

## Development and technical papers

The authors of this manuscript would like to thank the anonymous **referee #1** for his/her review.

We have numbered the main comments from the reviewer as shown below:

- 5 1. The paper is well written - a few minor edits to sentences would tidy it up a little - and well structured, and the illustrations are useful.
2. For me the text is a little wordy in places - and whilst I applaud the way the discussion is integrated with aspects of the method - I would like to have seen the method completely separated from any discussion etc. and perhaps the inclusion of a flow diagram of the method added. But this may just be a personal view.
- 10 3. The only other thing that I wondered about is whether there is any thoughts on using a UAV/drone based model as another comparison if appropriate.

The authors' response/edits to each one of the reviewers comment are summarized below:

- 15 1. The whole manuscript has been proof read and sentences has been streamlined when possible.
  2. A flow diagram of the method has been added and any discussion on the method section has been re-allocated to the discussion section.
  3. The proposed algorithm is sensitive to the resolution of the DEM but agnostic regarding the origin of the DEM. UAV/drone based DEM are therefore also valid sources of DEM. We have stated this explicitly in the discussion section of the revised manuscript.
- 20 Two versions of the revised manuscript has been submitted together with the response to the reviewers' comments: one version with all changes highlighted using Track-changes and a final (i.e. all changes accepted) revised manuscript.

## Development and technical papers

The authors of this manuscript would like to thank the anonymous **referee #2** for his/her review.

25

We have numbered the main comments from the reviewer as shown below:

30

35

40

45

50

55

60

65

4. This paper presents a cliff top and toe delineation method that is much quicker than existing manual or semi-automated approaches. The work and code are a useful contribution, however the setup of the sensitivity analysis and comparison to the hand-drawn maps lacks detail. Analysis methods are not always justified sufficiently for the reader.
5. Line 125, presumably LiDAR could also be used, but more widely available data sets such as global DEM (ASTER, SRTM) might have insufficient quality? It would be interesting to comment on DEM source if they authors have any insights because NEXTMap is UK focused?
6. Line 140: Is this something that could be illustrated in the figure? As presented it's obviously not possible to see the effect of changing resolution from 5 - 50m. Also, if the resolution is changed from 5 to 50 m how can the cliff top shift by only 10 m where the resolution is only 50. Does this not imply that at least at some locations the cliff top and bottom will have to move by 25 m?
7. Section 2.1 Why not use the same locations for the sensitivity analysis and hand drawn analysis? Please justify the choice of sites and decision to use different sites for the various analysis
8. Line 164: Would it be possible to define seed locations on islands to avoid having to manipulate the input DEM? Also do you have islands in your test cases, the text was slightly vague is this regard?
9. Line 200: please explain and justify your choice of sensitivity analysis method. It seems that you have done a one-at-a-time analysis rather than used any of the more advanced method available in the referenced toolbox (I'm not sure from the text)? Presumably interactions between the parameters are not thought to be important?
10. Line 211: Is NEXTMap accurate to 0.5 m in steep areas? I'd have thought less accurate, could you give a citation for this or consider increasing the range of the parameter if its linked to DEM quality. Could your maximum threshold be below the accuracy of the DEM in some steep locations?
11. Section 3.3: Here I was expecting some form of test that the automatically derived line was not statistically different to the hand drawn ensemble. This looks like it might be the case of the FH 1&2 toe but is less clear in the other cases, especially at DG site where the model-based estimates appear to have diverged from the hand drawn ensemble (if I have interpreted the plots correctly). Its half done in the discussion but only the variances are compared not the ensembles. Furthermore, would different parameterisations of the model have produced top or toe delineations closer to the hand drawn ensemble mean and does the model also flip between different cliff lines when given different parameters, if not why not?. There is some discussion of the hand drawn results in the discussion section but for me insufficient discussion on the model behaviour. How did you decide that the sensitivity of model outputs was less than the hand digitised uncertainty where there is no specific analysis of this in section 3.3? Is less sensitivity desirable if you do not capture the same ensemble mean (assuming hand delineation is the accepted benchmark)? There is no discussion of this point.
12. Section 4: discussion: A preamble is needed for the discussion to set up the reader.
13. Finally, in the discussion are the variances reported for the sensitivity analysis from a different site (St Bees) to the hand drawn maps (Sandhead & Flamborough head). If so this comparison is completely invalid and the sensitivity analysis is needed at the hand drawn sites? Even if this is not the case it does read as if two separate analysis have been conducted and put together rather than a progression of analysis towards a complete picture of the methods suitability.

## Development and technical papers

The authors' response to each one of the reviewers comment are summarized below. Two versions of the revised manuscript has been submitted together with the response to the reviewers' comments: one version with all changes highlighted using Track-changes and a final version (i.e. all changes accepted) revised manuscript.

- 70 4. In the revised manuscript, the setup of the sensitivity analysis and comparison to the hand-drawn maps has been explained in more detail as outlined on the answer to the specific comments shown below.
5. The only requirement of the proposed method regarding the DEM is that it should include the cliff toe and top (i.e. cover from the shoreline to sufficiently far inland to capture the cliff top). The algorithm is agnostic regarding the method used to collect the data (i.e. air-prone-Radar, terrestrial/UAV LiDAR, ...). We have used DEM from UK as an example of very irregular plan-shape coastlines but the method is in principle transferable to any other DEM.
- 75 This requirement has now been explicitly stated on the methodology section. We have shown how the cliff top and toe delineation might varies with DEM resolution but the question regarding if the quality of existing global DEM is sufficient is likely to be specific to the delineation purpose and out of the scope of this work.
6. The difference on the cliff toe/top locations due to changes on the DEM resolution is illustrated on Figure 7 and Table 4. As shown in Table 4, average differences due to a resolution change from a 5m DEM to a 50m DEM are, as rightly pointed by the reviewer, on average of 25m. The sentence at line 140 starting as "A visual inspection ..." is therefore somehow misleading and has been removed from the revised version.
- 80 7. This is a good and key point. The following text has been added to the study site selection to clarify the rationale of the site selection: "The aims of the sensitivity, model-to-model comparison and hand-digitized analysis are different and therefore the places selected to conduct each analysis are different too. Our sensitivity analysis and model-to-model comparison investigates the way in which the variation in the output can be attributed to variations in the different input factors (Pianosi et al., 2016) or different automatic delineation procedures respectively. The hand-digitized analysis illustrates the importance of the data outputs screening and algorithm behaviour. For the sensitivity analysis and model-to-model comparison, we have focused on a coastal cliff-dominated region with irregular plan-shape to make our findings more transferable to other similar cliffed coastlines elsewhere. For the hand-digitized analysis we have selected a challenging coastal region (i.e. very irregular shape, complex cliff profile sections intercalated with non-cliffed sections) to highlight the importance of screening the results and running the algorithm iteratively until the hand-digitized and automatically delineated cliff top and toe locations converges."
- 85 8. Cropping the DEM to PC-manageable-sizes is an unavoidable requirement. The requirement of been careful ensuring that the islands-inland-topography do cross the cropped tiles is very straight forward. In this context, we have not explored more elaborated methods of identifying automatically island within the tile. A flow chart has been included on the revised manuscript to make clear the minimum pre-processing required.
9. See response to question #4
- 90 10. NextMap Britain Horizontal accuracies are +/-2.5m horizontal on slopes less than 20 degrees. Accuracies on steeper slopes is not provided on the NextMap specifications. We have now included the important point of horizontal accuracies provided been for slope less than 20 degrees. The maximum threshold elevation is relative to the detrended elevation and it can be smaller than the DEM resolution. This is also now clearly stated in the revised manuscript.
- 100 11. Section 3.3 has been re-edited on the revised manuscript. Old Figure 13 showing the hand-digitized and automatic delineated profiles has been replaced by several figures. We now more clearly show that hand-digitized cliff edges seems to be biased towards slope changes rather than maximum and minimum elevation profiles making the one to one comparison not possible. Following the reviewer advice we have nevertheless shown how the algorithm is able to differentiate between the active and Holocene profile for the DG site and how the same set up used, as a reference for the sensitivity analysis seems to produce realistic cliff top and toe locations.
- 105 12. A preamble is now included on the discussion section as suggested.

### Development and technical papers

- 110 13. See response to question # 8. The text below has also been added to the discussion section on the revised  
manuscript: “Hand-digitized cliff top and toe location spread between participants are of the order of 4 to 23  
diagonal cells (i.e. for a DEM of 5m cell size). These large differences seems to be driven by the bias towards using  
changes of slope as the preferred cliff top and toe locations when hand digitizing over an aerial photography. This  
bias prevented a model to hand-digitized more in detail comparison. We have shown how the inputs parameter can  
115 be modified to resolve both active and Holocene cliff lines. The algorithm reference set up seems to be robust  
enough for the two FH sites despite the difference on the plan shape at both sites. Our algorithm delineates the cliff  
top and toe and produce all model outputs for a 1km section of coast in less than one second while hand-digitizing  
the same length of coast took around 10 minutes. Thus our algorithm is about 5 orders of magnitude faster than  
hand digitizing.”

120

Development and technical papers

## Development of an automatic delineation of cliff top and toe on very irregular planform coastlines (CliffMetrics v1.0)

Andres Payo<sup>1</sup>, Bismarck Jigena Antelo<sup>2</sup>, Martin Hurst<sup>3</sup>, Monica Palaseanu-Lovejoy<sup>4</sup>, Chris Williams<sup>1</sup>, Gareth Jenkins<sup>1</sup>, Kathryn Lee<sup>1</sup>, David Favis-Mortlock<sup>5</sup>, Andrew Barkwith<sup>1</sup>, Michael A. Ellis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>British Geological Survey, Keyworth, NG12 5GG, UK

<sup>2</sup>Cadiz University, Puerto Real, 11510, Spain

<sup>3</sup>University of Glasgow, East Quad, Glasgow, G12 8QQ, UK

<sup>4</sup>U.S. Geological Survey, [Geology, Minerals, Energy and Geophysics Science Center](#)~~Eastern Geographic Science Center~~, Reston, VA 20191, U.S.A.

<sup>5</sup>Environmental Change Institute, Oxford University Centre for the Environment, Oxford, OX1 3QY, UK

*Correspondence to:* Andres Payo (agarcia@bgs.ac.uk)

**Abstract.** We describe a new algorithm that automatically delineates the cliff top and toe of a cliffed coastline from a Digital Elevation Model (DEM). The algorithm builds upon existing methods but is specifically designed to resolve very irregular planform coastlines with many bays and capes, such as parts of the coastline of Great Britain. The algorithm automatically and sequentially delineates and smooth shoreline vectors, generates orthogonal transects and elevation profiles with a minimum spacing equal to the DEM resolution, and extracts the position and elevation of the cliff top and toe. Outputs include the non-smoothed-raster and smoothed-vector coastline, normals to the coastline- (as vector shapefiles), xyz profiles (as comma-separated-value files), and the cliff top and toe (as point shape files). The algorithm also automatically assesses the quality of the profile and omits low-quality profiles (i.e. extraction of cliff top and toe is not possible). The performance of the proposed algorithm is compared with an existing method, which was not specifically designed for very irregular coastlines, and to hand-digitized boundaries by numerous professionals. Also we assess the reproducibility of the results using different DEM resolutions (5 m, 10 m and 50 m), different user defined parameter-sets related to the degree of coastline smoothing, and the threshold used to identify the cliff top and toe. The model output sensitivity is found to be smaller than hand-digitized uncertainty. Code and a manual are publicly available on a github repository.

### 1 Introduction

Coastal cliff erosion is a worldwide hazard with impacts on coastal management, infrastructure, safety, coastal resilience and the local and national economies. Various types of cliffed and rocky coasts are estimated to represent about 80% of the world's oceanic shorelines (Doody and Rooney, 2015; Emery and Kuhn, 1982): these include plunging sea cliffs, bluffs backing

## Development and technical papers

beaches and cliffs fronted by rocky shore platforms. The increasing population of coastal zones has led to the accelerating occupation of cliff tops and faces by buildings and infrastructure, including areas that are seriously threatened by shoreline retreat (Del Río and Gracia, 2009). The impact of this increased human presence has exacerbated erosion problems in some places. As a consequence, conflicts between human occupation and the inherent instability of cliffed coasts have become a problem of increasing magnitude (Moore and Griggs, 2002). Quantification of cliff retreat rates is vital for stakeholders who manage coastal protection and land use. An essential component of this quantification is reliable delineation of cliff location. Automating the extraction of cliff top and cliff toe positions from topographic data will provide valuable constraints on coastal dynamics that will aid planning decisions, particularly where multi-temporal data are available, and thus will facilitate better predictions of coastal change. Cliff metric delineation has traditionally been done by hand-digitizing. Although efforts were made to standardize and eliminate subjectivity during hand-digitizing (i.e. Hapke et al., 2009), the delineation of cliffs and other shoreline features remains time-consuming and somewhat dependant on the analyst's interpretation.

### 1.1 The problem of defining the top and bottom of a cliff

Defining a cliff is a difficult problem. The top and bottom of a cliff are often readily apparent and implicitly defined along stretches of the coast with iconic vertical cliffs, e.g. those composed of chalk or massively bedded and indurate sedimentary rocks (Figure 1a). In less favourable circumstances, however, the relatively slow and sporadic erosion of cliffs may leave a compound surface that (in profile and in plan view) is composed of partly concave and convex shapes. These compound surfaces may be further complicated by the occurrence of pre-existing and uplifted marine terraces, intervening coastal rivers (some of which may be hanging), and anthropogenic structures such as transport corridors (usually roads). These complications make the top of such a compound cliff profile difficult to define.

The situation is made more complex still when it is recognised that cliff erosion is, on a human time-scale, episodic. Cliff erosion occurs typically by land-sliding. Landslides are well known to be of a variety of types and, in general, their frequency and magnitude follow a power-law distribution (Hurst et al., 2013). This means that larger landslides occur much less frequently than smaller ones. An obvious and clearly visible "top" of the cliff may simply be the top of more frequent but relatively small landslides. Earlier and larger landslides may be visible in a topographic analysis of the sort described here, but they may also be subsumed into anthropogenic landforms that form the boundaries of transport infrastructure (Figure 1b).

At the present day, cliffs are eroding in response to a relatively stable late Holocene sea-level established between 7 and 6 ky BCE, but the extent to which cliff erosion is accelerating or has reached a dynamic steady-state is also a function of the tectonic setting (e.g., whether land is actively uplifting or subsiding) and the form of the near-shore, which modulates wave energy as it propagates to the cliff line. Thus, the cliff top, if considered as the upper moving boundary of a dynamic process of cliff

## Development and technical papers

185 failure, is by no means easy to define: it may not always be the topographic high along the coast-normal profile. Still more  
complexity arises from the observation that cliffed coastlines are often interrupted by other non-cliffed coastal landforms such  
as estuaries and beaches (Figure 1c, d). For example, based on the European Commission (1998 – the CORINE project érosion  
cotière), the 14321 km of coastline of the British coast can be classified morpho-sedimentologically as: cliffs (67%) (56%  
hard-rock and 11% soft-rock), sand beaches (11%), shingle beaches (7%), heterogeneous beaches (4%) and muddy and  
190 estuarine coasts (10%) (May and Hansom, 2003).

The main advantage of an automatic algorithm for cliff top/toe delineation is that the uncertainty associated with hand  
digitization, which is subject to human error and subjective judgement, can be quantified and reduced. However, given the  
complexity of the problem, we acknowledge that this delineation will inevitably involve some ambiguity, which will only be  
195 resolved by human screening of the outputs. Therefore, a major requirement of any automatic cliff toe/top delineation  
procedure is some means of readily screening the outputs.

### 1.2 Review of automatic delineation procedures

Since cliff edges are linear features which are detectable in DEMs, automated and well-known methods used to extract  
200 breaklines can potentially be adapted to extract cliff edges. The automated methods of breakline extraction can be grouped  
into four major categories (Palaseanu-Lovejoy et al., 2016): (1) deriving lines from intersecting planes (i.e. Briese,  
2004;Brzank et al., 2008;Choung et al., 2013), (2) extracting lines through a neighbourhood analysis of DEM elevation values  
(i.e. Rutzinger et al., 2012;Hardin et al., 2012;Mitasova et al., 2011), (3) applying edge detection filters and segmentation  
methods developed for image processing (Sui, 2002;Richter et al., 2013;Lee et al., 2009) and (4) automatic elevation profile  
205 elevation extraction analysis (Liu et al., 2009;Palaseanu-Lovejoy et al., 2016). The method that we present here belongs to the  
last category and its rationale is described below.

Liu et al. (2009) developed a method based on elevation profile extraction across the cliffs and the observation that generally  
the variation of the slope along the elevation profile is greater at the top and the toe of the cliff than anywhere else along the  
210 profile. However, this may not be the case for complex cliffs with roads or terraces cut through the cliff gradient, cliffs with  
different erosional profiles or slope gradients, or cliffs formed at the base of hills. Palaseanu-Lovejoy et al. (2016) (hereinafter  
PL2016) proposed an alternative method based also on profile extraction from high resolution DEM but that does not involve  
variation in slopes between the profile point (i.e. cliff top and toe are delineated as the maximum and minimum respectively  
of the de-trended profile). The PL2016 automatic delineation method has proven useful in resolving a range of types, from  
215 almost-vertical cliffs with sharply defined top and toe inflection points to complex cliff profiles. The PL2016 method relies on  
the user being able to generate a reference generalized vector shoreline which is free from tight bends and as much as possible

## Development and technical papers

is parallel to the general direction of the cliffs. The generation of the reference shoreline is however not part of the automatic delineation method itself. Such a generalized vector shoreline is not always possible to achieve for very irregular coastlines (i.e. sequences of small bays and capes) such as parts of the northern and western coastlines of Great Britain. Also the length of the profile is a key parameter in this approach, but –as shown by Palaseanu-Lovejoy et al. (2016), the method is robust enough that the position of the top and toe of the cliff does not change with the length of the profile, as long as the cliff is the most prominent geomorphic feature present. Ensuring that the cliff is the most prominent feature can be achieved by shortening/lengthening the profile length along the different coastline segments as done by PL2016 during pre-processing. But even if the pre-processing is done carefully, it is likely that – due to natural variability of geomorphic features -- the cliff is not the most prominent feature in some locations. Thus this need to fine-tune the profile length for different coastal segments during the pre-processing stage detracts from the benefits of having an automatic delineation procedure. It remains unclear how the results might differ by using a fixed coastline normal versus a fine tuned normal length for each coastal segment.

Here, we present an automatic cliff toe/top delineation algorithm based on profile elevation extraction from a DEM, using a fixed profile length, and an automatic generation of a generalized coastline that is suitable for very irregular coastline shapes. The proposed method is demonstrated at several study locations along the British coastline using a DEM with national coverage. We compare the outputs of the proposed method with the outputs produced by the PL2016 method. We also explore the reproducibility of the results using different DEMs resolutions and user defined parameter settings (explained in detail below). Model outputs are compared with the uncertainty of hand-digitized cliff toe and top as part of a sensitivity analysis of our approach.

Our software and documentation is available under Open Government Licence (see software availability section).

## 2 Study site and methods

### 2.1 Digital Elevation Model source and study sites

Our automated procedure requires a bare-earth Digital Terrain Model (DEM). The only requirement of the proposed method regarding the DEM is that it should include the cliff toe and top (i.e. cover from the shoreline to sufficiently far inland to capture the cliff top). The algorithm is agnostic regarding the method used to collect the data (i.e. air-prone-Radar, terrestrial/UAV LiDAR ...). We have used several DEM from UK as an example of very irregular plan-shape coastline but the method is in principle transferable to any other DEM. Here, we have used different resolutions of the NEXTMap DEM for Britain. NEXTMap for Britain is a 5m resolution DEM derived by airborne RADAR technology by Intermap Technologies. The elevation data was captured during 2002-3 and provides elevation point data on a 5 meters grid, which has subsequently been interpolated using a bespoke algorithm to derive the underlying ‘bare earth’ terrain model i.e. removing surface features



## Development and technical papers

such as buildings and trees. NEXTMap Height Data has a vertical accuracy of around 1m +/- RMSE and a horizontal accuracy of 2.5m +/- RMSE on slopes less than 20 degrees. NEXTMap uses the OSGB36 Horizontal Datum and all elevations are relative to the Ordnance Datum Newlyn Vertical Datum. Radar cannot penetrate water and therefore the DEM records the elevation of the water surface at the time of image acquisition. Higher resolution DEMs of 10m and 50m where obtained by averaging the elevation of the 5m DEM.

The aims of the sensitivity, model-to-model comparison and hand-digitized analysis are different and therefore the places selected to conduct each analysis are different too. Our sensitivity analysis and model-to-model comparison investigates the way in which the variation in the output can be attributed to variations in the different input factors (Pianosi et al., 2016) or different automatic delineation procedures respectively. while the model-to-model comparison evaluates variation in the outputs and assesses how this may be attributed to the method used. illustrates the importance of the data outputs screening and algorithm behaviour. For the sensitivity analysis and model-to-model comparison, we have focused on a coastal cliff-dominated region with irregular plan-shape to make our findings more transferable to other similar cliffed coastlines elsewhere. For the hand-digitized analysis we have selected a challenging coastal region (i.e. very irregular shape, complex cliff profile sections intercalated with non-cliffed sections) to highlight the importance of screening the results and running the algorithm iteratively until the hand-digitized and automatically delineated cliff top and toe locations converges.

For our sensitivity analysis, we selected a 30km coastal stretch centred at the St. Bees Head Heritage Coast in NW England. This study area, which is part of the coast of the county of Cumbria, contains an assortment of different coastal morphologies but it is mostly dominated by high cliffs (Figure 2a). The southern section of the study area, south of St Bees Head, is fully exposed to the sea conditions from the Irish Sea, while the northern section is dissected by more sheltered estuarine environments. -The rock has been eroded by wave action to produce the spectacular 80-metre high vertical cliffs stretching from the Seacote foreshore to Saltom Bay. At Fleswick Bay, a shingle beach laid on large sandstone platforms. At the west end of the St. Bees valley, terminal moraines dating from the last glacial period (~12 - 14,000 BP) are exposed at the coast as bluffs. The West Pier at Whitehaven harbour forms a significant barrier to the movement of beach material further north. A small beach exists to the south of West Pier, formed by trapped beach material. The coastline for about 100 metres immediately to the north of Whitehaven harbour is protected by an armoured stone bank. A railway embankment fronts the natural cliffs along the coastline between Whitehaven and Harrington. At the northern limit of the study region is the port city of Workington. Around Workington slag banks from blast furnace plants cover large sections of the coast, which also contains alluvial deposits from the river Derwent. ~~A visual inspection of the elevation profiles for the three resolution DEMs along the St. Bees North head suggest that the location of the cliff top might be shifted by approximately 10 m just by reducing the resolution from 5m to 50 m (higher resolution DEMs where obtained by averaging the elevation of the 5m DEM).~~

## Development and technical papers

For the hand-digitized analysis we selected three 1 km sections that represent active cliffed coastlines of different height and plan shape – (Flamborough Head, North and South sections – and one section that represents a non-active (i.e. Holocene) cliff – (Sandhead (Figure 2b, c). The first cliffed section (**FM1FH1**) was located on the south side of Flamborough Head, Yorkshire (UK), within highly erodable glacial tills deposited during Devensian glaciations (c. 35 to 11.5 ka BP). The second cliffed section (FM2) was located on the north face of Flamborough Head on the chalk cliffs, which are overlain by the glacial till deposits. On both sections **FM1FH1** and **FM2FH2**, cliffs height are on the order of 20m but the coastline has a more irregular shape on **FM2FH2** than **FM1FH1**. Section 3 (DG) is located near Sandhead, Dumfries and Galloway (UK) and is an inactive cliffed coastline. At section DG, profiles maximum elevations are on the order of 20m.

### 2.2 Automatic delineation of cliff metrics

The automatic delineation procedure quantifies cliff top and cliff toe position, and cliff height, following the steps shown [as a flow chart in Figure 3](#), [illustrated further](#) in Figure 4 and described [in detail](#) below. All the resulting geospatial outputs produced by the proposed method are listed in Table 1.

#### 1. Extracting the coastline from a DEM

Figure 4a shows the input DEM that we use to illustrate the methodology. The first step is to delineate the shoreline at a user defined elevation. Coastline cells are delineated using a wall follower algorithm (Sedgewick, 2002). The wall is at the interface between cells above and below the user defined elevation. Raster cells “on” the shoreline are marked (Figure 4b); the coastline is also stored as a vector object. Depending on the coastal geomorphology and extent of each DEM tile, more than one coastline segment may be traced on the DEM. Each coastline segment is given an ID number ( $N_{\text{coast}}$ ). The wall follower algorithm used to delineate the coastlines searches the tile edges to find the start of any coastline. The coastline of islands (i.e. land topography that does not cross the edges of the DEM) is not delineated (Figure 5). To resolve the islands the tile need to be zoomed-in to ensure that the edges of the land topography intersect any of the tile edges.

#### 2. Generate a generalized (smoothed) coastline

The resulting coastline is then smoothed to eliminate artefacts resulting from the resolution of the DEM, due to local geomorphic variability associated with the heterogeneity of natural landscapes, and the presence of man-made features at the coast, in order to produce a generalized coastline. This is done either by running a moving average window across the positional X-Y coordinates, or by Savitzky and Golay (1964) smoothing, which involves fitting successive sub-sets of adjacent data points with a low order polynomial using least squares regression. The user need to decide which method better fit his perception of a generalized coastline. The resulting smoothed coastline comprises a compound vector object. This is made up

## Development and technical papers

of two set of consecutive points: a set holding the location of each smoothed coastline point and a set holding the original non-smoothed cell location of the coastline point (Figure 4c).

### 315 3. Extract transects normal to the coast

We then generate cross-shore transects, from which we extract the coastal topography. These cross-shore transects are located perpendicular to the smoothed coastline, extending inland from each coastline cell for a user-defined distance (Figure 4d). Normals that intersect the coastline more than once (e.g. barrier beaches, headlands) are flagged as “hitting the coast” profiles; their length is reduced (i.e. the profile is shortened to the segment between the first and the second shoreline intersection). Coastline normal transects that are too short (i.e. extend for only two raster cells) are considered invalid for the delineation of the cliff metrics: these are flagged as “non-valid”. Intersecting coastline normals are flagged as “intersecting but not truncated”.

### 325 4. Morphometric identification of the cliff top and toe

Coastline-normal elevation profiles are then sampled from the DEM cells under each valid coastal normal. The elevation of each point of the coastline normal is determined using the elevation of the centroid of the closest raster cell (thus coarser resolution DEMs will produce more jagged elevation profiles). A topographic trend line is then calculated as the elevation difference between the start and end points on the profile, divided by the horizontal profile length (Figure 4e). The de-trended profile elevation is then calculated as the residual when the topography is compared with the trend line. Finally, the cliff top and cliff toe are identified as the maximum and minimum de-trended elevations (Figure 4f). All cliff toe and top points for the input DEM, as identified using this procedure, are shown as a 3D model in Figure 4. Note that an optional user-defined elevation threshold may be used to avoid false peaks. If the absolute value of the peak elevation/depression is lower than the threshold elevation, it is assumed that the points at the end/start of the profile are the cliff top/toe respectively. This ‘elevation sanity check’ is required to avoid small bumps on rather slope-uniform profiles (i.e. non-cliffed coastlines) being picked up as cliff tops/toes.

## 2.3 Sensitivity analysis and model vs model comparison

340 Our sensitivity analysis investigates the way in which the variation in the output can be attributed to variations in the different input factors (Pianosi et al., 2016) while the model-to-model comparison evaluates variation in the outputs and assesses how this may be attributed to the method used.

### Development and technical papers

We assessed output sensitivity to: (1) the DEM resolution, using DEMs of 5m, 10m and 50m of the same study region, (2) the degree of smoothing of the generalized coastline, and (3) the threshold used to avoid false cliff top/toe locations. Table 2 summarizes results from these sensitivity analyses. As a reference, we used the cliff metrics outputs for the DEM of 5m resolution, a 61-cell moving average window for coastline smoothing, and 0.5m as the vertical threshold. This distance seems to be large enough to produce a smooth coastline and small enough to resolve the numerous headlands and bays along this part of the British coastline. To explore the local sensitivity to coastline smoothing, we have also used 31 cell and 7 cell moving average window size that are equivalent to ~165-220 m and ~35-50 m windows respectively. We selected the vertical threshold of 0.5m as the reference threshold because it is of the same order of magnitude of the vertical accuracy of the RADAR elevation data used by NEXTMap. The reference threshold elevation is relative to the de-trended elevation and it can be smaller than the DEM resolution. To explore the local sensitivity to vertical threshold value, we also used vertical thresholds of 0.01m and 1.5m.

Figure 6 shows the smoothed coastline obtained, using these different DEM resolutions and different smoothing window sizes, for six different coastal morphological environments: (a) estuarine, (b) bay with harbour, (c) un-interrupted high cliffed coast line, (d) pocket beach surrounded by high cliffs, (e) beach at the seafront of a relic valley, (f) low cliff coastline (i.e. eroding moraines).

When the number of points for the window size is chosen to make the window length similar under different DEM resolutions, the resulting smoothed coastlines are very similar. In particular, the smoothed coastlines for the 5m DEM and 61 points and the 10m DEM and 31 points are almost identical. In all cases, the smoothed coastline differs from the high water line, which is expected when using a still water level of 1.0m above the OD to delineate the coastline. By choosing a water level of 1.0m above Ordinance Datum, we have avoided delineating man-made coastal infrastructure, such as the Whitehaven harbour, which elevation has not been fully removed from the DEM. Around the Workington harbour, the estuary cuts the edges of the DEM and the model automatically creates two coastlines (a short one-north side of the Workington harbour, and a longer one to the south).

Choosing metrics to compare model outputs is not straightforward. The number of cliff top/toe points varies with the DEM resolution (because the method delineates one coastline normal through every coastal cell point) making a profile-to-profile comparison infeasible (because profile elevation and orientation will also vary with DEM resolution and selected coastline smoothing). Thus, we chose a point-to-line-distance approach. Points are the cliff top/toe location outputs; as a reference line, we converted the cliff toe/top points into a cliff top/toe line, for the reference model set up. The minimum distance between the cliff toe/top locations and the reference line was calculated using the QGIS 2.18.3 “Distance to nearest hub” tool. Given a layer with source points (i.e. cliff toe/top points) and another layer representing destination points or lines (i.e. reference cliff toe/top line), this “Distance to nearest hub” tool computes the distance between each source point and the closest destination

## Development and technical papers

one. The shortest distance between any point and a line is the length of the line segment that joins the point to the line and is perpendicular to the line. We calculated the average, standard deviation, maximum and minimum shortest distances for all source points.

380 For the model-to-model comparison, we compared the model outputs for the reference set up with the PL2016 model outputs. Both methods differ regarding the pre-processing that is required (Table 3). The PL2016 method requires more pre-processing than our approach since PL2016 needs to create a generalized coastline, split the coast into segments, and then associate a buffer width with each segment. For the St Bees study region of circa 30km, the coastline was divided into 25 segments. Buffer width ranged from 20 m to 400m (Figure 7). Our method delineates the smoothed coastline automatically and does not require  
385 the coastline to be divided into segments. However, coastline segments will be created if the delineated coastline cuts the edges of the DEM domain. We used the smoothed coastline produced by our algorithm, using the reference set-up, as the generalized line required for the PL2016 method. Both methods are therefore quite similar with regard to coastline selection. The main difference concerns the way that the coastline normals are defined. After some trial and error, we chose a profile length of 500m as our user defined fixed length. As a metric of the differences in outputs, we again use the QGIS “Distance to nearest  
390 hub” to calculate the differences on the cliff top and toe locations outputs produced by the method proposed here and PL2016.

### 2.4 ~~Assessment of automatic delineation precision vs hand digitized profiles~~ analysis and iterative output screening method

395 As outlined in the introduction section, a major requirement of any automatic cliff toe/top delineation procedure is some means of readily screening the outputs. In this section, we describe how we have developed a methodology to iteratively screen over the model results and run the automatic delineation algorithm to achieve a desired model behaviour or identify any bias on the target lines.

400 The target cliff top and cliff toe locations are obtained from a cluster of 24 hand-digitized lines from aerial photography. A group of 24 participants with a range of geological expertise participated in the experiment, each interpreting data for three 1 km sections (FH1, FH2 and DG, see Figure 2b, c). Using a Geographic Information System (GIS) (Google Earth Pro 7.1.8.3036 (32-bit)), participants attempted to delineate cliff top and toe lines without any prior knowledge of their location. As with the sensitivity analysis, we used a point-to-line metric to calculate the main statistics of the hand-digitized results. As a reference line, we generated a mean cliff top and toe line for each of the study sections from the participant data. We extracted the cliff  
405 top and toe points from each one of the hand-digitized lines and calculated the average, standard deviation, maximum and minimum shortest distances for all source points. ~~We carried out an experiment-~~ This provides us with both, a quantitative assessment of to quantify the uncertainty in human interpretation of cliff top and toe lines from aerial photography as well as a number of target cliff and top and toe lines to test the proposed algorithm behaviour.

## Development and technical papers

410 Building on: (1) the uncertainty on the human interpretation of cliff top and toe lines from aerial photography, (2) sensitivity analysis results and (3) model outputs (see Table 1) we developed an iterative output screening method to achieve the desired model behaviour and identify bias on the target lines. We clustered the hand-digitized lines to broadly capture the different interpretation of coastal cliff toe and top. The different clusters were then linked to the different model set up parameters. We then illustrate a model output screening method and iterative parameter selection for users to achieve desired model behaviour.

415 To assess the precision of the proposed automatic delineation method, we compared the model sensitivity results with the uncertainty of hand digitized cliff top and toe. If the uncertainty of the hand digitized profiles is larger than the model output sensitivity, it suggests that model outputs possess greater precision than the hand digitizing method. We carried out an experiment to quantify uncertainty in human interpretation of cliff top and toe lines from aerial photography. A group of 24 participants with a range of geological expertise participated in the experiment, each interpreting data for three 1 km sections.

420 Using a Geographic Information System (GIS) (Google Earth Pro 7.1.8.3036 (32-bit)), participants attempted to delineate cliff top and toe lines without any prior knowledge of their location. As with the sensitivity analysis, we used a point to line metric to calculate the main statistics of the hand digitized results. As a reference line, we generated a mean cliff top and toe line for each of the study sections from the participant data. We extracted the cliff top and toe points from each one of the hand digitized lines and calculated the average, standard deviation, maximum and minimum shortest distances for all source points.

425

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Output sensitivity to DEM resolution, coastline smoothing and vertical threshold

Figure 8 shows the cliff toe and top locations for a high-cliffed coastal segment at the St. Bees study site for different DEM resolutions and for different smoothing window sizes. The cliff metrics for the 5m DEM-61 points window size and 10m DEM-31 points window size are very similar and are clearly different to the metrics obtained for the 50m DEM-7 points window size. The cliff metrics for the 3D models illustrate how the cliff top and toe locations relate to the resolution of the DEMs. Figure 9 shows the cliff metrics for all six regions and the 3D model derived from the 5m DEM. While our approach is designed to resolve cliffed coastlines, it also seems to be able to resolve very irregular coastline shapes such as the one of a pocket beach between high cliffs (d), bay (b), and estuarine (a) environments.

435

Table 4 shows the results for the cliff-toe sensitivity analysis for the St. Bees study case. The average difference between the cliff-toe location outputs and the reference outcome varies between 1m to 26m. It is most sensitive to changes in DEM resolution (i.e. average differences of 4m and 25m for the 10m and 50m DEM resolution, respectively). Cliff-toe location is less sensitive to changes in the size of the smoothing window and the vertical threshold (i.e. differences always smaller than

### Development and technical papers

440 2m). Standard deviation is largest (about 40m) for the DEM of 50m resolution, and is about 10m for the outputs from the DEM of 5m and 10m resolution. The maximum difference is 368m for the DEM of 50m and vertical threshold of 1.5m.

Table 5 shows the results for the cliff-top sensitivity analysis. Average differences between the cliff-top location outputs and the reference outcome vary between 0m to 37m, again being most sensitive to changes in DEM resolution (i.e. average differences of 6m and 32m for the 10m and 50m DEM resolution, respectively). Cliff-top location is (again) less sensitive to changes in the size of the smoothing window and the vertical threshold (i.e. differences always smaller than 8m). Standard deviation is largest (about 60m) for the DEM of 50m resolution, and is about 10m-20m for the outputs from the DEM of 5m and 10m resolution. The maximum difference is 502m for the DEM of 50m and 7 points smoothing window size. There are about 6500 coastal points, 3200 points and 600 points for the DEMs of 5m, 10m and 50m resolution.

450 Since model outputs are most sensitive to DEM resolution, we extended the sensitivity analysis to DEM resolutions of 15m, 20m, and 35m. To keep the window-size-length of similar magnitude, we chosen the window size for smoothing the coastline to be 21, 15 and 9 points for the 15, 20 and 35m resolution DEMs respectively. We kept the vertical threshold unchanged (0.5m). Figure 10 shows average differences decreasing as the DEM resolution decreases. To estimate the trend in average differences, we fitted and extrapolated a polynomial line of order 3 to the cliff top and toe calculated differences. This fitted trend line suggests that the minimum differences (i.e. for the smallest DEM resolution) are 1m and 5m for the cliff toe and top respectively.

### 3.2 Model to model comparison

460 Our results show that the two automatically-delineated cliff top and toe locations are, generally, in good agreement (i.e. distances are less than one cell-diagonal). Toe locations are anticipated to be different since the proposed method uses a user-defined elevation (e.g. 1.0 m: chosen to avoid delineating the man-made infrastructures near the coast which had not been removed from the DEM) to begin its coastline profiles, while the PL2016 method begins its transects from the lowest elevation (i.e. 0 m for the DEM used here). Distances between cliff metrics of less than one cell-diagonal length (i.e. 7.07m for a 5m cell size) are considered within the DEM resolution limit and thus, for model-to-model comparison purposes, identical outputs. The PL2016 method applied to the St. Bee study site produced a set of 6655 toe points and 6324 top points (i.e. top points are less than toe points because concave profiles are not used to delineate the cliff top but the profile is still been used to delineate cliff toe). Our approach produced a data set of 6598 top and toe points, of which 68 were flagged as poor-quality points. The minimum distance between the line formed by the proposed method cliff top and toe outputs and the PL2016 outputs was calculated: the frequency distribution of the minimum distance between the cliff top and toe locations resulting is shown in Figure 11. The cliff toe locations are in good agreement (i.e. minimum distance less than one cell-diagonal) for 78% of the

### Development and technical papers

data, and the cliff top locations are in good agreement for 68% of the locations. The median distance for both top and toe locations always inferior to a cell-diagonal. The mean distance value is larger than the median, and a cell-diagonal, and of 8.41m and 10.93m for the toe and top locations. To understand where the outputs from the two methods differ between each other, it is necessary to look at the spatial distribution of the differences.

Figure 12 shows the spatial differences between the cliff metrics results using the PL2016 algorithm and our approach. The maximum differences in toe (236m) and top location (206m) are either in segments where the coastline makes sharp bends and the cliff is not the dominant feature (Figure 12a), or where the cliff has a steep face with talus at the toe (Figure 12b). Both methods were able to delineate the cliff metrics along the eroding moraines, but our approach was also able to trace a welded bar at the southern end of St. Bees beach (Figure 12c). The bar crest elevation is of the order of 2m height. It lays parallel to the coastline with eroding moraines of approximately 15m height. Most of the sea-facing cliff toe and toes along the bar were flagged as non-valid. At the inland-facing side of the bar, most of cliff toe and tops were flagged as valid (i.e. long enough and top elevation higher than toe).

### 3.3 Hand digitized uncertainty

~~Figure 12 shows the aerial imagery used for each section and the hand digitized cliff toe and toe lines. For comparison, we have also included the automatically digitized cliff metrics using the default set up. Note that the dates of the aerial photographs (12/31/2005 FM1 and FM2 and 12/31/2004 for DG) are not identical with the date of the DEM (2002-2003). For comparison, we have also included the automatically digitized cliff metrics using the default set up. Note that the dates of the aerial photographs (12/31/2005 FM1 and FM2 and 12/31/2004 for DG) are not identical with the date of the DEM (2002-2003).~~

Analysis of the resulting violin plots for each location (Figure 13) reveal that there is less variance in defining cliff toes when compared to the cliff tops, and the results are skewed towards the seaward side of the mean delineations. The lowest range in cliff top delineation comes from the FH1 site, where there is a 32.16 m spread between the 25th and 75th percentiles. The largest spread in cliff tops comes from the DG site, where there is a 166.97 m spread in the same percentiles. Further analysis of each section shows that two distinct peaks, separated by over 100m, are present in the derived histograms for each cliff top site. The spread of delineations around these peaks is similar to those for the cliff toes. The smaller range in cliff toe-line variance suggests that there is greater certainty in participants defining those lines from aerial photography. The negative skew within the violin plot analysis is likely due to tidelines, beach and platform being readily identifiable in the images and therefore less prone to be misinterpreted as cliff-line features. The bi-modal nature of the cliff top delineation can be attributed to participants' personal definition of what constitutes a cliff top. This dilemma is highlighted in the ~~FH1-FH1~~ and DG sites. In



## Development and technical papers

505 the former there are two distinct breaks in slope and participants tended to follow either a higher or lower cliff top line (Figure 14). This dilemma is not present on the FH2 site where only one distinct break in slope exists (Figure 15). Within the DG site there is a very low cliff (<1 m) at the top of the beach and a much more pronounced Holocene cliff line set back around 100m from the coastline (Figure 16). Participants tended to prefer either one cliff line or the other. Interestingly for the DG site, even if participants selected the Holocene cliff-top, they were unlikely to use the Holocene toe-line. This is highlighted by the lack of bimodal response in the DG toe line histogram.

510 Figure 17 shows the automatically delineated cliff top and toe for the DG and FH sites using different input model set up. Starting with the same model setup used as a reference for the sensitivity analysis (DEM of 5m resolution, a 61-cell moving average window for coastline smoothing, and 0.5m as the vertical threshold), and simply changing the still water level used to delineate the coast line from 0.01m to 6m and changing the profile length from 105m to 500m the algorithm is able to differentiate between the active cliff profile (still water level = 1m & profile length = 105m, Figure 17a) and the Holocene cliff (still water level = 6m & profile length = 500m, Figure 17b). By rising the still water level, we obtain generalized coastlines that represent current mean sea level and raised historical sea levels. By using a smaller profile length for the active profile we ensure that the active cliff is the dominant feature captured. At the location where the Holocene cliff is very close to the active cliff, the algorithm pick up the highest Holocene cliff as the dominant cliff feature but at the right and left sides picked up the active cliff. The reference model input (DEM of 5m resolution, a 61-cell moving average window for coastline smoothing, and 0.5m as the vertical threshold, still water level 1m, profile length 500m) seems to provide reasonable locations of cliff top and toe at FH1 and FH2 sites (Figure 17c, d). From the FH sites it seems clear that the automatically delineated cliff top does not everywhere corresponds with an abrupt change of slope.

## 4 Discussion and conclusion

525 Cliff metric delineation has traditionally been done by hand-digitizing. Although efforts were made to standardize and eliminate subjectivity during hand-digitizing (i.e. Hapke et al., 2009), the delineation of cliffs and other shoreline features remains time-consuming and somewhat dependant on the analyst's interpretation. PL2016 proposed method based on profile extraction from high resolution DEM that has proven useful in resolving a range of types, from almost-vertical cliffs with sharply defined top and toe inflection points to complex cliff profiles. However, the PL2016 method relies on the user being able to generate a reference generalized vector shoreline which is free from tight bends and as much as possible is parallel to the general direction of the cliffs. The generation of the reference shoreline is not part of the PL2016 automatic delineation method itself. Such a generalized vector shoreline is not always possible to achieve for very irregular coastlines (i.e. sequences of small bays and capes) such as parts of the northern and western coastlines of Great Britain. Also the length of the profile is a key parameter in this approach, but as shown by Palaseanu-Lovejoy et al. (2016), the method is robust enough that the position of the top and toe of the cliff does not change with the length of the profile, as long as the cliff is the most prominent

## Development and technical papers

geomorphic feature present. Ensuring that the cliff is the most prominent feature can be achieved by shortening/lengthening the profile length along the different coastline segments as done by PL2016 during pre-processing. But even if the pre-processing is done carefully, it is likely that – due to natural variability of geomorphic features -- the cliff is not the most prominent feature in some locations. Thus this need to fine-tune the profile length for different coastal segments during the pre-processing stage detracts from the benefits of having an automatic delineation procedure. Until now, it was unclear how the results might differ by using a fixed coastline normal (Figure 6c) versus a fine tuned normal length for each coastal segment. Here, we have presented an automatic cliff toe/top delineation algorithm based on profile elevation extraction from a DEM, using a fixed profile length, and an automatic generation of a generalized coastline that is suitable for very irregular coastline shapes. The proposed method is demonstrated at several study locations along the British coastline using an air-prone-radar DEM with national coverage at different resolutions. The algorithm is agnostic regarding the method used to collect the DEM and therefore it could be applied to other methods such as UAV/drone/terrestrial elevation data collection procedures. The main differences and similarities between the two methods are summarized in Table 3.

Fine-tuning the profile length, as proposed by PL2016, makes an appreciable but small difference to cliff toe and top automatic delineation when using a fixed profile length. The comparison of the outputs produced by the proposed method, which uses a fixed profile length, and the PL2016 method, which fine-tunes the profile length for each segment along the coastline, suggest that cliff toe and top location are virtually the same for more than 2/3 of the cases. For those cases where outputs location do differ, neither method seems to outperform the other. By avoiding the need of fine-tuning the profile length, the proposed method speed up the delineation process but does not eliminate the need of the screening of the model outputs. The main differences and similarities between the two methods are summarized in Table 3.

To facilitate the screening of the model outputs, our approach produces a set of shape and ASCII files (Table 1). These output files are therefore in a format that is readable by most GIS and spreadsheet software (i.e. QGIS, Excel,...). These outputs are an important requirement of any automatic delineation procedure. They are labelled in a self-explanatory fashion to allow the user explore the underlying data of any delineated cliff top/toe location.

Sensitivity of model output is decreased relative to that of hand-digitized uncertainty. Hand-digitized cliff top and toe location spread between participants are of the order of 4 to 23 diagonal cells (i.e. for a DEM of 5m cell size). These large differences seems to be driven by the bias towards using changes of slope as the preferred cliff top and toe locations when hand digitizing over an aerial photography. This bias prevented a model to hand-digitized more in detail comparison. We have shown how the inputs parameter can be modified to resolve both active and Holocene cliff lines. The algorithm reference set up seems to be robust enough for the two FH sites despite the difference on the plan shape at both sites. While the standard deviation of model outputs to the parameter setup, for the DEM of 5m cell size, is always less than 3 diagonal cells. In addition to the smaller spread of model outputs, our algorithm delineates the cliff top and toe and produce all model outputs for a 1km section of

Field Code Changed

### Development and technical papers

570 coast in less than one second while hand-digitizing the same length of coast took around 10 minutes. Thus our algorithm is about 5 orders of magnitude faster than hand digitizing.

To conclude, we developed and demonstrated a new automatic delineation procedure of cliff toe and top location based on the extraction of profile elevation from a DEM. This approach requires less pre-processing than other existing automatic methods, and it facilitates the screening of the delineated locations by outputting key supporting information. Our approach will be of  
575 great value in tracking changes of cliff metrics along coastlines of irregular shape.

### Code availability

The code for the proposed automatic delineation of the generalized coastline and cliff metrics has been coded in C++ and the source code is available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1412486>. See <https://github.com/coastalme/CliffMetrics> for the latest version of the source code. CliffMetrics builds easily using Linux. The CliffMetrics code uses the open-source GDAL package (version 2.1.3) to read and write the shapefiles and raster files. For this study, CliffMetrics was compiled using gcc  
580 4.8.4.

To install and run CliffMetrics under Linux:

- 585 1. Create a local copy of the github repository, for example by downloading a zipfile, then unpacking it
2. At a command-line prompt, change to the CliffMetrics master folder, then to the src folder
3. Run `cmake.sh`. If you see error messages re. missing software (for example, telling you that CMake cannot be found or is too old, or GDAL cannot be found or is too old) then you need to install or update the software that is causing the problem
- 590 4. Run `make install`. This will create an executable file called `cliff` in the `CliffMetrics-master` folder.
5. Edit `cliffmetrics.ini` to tell CliffMetrics which input file you wish to use (for example, `in/Example/UserInputs.dat`). The user inputs data file contains the user defined delineation parameters (Table 6).
6. Run `cliff`. Output will appear in the `out/` folder.

### Acknowledgements

595 This work was funded by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) as part of the (BLUEcoast) project (NE/N015649/1).

## Development and technical papers

### References

- Briese, C.: Three-dimensional modelling of breaklines from airborne laser scanner data, International Archives of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Istanbul, Turkey, 2004.
- 600 Brzank, A., Heipke, C., Goepfert, J., and Soergel, U.: Aspects of generating precise digital terrain models in the Wadden Sea from lidar-water classification and structure line extraction, ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, 63, 510-528, 2008.
- Choung, Y., Li, R., and Jo, M.-H.: Development of a vector-based method for coastal bluffline mapping using LiDAR data and a comparison study in the area of Lake Erie, Marine Geodesy, 36, 285-302, 2013.
- 605 Del Río, L., and Gracia, F. J.: Erosion risk assessment of active coastal cliffs in temperate environments, Geomorphology, 112, 82-95, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2009.05.009>, 2009.
- Doody, P., and Rooney, P.: Special issue - conservation and management of sea cliffs, Journal of Coastal Conservation, 19, 757-760, 10.1007/s11852-015-0420-x, 2015.
- Emery, K. O., and Kuhn, G. G.: Sea cliffs: Their processes, profiles, and classification, GSA Bulletin, 93, 644-654, 10.1130/0016-7606(1982)93<644:SCTPPA>2.0.CO;2, 1982.
- 610 Hapke, C. J., Reid, D., and Richmond, B.: Rates and Trends of Coastal Change in California and the Regional Behavior of the Beach and Cliff System, Journal of Coastal Research, 603-615, 10.2112/08-1006.1, 2009.
- Hardin, E., Kurum, M. O., Mitasova, H., and Overton, M. F.: Least cost path extraction of topographic features for storm impact scale mapping, Journal of Coastal Research, 28, 970-978, 2012.
- 615 Hurst, M., Ellis, M., Royse, K., Lee, K., and Freeborough, K.: Controls on the magnitude-frequency scaling of an inventory of secular landslides, Earth Surface Dynamics, 1, 67, 2013.
- Lee, I.-C., Wu, B., and Li, R.: Shoreline extraction from the integration of lidar point cloud data and aerial orthophotos using mean-shift segmentation, Proc. ASPRS Annual Conf. 2009, 3033-3040.
- Liu, J.-K., Li, R., Deshpande, S., Niu, X., and Shih, T.-Y.: Estimation of blufflines using topographic LiDAR data and orthoimages, Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing, 75, 69-79, 2009.
- 620 Mitasova, H., Hardin, E., Starek, M. J., Harmon, R. S., and Overton, M. F.: Landscape dynamics from LiDAR data time series, Geomorphometry, 3-6, 2011.
- Moore, L. J., and Griggs, G. B.: Long-term cliff retreat and erosion hotspots along the central shores of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Marine Geology, 181, 265-283, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227\(01\)00271-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227(01)00271-7), 2002.
- 625 Palaseanu-Lovejoy, M., Danielson, J., Thatcher, C., Foxgrover, A., Barnard, P., Brock, J., and Young, A.: Automatic Delineation of Seacliff Limits using Lidar-derived High-resolution DEMs in Southern California, Journal of Coastal Research, 162-173, 10.2112/si76-014, 2016.
- Pianosi, F., Beven, K., Freer, J., Hall, J. W., Rougier, J., Stephenson, D. B., and Wagener, T.: Sensitivity analysis of environmental models: A systematic review with practical workflow, Environmental Modelling & Software, 79, 214-232, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.02.008>, 2016.
- 630 Richter, A., Faust, D., and Maas, H.-G.: Dune cliff erosion and beach width change at the northern and southern spits of Sylt detected with multi-temporal Lidar, Catena, 103, 103-111, 2013.
- Rutzinger, M., Höfle, B., and Krüger, K.: Accuracy of automatically extracted geomorphological breaklines from airborne LiDAR curvature images, Geografiska Annaler: Series A, Physical Geography, 94, 33-42, 2012.
- Savitzky, A., and Golay, M. J.: Smoothing and differentiation of data by simplified least squares procedures, Analytical chemistry, 36, 1627-1639, 1964.
- 635 Sedgewick, R.: Algorithms in C, Part 5, Graph algorithms 3rd edn Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 2002.
- Sui, L.: Processing of laser scanner data and automatic extraction of structure lines, International Archives of Photogrammetry Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, 34, 429-436, 2002.

Development and technical papers

640 Figures & Captions





Figure 1: The problem of defining the top and bottom of a cliff is not trivial. For example, most of Britain coastline is made of cliffs (hard and soft) but also beaches and estuarine environments. (a) Cliff top and toe are readily apparent for the hard rock coast of Saint Bees but not as clear at the soft cliffed coastline of the Isle of Sheppey where landslides are ubiquitous (b). Cliffed coastlines are often interrupted by other landforms such as estuaries (c) and beaches (d).

645

Development and technical papers



Development and technical papers





Figure 2: The NEXTMap DEM of selected study sites around Britain's coastline; (a) St. Bees head in NW England, used for the model sensitivity analysis. The name of the main locations cited in the text are shown along this coastal stretch, (b) Sand Head and (c) Flamborough head sites are non-active and active cliffed coastlines sites used for the hand-digitized uncertainty analysis. At Flamborough, two study sites were selected with cliffs of similar heights but with relative uniform coastline (FM1FM2) and very irregular coastline shapes (FM1FM2).

650

Development and technical papers




Formatted: Normal, Centered

655 [Figure 3. Flow chart of the proposed automatic delineation algorithm](#)



## Development and technical papers



660 Figure 4: Illustration step by step of the proposed method to generate the generalized coastline and extract the cliff toe and top  
 665 elevation and location; (a) the input DTM (b) the cells on the coastline are marked and (b) smoothed to create a generalized coastline  
 vector, (d) coastline-normals are delineated starting at the cells marked as on the coastline and perpendicular to the straight line  
 connecting the before and after smoothed-coastline point, (e) profile elevation is extracted along each normal and cliff top and toe  
 are located as the maximum and minimum elevation of the detrended elevation profile; (f) shows the location of the cliff top and toe  
 along the elevation profile shown in panel (e); (g) shows the DTM in 3D and the outputs location of cliff toe (red circles) and top  
 (black circles).

Development and technical papers





Figure 5: The algorithm used to delineate the coastline searches the edges of the tiles to find the start point of the coastline. The solid grey line represent the coastline over the coloured DEM (i.e. the hotter the colour the highest the elevation). The coastline cut the edges of the DEM at the locations indicated by the solid black circles. The coastline of the Isle of Wight does not cut the edges of the DEM and therefore the user needs to define two smaller DEM domains (represented as dashed black and blue rectangles for the West and East side of the Isle). The Isle coastline does now cut the smaller domains at the locations indicated by the blue and black dashed circles. It is recommended to allow some overlap between the smaller domains to ensure that the cliff metrics is well resolved near the edges.


670



675


Figure 6: Location of six different coastal morphologies around St. Bees Heritage coastline and smoothed coastline obtained for different DEM resolutions and window size used for smoothing. Original RADAR images used to build the NEXTMap DEM shown on grey scale. Smoothed line for the 10m DEM with 31 points window size (orange line) is almost identical to the line obtained for the 5m DEM with 61 points window size (green line) and not always visible.

Development and technical papers




680 Figure 7: Generalized coastline and coastline normals used for the proposed method and the PL2016 method. (a) Smoothed coastline (solid black) on top of high water line (solid grey). Zoom in around Whitehaven and Workington harbours illustrate the differences between both lines. (b) Coastline normals derived using the proposed methodology. (c) Coastline normals derived using PL2016. The different **colors** represent the different segments used.

Development and technical papers



685 Figure 8: Cliff toe and top outputs for a high cliffed coastline section and different DEM resolutions and window size smoothing window. Upper panel shows the location of the cliff toe (left) and cliff top (right). Bottom panel shows a 3D model with the cliff toe and top as red and black spheres. Vertical dimension of 3D model has been exaggerated 10 times.

Development and technical papers



690 Figure 9: 3D models of different coastal morphology environments with the cliff toe (black spheres) and cliff top (red spheres) delineated using the 5m DEM and 61 points smoothing: (a) estuarine, (b) bay with harbour, (c) high cliffed coastline, (d) pocket beach, (e) beach at the seafront of a relic valley, (f) low cliffed coastline (eroding moraines).

Development and technical papers





Figure 10: The cliff metrics outputs (top and toe location) average difference decreases as the DEM resolution decreases.

Development and technical papers



695 Figure 11: The proposed method and the PL2016 method outputs are in good agreement. Panels shows the distribution of the minimum distances between cliff toe and top outputs location (for a 5m grid cell, the cell diagonal is 7.07m or the length of the hypotenuse of the square triangle made by two connected sides of the grid cell).

Development and technical papers





Figure 12: Minimum distance between the cliff Toe and Top outputs using the PL2016 vs the proposed method. The Toe and Top coloured squares represent the location of the outputs produced by PL2016 and the coloured scale the minimum distance to the outputs produced by this method. Cliff toe/top produced by the proposed method are represented in blue, as spheres/cones for the 3D plots. Panels a, b and shows both model outputs at locations where distances were the greatest. The largest differences between method correspond with (a) where there is a sharp bend on the coast morphology and cliff is not the dominant feature, (b) at the toe of a very steep cliff with a small talus and (c) there is welded bar in front of the cliff .

700



Development and technical papers




Formatted: Caption


Figure 12: Aerial imagery used for the sections DG, FM1 and FM2 and comparison between hand-digitized (orange solid lines) and automatically delineated (red pins) cliff toe and top locations.

705


Development and technical papers



710 Figure 13: Distance from participant cliff lines to the mean reference lines for each section.




**Figure 14.** Hand-digitized cliff top and toe lines (coloured lines) over the DEM for the FH2 site. DEM colours represent slope (darker colours represent higher slopes). The vertical dimension has been exaggerated 10 times. The roman numbers represent the main clusters of hand-digitized lines.



**Figure 15.** Hand-digitized cliff top and toe lines (coloured lines) over the DEM for the FH1 site. DEM colours represent slope (darker colours represent higher slopes). The vertical dimension has been exaggerated 10 times. The roman number represent the main clusters of hand-digitized lines.

Formatted: Normal




**Figure 16.** Hand-digitized cliff top and toe lines (coloured lines) over the DEM for the DG site. DEM colours represent slope (darker colours represent higher slopes). The vertical dimension has been exaggerated 10 times. The roman numbers represent the main clusters of hand-digitized lines.

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Caption

Development and technical papers



735 **Figure 17. Automatically delineated cliff top and toe locations (green cone and blue spheres) over the DEM for the DG and FH sites; (a) results using current still water level to delineate the coastline for the DG site; (b) results using a still water level 6m above current level to delineate the Holocene coastline for the DG site; (c) & (d) results using default model setup for FHI and FH2 respectively. DEM colours represent slope (darker colours represent higher slopes). The vertical dimension has been exaggerated 10 times.**

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Caption

## Development and technical papers

### Tables captions

740 **Table 1: Summary of output files produced by the proposed method: name, description and type.**

<u>Output name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Type</u>
XX.out	Log of user setup and run performance	ASCII
XX.log	Log of simulation run details	ASCII
sediment_top_elevation.tif	DEM read by the script and used to delineate the cliff metrics.	GeoTIFF
rcoast.tif	Raster coastline. Raster cells that are marked as on the coastline has 1 value and 0 otherwise	GeoTIFF
coast_point_XX.shp	Point vector with all the raster coastal points and and four attributes; nCoast is the coast number, nProf is the profile number which is unique for each coastline segment, CoastEl is the elevation in meters of the coast point (i.e. not all coast points have the same elevation but this varies according with the DEM), Chainage or distance in meters in the horizontal plane from the sea point (i.e. it should be 0 m for all coast points by definition).	point Shapefile
coast_XX.shp	Point vector with the smoothed coastline. The number of points of coast_XX.shp is equal to the number of points on coast_point_XX.shp	point Shapefile
rcoast_normal.tif	Raster coastline normal. Raster cells that are marked as on the coastline-normal has 1 value and 0 otherwise.	GeoTIFF
normals_XX.shp	Line vector with the valid coastline normals	line Shapefile
invalid_normals_XX.shp	Line vector with the non-valid coastline normals	ine Shapefile
coast_nCoast_profile_nProf_XX.csv	CSV file with the elevation profile for profile number "nProf" on coast number "nCoast" and DEM named XX. Each file contains the chainage (i.e. horizontal distance from seaward limit), absolute (x, y) location, elevation above vertical datum and de trended elevation.	ASCII
cliff_toe_XX.shp	Point vector with cliff toe position and four attributes; nCoast is the coast number, nProf is the profile number which is unique for each coastline segment, bisOK is a Boolean flag that will be 1 if the profile is valid or 0 otherwise, CliffToeEl is the elevation in meters of the cliff toe, and Chainage of the toe point.	point Shapefile
cliff_top_XX.shp	Point vector with cliff top position and four attributes; nCoast is the coast number, nProf is the profile number which is unique for each coastline segment, bisOK is a Boolean flag that will be 1 if the profile is valid or 0	point Shapefile

**Development and technical papers**

otherwise, CliffTopEl is the elevation of the cliff top, and Chainage of the top point.

---

XX is the user defined main output and log files name. All elevations are in meters.

**Table 2: Summary of the local sensitivity analysis of cliff toe and top locations to different model set up.**

		<u>DEM resolution</u>		
		5m	10m	50m
Window size smoothing	61pt	Reference	to DEM resolution only	
	31pt	to smoothing only	to DEM resolution, smoothing and threshold all combined	
	7pt			
Vertical threshold	0.5m	Reference	to DEM resolution, smoothing and threshold all combined	
	0.01m			
	1.5m	to threshold only		

Average, standard deviation, maximum, minimum shortest distance between reference and this output



**Development and technical papers**

745

**Table 3: Differences and commonalities of proposed method versus PL2016 method.**

	<u>Proposed method</u>	<u>PL2016</u>
<b>Differences</b>	- it is compiled so it is quicker (C++)	- the code is readable so profile extraction function from the DEM along transects is slower (R)
	- less pre-processing	- pre-processing work to set up the buffers for generating transects is necessary
	- computes only cliff top and toe	- computes secondary inflections on the face of the cliff and if desired identifies the top and 2 toes of a sand bar in front of the cliff (one toe on each side of the sand bar top)
	- process concave short profiles (i.e. incomplete cliff profiles look like a check mark)	- reject completely concave profiles (profiles that look like a check mark)
	- can deal with very long and narrow promontory by adjusting the normal length automatically	- cannot deal with long and narrow promontory, unless more involved pre-processing is done.
	- transects start at a user defined level and projected inland perpendicularly to an automatically delineated smoothed coastline	- transects are projected seaward and inland perpendicularly to a externally delineated coastline
<b>Commonalities</b>	- after the profile is extracted the 2 codes to extract top and toe are similar using the same logic	
	- both methods output the profile elevation for further processing	
	- rejects short profiles with $N_{min}$ or less elevation points on land, where $N_{min} = 3$ and 5 for proposed method and PL2016 (there is nothing preventing the methods to be set up for the same $N_{min}$ )	

Development and technical papers

750 Table 4: Cliff toe average, standard deviation, maximum difference and number of samples for the sensitivity analysis to DEM resolution, window size for coastline smoothing and vertical threshold.

<b>Cliff TOE</b>								
<b><u>Average differences</u></b>								
<b><u>Window size</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>	0	4	25	<b>0.5m</b>	0	4	25	
<b>31pt</b>	1	3	26	<b>0.01m</b>	1	4	25	
<b>7pt</b>	2	4	25	<b>1.5m</b>	1	5	26	

<b><u>Standard deviation</u></b>								
<b><u>Window size</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>	0	9	38	<b>0.5m</b>	0	9	41	
<b>31pt</b>	6	4	41	<b>0.01m</b>	4	7	41	
<b>7pt</b>	13	9	38	<b>1.5m</b>	9	12	43	

<b><u>Maximum differences</u></b>								
<b><u>Window size</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>	0	299	351	<b>0.5m</b>	0	299	351	
<b>31pt</b>	229	68	282	<b>0.01m</b>	159	221	351	
<b>7pt</b>	217	204	282	<b>1.5m</b>	289	299	368	

<b><u>Number of samples</u></b>								
<b><u>Window size</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>		3213	591	<b>0.5m</b>		3213	591	
<b>31pt</b>	6605	3274	596	<b>0.01m</b>	6598	3213	591	
<b>7pt</b>	6587	3279	611	<b>1.5m</b>	6598	3213	591	

Development and technical papers

Table 5: Cliff top average, standard deviation, maximum difference and number of samples for the sensitivity analysis to DEM resolution, window size for coastline smoothing and vertical threshold.

<b>Cliff TOP</b>								
<b><u>Average differences</u></b>								
<b><u>Window size</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>	0	6	32	<b>0.5m</b>	0	6	33	
<b>31pt</b>	3	5	32	<b>0.01m</b>	0	6	31	
<b>7pt</b>	5	8	29	<b>1.5m</b>	8	6	37	

---

<b><u>Standard deviation</u></b>								
<b><u>Window size</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>	0	11	62	<b>0.5m</b>	0	11	33	
<b>31pt</b>	10	21	63	<b>0.01m</b>	2	11	31	
<b>7pt</b>	19	33	59	<b>1.5m</b>	8	14	37	

---

<b><u>Maximum differences</u></b>								
	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>	0	186	470	<b>0.5m</b>	0	186	470	
<b>31pt</b>	153	477	479	<b>0.01m</b>	54	186	458	
<b>7pt</b>	465	497	502	<b>1.5m</b>	202	186	470	

---

<b><u>Number of samples</u></b>								
<b><u>Window size</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			<b><u>Vertical threshold</u></b>	<b><u>DTM Resolution</u></b>			
	<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>		<b>5m</b>	<b>10m</b>	<b>50m</b>	
<b>61pt</b>		3213	591	<b>0.5m</b>		3213	591	
<b>31pt</b>	6605	3274	596	<b>0.01m</b>	6598	3213	591	
<b>7pt</b>	6587	3279	611	<b>1.5m</b>	6598	3213	591	

## Development and technical papers

755 Table 6: ASCII input file with the user defined delineation parameters.

```
:SIMPLE TEST DATA
:
:
: Run information -----
1 Main output/log file names _____ [omit path and extension]: dg
2 DTM file (DTM MUST BE PRESENT) _____ [path and name]: in/DG/DG.tif;
3 Still water level (m) used to find the shoreline _____ : 1.0 ____;
4 Coastline smoothing _____ [0=none, 1=running mean, 2=Savitsky-Golay]: 1
5 Coastline smoothing window size _____ [must be odd]: 61 _____ ; was 205 for S-G
6 Polynomial order for Savitsky-Golay coastline smoothing _____ [2 or 4]: 4

: If user wants to use a given shoreline vector instead of extracting it from the DTM
7 Shoreline shape file (OPTIONAL GIS FILES) _____ [path and name]:

: Advance Run information -----
8 GIS raster output format _____ [blank=same as DEM input]: gtiff _____ ; gdal-config --formats for others
9 If needed, also output GIS raster world file? _____ [y/n]: y
10 If needed, scale GIS raster output values? _____ [y/n]: y
11 GIS vector output format _____ : ESRI Shapefile _____ ; ogrinfo --formats for others

12 Random edge for coastline search? _____ [y/n]: y
13 Random number seed(s) _____ : 280761
14 Length of coastline normals (m) _____ : 500 _____ ; was 80
15 Vertical tolerance to avoid false cliff top/toes (m) _____ : 0.5
:END OF FILE ----- : START OF CLIFFMETRIC INPUT FILE
```