

## NTHMP – THE WAY AHEAD

**Purpose:** To present a new governance structure to expand the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program (NTHMP).

### **Background:**

- The NTHMP provides an excellent model for identifying and prioritizing requirements to protect the U.S. and its citizens from the threat of tsunamis.
- Both House and Senate versions of the “Tsunami Preparedness Act” call for a NOAA led expansion of the NTHMP.
- The expanded program will consist of designated Federal agencies and representatives of the 23 at risk states, three commonwealths and two territories.
- Past practice of the NTHMP was to fund Federal and State programs related to tsunami, other than tsunami warning center operations.
- Initial development of NOAA’s DART, mapping, modeling, and forecast efforts as well as the USGS Consolidated Reporting of Earthquakes for Tsunami (CREST) network, depended heavily on Agency investment, but continuation of these programs has been almost completely dependent on funding from the NTHMP.
- Due to the above, progress in expanding capabilities has been extremely slow.
- FY05 supplemental funding, along with increases in the FY06 President’s budget and both versions of the Tsunami Preparedness Act, allow for funding of Federal programs separate from the NTHMP.

### **Discussion:**

- To make the NTHMP work, Federal Agencies should agree to include tsunami related support in their core budgets and ensure NTHMP funds are primarily used for state purposes.
- The current NTHMP model is excellent and needs only to be modified in terms of governance to make it work in its expanded capacity.
- Governance will be used to approve and distribute funds that will be distributed to the states or territories.
- A NOAA NTHMP leadership group met in Seattle on May 20, 2005 to discuss organizational aspects of and expanded NTHMP. [See Attachment 1](#)
- During a meeting of the NTHMP steering committee in Hawaii June 6 and 9, a [governance structure was created and is presented in the attached](#) Power Point slide. Atlantic and Gulf Coast States and U.S. Caribbean interests were represented by Eastern and Southern Region representatives. The structure divides the U.S into Atlantic and Pacific domains with 3 votes to the Pacific domain and two votes for the Atlantic. Vote distribution was determined by the perceived threat to each area.