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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

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