Comments from HRD:

Sept 29, 2022

Understandably, MMR is probably not on the forefront of your mind with all the recent events. Hope you came out ok from Ian. While I know it was a better scenario than what had originally been forecast for you all, I'm sure it was still not without impacts. So we can get to this when we get to it...

This kind of got put on the back burner from our side with all of the recent field program support. I actually had looked at what you passed along the day of... and what I found was not favorable, unfortunately. There just seems to be a disconnect between what we're clearly requesting and how they address it (or don't address it). I know I passed on to you the pdf of slides from the radar meeting that visually displayed what was wrong with the CfRadials from the test flight. Perhaps that got passed on to them. Perhaps it didn't. At this point, I think we just need a meeting with them given that the email exchanges, and sharing of requests, hasn't yielded our desired result.

One thing that should be considered as we move forward is that some items (in that pdf, attached for reference) cannot be addressed with these synthetic-data files they're sharing. Yes, some things, like the attributes in the CfRadial needed to convert their byte DBZ to float values, can be settled in this way. But some of the other issues have to do with actual data collected ... so vertifying a resolution there may require more test flight data.

October 4, 2022

Question from Jeff Price:

**Did the HRD group ever check the ELTA lab files to see if they agree with the signal data contained in the files?**

Neither I nor John/Peter understand the question from Jeff Price. We assume the ELTA lab files are those found most recently in the 1\_15.7z archive you shared with me back on 12 Sept. But we don't know what "signal data" refers to. In my most recent response (partially recopied below), I conveyed a bit of what we found disagreeable in those lab files. I don't think the lab files are suitable for determining "agreement" regarding *all* of the issues we noted in that pdf document given that some of the issues pertain to actual data collection (like the issue with VEL). However, in that pdf document we had noted a few items that were now acceptable in the 20220719I1 test flight CfRadials. Also, I noticed in the latest lab files that the attributes for radar\_beam\_width\_h and radar\_beam\_width\_v are now consistent and correct. So that is one improvement.

"This kind of got put on the back burner from our side with all of the recent field program support. I actually had looked at what you passed along the day of... and what I found was not favorable, unfortunately. There just seems to be a disconnect between what we're clearly requesting and how they address it (or don't address it). I know I passed on to you the pdf of slides from the radar meeting that visually displayed what was wrong with the CfRadials from the test flight. Perhaps that got passed on to them. Perhaps it didn't. At this point, I think we just need a meeting with them given that the email exchanges, and sharing of requests, hasn't yielded our desired result.

One thing that should be considered as we move forward is that some items (in that pdf, attached for reference) cannot be addressed with these synthetic-data files they're sharing. Yes, some things, like the **attributes in the CfRadial needed to convert their byte DBZ to float values**, can be settled in this way. But some of the other issues have to do with actual data collected ... so verifying a resolution there may require more test flight data."