

Participants: J. Allan; M. Eblé; D. Arcas; S. Ross; S. Grilli; F. Cheung; K. Stroker; K. Carrigan; C. Garrison-Laney; E. Lutu-McMoore; V. Huerfano; J. Kirby; R. Wilson; C. Allan; D. Eunguard;

Agenda Items

1. NCEI DEM Review (J.Allan/M.Eble)

The purpose of this discussion topic was to address the process for DEM selection and importantly the review loop timeline. The need is to avoid endless review loops when states and territories are reviewing completed DEMs from NCEI. Overall, NCEI is looking for a single POC to channel or review questions. J.Allan suggested that this should fall on the NTHMP science rep. Final review of a DEM released from NCEI should be undertaken quickly... ideally in < 4 weeks.

Broad discussion of the topic ensued. Several other issues came up including:

- whether states and territories should edit grids after a DEM has been completed and released by NCEI?
 - o Kelly S, Yes! Basically, there are no restrictions/limitations here as it is up to the NTHMP partner and modeler in order to meet their own needs.
- If states identify problem spots after a DEM has been released, what should they do?
 - o There is no established process for this. However, the consensus is that states should clearly identify the problem area and what data have been used to correct the problem. Updated DEMs accompanied by an update summary could and likely should be provided to NCEI for archive and discovery.
- How do we send updates to NCEI? What about versioning? Documentation?
 - o Yes, to all of the above.

Action item: Establish a small working group to evaluate the process further and come up with some guidelines. Agreement. Working group volunteers include K. Carrigan, K. Stroker, C. Allan, D.Nicolsky, D. Arcas, and J. Allan

2. DEM Resolution topic (D. Arcas)

When developing DEMs of a particular resolution, e.g. 1/3 arcsec, what proportion of the data in the DEM actually meets that resolution, compared with other areas (e.g. deep ocean), where there may be a paucity of data?

- Is there a minimum standard for data density that is used by NCEI when developing grids of varying resolution?
- How much interpolation occurs when developing DEMs, that reflect a wide range of resolutions?
- Since the MMS has defined standards for different grid types used in mapping and modeling (Types 1, 2, 3), should we further define the standards for data that need to meet a particular grid resolution?

Broad discussion. Recognized that this is a challenging topic and that as modelers we are often having to use whatever data we can find. In general, bathy/top lidar has improved our DEMs on land, where high resolution is needed. Nevertheless, large parts of the US (e.g. US territories and Alaska) still don't have sufficient data.

Topic was not fully resolved as we ran out of time. J.Allan suggested that this is a topic the DEM working group could perhaps evaluate further, in addition to the question of developing guidelines.

3. Landslide guidance (S. Grilli/J. Kirby)

The landslide guidance report has now been finalized. S. Grilli and J. Kirby provided a quick overview noting that the models that performed best account for dispersion. As with our mapping and

NTHMP MMS Thursday 23 July 2020 11-12 PT

modeling guidance, modelers wishing to simulate landslide generated tsunami need to satisfy the benchmark problems described in the report.

S. Grilli asked for clarification on what it would take to move information contained on their landslide website over to the NTHMP (i.e. NTHMP to host the model benchmark tests, background information and final report).

Action item for J. Allan and M. Eble: follow-up with I. Sears, L. Kozlosky and S. Grilli to see what could be done to implement this request.

Action item for MMS: J. Allan requested that the committee take a moment to review the final document. If no comments are returned within two weeks, the document will be considered final.

Other standing agenda topics were not covered as we ran out of time.
Meeting adjourned at ~11:55 PST.