8 | 1230 | - Questions from GPA on Federal Agency Views | Keegan |
| 9 | 1350 | - Lessons Learned - Evaluation of the MTRG
Process & Communications | Keegan |
| 10 | 1355 | - Recap / Summation of Action Items | Plachy |
| 11 | 1400 | - Adjourn | ALL |

***GPA has requested a working lunch if at all possible**

Note to Participants:

In order to minimize the possibility of a misunderstanding of the goals of the GPA project team members for this meeting, I have been asked to forward onto the participants the following:

GPA's sole goal is to determine and understand any and all concerns that agency representatives have for the performance of the hydrodynamic and salinity model, the dissolved oxygen model or the chloride model. In that light, all participants should strive to develop a clear and complete understanding of each concern, the factors and uses of model predictions that are causing the concern, the associated potential consequences of failing to meet the performance desired, and any potential work-around that might be applicable (if necessary).

In this regard, request that agency representatives bear in mind the following points when addressing the following 3 agenda items:

Agenda Item # 4

The technical adequacy of the model, i.e., ability to predict changes in water levels, dissolved oxygen (DO), salinity, etc., in the ecosystem:

- **What performance specifications should the model meet?**
- **What are the reasons for the model to meet each criterion? What are the decision need drivers?**
- **How accurate is accurate enough to enable the SHE project decisions that have to occur?**
- **Does the model have to meet absolute performance standards or relative performance standards?**
- **What are the accuracy requirements of the agency decision-makers?**
- **Why do these accuracy requirements exist?**
- **How does the model perform in comparison to other models used previously in the Savannah River or similar situations?**
- **Are the peaks and ravines just as important as the mean for assessing impacts?**

Agenda Item #7

Access to the Model & '99 Dataset:

- **What does “direct access” mean?**
- **Does it mean just a version of the model to run varying input parameters?**
- **Does it mean a version of the model that can have its underlying code modified and manipulated?**
- **What information was needed by the Federal agencies that they didn't get, i.e., concerns regarding selectivity of information provided at the MTRG meetings?**

Agenda Item #9

Lessons Learned – Evaluation of the MTRG process & communications:

- **Was the MTRG configuration not adequate to handle these problems?**
- **Were the recommendations and conclusions of the MTRG adequate for the federal agencies?**
- **What things about how this relationship needs to be worked out?**
- **Do we have adequate Communications?**
- **Are the records of meetings, discussions, phone calls, and decisions adequately coordinated?**