

TsunamiReady™ Update

Rocky Lopes, PhD

Deputy Program Manager for Stakeholder Engagement
Tsunami Program/National Weather Service/Contract support

Chris Gregg, PhD

Associate Professor of Geology
East Tennessee State University

Current TsunamiReady™ Status

TsunamiReady Communities



Number of designated communities: 161 (as of 01/17/2014)

Background drivers

- NAS Report, finding 10: Strengthen TsunamiReady™ Program
- First (and only current) TR Guidelines in 2001.
- Proposed changes to TR Guidelines developed through meetings with focus group sessions held in 2011 and MES meeting in 2012.
- MES returned proposed revisions for further review and focus groups held again in 2013.

TsunamiReady Program Changes

- TR Program transferred to the NWS Tsunami Program from National WCM
- TR Program to be separated from StormReady Program with separate web presence.
- Internal NWS Directive governing the TR Program in development.
- NTHMP input and advice needed as these transitions occur.
- Proposed new TR Guidelines to be reviewed and edited by stakeholder/user input.

TsunamiReady™ Guidelines

- This is what the NTHMP asked the NWS to direct via contract to Dr. Gregg at ETSU:
“evaluate the TsunamiReady™ (TR) program guidelines and provide a set of revised guidelines based on findings from community based input of TR program end-users.”
- Dr. Gregg *et al* conducted focus groups in 2011 and again in 2013, and conferred with NTHMP MES and leadership about revised TR Guidelines.

TsunamiReady™ Guidelines

Focus Group Results Themes

Theme 1. Subdivision of communities by vulnerability to tsunami instead of population

1. population should not have anything to do with TR requirements (all sites)
2. requirements should be based on subdivision by vulnerability (all sites)

TsunamiReady™ Guidelines

Focus Group Results Themes

Theme 2. Additional requirements for communities with local tsunami hazard

1. undertake more activities aimed at protecting life (all sites)
2. identify natural high or inland ground for evacuation (all sites)
3. guidelines should recommend construction of VE structures for communities without natural high or inland ground
 - 100% agreed requiring/mandating construction of VE structures would be unrealistic & poorly received

Four Standard Actions

Limitation of Subdivision by Vulnerability to Local & Distant Tsunami. Regardless of tsunami hazard, all communities should engage in *four standard actions* to protect life (all agreed):

1. Obtain info regarding the expected tsunami inundation;
2. Obtain info regarding the time of first wave arrival;
3. Determine population expected in inundation zone, including subpopulations (children, visitors, assisted living)
4. Obtain info regarding the time needed to evacuate people

1, 2, 4: obtained through local WFO.

3: community derived.

TsunamiReady™ Guidelines

Focus Group Results Themes

Theme 3. Existing community based evacuation strategies

1. Focus on communication plans, educating people

Theme 4: Defining “effective” evacuation strategies

1. Warning notification timing and communication flow were important
2. Evacuations should involve continual *evaluation* and *evolution* over time

TsunamiReady™ Guidelines

Focus Group Results Themes

Theme 5. Annual evacuation drills and exercises for schools in the tsunami inundation zone.

1. OR and HI require mandatory annual school tsunami evacuation exercises for schools in inundation zone.
2. All other sites agreed that those communities designated as having a local tsunami hazard should be required to conduct similar school evacuations annually for those schools located in the inundation zone

TsunamiReady™ Guidelines

Focus Group Results Themes

Theme 6. Annual education, training or outreach for high-occupancy business owners/staff in the inundation zone.

1. All sites agreed that providing education to the entire community (residents, businesses, all branches of government, etc.) is one of the most useful actions a community can take to increase tsunami preparedness.
2. Some communities believed it would be difficult to engage many businesses.

TsunamiReady™ Guidelines

Focus Group Results Themes

Theme 7. Usability of formatting by Mitigation, Preparedness, Response & Recovery

1. all study sites agreed the proposed format is much more useful and
2. aligns well with current NIMS hazard mitigation and emergency planning templates.

Other: Communication & Networking

1. All sites found lack of communication between current TR communities & those seeking TR

Where Do We Go From Here?

- Roll-out and sharing of results of latest TR Guidelines study, when released, with NTHMP partners, selected WCMs, and designees.
 - Socialization/familiarization of proposed new TR Guidelines with key stakeholder groups:
 - NTHMP/state, territory, and commonwealth reps.
 - NWS Warning Coordination Meteorologists
 - Current TsunamiReady™ Communities
 - The wider tsunami stakeholder community
- ➔ method: webinar/GoToMeeting discussions

Where Do We Go From Here?

- Socialization process focused on achieving consensus or at least to confirm we're on target.
- Then begin process to request formal review.
- All changes made through editing and the review process will be shared periodically so everyone will be able to see changes made.
- Procedures for implementation will need to be developed and reviewed through a similar sharing process to ensure seamless roll-out.

Questions?

- Rocky Lopes, Rocky.Lopes@noaa.gov
301-713-1858 x114
- Chris Gregg, gregg@etsu.edu
423-439-7526