

NTHMP Warning Coordination Subcommittee Telecon – June 24, 2014 10am PDT.

Attending: Althea Rizzo (OR), Paul Whitmore (NTWC), Jeff Lorens (NWS WR), Christa von Hillebrandt (CTWP), Elton Lewis (USVI), Melinda Bailey (NWS SR), Cindi Preller (NWS AR), Harvey Thurm (NWS ER), Rocky Lopes (NWS OCWWS), Kevin Miller (CA), Erv Petty (AK), Brian Yanagi (ITIC)

Agenda

The purpose of the call was to discuss the Social Science study recommendation for TWC messages.

Whitmore went over the project background and history. Lopes discussed some of the project methodology from a social science perspective. Each participant provided their initial view of the proposed changes:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Rizzo | No comment at this time – will provide in next few weeks. |
| Lorens | New recommendation make messages too long. Addressing the order of information is ok. Audience section is not necessary. Impact section is now very long. Length makes it harder to find information. |
| Thurm | No comments at this time. |
| Preller | Echoed Lorens comments concerning length. Had concerns with automatic parsing of messages. |
| Bailey | Length is a concern; potentially similar problem as experienced with the Hurricane Local Statement. There were some contradictions in the examples. Questioned putting the Evaluation at top. |
| von Hillebrandt | Must consider that this message is for public, not to EMs like the international messages. Level of language is high for general public. May be too specific for harbors and beaches. Likes ranges for forecasts. |
| Lewis | Agrees with von Hillebrandt. No comments at this time. |
| Miller | Length is not a problem. Organization good with what is happening now up front. Likes the Audience section. Update time is good. Had a few specific comments on verbiage. |
| Petty | Agrees with Miller. Will provide more comments later. |
| Yanagi | No specific comments on products, but had questions on process for approval of changes. Whitmore responded that WCS works through consensus. |
| Lopes | Could shorten by removing definitions. Should keep with facts only |
| Lorens | Suggested moving the warning regions before Audience and Evaluation. Earthquake section at top is too vague, prefers the detailed list given later in message. |

- Lopes We don't have to accept all recommendations.
- Whitmore Likes forecast table layout, message length a problem, does not like putting "it is not known if a tsunami as occurred..." back in message as it was removed on purpose years ago with a statement more designed to suggest action.
- Von Hillebrandt Format may be good for a 1 dimensional coast, what about 2 dimensions? Also, need more examples to see how it would look in different regions. For some regions, the length could go to 6 pages.
- Whitmore More examples can be provided. The example given did not do a good job of showing how the headlines would change with the complex coast team recommendations.
- Whitmore queried group on feedback based on the tsunami warning issued by NTWC the day before.
- Lopes NWS HQ had a positive opinion on the response.
- Petty Response went well in AK SEOC. Many people could not reach NTWC who wanted to during event.
- Lorens Overall good response on west coast. WFOs used social media to say the event was being evaluated.
- Miller Good flow of information throughout event. Some confusion with PTWC message.
- Petty The social media provided a good method to get information out, though there was too much junk in it as well.
- Action:** Whitmore will work with WCS chairs to go through recs. and provide a more refined recommendation for WCS consideration.

Meeting ended at 11am PDT.