

NTHMP Mapping & Modeling Subcommittee
16 July 2019 Teleconference

Participants: K. Carignan, A. Dolcimascolo, M. Eble, D. Eungard, C. Forson, C. Guard, S. Grilli, J. Horrillo, R. Lopes, E. Lutu-McMoore, D. Nicolsky, S. Ross, K. Stroker, R. Wilson, C. Wu

Meeting was opened with roll call, overview, and mention of the importance of maintaining a regular teleconference schedule.

First agenda item: August annual meeting agenda

M. Eble requested comments on the now posted draft agenda and made note that time during the August annual meeting will be tight as MMS will be providing the full NTHMP with updates on Annual workplan activities.

Discussion on NOAA data archive directive was started but deferred to later on the call.

S. Grilli asked about discussion time for USGS Powell Center Meetings, including a summary of the most recent meeting (Caribbean, East Coast, Gulf Coast) and discussion on probabilistic landslide approach.

M. Eble suggested discussion could be rolled into Agenda Item #9 (Powell Center Travel) and may also be part of Agenda item #1 (Source database). She encouraged everyone to come to the annual meeting prepared with updates on activities, including delays and issues.

S. Grilli: Discussion that includes probabilistic Landslide approach would be good too.

S. Ross: S. Grilli would lead Landslide discussion.

R. Lopes provided clarification on the timing of updates; partners will have 25-min blocks of time on Weds and half of Thur sessions. All members, including Federal, should come prepared to deliver updates on current and planned activities and discuss where collaboration is desired.

M. Eble adds that we don't anticipate presentations during Monday MMS meeting.

Agenda item #2 Required data archive and public discovery

C. Forson & D. Eungard noted general confusion on data archive directive and asked about now having to refer all questions to grants management.

M. Eble noted that there is confusion too among fed agencies who have to make their data discoverable and archived. There is no real consensus on what data are to be archived or from where data should be hosted. The lack of exact guidance may, in part be due to legal/FOIA concerns. There could be unintended legal consequences of one government entity giving explicit directions for archiving.

K. Stroker provided information about federal archiving at NCEI. Directive might be addressed with funding through grants. Problem lies when there's a specific request for direction.

Kelly C: the archive directive causes a lot of confusion. Seems like a lot of work that could be streamlined. Consistency in format would be very helpful as it is difficult for us (NCEI) to provide public access to data when it's in a variety of formats.

R. Lopes: NOAA's data management doesn't prescribe the way, just directs that you will make data available on closure of a grant. One of the options is to provide data to NCEI.

K. Carignan: NCEI's ability to archive depends on requirement-driven type of information and associated cost. A Net CDF catalog would be the least costly way to get data online quickly but this is not a great format for users. NTHMP specifications would be useful (ex: everyone wants data served from a map viewer).

M. Eble: Grant partners could satisfy archive directive by putting data on their website. Would there be cost for a grant partner to archive at NCEI?

K. Stroker: NCEI Protocol is that folks on the Data Stewardship side provide cost. NCEI continues to archive data from some university folks who have been archiving with us for decades but the practice of 'grandfathering in' is being looked at again as volume increases. K. Stroker suggests the question for everyone in general meeting as seems it has come up in other subcommittee working groups.

M Eble: the challenge of discussing broadly is that NWS folks have been told not to answer technical questions.

R. Lopes: Directive was a special awards condition placed on last, and this years' grants. NTHMP partners lean on L. Kozlosky, R. Lopes, and M. Angove to provide guidance but NOAA grants management now prohibits them from doing so.

M. Eble: Instead of guidance, discussion could lean towards costs and partner approaches. Question: Could NCEI get an example cost estimate?

R. Lopes: would like to hear from NTHMP partners on how much money should be taken off the top of the funding allocated for grants for this. There will be a trade-off that requires decision.

C. Forson: Storing locally vs NCEI should be a discussion point. So much information goes into a tsunami model, much of which is not useful to the public. Might be most useful to have an internal NTHMP discussion on what most states are archiving to form a consensus on consistency.

R. Lopes reiterates that no one will be available at the meeting to provide technical guidance on what "discoverable" really means.

He also clarifies that funds taken "off the top" are done from grant pool (ex. funds transferred to NCEI decrease the total amount before individual grantee distribution.

D. Nicolsky: Modeling needs to be reproducible so maybe consensus can be formed on keeping key components (DEMs, run files)

C. Forson advocates for this type of consistency among the states: a baseline of what the states and territories decide to archive.

M. Eble question of R. Lopes: could states hold a teleconference to discuss, outside of the meeting?

R. Lopes Answer: Apologizes that answers to technical questions cannot be provided.

Brainstorming:

R. Lopes: Maybe form a work group or team to explore then share results at a future meeting.

M. Eble: Maybe everyone could come up with a list of what is important to meet the directive.

R. Lopes: would involve colleagues from other subcommittees, so in the interest of time and collaboration, might be added to Tuesday morning agenda.

K. Stroker sees value in getting cost numbers from examples.

C. Forson and D. Eungard volunteer to provide examples

ACTION: C. Forson & D. Eungard (and A. Dolcimascolo) to provide K. Stroker with a list of potential maps and other products, size of package, type of access required

ACTION: D. Nicolsky to send K. Stroker with examples of key components to archive

ACTION: K. Stroker will pull together costs for each of the examples provided by C. Forson & D. Eungard and D. Nicolsky.

D. Nicolsky adds that NTHMP website links to individual state pages so could also link to data stored with NCEI.

R. Wilson is concerned that we as a body are complicating the data archive directive and advocates for simplicity. Is further concerned that more work than necessary is being identified.

M. Eble agrees but notes that some groups remain unsure as to how much they need to archive and make discoverable. What satisfies a management plan for one entity may not be the same as what satisfies the plan for another. There is a disparity in resources so some might want to explore using NCEI if they don't have the capability themselves.

R. Wilson sees a danger in complicating a data management plan given it is something that gets approved each year.

R. Lopes notes that R. Wilson's point is well taken. Every state and territory handles their data plan differently. It might, therefore, make the most sense to focus discussion on how each state is

handling their plan. More specifics can be discussed if needed, and expresses his agreement with R. Wilson that the plan doesn't need to be more complicated than it is.

ACTION: M. Eble will work with MES to add 'Data Management Plan Information Exchange and Needs' to agenda for joint meeting. (C. Forson and D. Nicolsky will still send K. Stroker examples to base cost estimates on.)

Other agenda additions or concerns?

- R. Wilson asks if there is anything specific that members should think about for agenda item 'Subcommittee Workload & Structure'.
- R. Lopes: 'Subcommittee Workload & Structure' will be discussed Thursday 1-5.
- D. Eungard requests that time be left for discussion on bullet 10.

K. Stroker asks about remote connectivity (will be participating in person but other staff will not)

R. Lopes can provide teleconferencing.

Meeting wrap-up

ANNUAL MEETING AGENDA

08:40 - 08:50 Agenda Overview

08:50 - 10:20 2019 Annual Work Plan

Overview

Item-by-Item documentation of status (Completed / Incomplete / In Progress...)

1. Tsunami Source Database (Lead: California)
2. Maritime Guidance (Lead: California)
3. Hazard Assessment Gap Analysis (MMS)
4. Currents Modeling Criteria (MMS)
5. Mapping & Modeling Guidance Update (MMS)
6. Sediment Transport Guidance (Lead: East Coast)

10:20 - 10:30 Break

10:30 - 12:00 2019 Annual Work Plan (Cont.)

7. HAZUS Guidance (MMS)
8. Landslide Modeling Guidance (Lead: East Coast)
9. Powell Center Travel (Lead: USGS)
10. NCEI DEM Development (Lead: NCEI)
11. MeteoTsunami Guidance (Lead: Gulf Coast)

12:00 – 1300 Lunch

13:00 – 14:00 Subcommittee Workload & Structure

14:00 - 14:20 Proposals for MMS-endorsed projects in NTHMP Grant year 2020.
Brief 'around-the-room' description or list of planned NTHMP Grant Fy20
projects

14:40 – 14:50 Wrap-up and Adjourn