**NTHMP Meeting Notes**

**Jan 28, 2013**

*Note: All presentations (ppt) to be posted to NTHMP web site*

**Vickie Nadolski:**

* Vickie welcomed all participants.
* Budget uncertainties are numerous.
* Expect a decreased scope in tsunami program.
* NTHMP must continue to support the full spectrum of activity; keep the momentum going.

**Mike Angove:**

* Times are uncertain times financially. Focusing on “must pay” requirements.
* TWEA reauthorization (TWERA) uncertain
* Stated the NOAA Tsunami Program includes mitigation as well as forecast and warning. Rocky Lopes is back in the program, but contract ends soon (April?)
* New developments include:
	+ SIFT ver 3.1 OTE (in final phase of fielding at TWCs)
	+ Tsunami Models to run at NCEP (much better computing power available).
	+ TWC IT Modernization Project
	+ Tsunami Ready improvements based on social science study
	+ NOAA Tsunami Program Strategic Plan finalized
	+ Tsunami.gov: single web site to display National tsunami alert status
* Challenges for Program – Reduced funding, TWERA legislative status unknown; some possibilities surfacing, but nothing definite yet
* Staffing – needs 5 people to run program (Only Mike Angove and Lewis Kozlosky are Program full-timers). Also noted key NWS Leadership Vacancies.
* Program opportunities include developing a stable way to fund NTHMP, TWC common practices through IT Modernization, improve TsunamiReady, and focus research activities on operational needs.
* FY12 budget - $22M; FY13 budget - ??? Have target allocations, but a BIG drop expected. Many unknowns.
* Need to be creative; continue to build on past success.
* Repository pared back to bare bones (Lewis has info if needed).
* DEMs continue to be supported as funding allows.

**Group discussion:**

* Schelling thanked Program for taking on TsunamiReady improvements through social science research.
* Grilli suggested continuing push of new research for forecasting into TWCs.
* Wilson stated California is doing research and would like to continue doing so in cooperation with other states.
* Priest stated the NSF was originally a member of NTHMP and unfortunately lost interest in Program.
* Kong stated interaction with NSF was OK for post-event tsunami surveys.
* Gregg suggested using NSF small grants for exploratory research to collect perishable data.
* Wilson promoted partnerships to help attain NTHMP goals.

**TsunamiReady (TR) Criteria Review Status (Dr. Chris Gregg)**

* Two parts to NWS grant: improve TWC products and improve TsunamiReady
* Recall the purpose was to integrate social science into TR
* Objective:
	+ Solicit feedback from EMs/stakeholders in 7 communities to draft guidelines and community rating system for communities > 50,000
* Focus group methods
	+ Purposeful sample of stakeholders
	+ Fed, state, local partners
* Groups were provided proposed MES guidelines
* TsunamiReady focus groups convened in 7 communities to obtain user feedback
* Groups composed of 6-12 people for 2-3 hours
* Groups reviewed proposed guidelines
	+ Tiered system was unpopular
	+ Could be criticized by public
	+ May create liability for damages
	+ Should be either compliant or non-compliant recognition
	+ Didn’t like that guidelines required other agencies to do things
	+ Challenges included turnover in local leadership and school drills
	+ Risk considered a more important basis than population for guideline controls
	+ Guidelines must be achievable
	+ Guidelines should be based on vulnerability instead of population
	+ Need short list of important and achievable criteria
	+ Streamline application process – proposed too complicated
	+ Delineate mandatory from optional guidelines
	+ Collaborate with FEMA to get grants for TR program
	+ Perception of impact on tourism was a concern
	+ Little incentive to follow guidelines and achieve recognition
		- Wanted financial incentive
		- Need to do better job highlighting incentives
* Need to finalize proposed guidelines
	+ First figure out:
		- Define what’s really meant by TR recognition – what does it MEAN?
		- Recognized need for NOT granting TR recognition to communities not really “ready” (TR vs. working toward TR)
		- Resolve distinction between threats to human life vs. property for far-field and near-field tsunamis
		- Agree on delineation of mandatory TR guidelines for near- and far-field tsunamis
		- Add set of mandatory guidelines for those at risk to near-field tsunamis
		- Requirement for vertical evacuation for near-field threats (vs. just a plan for)
	+ Themes and subthemes
		- Mandatory vs. optional guidelines
		- Rating method
		- Needs and incentives
	+ Results:
		- Challenges:
			* participation requirements by external agencies
			* Turnover of local leadership
			* Evacuation drills
			* Relative risk – requirements should reflect risk
			* Mandatory guidelines should be achievable (large and small communities)
			* Community reluctance due to perception of effects on tourism (a myth?)
			* Lack of incentives to be recognized as TR (especially financial); need to better highlight program incentives
		- Tiered rating system:
			* Unpopular
			* May generate criticism
			* May create liability
			* Should be compliant/non-compliant
		- Recommendations:
			* Implement compliant/non-compliant system
			* Requirements should be based on vulnerability to near and far-field tsunami threats
			* Identify short list of achievable, important criteria
			* Streamline the application process
			* Clearly delineate mandatory requirements and optional elements
			* Sustain a TR program!
			* Collaborate with FEMA for additional funding?

**Discussion:**

* Schelling applauded effort which kept program from going down the wrong path and stated program should be intended to recognize basic preparedness instead of imperviousness to tsunamis. Early idea of TR was to provide recognition for those taking proactive steps toward readiness. The situation has since evolved. As a group, NTHMP needs to determine what is really needed from the program – really “ready”, or “more ready”? The former is probably not fully attainable.
* Williams asked about relationship to Storm Ready and dependence on population versus risk.
* Sulemani questioned if the population was related to the population in the inundation zone or total population.
* Grilli questioned if early warning systems would be part of the Program. Mike A. – We need to provide a path for TR – whatever that becomes; we all need to figure that out
* Whitmore – We still need to have people react even without a formal warning (for felt earthquake); people fundamentally need to know what to do.
* Priest stated program still has benefit even if the community may be overwhelmed by the worst-case tsunami. Evaluate communities based on their own relative capabilities and resources.
* Von Hillebrandt stated TR has gone international in the Caribbean.

**TsunamiReady Program Update (Chris Maier)**

* TR a key activity of NTHMP
* Voluntary local partnership; modeled after StormReady
* Recognizes a basic level of preparedness
* Progress: 132 communities (14 this year so far); 2 international sites; 88% since Sumatra tsunami (2004)
* Improvement plan: move toward resilience
* Next steps:
	+ Make decisions in MES
	+ Review/comments from WCMs and EMs
	+ Pilot guidelines in select communities
* Wilde: Can we increase CRS points (FEMA)? Biasco: Flood insurance rates are rising dramatically, so even the small current points allowed are becoming more significant; Maier: Would be happy to work with anyone in FEMA if this is a possibility.

**Vertical Evacuation Guidelines (Mike Mahoney)**

* Future opportunity for papers: National Conference for Earthquake Engineering (Anchorage, AK – July 2014) FEMA has updated manual P646 and replaced it with second edition (ATC79).
* A few hard copies provided at meeting; can send more if requested (provide contact info)
* ASCD7: Planning for 2015 edition; 2018 international building codes
* Revised based on Japan tsunami.
* FEMA wants first edition to no longer be referred to.
* ASC considering tsunami building codes for inclusion in 2015 code edition
* International bldg. code Appendix M on tsunami design will continue to be in place
* July 2014 conference on earthquake engineering to be held in Anchorage with strong emphasis on tsunamis.
* Schelling expressed appreciation based on the Washington Safe Haven experience with vertical evacuation.

**NTHMP Grant Process (Lewis Kozlosky)**

* PB13 removed NTHMP grants
* Proposals must map to Outcomes in Strat. Plan
* Follow RoP for grant process
* Make extension requests at least 60 days in advance of grant end-time
* Presently there is no money available for new grants
* Funding unknown, but be ready should funding be restored
* If funding is restored, may initiate an “off-cycle” process
* Remember – must be tied to established performance metrics, have a high confidence of completion
* No-cost extension requests due at least 60 days before end of current FY – sooner is better

**Introductions and Charges to Subcommittees:**

* **Warning Coordination Subcommittee (WCS) – Paul Whitmore and Althea Rizzo (co-chairs)**
	+ Accomplishments:;
		- Expansion of local warning dissemination systems
		- Expansion of local community tsunami reception systems; not as much money spent, but NWRs and some EMWINs purchased for communities
		- Coordinated National exercises since 2008 (Pacific and Atlantic basins)
		- Improved tsunami warning products and graphics
		- Guidance inputs vetted through WCS “invaluable”
		- Excellent venue for sharing lessons-learned following tsunami events
	+ Rizzo: Wonderful partnership with states; the products are better!
	+ Whitmore: How do we keep the success going? (challenge) The mechanism must continue, even if it is only “maintenance.”
* **Mitigation / Education Subcommittee (MES) – John Schelling, Tamra Biasco, Laura Kong (co-chairs)**
	+ Accomplishments:
		- Many communities recognized as TR; strongly exceeded expectations
		- Appendix M in Intl Building Code
		- Loss Estimation Tool being developed
		- First national baseline assessment of tsunami readiness completed (survey)
		- Incorporated maps from MMS to educate local communities
		- National Media Guidebook
		- “Repository-Lite” created; compendium of all materials created within NTHMP
		- Framework created for national tsunami education plan FEMA loss-estimation tool
	+ MES needs:
		- Build on education plan framework
		- Respond to needs of maritime community (e.g. impacts on ports); CA and HI are leading the way
	+ Still many goals and new challenges
		- Need to keep TR moving forward (much discussion on this!); don’t let existing communities “fall off the map”; need to continue to recognize their efforts while striving to make the program more meaningful – a major challenge.
* **Mapping and Modeling Subcommittee (MMS) – Rick Wilson and Marie Elbe (co-chairs)**
	+ Accomplishments:
		- Historically produced inundation maps for communities on which to base evacuations
		- Workshop held to benchmark models
		- Tsunami inundation model output standard developments
		- DEM priorities incorporated
		- Hazard Assessment Workshop held; identified future directions for MMS
		- Session at AGU: Advances in Tsunami Hazard Mitigation
		- Contributed to Tsunami Strategic Plan
	+ Planning to update National Tsunami Hazard Assessment (if funding materializes)
	+ MMS could play increased role in validating new products (Iower costs compared to development)
	+ Challenges:
		- Funding for and production of consistent products nationally (maps)
		- Evacuation planning
		- Meeting new needs for maritime and land use

**NTHMP General Meeting Notes**

**Jan 30, 2013**

***(Subcommittee meetings held on 1/29 and CC meeting held on 1/30 have separate notes.)***

* Mike Angove – The Tsunami Program is committed to the NTHMP and will maintain at least a base level of sustainment.
* Members should collectively define national priorities.
* The NTHMP should create an annual report of accomplishments from each partner. The Coordinating Committee will define the overall idea of national priorities.
* George Priest emphasized the education program is critical and needs to be fully funded.
* Christa Von Hillebrandt – The warning component is critical as well.
* Vickie Nadolski – There is a need to determine how effective awareness is; the number of TsunamiReady communities should not be the only criterion.

**Summary and Recommendations from Subcommittee Co-Chairs to CC:**

MMS

* Summarized the number of DEMs to be created. Could have used USGS input; and should try to get them more involved.
* Rick was re-elected as state co-chair, and would to add an east coast and FEMA representative.
* Working on a national hazard assessment document.
* Working with MES to ensure consistent priorities are established.
* MMS is working to create offshore safety zone and hazard maps. Vasily Titov - modeling work is complimentary work to hazard assessment work of MMS. Efficiencies could be gained by more coordination.
* George Priest sees value in coordinating the safe depth analysis.
* Laura Kong - Hawaii says 200 fathoms is a safe depth, Japan says 30m. Analysis by MMS is important. Christa – the cruise ship industry could a good partner for the analysis.
* Land use planning demonstration project is underway at Crescent City to include building codes; looking at worst-case scenarios.
* MMS created a timeline. The national hazard assessment is high priority.
* Tamra Biasco is working on a HAZUS module, which could be used as part of the analysis.
* Vasily Titiov indicated that the NAS flagged a national hazard assessment.
* John Schelling - could consult with risk assessment experts to help answer the question.
* Landslide source benchmarking would be especially important for gulf and east coasts.
* There is the opportunity to develop mapping and modeling guidance since the demonstration projects are underway.
* It would be ideal for the MMS to meet to put together guidance documents for maritime interests. There is a plan for a joint MMS/MES meeting in the summer. Workshops on landslides and current velocities will be of value. MMS will coordinate with MES to ensure priorities match.

MES

* Laura Kong – The MES is looking to work in concert with the NTHMP strategic plan regarding post-tsunami assessment activities.
* John Schelling – The main deliverable is the unfinished national education plan. The education plan will provide a framework for education and outreach efforts across the board. Vertical evacuation is another important effort, which is new to the U.S.
* Tsunami Preparedness Week is also a focus to get people to know how to take action. The 50th  anniversary of the Alaska event will make 2014 an important year for TPW.
* MES is working on the MES Terms of Reference, looking to increase Pacific Island representation.
* A training spreadsheet is being developed and will be distributed to for input. MES working on risk assessment to include shelter needs, debris, etc. Will be test piloting the hazard model in the spring. Collaboration with MMS will be important to develop the model.
* MES is working with E. TN State on TR guidelines. Did adjudicate the TR recommendations and will provide them to the CC. Mike Angove - Need to determine how to make TR more effective and more meaningful. Need to leverage activities of other organizations to fulfill the goals of TR.

WCS

* A post warning effectiveness survey was received from Washington State.
* Govdelivery service is an issue that needs further evaluation and discussion.
* EAS activation recommendations need to be refined. Exercises for the Atlantic and Pacific are planned.
* California provided information on observer networks.
* New products are being developed and are being reviewed.
* Coastal hazards are being reviewed for both Canada and U.S.
* Most important – the ability to convene at least once per year to share experiences and coordinate with partners.
* Communication tests, siren maintenance, and other activities are being pursued.