

# Progress in Refinement of Draft TsunamiReady™ Guidelines



Colleen Scott<sup>1</sup>, Chris Gregg<sup>1</sup>, Nate Wood<sup>2</sup>  
ETSU<sup>1</sup>, USGS<sup>2</sup>

NTHMP Meeting,  
PMEL, Seattle, WA, August 20, 2013

# Findings: 1-3

- Challenges posed by guidelines requiring participation of external agencies
- Challenges posed by turnover in local political leadership
- School preparedness is a major challenge, particularly tsunami evacuation drills

# Findings: 2-3

- Relative risk (*hazard, vulnerability, value*)
  - seen as more appropriate basis for determining minimum requirements for TR recognition than population
    - Yet, how to measure risk was debatable?
- Mandatory guidelines should be achievable for both large and small communities, regardless of population

# Findings: 3-3

- Challenge of community reluctance to promote tsunami awareness due to “perceived” potential impacts on tourism
- Lack of Incentives to become TR recognized!
  - “financial incentives” most common answer
  - need to better highlight incentives
    - Hazard & Evacuation signage, CRS points, etc

# Results: Review of Tiered Rating System

- Unpopular
- Could generate criticism from public and
  - may deter communities from trying to achieve TR recognition as large communities perceived to have more resources
- TR recognition should be compliant/non-compliant, indicate basic preparedness

# Recommendations for Changes to Guidelines

- Implement
  - a compliant/non-compliant TR recognition rating
  - requirements based on:
    - vulnerability to near- and far-field threats or
    - other category that recognizes tsunami threat to life vs property
- Identify short list of important & achievable criteria
- Streamline application process
- Integrated with StormReady
- Clearly delineate mandatory from optional/ but recommended guidelines
- Sustain TR Program
- Collaborate with FEMA to identify additional funding for community grants and risk assessments

# Current Situation

- Doctoral student in Public Health, Colleen Scott, to continue broader commenting and refining draft guidelines,
  - additional data collection in study communities
  - qualitative data collection Oct- early Nov 2013
  - analysis/initial reporting of revisions to M. Angove by Jan 2014
  - final reporting by April-May

# Site Details

	Community	State/Territory	Population	TsunamiReady™ recognition	Relative Degree of Tsunami Hazard
1	Ocean Shores	WA	5,596	Yes	High
2	Seaside	OR	6,457	No	High
3	Kodiak	AL	6,357	Yes	High
4	Coronado	CA	24,697	No/Yes (2012)	Intermediate
5	Kauai County	HI	58,463	Yes	High
6	New Hanover Co.	NC	192,538	Yes	Low
7	St Croix / St Thomas	US Virgin Islands	50,601/ 51,634	No	High