

## CHAPTER 11

# The Modeling Report, Archive, and Review

### COMMON ERRORS IN REPORT/ARCHIVE PREPARATION AND REVIEW

- The report is not targeted to stakeholders or other end users. The information in the report is either overly complex or too simple for the target audience.
- The report is poorly written and/or poorly organized such that the modeling process and results cannot be understood and/or evaluated. Furthermore, a poorly written report brings the credibility of the author(s) into question.
- A model is transmitted to reviewers and/or stakeholders with missing or incorrect input or output, or without the GUI file that was used to construct the input. In addition to causing delay and expense to others, such negligence reflects poorly on the modeling effort.
- Archives are poorly organized and incomplete. Archives are of greatest value when they are carefully designed; archive maintenance should be performed on a regular schedule to modernize data format and verify access.
- Model review is conducted by poorly qualified evaluators. When professionals who have limited knowledge of the formulation, execution, and analyses of groundwater models act as reviewers their comments may improperly represent the modeling effort by either understating or overstating the value of the modeling results.
- A model and its report are prepared with a limited budget as a preliminary analysis of groundwater conditions but model reviewers evaluate it in the context of a fully budgeted detailed modeling project. Requests by clients for a preliminary groundwater model of a site may produce a model that will be criticized for its simplicity and incompleteness. Therefore, reports that document preliminary modeling efforts should clearly state modeling objectives and limitations.