

## MMS/MES Gap Analysis Discussion (1), 04/04/2019:

Attendance: Jon, Rocky, Dmitry, Maximilian, Kevin Yvette, Chip. Denise unavailable

Purpose: **to summarize high-level information relevant to the tsunami program of each NTHMP state partner and US territory that can be easily maintained and updated.** These data should consist of first and foremost information that is fundamental to the respective state tsunami programs, and of sufficient resolution and detail for identifying gaps in state-wide efforts related to tsunami modeling, evacuation brochures, tsunami ready communities, community tsunami planning etc. This information will be of use to state programs when demonstrating program needs as they develop future tsunami funding proposals (i.e. founded on clearly identified gap).

A secondary goal of the gap analysis is to enable state programs to more easily extrapolate information that could be used to develop metrics about the status of work being done both at the individual state level, and in a consistent manner across all NTHMP partners.

Meeting Goals: review the gap spreadsheets and think about the content/categories as defined, particularly as it relates to state needs. Some discussion points for consideration:

- 1) Purpose of such material. How will these data be used and by whom?
- 2) Level of effort needed to populate the spreadsheet. Simply, it can be whatever you make of it, which feeds into points 3 and 4...
- 3) What are the essential elements that as a minimum should be identified, documented and subsequently tracked by each state?
- 4) What additional secondary types of information could be included in such a spreadsheet (i.e. relevant to individual state needs). Does it really matter since the latter is really up to each state partner?
- 5) There may be security concerns with some of these data... something to think about.

We want to reach a consensus on item 3. This will encourage states to begin developing their gap spreadsheets, such that the core elements are consistent across all NTHMP partners.

### Meeting discussion:

Dmitry provided context for why we are doing this in that it is included in our NTHMP strategic plan.

Jon noted that at the San Diego meeting concerns were expressed about expectations of the gap analysis, particularly how the data could be used and by whom. Hence, purpose of this work group is to provide guidance on this.

Chip noted that this type of assessment is timely and would have been useful now for an ongoing evaluation in CNMI/Guam in relation to lidar collection currently underway and existing and future modeling needs/gaps (having to reach out to Fai Chung and PMEL for this information as the information is not readily available);

Maximilian expressed similar needs for WA, where gaps in modeling have been discovered, along with issues with DEMs/SIFT

Yvette noted usefulness for tracking progress. Noted would like to add additional information to the spreadsheet (e.g. PTHA, recurrence etc).

Dmitry reminded that the purpose of this effort is to enable tracking of high-level metrics... e.g. completed brochures, modeling, tsunami ready communities, sirens etc.

Jon restated Dmitry's comment while also stressing that the gap analysis spreadsheet is not set in stone and the work group needs to weigh in what's included right now, and what's missing. Goal is a uniform product that would be available for all states to eventually complete. Secondary information beyond what is the spreadsheet can be included but up to individual states.

Yvette expressed a need for a policy document that would clearly define the purpose of the gap analysis effort. What it would be used for and by whom. Expressed the need for clear definitions of terminology used and guidance on each column heading. Consensus among all that this would be beneficial.

Jon restated the goal which is a product that first and foremost is to assist the state programs.

General discussion followed on what constitutes a model/brochure product. Questions revolved around versioning of model/map products... when do you update? What triggers this?

Dmitry and Jon stressed that these needs are driven by the state programs but typically new modeling/mapping would be initiated based on the availability of new DEMs, substantive changes to DEMs, new earthquake sources etc..

Kevin expressed concern over other factors that might come into play, e.g. increased population in vulnerable communities.

General concern over how NOAA might use this information.

Rocky stressed that the National Weather Service would not use the information to prioritize grant funding. The Grant review panel may use the gap analysis to conduct independent verification of statements made in grant requests. No one higher than the Tsunami Program at the NWS would look at or use the gap analysis.

Rocky expressed concerns over keeping the gap analysis spreadsheet up-to-date regularly, based on history of partners having good intentions to do things like contribute to a centralized repository of state-produced tsunami materials, but don't. It's like pulling teeth to keep this page on the NTHMP website updated: [https://nws.weather.gov/nthmp/NTHMP\\_Web\\_Resources.html](https://nws.weather.gov/nthmp/NTHMP_Web_Resources.html).

Maximilian/Jon restated that there could be 2 tiers of information, with a high-level assessment undertaken by the states that would be consistent across the program. The biggest lift would be early on to initially populate the spreadsheet, but time to maintain thereafter should not be too difficult. If states want to go beyond this to store more info they can.

Outcomes:

The work group was asked to review the example spreadsheets that was shared and provide feedback by the end of April on existing and missing subject content.

Jon/Maximilian would begin putting together a document that would include a clear understanding of goals and outcomes, definition of terms and a standardized understanding of content.

Next meeting TBD... mid May.