

**Neil Jacobs - NOAA Federal**

---

**From:** Neil Jacobs - NOAA Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, September 6, 2019 10:46 AM  
**To:** Christopher Vaccaro - NOAA Federal  
**Subject:** Fwd: AL plot

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "(b)(6) EOP/NSC" <(b)(6)>  
**Subject:** Re: AL plot  
**Date:** September 5, 2019 at 6:49:41 PM EDT  
**To:** Neil Jacobs - NOAA Federal <[neil.jacobs@noaa.gov](mailto:neil.jacobs@noaa.gov)>

Thanks, Neil, you've been great throughout.

(b)(5)

All the best,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

---

**From:** Neil Jacobs - NOAA Federal <[neil.jacobs@noaa.gov](mailto:neil.jacobs@noaa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 5, 2019 5:37 PM  
**To:** "(b)(6) EOP/NSC" <(b)(6)>  
**Subject:** [WARNING: UNSCANNABLE EXTRACTION FAILED]Re: AL plot

Very much appreciate it, as well as your sense of humor. I think what POTUS tweeted was good. It shows Alabama was within the non-zero probabilities of seeing tropical storm force winds. Even though the state was in the 5-20% range, which are very low odds, it was not zero.

Anything I can do to help? Going forward, if anyone there needs clarification on the best ways to interpret our graphics, I'm available. Even our publicly available plots are meant more for trained meteorologists.

Also, it looks like the US model outperformed the European model on this storm. I can calculate the stats, but that is a big win for the US. Most of the runs taking the storm into the Gulf were the Euro.

On Sep 5, 2019, at 5:27 PM, (b)(6) EOP/NSC  
<(b)(6)> wrote:

Neil,

(b)(5)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

---

**From:** (b)(6) EOP/NSC  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 5, 2019 12:13 PM  
**To:** 'Neil Jacobs - NOAA Federal' <[neil.jacobs@noaa.gov](mailto:neil.jacobs@noaa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: AL plot

Super helpful and timely, Neil, thanks.

(b)(5)

Thank again,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

---

**From:** Neil Jacobs - NOAA Federal <[neil.jacobs@noaa.gov](mailto:neil.jacobs@noaa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 5, 2019 11:51 AM  
**To:** (b)(6) EOP/NSC <(b)(6)>  
**Subject:** Re: AL plot (urgent)

We don't produce spaghetti plots with our output because it generates confusion; however, many private sector companies do.

Here is a link to all the 5-day cones:

>>[https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/archive/2019/DORIAN\\_graphics.php?product=5day\\_cone\\_no\\_line\\_and\\_wind](https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/archive/2019/DORIAN_graphics.php?product=5day_cone_no_line_and_wind)<<

Here is a link to all the 5-day wind speed probabilities for >39mph:

>>[https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/archive/2019/DORIAN\\_graphics.php](https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/archive/2019/DORIAN_graphics.php)

[product=wind\\_probs\\_34\\_F120<<](#)

Here is a link to the archive of all the NHC plots:

[>>https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/archive/2019/DORIAN\\_graphics.php<<](https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/archive/2019/DORIAN_graphics.php):

In the wind speed probability plot, you can see that Alabama \*is\* included from advisory #15 all the way to advisory #41. Granted, it never exceeded a 30% chance (light green).

Let me know how I can help with this issue.

(b)(5)

Do you know what the reason was for the marker on the poster? Perhaps it was with respect to something else? Maybe where Michael made landfall last year?

On Sep 5, 2019, at 11:32 AM, (b)(6) EOP/NSC

<(b)(6)> wrote:

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Thanks,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

---

**From:** Neil Jacobs - NOAA Federal <[neil.jacobs@noaa.gov](mailto:neil.jacobs@noaa.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 4, 2019 3:52 PM

**To:** (b)(6) EOP/NSC <(b)(6)>

**Subject:** AL plot (urgent)

(b)(6)

I believe this was the graphic that POTUS was referencing. It shows AL included in a small (5-20%) but non-zero chance to see winds exceeding 39 mph.

If you need more info, feel free to call.

-Neil

<image001.jpg>