

Notes for MMS Teleconference call (9/6/2018)

In attendance:

- Alaska: Dmitry Nicolsky, University of Alaska, Fairbanks
- American Samoa: Elinor Lutu-McMoore, NWS Weather Services Office, American Samoa
- California: Rick Wilson, California Geological Survey
- East Coast: Stephan Grilli, University of Rhode Island
- Gulf Coast: Juan Horrillo, Texas A&M University at Galveston
- Hawaii: Kwok Fai Cheung, University of Hawaii
- Puerto Rico: Aurelio Mercado-Irizarry, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez
- Puerto Rico: Victor Huerfano, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez
- Washington: Corina Forson, Washington Department of Natural Resources;
- Washington: Daniel Eungard, Alternate, Washington Department of Natural Resources
- Marie C Eble, NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory
- Kara Gately, NOAA National Tsunami Warning Center
- Kelly Stroker, NOAA/NESDIS, National Centers for Environmental Information
- Kelly Carrigan, NOAA/NESDIS, National Centers for Environmental Information

Meeting begins at 12:00pm, Alaska Time

Dmitry leads the call, thanks everyone for their participation in the Sacramento meeting, and reminds the group to review and finalize the meeting notes so that Rocky can publish them. Emphasis on getting them in soon as they need to be done before Marie heads to DC next week.

First agenda item: Gap analysis spreadsheet (Dmitry)

Dmitry- asks the group for comments or improvements:

Daniel- Making the data spatial eventually (future enhancement), and adding more columns or some other method to accommodate multiple local sources in a single jurisdiction

Rick- Adding a date field might help for versioning as well as identifying areas that may be due for updates. Also, he mentioned the lengthy edits that he provided to Dmitry prior to the call, wants to have the edited version out when possible for our review. Separated out the MMS and MES specific products so that each can be tracked, added mitigation and recovery planning columns with the understanding that many partners may not be quite there on their work plans yet. This will be helpful with gaining FEMA and NTHMP recognition for projects completed. Also, separates harbor mitigation from on-land mitigation. Also added a column to add an additional threat level for a significant >3 meter tsunami. Mentions that he is uncomfortable with using a low-high threat categorization or language due to how it might be interpreted by others, would prefer a A-B-C approach or something similar.

Corina- Agrees with Rick about changing the threat level classifications. Also, is wondering if a hyperlink field would be provided for linking to developed products.

Victor- Agrees with this.

Dmitry- How would this work, a single field full of links or each (x) in the column serving as a hyperlink?

Daniel- There is no reason why excel couldn't host multiple links in one field, and moving to spatial datasets would support this as well

Corina- Would encourage individual columns for multiple hyperlink situations

Rick- Also added a column for tsunami damage from historical events

Dmitry- Will recompile the document with Rick's edits and our comments, we will need to have it prepared as a templet to send to MES for their review

Corina- Would this be approved by MES before populating with data?

Dmitry- Yes

Kelly S- Would this include detailed damage information or a simple yes/no?

Daniel- Individual states could have extra data for damage, but NTHMP may normalize it to a yes no for simplicity

Item number two: DEM Development (Kelly S.)

Areas to be completed this year:

Nantucket

SW Washington (is actually NW/Central outer coast)

Two Alaska (due by end of year, didn't catch the names)

Charleston, SC

Juan- Is there a DEM being developed for Gulf of Mexico?

Kelly- uncertain, Houston and part of Florida are done/nearly complete now

Dmitry- We need to start thinking of DEMS for next year, mentions some project areas on the east coast.

Corina- mentions that Washington is waiting for Lidar and data collection, wonders if we could be placed on a waitlist with possibility to jump to priority once the data is available

Kelly- they run off the Calendar year.

Dmitry- Does Stephan have anything for his wish list?

Stephan- needs to review the gaps they have, and will think about it.

Daniel- Does NCEI reassess DEM development to automatically flag areas that may be out of date?

Kelly- Their new tiling scheme that they are developing will make this easier and also flag when Lidar updates are available. The process has been started on the east coast, and is working through the Gulf and then PNW.

Dmitry- Want to add DEMS for Port Gratham and Klawock

Kelly- if you all provide a wish list I will look at a number of them and adjust for their capacity, also look at areas that may be covered by other funding mechanisms

Victor- they have new Lidar that could be used to update their DEMS

Kelly- Send it to her and she will look at it

Aurelio- They have 1m coverage of the entirety of the Island, that apparently no one knows about, mentions some specifics on DEM, wants to use money for Maria recovery to cover DEM development costs.

Marie- When we send out the minutes we can reach out to the folks that are not on the call, also there will need to be footprints provided to Kelly.

Dmitry- Oregon and some other territories are not on the call so they will need a chance to weigh in

Elinor (just joined)- American Samoa has complete coverage, but new Lidar is now available possibly from the USGS. Who to share it with, Kelly?

Kelly- Yes

Dmitry- reiterates that the minutes will reflect the need for extents

Juan- Has a wish list of getting land cover analysis particularly over dunes and such, may be very useful for sediment transport analysis

Daniel- USGS has 30m land cover layer available for the Continental US, not sure about Alaska and territories. Buyer beware, given the grid size it may not be useful for the scale of the analysis you are running.

Dmitry- Also is only classified into 10 or so categories which limits its use as well

Kelly- has states done any sort of analysis to this end?

Daniel- yes, Washington has a vegetative index analysis based on available Lidar data, has both vegetation density and canopy height.

Last agenda item: New business

NTHMP Subcommittees Restructuring work group:

Dmitry- Corina you are now on the NTHMP Subcommittees restructuring workgroup

Corina- Yes, I would love anyone's input about concerns, thoughts, etc.

Dmitry- Time of first meeting?

Corina- None established yet

Marie- Thank you for participating, and mentions not being on the work group, had to bow out due to other commitments. Clarifies that the meeting will not be establishing how to restructure the NTHMP specifically, but rather come up with ideas for how the NTHMP subcommittees *might* be altered. This is very broadly addressed and does not necessarily mean that it will be a complete overhaul nor be done by the next annual meeting.

Corina- Completely correct

Marie- This is a MES driven issue due to the comment that they are not necessarily meeting all the requirements of NTHMP as they are presently operating.

Corina- again please think of anything that would help the conversation and send them to me to include in the discussion.

Dmitry- Thanks Corina and notes she is the sole MMS representative on the work group

Harbor Improvement Report

Rick- Wanted to plug the mitigation report review and make sure people get a chance to comment on it, points out Daniel's catch of an important misspelled word. Also want to address any sediment transport and harbor analysis specifics that may be of concerns to the MMS.

Corina- thanks Rick for putting it together.

Protocol for establishment of next meeting time

Dmitry- Thanks people for joining, and proposes that the MMS teleconference be held one hour prior to the Coordinating Committee meeting.

Marie- seconds that ideas

Kara- appreciates the doodle polls and likes possible flexibility in the call time

Elinor- agrees that the doodle poll helps for those who are shift workers

Marie- Could you possibly check the CC meeting schedule and identify which ones would or would not work?

Dmitry - Could do a doodle poll plus or minus 2 days to limit the period of time available, points out the only 50% responded to the doodle poll, but likes the flexibility

Dmitry calls the meeting adjourned at 1pm, Alaska time.