

MMS Meeting July 5th, 2016 (11-12PM PDT)

In attendance via conference call:

- [Marie C Eble](#), NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory
- [Dmitry Nicolsky](#), University of Alaska at Fairbanks
- [Kara Gately](#), National Tsunami Warning Center
- California: [Rick Wilson](#), California Geological Survey
- East Coast: [Jim Kirby](#), University of Delaware
- [Stephan Grilli](#), alternate, University of Rhode Island
- Gulf Coast: [Juan Horrillo](#), Texas A&M University at Galveston
- Hawaii: [Kwok Fai Cheung](#), University of Hawaii
- Oregon: [Jon Allan](#), Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
- Washington: [Tim Walsh](#), Washington Department of Natural Resources
- Elinor Lutu-McMoore, NWS American Samoa
- Victor Huerfano, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez

1. Landslide Workshop:

(update by Stephen Grilli)

Proposed: Jan 9th-11th, located in Galveston, TX. Preliminary email sent to participants, date seems to be good. (Juan agrees works well for TX). Going to finalize and send out formal invite soon. Then evaluate where we are with funding. Concerning benchmarks, plan to have something on the temporary website in 4-6 weeks. (Marie) Can this be announced at next CC meeting? (Stephen/Jim response) YES.

Q. (Marie) Funding for invitees... are there guidelines for who gets priority and covered? Guidelines left up to steering committee (Landslide Workshop Organizing Group). Invited presenters first, students if funds remain.

Date and location will be announced during the upcoming NTHMP Coordinating Committee conference call.

2. Scheduling an MMS Science Exchange Meeting:

Feds who want to attend will have to fund themselves.

(Kara) request webinar capability or at least conference call capability

(Dmitry) Should we include USGS? Other science research?

(Jim) Lots of east coast specialized research involving the wide shelf.

(Kara) Is this in addition to a MMS Summer Meeting for 2017? I thought we bargained for the return of NTHMP funded MMS summer meetings in 2017? Some discussion and it's unclear.

- **Marie sending Rocky an email concerning funding for a 2017 MMS Summer Meeting.**

Rocky's reply:

"There will *not* be funding from NWS for invitational travel for future MES or MMS summer meetings for grant-funded NTHMP partners due to both budget cuts and the travel cap. If states/territories don't include this travel in grants, there will not be funding for travel for any summer meetings; only annual meeting w/subcommittee meetings at that time. However, appointed Coordinating Committee Science Members who are not eligible to use NTHMP grant funding for travel may be offered invitational travel by the NWS to attend the MMS Science Collaboration meeting. As of this date, there is only one person from FEMA and one from NOAA who fit that category.

NTHMP is not a funded entity. NTHMP never sponsored travel. It has no budget. So there is not "travel sponsored by NTHMP." Travel when available has been sponsored by the National Weather Service. NTHMP folks need to understand that there is no dedicated funding for NTHMP, especially since the expiration of TWEA and funds designated by Congress for NTHMP activities. Since TWEA expired and appropriations by Congress went with it, NTHMP has remained at the mercy of the NWS for funds for anything."

(Marie) More of a workshop format than just presentations. How many days? (MMS Response) 3 days.

Note: Marie confirmed 3 days of travel requested by the sampling of grantee proposals looked at quickly.

(Fai) A forum to discuss what we are doing...

(Dmitry) How do we address agenda? Do form a tiger team? (MMS Response) NO.

(Marie) Begin with presentations and continue onto discussion and specific issue forums.

(Marie) Suggest after the landslide workshop. (MMS Response) NO.

(Dmitry) Not summer, too much USGS field work

(Stephen) Looking to: End of May Places: Rhode Island or Delaware... or? Let's define who we want first.

(Kara, Rick) Get feedback via email, have attendees provide their topics. Based on that consider the agenda, who will be attending, and the location.

- **Co-Chairs to circulate email accordingly**

3. Maritime Guidance:

(Dmitry) Basically finalized. Some edits to the graphic incorporating feedback from Kara. Needs a title and full descriptions in columns so it can be used and understood when "stand-alone"

(Rick) Get it as finalized as best we can and I will share it at the MMS meeting. They are expecting an update. Rick will circulate and provide feedback.

- **If anyone wants has additional input for the document, provide feedback to Rick by July 15th.**

4. Update on tsunami currents. ATFM paper was pulled, so all the graphics are being redone (without the ATFM results included). Kara will follow up with Pat Lynett if we haven't seen it disseminated in a week.

(Dmitry) There is a need to add new/updated models to the Appendix of the workshop proceedings.

(Rick/Kara) The proceedings document is results. How does MMS use those results to move forward with tsunami current modeling and products? Discussion concerning the path forward (aka guidance) for use of the models within NTHMP and final model products. How does a model "Qualify"? How should they be used? What products should be created? Possibly a separate document will need to be created by MMS providing clear guidance for these purposes.

(Rick) A good topic for the MMS Science Meeting. (Marie) Agreed.

5. CLIFFs

(Marie) What constitutes a new model? Do we as a group wish to take the time to benchmark everything that is modified? Who determines when it's a new model?

(Fai) Changes to the numerical method or computational scheme would need to be benchmarked again. Parameters or option changes, bug fixes, possibly grid changes, likely do not need to be re-benchmarked.

(Stephen) Concerning CLIFFs, it's not a new model, but her implementation of the physics is different. Different run-up algorithm than MOST (Dmitry). (Rick) The MMS Guidance on the website explicitly states that when a run-up algorithm is changed the model needs to be re-benchmarked.

(Marie) Inundation computation in 2014 say's "modified" the run up algorithm, (plus a changed reflected boundary condition).

(Stephen) Numerical algorithm has been re-implemented, with new code.

Summary of major issue: There is a large time consideration that needs to be taken into account when a modeler seeks MMS approval for their benchmarking. All benchmark problems, data sets, and NTHMP model results are publicly available. Modelers wishing to use the benchmarking process for validity may do so and publish their results with or without MMS approval. Do we want to spend time (presentation to MMS, formal review, discussion, and approval by MMS, posting of approved model to MMS website list and model results to the proceedings journal addendum) doing this process for models that are NOT being used for NTHMP purposes?

(Kara) Does MMS WANT to spend it's time on approving models that are not for NTHMP?

(Stephen) What does a modeler gain from MMS approval versus just passing the benchmarks and publishing to a peer reviewed journal?

MMS approval should only come for models used for NTHMP products. Agreement (Jon, Tim, Rick, Fai, Stephen, Kara, Marie, Dmitry) General MMS agreement.

(Kara) I will update the Benchmarking procedures document on the website to clearly address this oversight and recirculate to the group.

(Dmitry) As the wording was not exclusive to NTHMP models initially, and we have already begun the process with CLIFFs, do we go ahead and (based on the grandfather clause) allow MMS review and approval for CLIFFs?

(Stephen) Have we already committed ourselves? if so we should honor it.

(Marie) If not being used for NTHMP work, should not be in MMS approved model list on website.

Some mixed opinions and of a controversial nature. Hence, requesting feedback via email.

- Kara to update the Benchmarking document and disseminate to group. Will also request feedback concerning moving forward with CLIFFs.

6) USGS/NTHMP Workshop Updates

(Rick) We need to keep momentum and follow through with the creation of an initial WORK GROUP – the one to find the best path forward for USGS/NTHMP collaborations. Recall, a source database was first priority. Thinking ~ 4 NTHMP & 4 USGS for size of committee. Rick to pick up a MES representative while at MES meeting this month.

- **Marie, to take the lead and help get this going**

Other Items:

(Kara/Dmitry) Suggest meeting again after the MES Meeting and before the next NTHMP CC Meeting.

(Marie) Asked if this time was good for everyone, possibly we can schedule without a Doodle poll or set a regular meeting time.

Next meeting: Will be scheduled in the next few weeks. Preference is for teleconferences to be held every other month, so next meeting should be held the week of 29 August, 5 September (Labor day week), or 12 September.