

Disaster Coordination Strategies: Research Methods

Phase I

A. 10 post-disaster field studies

1. Communities with minimal forewarning

- a. City of Moore, Oklahoma (tornado; May, 1999)
- b. Oklahoma County, Oklahoma (tornado; May, 1999)
- c. Sedgwick County, Kansas (tornado; May, 1999)
- d. Otero County, Colorado (flash flood; June, 1999)
- e. Pueblo County, Colorado (flash flood; June, 1999)

2. Communities with extended forewarning

- a. City of Corpus Christi, Texas (Hurricane Bret; August, 1999)
- b. Kleberg County, Texas (Hurricane Bret; August, 1999)
- c. New Hanover County, North Carolina (Hurricane Floyd, September, 1999)
- d. Pitt County, North Carolina (Hurricane Floyd, September, 1999)
- e. Horry County, South Carolina (Hurricane Floyd, September, 1999)

B. Interviews and questionnaires

1. 10 local emergency managers (4-6 hour interview) (questionnaire return rate = 100%)
2. 89 contact agency personnel, e.g., law enforcement, fire, public works, elected official, Red Cross, etc. (1 hour interview) (questionnaire return rate = 93%)

Phase II

A. 52 post-disaster telephone interviews (national sample)

1. Local emergency manager interviewed; 1 hour
2. Questionnaire return rate = 100%

B. Range of events selected

1. Flood – 21%
2. Tornadoes – 27%
3. Hurricanes – 21%
4. Earthquakes – 6%
5. Wild fires – 15%
6. Other – 10% (included such events as a pier collapse in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; an underground gas leak and explosions in Reno County, Kansas; avalanche near Anchorage, Alaska; pedestrian bridge collapse in Cabarrus County, North Carolina; hazardous materials spill in Lewis and Clark County, Montana).

Adapted from: Drabek, Thomas E. 2003c. *Strategies for Coordinating Disaster Responses*. Boulder, Colorado: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, pp. 18-42.