State of Oregon
Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
Brad Avy, State Geologist

OPEN-FILE REPORT O-20-10

EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR COASTAL CLATSOP COUNTY, OREGON

By Jonathan C. Allan[1], Fletcher E. O'Brien[2], John M. Bauer[3], and Matthew C. Williams[2]

2020

[1]Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Coastal Field Office, P.O. Box 1033, Newport, OR 97365
[2]Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, 800 NE Oregon Street, Suite 965, Portland, OR 97232
[3]Formerly with Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries

WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT?

This report evaluates a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake (Mw 9.0) and tsunami (M1, L1, and XXL1 scenarios) affecting coastal Clatsop County, Oregon, in order to understand the degree of potential destruction, including building losses, debris generated, fatalities and injuries, and estimated numbers of the displaced populations. The goal is to help coastal communities prepare for this inevitable disaster.

Cover: Devastation after the 2011 tsunami in Iwaki, Fukushima, Japan. Photo from Wikimedia commons; https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Devastation_after_tsunami_in_Iwaki_2.jpg, under license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.1/jp/deed.en

Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-20-10
Published in conformance with ORS 516.030

For additional information:
Administrative Offices
800 NE Oregon Street, Suite 965
Portland, OR 97232
Telephone (971) 673-1555
https://www.oregongeology.org
https://oregon.gov/DOGAMI/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

EXCEL SPREADSHEET

A Microsoft® Excel® spreadsheet showing data that are the basis for this report's tables and figures is available in the digital file set of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides an evaluation of the potential impacts of a Cascadia earthquake and accompanying tsunami in coastal Clatsop County. The analyses presented here include an assessment of the numbers of people, businesses, and critical facilities located in three Cascadia tsunami inundation zones (M1, L1, and XXL1). Furthermore, our analyses evaluate local population demographics in each community in order to better understand potential evacuation challenges that could affect different population groups, as well as socioeconomic impacts associated with a Cascadia subduction zone (CSZ) earthquake and resultant tsunami. The results and analyses presented here reflect a comprehensive effort to document the likely effects the next great earthquake and tsunami will have on Clatsop County.

We used previously developed physical models of a CSZ earthquake and tsunami, "Beat the Wave" tsunami evacuation modeling, and the recently published FEMA Hazus Tsunami Model to develop standardized loss estimates for each community, including injuries, fatalities, and building damage. From the latter we estimated the amount of debris generated from the building damage. Our population model improves upon previous studies by providing spatially detailed estimates of permanent and temporary populations — the latter quantifying numbers of visitors and second-home owners, which vary widely throughout the calendar year. The tsunami injury and fatality modeling evaluates a nighttime (2 AM) evacuation scenario (maximizing visitor occupancy), quantifying impacts to permanent and temporary residents.

- The total permanent resident population present on the Clatsop County coastline within a tsunami zone ranges from ~11,880 (M1) to ~19,440 (XXL1). If the temporary population is included, the local population could increase by as much ~17,380 (M1) to ~29,600 (XXL1) assuming 100% occupancy;
- The fraction of the total permanent resident population within the three tsunami zones varies widely between communities. For example, the entire community of Jeffers Garden is located within all three tsunami zones. At Gearhart, the entire (100%) community is located in the XXL1 tsunami zone, 82% is in the L1 zone, and only 44% is within M1. Conversely, Astoria, located 11 miles inside the lower Columbia River estuary, is characterized by 23%, 17%, and 11% of the resident population in the XXL1, L1, and M1 zones, respectively. These findings reflect contrasting patterns in the general shape and elevation of the Clatsop coastline, whether it is open coast versus up an estuary, tsunami travel, dispersion (loss of energy), and inundation extents between the communities as well as the distribution of permanent residents within the communities;
- All seven Clatsop County coastal communities can experience large influxes of visitors, well exceeding their local resident populations. Of note, the community of Cannon Beach can swell by ~700% to 940% (XXL1 and M1), while Seaside experiences lower increases of ~250% to 270% (XXL1 and M1) due to its larger resident population. These results demonstrate the importance of both communities as major tourist destinations with potentially large numbers of visitors located in the tsunami zones. The popularity of these communities as centers of tourism presents challenges associated with preparing such a large transient population for a CSZ earthquake and tsunami;
- Analyses of Clatsop County population demographics indicate that the countywide resident population of ≥65 years of age is ~22-23% of the total population for all three tsunami zones; this reflects ~2,250, 3,130, and 3,940 residents in the M1, L1, and XXL1 zones who are ≥65 years of age. Nevertheless, several communities have slightly more people ≥65 years of age, including

Gearhart (~27%), Cannon Beach (~27%), and Arch Cape (~29%). Variations in demographics will likely impact ability to evacuate from the tsunami zone;

- The number of buildings located in a tsunami zone are greatest in Seaside, Warrenton, Gearhart, and Cannon Beach. At Seaside, the relatively small change between M1 and XXL1 is indicative of the fact that virtually the entire community is inundated by tsunami in all three scenarios, such that its exposure risk is especially high;
- Building damage caused by earthquake shaking is estimated to range from a maximum of $459 million in Astoria to a minimum of ~$8 million in Arch Cape. The large losses estimated for Astoria can be attributed to the effects of liquefaction (and lateral spreading) and landsliding. Earthquake damage losses in Warrenton and Seaside are also substantial, reaching, respectively, $347 and $362 million. Countywide damage losses caused by the earthquake are expected to exceed $1.8 billion, which equates to ~35% of the buildings damaged;
- Incorporating damage caused by the tsunami results in destruction levels for an M1 event that range from ~43% (Astoria) to 92% at Seaside; for an XXL1 event our analyses indicate 78% destruction of Arch Cape and near 100% destruction at Gearhart, Jeffers Garden, and Seaside. These data reflect the large hydraulic forces associated with the tsunami and the prevalence of light-frame construction material (i.e., wood frame) on the Oregon coast;
- Combined earthquake and tsunami damage for each tsunami zone indicates losses that range from ~$3 billion for an M1 size event, $3.87 billion for an L1 size event, and $4.92 billion for an XXL1 size event. These estimates reflect community-wide losses associated with the earthquake, combined with destruction caused by the tsunami. Note that these estimates exclude building content losses, such that the numbers may be viewed as minimal estimates;
- The destruction of buildings in coastal Clatsop county is expected to generate ~535,000 tons (M1) to ~1,133,000 tons (XXL1) of debris. This equates to ~53,000 dump trucks for M1 to as much as 110,000 dump trucks for an XXL1 event. These estimates are almost certainly on the low end, as they do not include debris associated with content from buildings (personal items, business equipment, etc.), road rip-ups, vehicles, and vegetation;
- Modeled tsunami casualties vary widely between communities. This is due to many factors, but most important is the relative distance to high ground.
    - For the M1 scenario, estimated fatalities are confined mainly to the communities of Seaside (~3,260 resident/7,080 visitor), Warrenton (~460 resident/590 visitor), and Jeffers Garden (~160 resident/0 visitor) with few fatalities in the remaining communities. Low casualties associated with the M1 scenario in the majority of the communities is indicative of the fact that high ground is located close to the population centers allowing for quick access to high ground;
    - For the maximum-considered XXL1 tsunami scenario, the number of fatalities increases dramatically, ranging from a few hundred (e.g., Jeffers Garden) to as many as 11,900 in Seaside. Of the latter, the bulk of the fatalities (67%) are likely to be from the temporary visitor population. At Seaside, the difference in fatalities between the M1 and XXL1 scenarios is ~1,500 people and is a testament to the high degree of risk observed at Seaside under all three tsunami scenarios;
    - High casualties associated with the temporary visitor population is predicated on the assumption that these facilities are at 100% occupancy.

    - The large number of potential fatalities in the communities of Seaside and Gearhart is entirely due to the significant travel distances required to reach high ground in the eastern foothills of southern Clatsop Plains.
    - These results demonstrate a need to evaluate alternative forms of high ground (e.g., vertical evacuation structures), and/or retrofitting bridges to withstand the earthquake shaking, thereby allowing for faster evacuation of the western part of Gearhart and Seaside;
- Following the effects of the earthquake and accompanying tsunami, communities can expect to have to deal with many hundreds to potentially thousands of displaced people requiring short-term shelter and care (~days to a few weeks). Hazus modeling indicates that the numbers of displaced increase significantly as one progresses from M1 (~17,690) to XXL1 (~27,530). We expect these challenges to be especially difficult at Cannon Beach, Warrenton, and Seaside; and
- Compared with fatalities, injuries from the earthquake and XXL1 tsunami were found to be relatively low, varying from ~1% to 6% of the affected community; injury ratios in Astoria (12%) and Arch Cape (15%) are highest due to having fewer deaths. Overall, our combined earthquake and tsunami Hazus modeling indicates ~1,180 injured in the M1 scenario, ~1,190 for L1, and 1,350 for XXL1.

Although each community in coastal Clatsop County has unique circumstances and challenges, as supported by the results of this study, our results unequivocally demonstrate that in every community, ***injuries and fatalities from a tsunami can be minimized if people evacuate on foot toward safety as soon as possible and travel as fast as possible.***

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The destructive and life-threatening forces of tsunamis are well known globally, as demonstrated by the 2011 Tōhoku, Japan event that resulted in 15,868 killed and another 2,848 missing (as of August 8, 2012; Goto and others, 2012). Most (92.4%) of these deaths were due to drowning (Government of Japan Cabinet Office, 2011). The Oregon coast is similarly exposed to large megathrust subduction zone earthquakes, capable of generating catastrophic tsunamis (Witter and others, 2011). Verification for such events is recognized in the geologic record, with evidence of at least 19 megathrust earthquakes (>8.5 Mw) over the past 10,000 years (Goldfinger and others, 2017, 2012; Priest and others, 2009; Satake and others, 2003; Witter and others, 2012). The most recent tsunami generated by a large subduction zone earthquake on the Oregon coast occurred on January 26, 1700 (Atwater and others, 2005). Goldfinger and others (2017) estimated the conditional probability of an earthquake on the Cascadia subduction zone (CSZ) at ~16–22% in the next 50 years; a partial rupture of the CSZ impacting the southern Oregon coast has a conditional probability of ~37–43% (Goldfinger and others, 2017). Because many communities on the Oregon coast have large numbers of people, residences, and businesses located in the tsunami zone, there is a high potential that the next great earthquake and tsunami will result in many fatalities, catastrophic destruction of local infrastructure, and lasting damage to Oregon's economy. The objective of this report is to perform an analysis of community exposure to tsunami inundation, providing estimates of infrastructure damage and casualty estimates for Clatsop County on the northern Oregon coast. In providing such information, we address a specific need expressed in the 2013 Oregon Resilience Plan, to document the "who," "what," and "where" in terms of population exposure, building damage and socioeconomic impacts (OSSPAC, 2013).

Following the 2011 Tōhoku, Japan tsunami, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) commissioned an effort to standardize quantification of tsunami impacts (FEMA, 2013), later refined and incorporated into FEMA's Hazus framework (FEMA, 2017). Hazus is a geospatial information system (GIS) software model that produces loss estimates for earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, and tsunamis based on state-of-the-art scientific and engineering risk analyses and knowledge. Critical inputs needed by Hazus includes a wide variety of tsunami modeling, engineering, and societal information, including earthquake ground motion and ground deformation, tsunami inundation, flow velocities and flow depths, and building inventories and population demographics.

In Oregon, considerable mapping and modeling has been undertaken by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) in order to better advise local and state government agencies on the various geologic hazards that could impact the state. For example, DOGAMI and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) published ground motion/deformation maps for a magnitude (M_w) 9.0 Cascadia subduction zone (CSZ) earthquake (Madin and Burns, 2013); these data were integral in initial efforts to evaluate impacts from a CSZ event throughout Oregon (OSSPAC, 2013). In parallel, DOGAMI combined high-resolution lidar-derived terrestrial digital elevation models (DEMs) with detailed bathymetry in order to model five scenarios for locally (CSZ) generated tsunamis (Priest and others, 2013g; Witter and others, 2011). More recently, DOGAMI pioneered techniques for tsunami evacuation modeling ("Beat the Wave" [BTW]) at Seaside and Gearhart, Oregon (Priest and others, 2015), Warrenton/Hammond (Gabel and Allan, 2016), Rockaway Beach, (Gabel and Allan, 2017), Pacific City (Gabel and others, 2018a), Reedsport and Florence (Gabel and others, 2018b), Newport (Gabel and others, 2019a), Lincoln City/unincorporated Lincoln County (Gabel and others, 2019c), Coos estuary (Gabel and others, 2019b), unincorporated Tillamook County (Gabel and others, 2019d), Port Orford (Gabel and others, 2020a), and Nehalem Bay (Gabel and others, 2020b). These BTW studies graphically demonstrate evacuation challenges and mitigation opportunities but do not quantify potential loss of life. Since 2015, Williams and others (Matthew Williams, DOGAMI, written communication, 2019) developed a Hazus-compatible building inventory for all seven Oregon coastal counties, identifying the locations, size, and primary usage (e.g., residential, commercial) of buildings, which is fundamental to addressing fatalities and building damage potential.

Although most data needed by Hazus to model the effects of earthquake and tsunami impacts are in place, one key missing element is a spatially explicit population model for the Oregon coast. Specifically, how many people are located in the tsunami zone, their demographics, and where they are located relative to safety from the tsunami at the time of the earthquake. Such a model is complicated because many Oregon coastal communities experience large influxes of daytime and overnight visitors throughout the year (Dean Runyan Associates, 2018). In addition to full-time residents, many homes and condominium units located in the tsunami zone are second homes or vacation rentals (Raskin and Wang, 2017), while many coastal parks and campgrounds are also located in the tsunami zone and potentially host many thousands of overnight visitors (White, 2018). Each of these considerations must be carefully evaluated and accounted for in order to generate meaningful statistics of both local and visitor populations and, ultimately, potential casualties and displaced populations associated with a CSZ earthquake and tsunami. Furthermore, *population estimates should assume the highest seasonal occupancy so that design capacities will be based on the maximum potential evacuation need*, while also identifying vulnerable population groups within the tsunami zone that may present special evacuation challenges (DLCD, 2015).

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the potential effect of a CSZ earthquake and accompanying tsunami in coastal Clatsop County. Specifically, we evaluate estimates of potential building losses, generated debris, fatality and injuries, as well as estimates of numbers of displaced people. The study also provides an assessment of vulnerable population groups, essential facilities, and critical infrastructure that are integral to response and recovery. This study integrates previous earthquake and tsunami modeling with a new population model (comprising permanent and temporary people) for the purpose of

a. evaluating tsunami evacuation challenges and opportunities on the coast; and
b. completing a detailed socioeconomic analysis using several data sources to identify vulnerable communities in the tsunami zone, as well as the number and types of jobs in the tsunami zone that would be impacted by a CSZ event.

This report initially describes and documents our overall Hazus approach, especially the development of the population model. Results from the countywide assessments are provided in Section 3, with broad conclusions in Section 4. Summary information specific to each community and tsunami inundation zone is provided in Appendix A.

2.0 METHODS

2.1 Overview

Baseline information required by Hazus includes:

1. A physical description of the earthquake and tsunami hazard; and
2. A comprehensive building database, with each building populated with an occupancy estimate derived from our population model.

For the earthquake and tsunami hazard, we used a CSZ M_w 9.0 earthquake as defined by the Oregon Resilience Plan (Madin and Burns, 2013; OSSPAC, 2013) and a corresponding "T-shirt" sized tsunami. For the purposes of this study, we provide Hazus modeling results for three tsunami inundation zones (Priest and others, 2013g; Witter and others, 2011), including Medium (M1), Large (L1), and Extra Extra Large (XXL1). Model results presented here reflect earthquake related damage (including the amount of debris) and casualties simulated for the entire community, while damage and casualties caused by the tsunami are specified for each of the three tsunami inundation scenarios. For injury and fatality estimation we analyzed a "2 AM" scenario for all communities, distinguishing between permanent residents and temporary residents. We did not evaluate a 2 PM scenario because the 2AM scenario defined for summer occupancy conditions assumes maximum occupancy and we believe is sufficiently conservative to account for uncertainty associated with day trippers.

2.2 Natural Hazard Dataset Development

2.2.1 Earthquake

We used the bedrock ground motions associated with a M_w 9.0 CSZ earthquake (Madin and Burns, 2013) for use in the FEMA Hazus Advanced Engineering Building Module (AEBM, FEMA, 2010). Bedrock ground motions were adjusted for discrete areas in each study area by using NEHRP-recommended site amplification factors (FEMA [2015a], implemented as piecewise linear equations by Bauer and others [2018, Appendix B]). Madin and Burns (2013) NEHRP site classification and Hazus-scale liquefaction susceptibility GIS data were used. Sites with NEHRP site classification (as defined by FEMA, 2003, Section 3.5) rated as "F" (soils requiring site-specific evaluations) were reclassified as "E" (soft soils) — a commonly implemented assumption for loss estimation purposes (Bauer and others, 2018). For liquefaction modeling, we assumed a water table level of zero (0) feet (i.e., fully saturated soil). Hazus-scale landslide susceptibility data were obtained by processing landslide susceptibility GIS data given by Burns and others (2016). We mapped the 1–4 scale defined by Burns and others to the FEMA Hazus landslide susceptibility scale of 0–10 as follows: "Low" corresponds to 1, "Moderate" corresponds to 4, "High" corresponds to 7, and "Very High" corresponds to 10. The mapping corresponds to the "WET" scenario described by FEMA (2011, Table 4.15).

2.2.2 Tsunami

The earthquake scenarios and corresponding surface deformation used to simulate tsunami inundation for the Oregon coast reflect a full-length rupture of the Cascadia megathrust (Witter and others, 2011, 2013). Four representative earthquake slip models were defined and tested, including slip partitioned to a hypothetical splay fault in the accretionary wedge and models that vary the updip limit of slip on the megathrust. Recurrence information was defined from a suite of scientific studies including work undertaken in coastal estuaries (Nelson and others, 1996, 2006; Peterson and others, 1995; Witter and others, 2003) and on the continental shelf (Goldfinger and others, 2012). Inter-event time intervals that separate the 19 full-length tsunamis range from as little as 110 to ~1,150 years (Witter and others, 2011, Table 1). Each tsunami scenario was then weighted using a logic tree, to account for the different models, convergence rates, and recurrence. From these data, four time intervals (mean values rounded to the nearest quarter century) were defined as representative of four general earthquake size classes:

- Small (SM), these events have a mean inter-event time of 300 years (range=~110 to 480 years, 5 events);
- Medium (M), 525 years (range=~310 to 660 years, 10 events);
- Large (L), 800 years (range=~680 to 1,000 years, 3 events); and
- Extra Large (XL), 1,150 years (1 event), rounded to 1,200 years.

The mean inter-event time interval multiplied by the CSZ plate convergence rate at each latitude equates to the amount of slip deficit released in each scenario earthquake. Slip was also reduced progressively from north to south on the CSZ to account for evidence in the paleoseismic record of increasing numbers of partial CSZ ruptures from north to south (Goldfinger and others, 2012; Witter and others, 2013). A fifth scenario termed Extra Extra Large (XXL1), which simulated a maximum-considered tsunami, was eventually used to guide evacuation planning (Witter and others, 2011). This last hypothetical scenario assumes 1,200 years of slip deficit release but without any reduction of slip from north to south. According to Witter and others (2013), the defined earthquake size classes correspond to approximate recurrence rates as follows: SM, 1/2,000 yr; M, 1/1,000 yr; L, 1/3,333 yr; and XL, <1/10,000 yr. Recurrence for the XXL1 event is not known.

Maximum flow depths were obtained from Priest and others (2013a,b,c,d,e,f), while the maximum momentum flux was derived from Priest and others (2014a,b,c,d,e,f). The unstructured computational grid data were converted to raster format for use in Hazus by using the Esri® ArcGIS Spatial Analyst Natural Neighbor tool. We specified a 3-m (~10 ft) grid resolution, noting that the mean distance between points in the terrestrial regions within the XXL1 tsunami zone was ~5 m (~16 ft). The Hazus tsunami building damage and casualty fragility curve parameters (determined by engineers) are based on median rather than the maximum depth and momentum flux values (FEMA, 2017, section 4.6). To that end, the raster data were subsequently converted to both median depth and median momentum flux using a 0.66 multiplier; the results were also converted to non-SI (English) units for use in Hazus.

Wave arrival times at the tsunami runup limit were obtained from data originally developed by Priest and others (2013a,b,c,d,e,f). As documented by Bauer and others (2020), an independent spreadsheet that implements the Hazus tsunami casualty model was developed to facilitate analysis and reporting of injuries and fatalities resulting from a tsunami (see Section 2.6). The original approach relied on an average wave arrival time unique to the five communities studied. For this project, however, we modified the spreadsheet to support per-record maximum wave arrival times at the tsunami runup limit (in minutes). This was necessary due to the large variation in maximum wave arrival times observed along the Oregon coast and especially up the various estuaries (e.g., the Columbia or Tillamook estuary). For example, in Warrenton, Clatsop County, the wave arrival time ranges from 34 minutes for a tsunami wave arriving from the ocean at the Delaura Beach Lane/Ridge Road tsunami exit point, compared with 60 minutes for a tsunami wave traveling up the Alder Creek drainage on the Columbia River and arriving at the exit point at SW 9th Street and Ridge Road (Gabel and Allan, 2016). Such differences would have significant ramifications for the calculation of casualties. To resolve this limitation, we used the evacuation flow zone polygons defined in our various Beat The Wave studies to associate a group of buildings with a particular tsunami safety point, or exit point. We then determined the maximum wave arrival time at a particular watershed's exit point and assigned that value (in minutes) to the polygon. All buildings within that watershed were then associated, via a spatial overlay, with that wave arrival time. In some open coast communities, such as Arch Cape, the maximum wave arrival time varies only slightly, and a single value was assigned to all buildings. Wave arrival times for areas located outside our detailed Beat the Wave investigations were defined based on average wave arrival times for that particular area of coast.

2.3 Building Database Development

A Hazus-compatible building database contains a record for each distinct building, with each record containing essential information for estimating damage potential to the structure and harm to the building's occupants (**Table 2-1**). Information associated with the building record, commonly referred to as attributes in a GIS context, is populated primarily from county assessor records or, where better data are available, from ancillary datasets (e.g. Lewis, 2007). We followed the methods established by Bauer and others (2018), starting with the incorporation of building records previously developed by Williams and others (2020) and modifying or amending records where better information was available.

The User-Defined Facilities (UDF) dataset obtained from Williams and others (2020) attempted to identify all buildings that can be considered a residential facility, including traditional single-family residences, manufactured housing, multi-family residential buildings including condominiums, motels and hotels, dormitories and assisted living facilities. The dataset contains information on building primary usage (Hazus "occupancy class"), square footage, number of stories, year built, and building type (e.g., wood frame, steel frame construction, etc.). Although the UDF dataset was a good starting point, it did not always correctly classify residential structures. Therefore, it required a thorough review during which many records were manually updated to correct its existing attributes.

We augmented the UDF dataset as follows. We added a "*number of units"* field, identifying the number of rooms, where available, for motels, multi-family residential, and dormitory building types (Hazus occupancy type, "RES4," "RES3," "RES5," respectively). We further augmented the UDF dataset by adding records to capture the locations of individual tent and yurt sites, recreational vehicle spots, and boat slips in marinas that permit overnight docking. Such locations were digitized as points using orthoimagery and other ancillary data sources, such as Oregon State Park campground maps. We note that the Hazus earthquake and tsunami building damage model is limited to traditional buildings, and thus our building loss estimates exclude damages to temporarily occupied structures such as tents, recreational vehicles, and boats.

We used the RSMeans valuation method for estimating a building's replacement cost (Charest, 2017) where:

$$\text{RSMeans} = \text{building square footage} \times \text{standard cost per ft}^2 \tag{1}$$

Per-square-foot replacements costs are derived from the Hazus 4.2 database[1] that incorporated the 2014 RSMeans valuation. Adjustments for inflation or regional variation to the tabular data were not incorporated.

Building replacement cost is not the same as a property's assessed value. For analysis purposes, we assume repair or replacement costs to damaged structures will be charged at standard construction rates, independent of a building's age or the land on which the building is placed. Assessed value includes the land's value, which may fluctuate greatly depending on real estate markets, and home improvements, while assessors may also factor in the building's depreciation into the assessed value.

An abnormal shortage of skilled labor or materials can occur after a large-scale disaster. *Demand surge* is a process resulting in a higher cost to repair building damage after large disasters, compared with the same repair for damage after a small disaster (Olsen and Porter, 2011). Adjusting repair/replacement costs due to a likely demand surge was beyond the scope of this project.

Williams and others (2020) used street-level imagery to determine the building type of all non–single-family residential buildings, using the guidance provided by FEMA (2015b); selected records were updated with information from Lewis (2007) and other ancillary data sources. Williams and others (2020) were unable to locate additional building information that might have helped further refine the building type assignment, or any seismic retrofitting datasets that could be used to update an individual building's seismic design level. Finally, our observations from numerous field visits and analysis of street-level imagery suggested that the statistical distributions for building types identified by FEMA (2011, Tables 3.A1–3.A.10) are not applicable to the Oregon coast. This is because most commercial and industrial buildings built on the Oregon coast use wood-frame construction. For single-family residential buildings, our field observations confirmed the FEMA Hazus assumption of 99% wood/1% other (FEMA, 2011, Table 3A.17). For simplicity, we assigned wood frame to all single-family residences except manufactured housing.

Table 2-1. Building information required by Hazus earthquake and tsunami model.

Hazus Attribute	Example	Purpose
Location of building	latitude, longitude	Extract ground motion and ground deformation data
Building usage	Single-family Residential; Retail Commercial	Repair/replacement cost; number of people per building
Building material	wood; steel	Building response to ground motion; debris
Year built	1968	Seismic design level: building response to ground motion
Number of stories	2	Building response to ground motion
Square footage	2,250	Building repair/replacement cost; debris; number of people per building
First floor height	3.0	(in feet) Tsunami non-structural building damage estimate
Daytime occupancy[+]	2.1	Casualty estimate
Nighttime occupancy[+]	3.4	Casualty estimate

[+]*Daytime* and *Nighttime occupancy* are Hazus terminology. For our analysis purposes we populate *Daytime occupancy* with the number of temporary residents in the building at 2 PM and *Nighttime occupancy* with the number of permanent residents in the building at 2 AM.

[1] FEMA Hazus SQL tables [dbo].[hzRes1ReplCost] for single-family residential; [dbo].[hzReplacementCost] for all other occupancy types.

2.4 Population Modeling

In order to estimate injuries and casualties from damaged buildings, the FEMA Hazus earthquake model requires estimates of individual building occupancy (FEMA, 2010). People occupying tents, yurts, recreational vehicles, and boats, or who happen to be outside of a building at the time of the earthquake are assumed uninjured from the ground motion. To estimate injuries and fatalities from a tsunami, the FEMA Hazus tsunami model requires the user to refine the population model further to include locations, numbers, population demographics (age), and distance to safety outside the tsunami zone (FEMA, 2017). Typically, people are associated with a building in tsunami modeling, but they can also be placed in temporary lodging, such as in a tent or recreational vehicle, or out on a beach. Given the dynamic human environment the modeler must therefore make several assumptions about each parameter in order to simulate fatalities and injuries.

To minimize the complexity associated with a dynamic human environment, FEMA Hazus documentation recommends modeling be undertaken for two time periods:

- a mid-week "2 PM" scenario, where people are dispersed among work, institutional, and home buildings; and
- a "2 AM" scenario, where most people are in a residential structure (in the Hazus model, hotels/motels are considered residential structures; temporary structures such as a tent or RV were also accounted for in our model).

Such divisions, however, are inadequate to meet the needs of this project (Bauer and others, 2020). This is because Oregon coastal communities experience significant temporal (daily, seasonal, and annual) population fluctuations with large visitor influxes occurring on weekends and in the summer months (Dean Runyan Associates, 2018). Community planners have expressed strong interest that our population model accounts for such variations, which could then be used to assist with identifying tsunami evacuation challenges and short-term sheltering needs. To better understand these effects, we distinguish two broad population groups:

- *permanent residents*, who have established residence within the tsunami zone; and
- *temporary residents*, who are visiting the community.

At night, temporary residents occupy residential facilities such as second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds; permanent residents typically occupy residential structures. During the day permanent and temporary residents may occupy institutional, educational, commercial, and industrial buildings, along with residential buildings, or may be dispersed throughout the tsunami zone (e.g., at the beach) and thus may not be directly associated with any particular building type.

Development of a detailed temporary population model was therefore motivated by several important factors (Bauer and others, 2020):

1. Computing an overall injury/fatality ratio[2] for the permanent population and assuming that the ratio could be applied to the temporary population could lead to significantly underestimating the casualties and injuries. For example, analysis of U.S. Census data and observation of real estate dynamics on the Oregon coast indicate a strong spatial correlation between the temporary population's preference to be close to the ocean, and thus farther away from tsunami safety, when

[2] Total number of tsunami injuries and fatalities divided by the total exposed permanent population.

compared to the permanent population (Raskin and Wang, 2017; illustrated with 2010 U.S. Census data in **Figure 2-1**);

2. It is reasonable to assume that the temporary population may be less aware of tsunami risk, locations of tsunami safe zones, signage, understanding of temporal urgency (e.g., if you feel strong ground shaking, evacuate immediately), and local evacuation routes when compared with permanent residents; and
3. Community planners expressed a need for detailed estimates of tsunami injuries and fatalities, as well as estimates of the number of displaced people following a Cascadia event. These data are essential for effective mass care planning. Thus, our modeling of tsunami-caused injuries and fatalities is undertaken assuming maximum occupancy, combining permanent and temporary residents, and distinguishing injuries and fatalities between the respective population groups. By doing so, we established a range that planners can use and apply educated judgment to estimate impacts at non-maximum occupancy periods.

Given project scope constraints and discussions with community members we focused our attention on developing a summer weekend “2 AM” population model for all communities, in order to maximize estimates of the temporary population and thus provide a more realistic worst-case tsunami evacuation scenario for those communities. Although our summer weekend “2 AM” population scenario does not account for day trippers to the coast, the injury and fatality estimates derived from this scenario, along with the displaced population, may be considered a conservative estimate (i.e., upper bound), as the population model assumes maximum occupancy. Conversely, planners can use the permanent resident casualty estimates as a baseline (i.e., lower bound). FEMA guidelines (FEMA, 2012a, p. 3-6) note that full occupancy at the individual building level happens only occasionally and that “point-in-time population models can be used to develop a better understanding of the uncertainty in casualties associated with time, but it is necessary to perform a large number of realizations to do this in a meaningful way.” Such extensive modeling for all communities was beyond the scope of this project. Within this range, planners can estimate the number of temporary residents present in their communities at other times of year and assume the injury and fatality estimates will scale proportionally.

Our summer 2 AM weekend scenario assumes permanent residents are at their homes and that all available designated temporary lodging such as vacation rentals, second homes, vacation condominiums, campsites, marina boat slips, and recreational vehicle spots are fully occupied (i.e., 100% occupancy). Institutions and businesses, with certain exceptions, are considered to be unoccupied.

For permanent resident occupancy we established locations, numbers of individuals, and age group using 2010 U.S. Census data. Bauer and others (2020) used geocoded Oregon Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) driver license registration records as of September 2017 to perform similar analyses for five coastal communities, as DMV records are typically associated with a single-family residential home. Although such an approach is more accurate for defining the permanent population, the time required to process DMV records on a countywide basis was beyond the scope of this investigation.

Figure 2-1. Example of "seasonally occupied households" relative to the ocean compared to the total households per census block in Gearhart, Oregon. XXL1 tsunami inundation zone shown as a light blue line on the far right. Census blocks with fewer than five households as of 2010 are shown in grey. Residential buildings shown as dots and include residential buildings constructed since 2010 that were not captured in the 2010 census. Census block data source: U.S. Census Bureau (2010).



U.S. Census population data are organized into hierarchical spatial units of varying sizes, the smallest of which is the census block. Census blocks are typically "bounded by visible features such as roads, streams, and railroad tracks, and by nonvisible boundaries such as property lines, city, township, school district, county limits and short line-of-sight extensions of roads" (Rossiter, 2011, unpaginated). One level above a census block is the census block group, which is how the U.S. population is defined and distributed. In Clatsop County, the census block groups average 1,000 people (± 470) and vary in area from 79 acres (32 hectares) to 192,100 acres (77,740 hectares), while the mean size is 18,270 acres (7,394 hectares). In urban areas, census blocks are usually defined at the city block level, whereas in rural areas census blocks may cover a few hundred square miles. Within each census block group the population may range from negligible to several thousand people. However, unlike DMV records that associate a person with a specific address, census block groups provide a single aggregated population count. For our purposes, we used updated population statistics obtained from the American Community Survey (ACS) data products (2013–2017 census data) at the census block-group level. To estimate the size and distribution of the permanent population in our study area, we distributed the population per census block group among the residential buildings and pro-rated based on square footage. The specific steps associated with this process is summarized in **Figure 2-2A** for the permanent population.

After populating the buildings, or in the case of multi-family residential structures, units, with permanent residents, we then assumed the proportion of residential buildings or units that are not occupied by a permanent resident are occupied on a temporary basis by out-of-town residents. For single-family residential houses, we used the number of bedrooms (units) to determine temporary occupancy (**Figure 2-2B**). We populated hotels/motels, campgrounds, recreational vehicle parks, and marinas using the number of rooms, tent or RV sites, or boat slips as a baseline, and multiplying by a people-per-unit occupancy assumption (**Figure 2-2B**). To accomplish these steps, we used the 2010 census data to identify the residential household[3] vacancy rate at the census block level. For each UDF, we then multiplied the corresponding vacancy rate by the number of units, establishing the number of units occupied by temporary residents. This latter value was then multiplied by the people per unit value to derive a temporary population (**Figure 2-2B**) per household unit.

Finally, researchers have recognized that demographic factors can be an important factor in tsunami casualties (summarized by González-Riancho Calzada and others [2015]). This is because specific age groups have been recognized as having different evacuation speeds, which affects their evacuation potential. Accordingly, FEMA (2013, 2017) incorporated population demographics into the FEMA Hazus casualty model. This is accomplished by differentiating those people < 65 years with those ≥ 65 years in the Hazus tsunami casualty model (FEMA, 2017), with the latter group assumed to evacuate at slower walking speeds; a 0.8 walking speed reduction factor was used to account for travel speeds used by persons ≥65 (see Section 2.6.2.4). Hence, for our tsunami casualty modeling purposes, an individual is identified as 1) either permanent or temporary, and 2) either < 65 years of age or ≥ 65 years (**Figure 2-2**).

[3] H005006, "Total for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use" in the Total Vacancy data per census block, 2010 U.S. Census, divided by total number of households in the census block, obtained from Table S1101.

Figure 2-2. Summary parameters used to define the process for distributing the permanent resident and visitor populations across U.S. census block-groups.

	Occupancy Type	Number of Units	People Per Unit	People per UDF: Explanation	People per UDF: Math	Age < 65 Ratio
A) Permanent Population	Single-family Residential	1 unit	The ACS 2013–2017 census data report the number of permanent residents at the census block group (CBG) level. For each CBG in the study area, the permanent population number was divided by the total number of units within the CBG. This established a People per Unit number.	The People per Unit value was then multiplied by the total number of units belonging to each UDF to assign the total number of permanent residents.	[Number of Units] * ([Number of permanent people in CBG] / [Number of units in CBG])	0.7
	Multi-family Residential	1 unit per 800 ft^2				0.7
	Dormitories	1 unit per 400 ft^2				0.9
	Assisted Living	1 unit per 600 ft^2				0.05
B) Temporary Population	Single-family Residential	2 units < 1,500 ft^2 3 units < 2,700 ft^2 4 units < 4,000 ft^2 5 units < 5,500 ft^2 6 units ≥ 5,500 ft^2	2.0	The 2010 census data reports the residential vacancy rate at the census block (CB) level. For each residential UDF, the corresponding vacancy rate was multiplied by the number of units, establishing the number of units occupied by temporary residents. This last number was then multiplied by the People Per Unit value.	[People per Unit] * [Number of Units] * [CB vacancy rate]	0.7
	Multi-family Residential	1 unit per 800 ft^2	2.2			0.7
	Hotel/Motel	1 unit per 455 ft^2	1.7			0.7
	Dormitories	1 unit per 400 ft^2	1.0			0.9
	Recreational Vehicle	1 unit	3.22	For mapping simplicity, some UDF points are assigned multiple units, such as docks in boat marinas.	[Number of Units] * [People per Unit]	0.3
	Tent, Yurt	1 unit	3.22			0.9
	Boat	1 unit	0.1			0.9

Notes:

Permanent population numbers are taken from ACS 2013–2017 census data at the census block group level.

Temporary vacancy rates are taken from 2010 U.S. census data at the census block level.

No permanent residents are assigned to Hotel/Motel; Recreation Vehicle; Tent, Yurt; or Boat.

No temporary residents are assigned to Assisted Living.

Average number of people staying in a recreational vehicle (includes camper trailers), tent, or yurt. Mean value derived from T. Bergerson (Visitor survey of day use and overnight use at Oregon State Park coastal region parks, unpublished Oregon State Parks report, 2012, 151 p.), who evaluated the numbers of recreational visitors camping in coastal state parks.

Estimates of those residing on a boat were derived from consultation with local ports and marinas in both Clatsop County and Tillamook County.

2.5 Building Damage and Building Debris Estimation

2.5.1 Earthquake

To calculate combined building losses from an earthquake and tsunami the Hazus model requires the user first to model earthquake damages using the Hazus User-Defined Facilities (UDF) earthquake model (FEMA, 2011,2017). In the Hazus earthquake simulation we used Hazus 4.2 Service Pack 1 to model a fully saturated soil scenario, with groundwater level at the surface, thereby incorporating the potential impacts of liquefaction. We believe this is a reasonable assumption for low-lying coastal areas.

As noted previously, we model the effects of three discrete tsunami inundation scenarios described by Witter and others (2011) and Priest and others (2013e), including M1, L1, and XXL1. These reflect the following CSZ earthquake moment magnitudes (M_w): 8.9 (M1), 9.0 (L1), and 9.1 (XXL1); each event is characterized by a unique deformation model to account for the coseismic response. These scenarios contrast with the terrestrial ground motion data from Madin and Burns (2013), which assumes a moment magnitude (M_w) 9.0 CSZ earthquake. For Hazus loss estimation purposes we determined that the ±0.1 difference in moment magnitude is minor and accounted for by our choice of the "default betas" in the Hazus Advanced Engineering Building Model (probability of damage state, Kircher and others, 2006; Kircher, 2002). The default betas (also referred to as relaxed betas) were crafted by the Hazus earthquake model developers to account for greater uncertainties in the ground motion for an earthquake scenario compared to an instrumented earthquake event.

Building repair cost estimates were obtained by using the probability of damage state (PDS) values for each building[4]. The Hazus UDF earthquake model currently overestimates repair costs for UDFs by using overly conservative PDS multipliers for determining a building loss ratio (Bauer, 2016). Using corrected PDS multipliers (described by Bauer [2016]), we calculated per-building repair cost estimates, and then summarized building repair costs due to earthquake ground motion and earthquake-induced ground deformation by community.

2.5.2 Tsunami

The M1, L1, and XXL1 median depth and momentum flux grids were input data to the Hazus tsunami tool as "Level 3" tsunami data (FEMA, 2017), which reflect advanced level user-provided tsunami model scenarios. We summarized building repair costs for the M1, L1, and XXL1 tsunami events by community[5].

2.5.3 Combined earthquake and tsunami

The Hazus tool combines the per-building damages state probabilities from the earthquake and tsunami into an overall damage state probability and then calculates per-building repair cost estimates (FEMA, 2017, Section 5.7). We summarized the combined building repair costs for the earthquake and for each of the tsunami inundation scenarios by community[6].

Building recovery times are provided in the FEMA Hazus methods (FEMA, 2017, Table 7.10), but we chose not to report them, as Bauer and others (2020) argued that the assumptions behind the tabular

[4] Hazus SQL table [dbo].[eqUserDefinedFlty].

[5] Per-building repair cost estimates from the tsunami event by itself were obtained by exporting the Hazus SQL table [dbo].[tsUserDefinedFlty].

[6] Per-building repair costs that combine earthquake and tsunami events were obtained by exporting the Hazus SQL table [dbo].[tsCombUserDefinedFlty]. The table also contains structural and nonstructural probability of damage state (PDS) data for each building.

entries are overly optimistic given the spatial scale of a M_w 9.0 CSZ earthquake and tsunami and the likely catastrophic nature of the event on core infrastructure. Thus, access to labor, material, and investment capital may be constrained for prolonged periods during recovery, in large part due to the anticipated damage to western Oregon's transportation network, infrastructure, and fuel supply (ODOE, 2017; ODOT, 2014; OSSPAC, 2013).

2.5.4 Building debris

The Hazus version 4.2 model (FEMA, 2017, 2018) presently does not provide support for debris estimation from a tsunami event, due in part to the challenges of accounting for debris redistribution from advection, including debris washed out to sea, sediment transport, and uprooted vegetation. While recognizing the complexities associated with estimating debris caused by the earthquake and tsunami, we contend that estimates of debris tonnage derived from damaged buildings are valuable for community planners to better understand the scale of the disaster and, importantly, to develop post-disaster community debris plans. Timely recovery from a major earthquake and tsunami will depend not only on the localized damage in each community, but also on the ability of communities to stage and dispose of earthquake- and tsunami-generated debris. To that end, we provide estimates summarized by community of debris generated by the earthquake and for the three tsunami scenarios.

Estimates of the amount of debris (expressed as tonnage) generated by the earthquake can be obtained using guidelines provided by FEMA (2010). Our building debris estimates combine the guidelines provided by FEMA (2013, Chapter 7; 2011, Chapter 12). The Hazus tsunami model, when run in conjunction with the Hazus earthquake model, provides combined probability of damage states for a building's structural and nonstructural components. We first calculated the weight of the building based on the model building type using the values provided by FEMA (2011, Table 12.1). Using the building weight together with the probability of damage states estimate for each building (Section 2.5.3), we then estimated the debris tonnage using the FEMA (2011) equation 12-3.

2.6 Injury and Fatality Estimation

We independently evaluated injuries and fatalities resulting from a CSZ earthquake and tsunami, using, respectively, the Hazus AEBM model (FEMA, 2010) and the Hazus tsunami model (FEMA, 2017). Unlike the building damage estimates described previously, the FEMA Hazus methods currently do not provide a method for combining injury and fatality estimates from the two events. The approach we used is described in more detail in the next two sections.

2.6.1 Injuries and fatalities from earthquake

We used the Hazus AEBM model (FEMA, 2010) to calculate injuries and fatalities, populating the individual buildings with the permanent and temporary population "2 AM" summer weekend occupancy estimates. The *DayOccupants* and *NightOccupants* fields were used as Hazus AEBM inputs for the two population groups. We note that the *DayOccupants* and *NightOccupants* are simply Hazus field names, and their usage does not suggest we modeled a daytime building occupancy.

The Hazus AEBM model first calculates a building's structural and nonstructural probability of damage state (PDS) from the ground motion and liquefaction/landslide data provided to the model. It then uses the PDS values to calculate injuries and fatalities based on the number of user-specified people occupying the building and the building type. The methodology assumes a strong correlation between building damage and the number and severity (injury level) of casualties (FEMA, 2011). According to FEMA (2011), casualties (both injuries and fatalities) are classified into four levels: minor injuries, injuries requiring hospitalization, life-threatening injuries, and deaths (**Table 2-2**).

Earthquake-induced casualties have been summarized by community, by casualty level, and by resident status (permanent versus temporary). For comparison with the Hazus tsunami casualty model we summarized earthquake casualty levels 1 through 3 as *injuries*, while casualty level 4 reflected *fatalities*. We note that in Oregon coastal communities, most residents occupy wood-frame structures at 2 AM, and such structures are much less likely to be severely damaged in an earthquake compared to other building types (FEMA, 2011).

Table 2-2. Hazus earthquake casualty level descriptions (FEMA, 2011).

Injury Severity Level	Injury Level Description
Level 1: Minor Injuries	Injuries requiring basic medical aid that could be administered by paraprofessionals. These types of injuries would require bandages or observation. Examples: a sprain, a severe cut requiring stitches, a minor burn (first degree or second degree on a small part of the body), or a bump on the head without loss of consciousness. Injuries of lesser severity that could be self-treated are not estimated by Hazus.
Level 2: Injuries Requiring Hospitalization	Injuries requiring a greater degree of medical care and use of medical technology such as x-rays or surgery, but not expected to progress to a life-threatening status. Examples: third-degree burns or second-degree burns over large parts of the body, a bump on the head that causes loss of consciousness, fractured bone, dehydration, or exposure.
Level 3: Life-Threatening Injuries	Injuries that pose an immediate life-threatening condition if not treated adequately and expeditiously. Examples: uncontrolled bleeding, punctured organ, other internal injuries, spinal column injuries, or crush syndrome.
Level 4: Deaths	Instantaneously killed or mortally injured.

2.6.2 Injuries and fatalities from tsunami

The Hazus tsunami casualty model estimates are based on a rational actor pedestrian evacuation model in which all persons in the tsunami zone have acute awareness of the impending tsunami, that they possess knowledge of or can quickly determine the most optimal route to a tsunami safety area, and that all individuals seek safety as pedestrians and not by vehicles. The model assumes a group average (median) departure time and travel (walking) speed and accounts for individual variations from the group average using a lognormal distribution (FEMA, 2017). Although human behavior in an emergency situation is likely to be highly variable, we believe the results from the Hazus tsunami casualty model provide critically important data for planners that will help assess the status quo, identifying areas in their communities where injury and fatality rates will likely be higher, while also providing the ability to quantify the efficacy of proposed mitigation solutions such as tsunami vertical evacuation structures. The following sections define in more detail the overall approach and assumptions used to define injuries and fatalities from a CSZ tsunami.

2.6.2.1 Model implementation

Bauer and others (2020) integrated the Hazus tsunami casualty model into a standalone Excel spreadsheet in order to estimate the likelihood of a casualty for every person, incorporating their particular distance to their nearest tsunami safety destination, assumptions on group median departure time, and median travel (walking) speed. A travel dispersion coefficient (C_{STD}) was also incorporated in the spreadsheet to account for variations (uncertainty) within the group's departure time and evacuation travel speeds. Motivations for developing the spreadsheet versus using the dedicated Hazus tsunami tool are:

1. Our existing tsunami evacuation modeling already provides the needed path distance to safety data needed by the Hazus tsunami casualty model; the Hazus tsunami casualty model includes the USGS Pedestrian Evacuation Analyst Tool (PEAT) (Jones and others, 2014), which performs the same calculations as the DOGAMI approach. Thus, rerunning this capability within Hazus is not warranted;
2. Our project requires a model with considerable flexibility for evaluating alternative population and evacuation scenarios (including distinguishing temporary and permanent residents), and, crucially, for testing population assumptions and model parameter settings; and
3. Importantly, the Hazus tsunami model currently estimates casualties at the census block level, not at the building level, and thus uses a worst-case assumption of time-to-safety for all occupants within a particular census block (D. Bausch, written communication, July 2018). The Hazus approach is thus too coarse for our objective, which includes a more refined population model disbursed across individual buildings and campground sites.

More detail on our spreadsheet casualty model is described by Bauer and others (2020, Appendix C). There we demonstrate functional equivalence of the spreadsheet with the FEMA Hazus tsunami Level 2 casualty tool. To minimize confusion, we use the term "Hazus tsunami casualty model" to refer to the FEMA-established methods of estimating injuries and fatalities resulting from a tsunami, and not a specific tool or spreadsheet.

A local source tsunami provides no warning — the ground shaking itself is the signal to evacuate. Thus, the warning time (T_W) discussed by FEMA (2017) is assumed to be zero for a CSZ tsunami. Furthermore, tsunami modeling by Witter and others (2011) indicates that the maximum tsunami runup from a CSZ earthquake is typically associated with the first wave arrival[7].

2.6.2.2 Distance to safety

The Hazus tsunami casualty model requires the user provide a GIS file that specifies the distance to tsunami safety at all points along the established evacuation routes. Previous "Beat the Wave" efforts undertaken for multiple coastal communities (Gabel and Allan, 2016, 2017; Gabel and others, 2018a,b, 2019a,b,c,d, 2020a; Priest and others, 2015) have used the anisotropic least-cost distance approach established by Wood and Schmidtlein (2012) to calculate a distance to safety at all locations along evacuation routes. The distance to safety (referred to as *path distance*) is adjusted to account for the slope of the ground (steep versus flat) and terrain type (e.g., sand versus pavement) that may slow down a person's ability to evacuate. Given that tsunami evacuation nearly always requires the evacuee to move

[7] The Hazus tsunami casualty model is one-dimensional and does not incorporate time-sensitive inundation information en route to safety; it simply assumes an evacuee arrived at the tsunami runup (tsunami safety) in time (T_{MAX}). Complex decision points, such as early wave arrivals or bridge failures that are likely to preclude or impact evacuation along certain routes are not evaluated.

up in elevation, this adjusted distance to tsunami safety is always greater than the straight-line distance measured on a map. In this report, our usage of *distance to safety* reflects the combined slope and adjusted walking distance.

We associate each building and its occupants with the tsunami evacuation network that specifies the distance to tsunami safety using the Esri® ArcGIS® Near function. The linear distance from the building footprint's centroid to the evacuation network is then added to the distance to safety from the GIS file to derive an overall distance to tsunami safety. We did not implement the method of Wood and others (2016), which has pedestrians evacuating via driveways typically generated on paths perpendicular to the road network. Visual inspection suggested the distance from the building centroid to the evacuation network was minor relative to the overall distance to safety, and such a refinement would only marginally improve the accuracy of the model's results. Moreover, the time to evacuate a building may be accounted for as simply an evacuation delay, described further below.

A community often has more than one tsunami evacuation scenario defined, which can include the impact of damaged bridges and/or the inclusion of a tsunami vertical evacuation structure. Each scenario has a unique distance to safety GIS dataset, which can be captured separately, when needed. Such scenarios have been evaluated previously for Seaside (Priest and others, 2015) and Warrenton/Hammond (Gabel and Allan, 2016). For the purposes of this countywide Hazus assessment, we used the most conservative bridge out scenario, to account for the likely failure of non-retrofitted bridges; bridges that have been retrofitted or rebuilt to current engineering standards are designed to withstand the intense ground motion caused by the earthquake.

2.6.2.3 Departure time

The Hazus tsunami casualty model uses the term *Community Preparedness Level*, which reflects the time required between the tsunami warning (i.e., earthquake shaking) and actual evacuation of the community (FEMA, 2017). The degree of preparedness is classified according to three categories: *Good*, *Fair*, or *Poor*, and is dependent on a suite of factors including tsunami awareness (education/knowledge), preparation of evacuation routes and signage, a community's risk management level, and, where available, emergency loudspeakers and tsunami sirens (FEMA, 2017). According to FEMA, a community with a "good" rating could be one that is designated "Tsunami Ready" by the NOAA National Weather Service. However, we contend that such designations do not truly reflect a community's level of preparedness given the large uncertainty in people's hazard awareness, knowledge of evacuation routes, their actual response at the time of the event, and the degree of pre-disaster preparation undertaken by communities to prepare for such an event. Thus, for the purposes of this report we chose not to use the *Community Preparedness* terminology; instead, we focused our efforts on the importance of group departure times.

It is essential that our injury and fatality estimates quantify the impact of delays in departure times, often referred to as *milling time* in the literature (Buylova, 2018; Mostafizi and others, 2017; Wood and others, 2016; Wood and Schmidtlein, 2013). In this study we provide injury and fatality estimates assuming a 10- (*good*) and 15-minute (*fair*) group departure (delay) times; we did not model a poor preparedness level as the casualty numbers associated with this specific category are very large. The 10-minute departure delay is the default value used in all our BTW tsunami evacuation modeling and refers to the time elapsed since the start of the earthquake. It accounts for up to 5 minutes in which earthquake shaking takes place in which people will drop, cover and hold on, followed by an additional 5 minutes of individual preparation — donning shoes and outdoor clothing, gathering immediate family, collecting a go-bag — before leaving the building. We also model a 15-minute (*fair* level of preparedness) departure time to demonstrate how additional milling time (evacuation delay) causes community fatalities to increase significantly.

The departure time is assumed to be the group median value. In reality, some individuals may leave earlier, others later, while some may walk faster or slower than the group median evacuation speed. The Hazus tsunami casualty model accounts for these variations by adopting a dispersion factor (defined by a lognormal distribution), which can be accounted for by specifying a standard deviation (or *beta*) value (referred to as C_{STD} by FEMA [2017]). For the purposes of our study, we used the Hazus tsunami casualty model defaults of 0.3 and 0.5 for the 10- and 15-minute departure times, respectively, corresponding to the Good/Fair community preparedness levels noted above; theses values are the default standard deviation (C_{STD}) recommendations provided by FEMA (2017, Table 6.3). **Figure 2-3** illustrates the probabilistic nature of the lognormal distribution model. It assumes a group departure time of 10 minutes, a walking speed of 4.0 feet per second, and a wave arrival time of 25 minutes. An individual departing at those specifications can cover 1,097 m (3,600 feet). The standard deviation term, C_{STD}, models the dispersion in individual evacuation times and evacuation walking speeds. The model effectively assigns a probability of evacuating to safety that ranges between 0 and 1. As a result, an individual having traveled 1,097 m (3,600 feet) is not assumed to have safely evacuated but instead is assigned a probability of 0.5 of evacuating safely. As previously discussed, this value accounts for dispersion in departure times and walking speeds. Note the asymmetric nature of the lognormal distribution: it implements a conservative assumption regarding a tendency for humans to delay their departure times.

Figure 2-3. Hazus tsunami casualty model predictions for a hypothetical wave arrival time of 25 minutes (with no warning time), a group departure time of 10 minutes, an evacuation walking speed of 4 feet per second, and variations in the lognormal standard deviation term (C_{STD}).



We are unable to quantify how earthquake-induced building damages may inhibit rapid evacuation from a building prior to the arrival of a tsunami. This understudied concern may be important in older manufactured housing units that may slip off their foundation supports, warping framing and possibly jamming doorframes and windows (EERI, 2014; Maison and Cobeen, 2016; OBCD, 2010; SPA Risk, 2014). The situation can also arise due to unsecured nonstructural elements such as large bookcases that are likely to tip over during the ground motion and block potential exits. FEMA (2012b, Section D) provides guidelines on minimizing potential constraints to egress, including advice on storing large crowbars and sledgehammers near primary door(s) to facilitate emergency exiting.

2.6.2.4 Evacuation speed

We assume a standard 4 feet per second (fps) (2.7 miles per hour, which equates to a "walk" speed) evacuation speed as a baseline for estimating tsunami injuries and casualties. Variations in individuals' walking speeds are incorporated into the C_{STD} standard deviation value discussed previously.

The Hazus tsunami casualty model incorporates a travel (walking) speed reduction factor for persons aged 65 and over (FEMA, 2017). This assumption is based on analyses of fatalities in recent tsunamis (González-Riancho Calzada and others, 2015; Koyama and others, 2012; Suppasri and others, 2016). Accordingly, we used a 0.8 walking speed reduction factor to account for travel speeds used by persons ≥65, which equates to an evacuation speed of 3.2 fps (2.2 miles per hour). It is important to emphasize that travel speed is modeled for the group average (median) and is applicable for the *entire* evacuation route.

The distance covered by an evacuee can be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Distance Covered} = (T_{ARRIVE} - T_{DEPART}) \times \text{WalkSpeed} \tag{2}$$

where T_{ARRIVE} is the time interval between the earthquake start and the tsunami first wave arrival, T_{DEPART} is the time interval between the start of the earthquake and when the population begins evacuating, and WalkSpeed is the specified travel (walking) speed. For reference, we calculate the distance an individual could travel prior to a tsunami arriving based on a range of evacuation speeds and wave arrival times (**Table 2-3**). As noted previously (Section **2.6.2.3**), although the group average (median) departure time may be 10 minutes, the Hazus tsunami casualty model accounts for individual variations from the group average using the cumulative lognormal distribution and dispersion factor.

2.6.2.5 Tsunami injury and fatality estimation

The Hazus tsunami casualty model assumes a 99% likelihood of fatality and 1% likelihood of injury to an individual caught up in a tsunami where the wave depth exceeds 1.8 m (6 feet [FEMA, 2017]). Thus, the model assumes a likelihood of 50% fatality/50% injury for individuals caught where the tsunami wave depth is <1.8 m (6 ft). In practice, because the topography of many Oregon coastal communities is relatively steep, the horizontal distance between the 1.8 m (6 ft) and 0 elevation contour (tsunami safety) is generally small compared to the typical distance to safety an individual must travel. Analyses by Bauer and others (2020) indicated that these distances range from ~30 to 90 m (100 to 300 feet, **Figure 2-4**). In the DOGAMI implementation of the Hazus tsunami casualty model, we defaulted to a 60 m (200 ft) buffer distance as determined by Bauer and others (2020). The Hazus tsunami casualty model provides injury and fatality estimates for each individual with a likelihood between 0 and 1. We summarize the individual injury and fatality likelihoods to obtain overall injury and fatality estimates at the community level.

Table 2-3. Distance walked (in feet) for several departure times and tsunami wave arrival times at the tsunami runup limit. No warning time is assumed. Departure time is the time after earthquake ground motion begins.

Tsunami First Wave Arrival Time (minutes)	Walking Speed Category	Walking Speed		Distance Walked (in feet) for Various Departure Times (in minutes)			
		Feet per Second	Miles per Hour	5 min	10 min	15 min	20 min
15	Slow Walk	2	1.4	1,200	600	—	—
	Moderate Walk	4	2.7	2,400	1,200	—	—
	Fast Walk	6	4.1	3,600	1,800	—	—
	Jog	8	5.5	4,800	2,400	—	—
	Run	10	6.8	6,000	3,000	—	—
20	Slow Walk	2	1.4	1,800	1,200	600	—
	Moderate Walk	4	2.7	3,600	2,400	1,200	—
	Fast Walk	6	4.1	5,400	3,600	1,800	—
	Jog	8	5.5	7,200	4,800	2,400	—
	Run	10	6.8	9,000	6,000	3,000	—
25	Slow Walk	2	1.4	2,400	1,800	1,200	600
	Moderate Walk	4	2.7	4,800	3,600	2,400	1,200
	Fast Walk	6	4.1	7,200	5,400	3,600	1,800
	Jog	8	5.5	9,600	7,200	4,800	2,400
	Run	10	6.8	12,000	9,000	6,000	3,000
30	Slow Walk	2	1.4	3,000	2,400	1,800	1,200
	Moderate Walk	4	2.7	6,000	4,800	3,600	2,400
	Fast Walk	6	4.1	9,000	7,200	5,400	3,600
	Jog	8	5.5	12,000	9,600	7,200	4,800
	Run	10	6.8	15,000	12,000	9,000	6,000

Note: "—" denotes individuals traveling at the designated speed would not reach safety before tsunami arrival.

2.6.2.6 Sensitivity testing

We varied evacuation speeds (2 to 10 fps in 1-fps increments) and departure times (5 minutes to 20 minutes in 1-minute increments) consistent with Wang and others (2016), calculating overall injuries and fatalities for each community. Such data can assist in gaining a better understanding of evacuation challenges facing communities. Furthermore, when presented in graphical form these data can be used in education and outreach material to reinforce existing tsunami evacuation messaging, stressing key points such as the need to evacuate immediately and, importantly, to travel as fast as possible in order to reach safety in time. We adjusted the dispersion factor (C_{STD}) as specified in section **2.6.2.3** proportionally for 10- and 15-minute departure times.

2.6.3 Combining earthquake and tsunami casualty estimates

The Hazus approach does not provide a method for combining injury and fatality estimates derived from the earthquake and tsunami modules. Some portion of the injured people due to the earthquake may not be able to evacuate in a timely manner as they may be disoriented, tend to their own injuries or injuries sustained by another household member, or sustain injuries that prevent or constrain an on-foot evacuation. We report both sets of casualty numbers to provide planners with a more complete accounting of the potential situation. The estimates do not include injuries or fatalities arising from for example, heart attacks, bridge failures, automobile or maritime accidents, electrocutions from downed power lines, exposure to released hazardous materials, upstream dam failures, ground failures such as earthquake-induced landslides, or fires. Furthermore, large-scale natural disasters are known to contribute to illness, injury, or death from other factors such as lack of access to clean water or medicine, interruption of power to life-sustaining medical equipment, exposure due to lack of shelter, disease outbreak, domestic violence, and civil unrest. Quantifying these latter causes of injury or death were beyond the scope of the present investigation.

Figure 2-4. Example of modeled tsunami wave depth near the tsunami inundation limit (blue line), Port Orford, Oregon. The contours in yellow represent the median tsunami depth value (in feet), per Hazus methods (Section 2.6.2.5) for an XXL1 tsunami. Building outlines in orange. Imagery: National Agricultural Imagery Program (2016).



2.6.4 Displaced population

For mass care planning purposes, we calculated the number of uninjured individuals likely to have safely evacuated from the tsunami zone. Those individuals will need shelter, as their homes, motels, recreational vehicles, boats, and tents are assumed to be destroyed by the tsunami. The temporary population that happens to be visiting when the earthquake and tsunami strike will also require shelter needs that may be on the order of days to a few weeks, as arrangements for transportation out of the disaster zone and, ultimately, home may be delayed.

2.7 Essential Facilities and Key Infrastructure

We provide the names of essential facilities, special facilities, and key infrastructure located within each city's tsunami zone. For this report we use the *essential facility* definition provided in Oregon Revised Statute 455.447, Regulation of certain structures vulnerable to earthquakes and tsunamis; rules. (2017[8]):

"Essential facility" means:

(A) Hospitals and other medical facilities having surgery and emergency treatment areas;
(B) Fire and police stations;
(C) Tanks or other structures containing, housing or supporting water or fire-suppression materials or equipment required for the protection of essential or hazardous facilities or special occupancy structures;
(D) Emergency vehicle shelters and garages;
(E) Structures and equipment in emergency-preparedness centers;
(F) Standby power generating equipment for essential facilities; and
(G) Structures and equipment in government communication centers and other facilities required for emergency response.

We define a *special facility* as one that is likely to contain population segments that may present additional tsunami evacuation challenges. This builds on, but is not limited to, the "special occupancy structure" definition provided in Oregon Revised Statute 455.447. Examples include assisted living facilities, detention facilities, facilities where groups of children are placed in the care of non–family-member adults, and facilities with particular focus on persons with a disability. Facilities with incidental usage by persons with disabilities are not included. Geocoded Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) data obtained from the Oregon Employment Division in September 2018 was another dataset used to evaluate other potential facilities. We created a lookup table wherein we identified a subset of employer types based on their 6-digit North American Industrial Classification System code (OMB, 2017) that may host a population that may face additional tsunami evacuation challenges. The table was joined to the QCEW data, which identified specific businesses that could be considered a special facility.

Although great care was taken to develop as complete a list of special facilities in the tsunami zone as feasible, it is acknowledged that not all businesses may have been included. This is mainly because of the provisional nature of the QCEW data, such that some business locations may not have been captured in our overlay analysis. Furthermore, it is important to note that the designation of a building as a "special facility" should not be interpreted as any statement on the building owner or operator's level of tsunami preparedness. The analysis simply identifies those businesses located in the tsunami zone.

The *key infrastructure* list includes facilities necessary for community recovery but not covered in the essential facilities list and includes such facilities as water treatment plants and electrical substations. We constructed this list from visual inspections of orthoimagery and other ancillary geospatial data sources such as Homeland Infrastructure Foundation-Level Data (https://gii.dhs.gov/hifld/). As with the essential facilities and special facilities list, every effort was taken to develop as complete a list as possible.

[8] https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors455.html

2.8 Social Characteristics

DLCD (2015) recommended that a tsunami risk and vulnerability assessment include analyses of the characteristics and locations of populations that may have additional needs or requirements for evacuation. Our modeling allowed us to provide demographic information classified into two broad age groups: <65 years of age, and ≥65 years, for each tsunami zone. In addition to basic demographic information, we further queried the American Community Survey (ACS) data products (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018, Table 1.1), in order to extrapolate additional information that may be useful for informing community tsunami education and evacuation planning. These included:

- S0101 Age and Sex
- S1601 Limited English Speaking Households
- S1810 Disability Characteristics

We obtained the selected ACS tables at the city ("community" in ACS terminology), county, and state level. The 2013–2017 ACS 5-year estimates were based on data collected between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2017. We chose the ACS 5-year estimates based on U.S. Census guidance for smaller geographies (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018, Table 3.1). We note that the ACS estimates are for the city jurisdiction and not its UGB, and that the ACS data are not available by tsunami zone or at any unit finer than the city. We include the ACS-provided margin of error (MOE) to emphasize the sampling nature and uncertainty of the survey. The U.S. Census Bureau sets a 90% confidence level, where the estimate and the actual population value will differ by no more than the value of the MOE.

2.9 Model and Data Limitations

2.9.1 Earthquake

Our earthquake ground motion and deformation model is based on various assumptions about the Cascadia rupture zone (Madin and Burns, 2013). Soil amplification, liquefaction susceptibility, and landslide susceptibility values were assigned on the basis of the best available local geologic data, much of which was mapped prior to the availability of lidar imagery. As a result, information provided by Madin and Burns (2013) may include generalizations about local conditions that could be better refined in the future with more detailed community or site-specific mapping efforts.

2.9.2 Debris

The weight of damaged building contents such as refrigerators and furniture, and where applicable, business inventory such as groceries, were not included in our estimates of debris. Furthermore, we do not quantify the amount of buoyant debris from damaged buildings that may be washed out to sea, nor do we estimate the weight of concrete and asphalt that would be produced from damaged roads and bridges. Debris from damaged automobiles, trucks, recreational vehicles, shipping containers, boats, and logs in staging areas are not included, but an estimate can be obtained by using the weights provided by FEMA (2013, Table 7.6). Estimates of the weight of sediment redistributed across the landscape or vegetation removed and transported by the tsunami were also excluded from our analyses.

Commercial movers provide guidelines for estimating the weight of a typical household content (e.g. https://www.move.mil/resources/weight-estimator). The content of a three-bedroom house is generally estimated at around 5 tons. Although we do not report on content damage in this study, a reasonable assumption is that nearly all the content of a house in the tsunami zone will be destroyed and will be added to the total debris. The building database developed for this study could be used to calculate the added weight of debris associated with household content.

2.9.3 Economic losses

Our economic loss estimates are limited to the direct cost of repairing a damaged building or replacing a severely damaged building with an equivalent structure. Our model assumes standard labor and material costs and availability of capital and credit. It does not factor in demand surge, which occurs following large disasters and results in higher costs to repair building damage compared with comparable damage observed in smaller disasters (described previously in section **2.3**). Olsen and Porter (2011) reported demand surges ranging from 10% to 40% from several large-scale disasters. Adjusting repair/replacement costs due to a likely demand surge was beyond the scope of this project. Further, we do not quantify permanent loss of use, and thus value, of the land due to ground failure, presence of spilled hazardous materials, loss of buildable land due to scour and erosion from the tsunami, or loss of use from tidal flooding due to co-seismic subsidence.

2.9.4 Population models

Our estimates of the permanent population in the tsunami zone are derived from U.S. Census data collected in 2010 and ACS data maintained by the U.S. Census Bureau. This approach differs from the approach of Bauer and others (2020), which used Oregon Department of Motor Vehicles records to identify the number of permanent people in the tsunami zone.

Table 2-4 presents results for four communities where we can compare the approach of Bauer and others (2020) with the approach developed here, which incorporated both ACS data and U.S. 2010 census data. With respect to defining the population, **Table 2-4** highlights two differences. First, both approaches yield comparable permanent population numbers in the communities of Gearhart and Rockaway Beach. This is due entirely to the fact that both these communities are virtually completely inundated under the XXL1 scenario, the extent of which is comparable to the boundaries of the census block group (CBG). Hence the values reported are similar. In contrast, **Table 2-4** indicates that the CBG results for the permanent population in Lincoln City and Newport are significantly (~20–40%) higher when compared with the DMV approach. There are three possible explanations for this: first, it may be a function of both communities having narrow inundation zones (having been built on high ground) with large portions of both communities outside of the tsunami zone. Thus, the CBGs in these areas account for people located outside of the tsunami zone. Hence, the process of distributing the permanent population across the UDFs based on those buildings in the tsunami zone may be overestimating the number of people actually residing in the tsunami zone. Second, it may be a function of the ACS data having more up-to-date population statistics, though this seems less likely given that DMV records should provide a good representation of numbers of people residing in both these communities. Third, it is possible that Bauer and other (2020) may have undercounted the number of people residing in Lincoln City and Newport.

Estimates of the number of temporary population in each of the four communities (**Table 2-4**) and defined for this study were generally consistently lower compared with the Bauer and others (2020) approach. The Lincoln City visitor population was substantially lower, a 45% decrease. The reason for this change is primarily due to the number of people assigned to each room/unit. Bauer and others (2020) used a value of three people per room for Lincoln City; this was the preferred choice by community planners. However, for the purposes of this study, we chose to use a standard value of two people per room. Despite the lower numbers of temporary visitors observed in our latest population modeling and given the large uncertainty in the numbers of visitors in any given community on any given day, we remain confident in our overall estimates of potential visitor numbers in coastal Clatsop County.

Table 2-4. Comparison of the Bauer and others (2020) population model approach with the present study.

	Bauer and others (2020) (DMV records)		Census Block Group (CGB) Approach		Population Difference		Building Count		
Community	**Permanent**	**Temporary[1]**	**Permanent**	**Temporary**	**Permanent**	**Temporary**	**XXL**	**Entire CBG[2]**	**Difference[3]**
Gearhart	1,495	5,459	1,447	4,532	−3%	−20%	1,651	1,961	310
Rockaway Beach	1,440	7,592	1,503	6,642	4%	−14%	2,372	4,056	1,684
Lincoln City	2,154	11,844	2,692	8,167	20%	−45%	2,523	8,499	5,976
Newport	1,161	7,171	2,002	6,161	42%	−16%	1,642	8,394	6,752

Notes:

[1] The temporary population modeling script used by Bauer and others (2020) differed slightly from the present study. Bauer and others assigned three people/bedroom for Lincoln City when estimating the temporary population. In the present study we assign two people/bedroom for all communities.

[2] This is the total building count within all CBGs that intersected the community boundary.

[3] Difference in both building counts.

The potential for inaccurate population results in a CBG, including undercounting by Bauer and others (2020), is probably the most likely explanation for the differences observed in **Table 2-4** and may be a function of building UDFs not having been fully checked for attribute accuracy, leading to over- or under-estimation of the local population. In the approach developed here, great care was taken to evaluate building attributes within the XXL inundation zone. The specific step included the following:

1. Is the building a residential occupancy type? If it is, then it contains residents;
2. What type of residential building is it? For example, if it is a multi-family building such as an apartment, it likely contains both permanent and temporary residents, but if it is a hotel, it contains only temporary residents; and
3. What is the square footage of the building? Depending on the occupancy type, the square footage determines the number of units/rooms, which then determine the number of residents estimated to live there.

However, manually checking the many thousands of buildings outside the tsunami zone is challenging. An example of how the population statistics may be skewed is described here. If an apartment building contained 200 permanent residents and was located outside of the tsunami zone but within a CBG, because the apartment was located outside of the tsunami zone it may not have been flagged for further evaluation. Thus, the 200 people residing in that building may be inadvertently counted as residing in the tsunami zone. Other possible ways in which inaccurate population modeling may occur include:

1. The building is not categorized as a residential building – that means no residents are assigned to it.
2. The building is categorized as a hotel – that means that no permanent residents are assigned to it.
3. The square footage is incorrect – that means that either more people or fewer people will be assigned to the building than is realistic.

Continuing with this example, let us say that the previously mentioned apartment building was categorized as a hotel and no permanent residents were assigned to it. In this case, those 200 permanent residents, which are part of the total in the CBG, are distributed elsewhere in the CBG, skewing the results in other locations. In summary, although great care was taken to evaluate building UDF attributes, especially those adjacent to the tsunami zone boundary that could potentially skew the population statistics (e.g. multi-family residential), it is possible some of these buildings were misattributed.

Our assignment of 0.318 children for every adult between 18 and 64 years of age (described by Bauer and others [2020, Appendix B]) may either overestimate or underestimate actual numbers. Temporary resident estimates and age demographics were based on several key assumptions as described by Bauer and others (2020), and are without doubt the largest challenges when specifying visitor population on any given day. Finally, our population model does not account for people living in the tsunami zone who are experiencing homelessness. Homeless encampments are likely present within the tsunami zone of many Oregon coastal communities.

2.9.5 Hazus tsunami casualty model

The Hazus evacuation modeling assumes the following responses: 1) everyone in the tsunami zone will evacuate on foot at some time after the ground stops shaking; 2) their exit from the building and the route to safety is unimpeded; 3) they take the most optimal route to safety; and 4) their walking speed is not limited by congestion from fellow evacuees or vehicles or the presence of obstacles on roads and trails. Furthermore, it does not account for certain human behaviors and other factors that could result in higher fatality rates. For example, some portion of the population may be unaware of the impending threat and thus do nothing. Others may be fully aware of the threat but for various reasons, including a fatalistic outlook (Johnston and others, 2013), choose not to evacuate. Some may tend to a person with disabilities or a person who sustained injuries during the earthquake and thus fail to leave in a timely manner or are greatly limited in their travel speeds. Still others may spend time checking on neighbors. Fatigue may impact a portion of the population over longer travel distances, especially individuals with limited mobility or health-related problems. Delay introduced by descending multiple flights of stairs in multi-story structures is also not considered.

Other non-behavior factors that the model does not account for include structural failures in a building leading to jammed doorways, and blocked hallways and doorways, all of which may limit egress. Evacuation on roads and trails is likely to be affected by: building debris produced by the ground shaking strewn onto roadways and sidewalks, deformed roads and trails due to lateral spreading due to liquefaction, the presence of liquefaction sand boils, and downed power lines. Depending on the number of evacuees, pedestrian and vehicle congestion at choke points could also influence evacuation travel speeds.

Occupants of boats docked in marinas are assumed to recognize the signs of a major earthquake and be able to safely leave their vessels and exit to high ground via intact docks and dock ramps. Seiching within enclosed marinas is not modeled, nor is potential damage to the dock or its walkway to dry land.

Although the Hazus earthquake model estimates earthquake-induced building damage, the Hazus tsunami casualty model does not factor in how damage to a building from the earthquake itself may restrict egress and thus possibly impede evacuation of damaged buildings prior the arrival of a tsunami. This understudied concern may be especially pronounced in older manufactured housing units that may slip off their foundation supports, warping framing and possibly jamming doorframes and windows.

Although one can identify shortcomings with the FEMA Hazus tsunami modeling, given its assumptions of ideal behavior on the part of evacuees and intact, unimpeded evacuation routes, the injury and casualty results from the model should be perceived “as starting points and not an end point for tsunami risk-reduction discussions” (Wood and Schmidtlein, 2013, p. 1625).

3.0 RESULTS

This section presents results of the Hazus analysis used to quantify earthquake and tsunami related impacts (i.e., building damage, debris, injuries, fatalities etc.) for communities along the Clatsop County coastline. Each community is characterized by diverse population demographics, historical and contemporary development patterns, socioeconomic characteristics, tsunami risk, and bathymetric, topographic, and geologic circumstances that influence evacuation potential and building damage. Each of these characteristics affects community preparation, response, and, ultimately, recovery following a CSZ earthquake and tsunami.

3.1 Population Demographics

Summary population and demographic information for coastal Clatsop County is presented in **Table 3-1** and **Figure 3-1**. Both present the permanent population within each community's tsunami zone and include a conservative estimate of the temporary population that may also be present. As a reminder, the temporary population is derived from a summer 2 AM weekend scenario that maximizes visitor occupancy. Examination of **Table 3-1** indicates the following results:

1. The total permanent resident population present on the Clatsop County coastline within a tsunami zone ranges from ~11,880 (M1) to ~19,440 (XXL1) (**Table 3-1**). Including the temporary population suggests that the local population could increase by as much as ~17,380 (M1) to ~29,600 (XXL1) assuming 100% occupancy;
2. As expected, the numbers of permanent and temporary residents within each tsunami zone increase as the magnitude of the earthquake and tsunami inundation increases (i.e., from M1 to XXL1, **Figure 3-1**);
3. The fraction of the total permanent resident population within the three tsunami zones varies widely between communities (**Figure 3-1**). For example, the entire community of Jeffers Garden is located within all three tsunami zones (**Figure 3-1**, *middle* plot). At Gearhart, the entire (100%) community is located in the XXL1 tsunami zone, 82% is in the L1 zone, while only 44% of it is within M1. Astoria, located 11 miles inside the lower Columbia River estuary, is characterized by 11%, 17%, and 23% of the resident population in the M1, L1, and XXL1 zones, respectively (**Figure 3-1**, *middle* plot). These findings reflect contrasting patterns in the general shape and elevation of the Clatsop coastline, whether it is open coast versus up an estuary, tsunami travel, dispersion (loss of energy), and inundation extents between the communities as well as the distribution of permanent residents within the communities; and
4. All seven Clatsop County coastal communities can experience large influxes of visitors, well exceeding their local resident populations (**Table 3-1** and **Figure 3-1**, *right* plot). Of note, the community of Cannon Beach can swell by ~700–940% (XXL1 and M1). Despite Seaside experiencing lower increases of ~250–270% (XXL1 and M1), a function of its larger resident population, **Figure 3-1** nevertheless demonstrates the importance of both these communities as major tourist destinations with potentially large numbers of visitors located in the tsunami zones. Accompanying their popularity as centers of tourism are challenges associated with preparing such a large transient population for a CSZ earthquake and tsunami.

Table 3-2 and **Figure 3-2** differentiate local populations by age group (<65 and ≥65 years of age). These results have an important bearing on the ability of people to evacuate quickly, specifically as it relates to the speed at which people may be able to travel to reach safety; recall that the evacuation speed for those ≥65 is reduced by 20% (a 0.8 walking speed reduction factor, see section 2.6.2.4). Thus, communities with larger numbers of people ≥65 years of age may want to consider evaluating where these people are situated with a focus toward developing community evacuation response plans specific to their needs (e.g., prioritizing mitigation such as constructing a vertical evacuation structure in one part of town over another because more elderly live in that area). As can be seen from **Table 3-2**, the countywide resident population ≥65 is ~22-23% of the total population for all three tsunami zones; this equates to ~2,250, 3,130, and 3,940 residents in the M1, L1, and XXL1 zones who are ≥65 years of age. However, the actual number of people age ≥65 does vary from one community to another, with the communities of Gearhart, Cannon Beach, and Arch Cape having slightly higher numbers of people ≥65 in the various tsunami inundation zones (**Table 3-2**).

3.2 Building Damage and Debris

The number of residents (permanent and temporary) per building occupancy type is provided for each community in **Table 3-3** and summarized graphically in **Figure 3-3**. Apparent from both the table and figure are notable differences in where people live or visit among the communities. Permanent residents overwhelmingly reside in single-family dwellings, especially in the communities of Jeffers Garden (92%), Gearhart (93%), and Arch Cape (90%). Conversely, multi-family residential buildings are more common in Warrenton (24%), Seaside (21%), and Cannon Beach (20%).

There are notable differences between the communities with respect to temporary residents. For example, hotel/motel availability in Astoria (48%), Seaside (31%), and Cannon Beach (25%) stand out relative to the other communities (**Table 3-3**, **Figure 3-3**). Furthermore, although communities such as Seaside and Cannon Beach have large numbers of motel/hotel rooms, the majority of people staying in these communities are more likely to occupy single-family residential rental units (through e.g., VRBO or Airbnb), of which there are many more available. Finally, visitors staying in RV and tent sites are especially prevalent in Warrenton (79%) and Jeffers Garden (96%). The former is a function of its close proximity to Fort Stevens State Park.

An evaluation of the number of permanent and temporary residents residing in single-family residential buildings in coastal Clatsop County communities is further explored in the final two columns of **Table 3-3**. We focus on single-family residential buildings because they account for the dominant housing type present on the Oregon coast (Bauer and others, 2020) and account for a potentially large group of vacationers that may not be directly exposed to tsunami awareness material or evacuation guidance that is at least occasionally found in hotels, motels, and campgrounds. As can be seen in **Table 3-3**, the countywide ratio of permanent residents to single-family homes averages 2.08, while the ratios for the individual communities of Gearhart, Seaside, Cannon Beach, and Arch Cape fall below that threshold. Conversely, the ratio of temporary visitors at Gearhart, Seaside, Cannon Beach, and Arch Cape range from ~3.9 in Gearhart to more than 5 in Arch Cape. These results serve to further highlight the importance of each of these coastal communities as major recreation destinations. In addition, the results demonstrate the importance of vacation homes, especially during a summer weekend when visits to the coastal tend to be maximized compared with the baseline that considers just the permanent residents; compare last two columns of **Table 3-3**.

Table 3-1. The number of residents in the tsunami-hazard zone for coastal communities in Clatsop County, Oregon, based on census block and tsunami-hazard data.

Community	Total Permanent Resident Population	Combined Population (Permanent + Temporary[1])	Number of Permanent Residents			Permanent Residents (%)[2]			Number of Temporary Residents[1]			Permanent-Temporary Percent (%) Increase		
			Medium	Large	XX-Large	Medium	Large	XX-Large	Medium	Large	XX-Large	Medium	Large	XX-Large
Astoria	9,768	12,275	1,026	1,700	2,230	11	17	23	1,168	1,532	1,581	214	190	171
Jeffers Garden	473	564	473	473	473	100	100	100	144	144	144	130	130	130
Warrenton	5,554	8,307	3,349	3,809	4,583	60	69	83	1,229	2,296	3,431	137	160	175
Gearhart	1,447	5,950	643	1,186	1,447	44	82	100	1,251	3,220	4,532	294	371	413
Seaside	6,774	15,959	5,394	5,980	6,272	80	88	93	9,367	9,476	9,515	274	258	252
Cannon Beach	1,466	8,930	415	917	1,141	28	63	78	3,478	5,864	6,981	939	739	712
Arch Cape	241	1,545	88	125	216	37	52	90	579	790	1,240	755	734	673
Other[3]	12,298	16,041	491	1,449	3,078	4	12	25	162	893	2,185	133	162	171
Clatsop County Total	38,021	69,571	11,880	15,638	19,440	45	60	74	17,377	24,215	29,610	359	343	337

Notes:

[1] Assumes 100% occupancy of second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds.

[2] Expressed as a proportion of the total resident population.

Figure 3-1. (left) The number and (center) percentage of permanent residents (right) and temporary (visitor) populations by community in the tsunami-hazard zones.



Notes:

Percentage of residents expressed as a proportion of the total resident population.

Temporary population estimate assumes 100% occupancy of second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds.

Table 3-2. Permanent resident age demographics per tsunami zone.

	Medium			Large			XX-Large		
Community	**<65**	**≥65**	**Older Age Ratio[1]**	**<65**	**≥65**	**Older Age Ratio[1]**	**<65**	**≥65**	**Older Age Ratio[1]**
Astoria	823	203	20	1,320	380	22	1,750	480	22
Jeffers Garden	376	97	20	376	97	20	376	97	20
Warrenton	2,860	489	15	3,253	556	15	3,927	656	14
Gearhart	472	171	27	861	325	27	1,037	411	28
Seaside	4,338	1,056	20	4,819	1,161	19	5,057	1,214	19
Cannon Beach	296	119	29	666	252	27	831	310	27
Arch Cape	61	27	31	87	38	30	153	64	29
Other	404	87	18	1,131	318	22	2,370	708	23
Clatsop County Total	9,631	2,248	22	12,513	3,126	23	15,501	3,939	23

Notes:
[1] Ratio of ≥65 relative to total resident population.

Figure 3-2. Local resident population demographics. Example provided is for the XXL1 tsunami zone.



Table 3-3. Number of residents (permanent and temporary) per building occupancy type per community in the XXL1 tsunami zone. P is permanent and T is temporary population.

Community	Total Number of Single-Family Residential Homes	Single-Family Residential		Manufactured Housing		Multi-family Residential		Hotel/ Motel		Mobile[1]		Other[2]		Total[3]		Ratio of Permanent Residents Relative to Number of Single-Family Residential Homes	Ratio of Permanent and Temporary Residents Relative to Number of Single-Family Residential Homes, Summer Weekend
		P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T		
Astoria	3,223	6,714	1,054	9	1	2,678	229	0	1,205	0	19	366	0	9,768	2,508	2.08	2.41
Jeffers Garden	198	437	5	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	0	0	473	144	2.21	2.23
Warrenton	1,608	3,576	418	600	24	1,314	70	0	277	0	3,005	65	0	5,554	3,794	2.22	2.48
Gearhart	1,312	1,345	3,805	19	2	83	106	0	542	0	77	0	0	1,447	4,532	1.03	3.93
Seaside	2,846	4,277	4,802	436	25	1,404	472	0	3,034	0	1,256	657	70	6,774	9,660	1.50	3.19
Cannon Beach	1,476	1,167	4,844	9	5	291	282	0	1,946	0	592	0	0	1,466	7,669	0.79	4.07
Arch Cape	285	217	1,251	0	0	23	33	0	20	0	0	0	0	241	1,305	0.76	5.15
Other	4,833	10,540	3,250	1,637	89	120	4	0	274	0	203	0	0	12,298	3,820	2.18	2.85
Clatsop County Total	3,223	28,273	19,431	2,746	146	5,914	1,195	0	7,300	0	5,291	1,088	70	38,021	33,433	2.08	2.41

Notes:

[1] Mobile includes tents, boats, and recreational vehicles.

[2] Other includes dormitories, retirement villages and private camps.

[3] Aggregate of all permanent and temporary building occupancy types.

Figure 3-3. Community overview showing building occupancy type for permanent and temporary residents in the XXL1 tsunami zone.



Integral to pre- and post-disaster planning is knowledge of what will happen to buildings in the various communities as a result of the earthquake ground motion and subsequent tsunami forces. These data are presented in **Table 3-4**; note **Table 3-4** also includes estimates of the broader community-wide earthquake related damage that is expected to occur both inside and outside the tsunami zone. **Figure 3-4** summarizes graphically the results of **Table 3-4**.

The number of buildings located in each of the three tsunami zones is provided in the second through fourth columns of **Table 3-4**, and plotted as bar graphs in **Figure 3-4** *(upper left*). Not surprisingly, the communities of Seaside, Warrenton, Gearhart, and Cannon Beach have the most buildings located in a tsunami zone. At Seaside, the relatively small change between M1 and XXL1 is indicative of the fact that virtually the entire community is inundated by tsunami in all three scenarios, such that Seaside's exposure risk is especially high. Building replacement costs (assuming complete destruction) are shown in **Figure 3-4** (*upper right*) for each of the tsunami zones. Seaside once again stands out ($1.3 billion), along with Astoria ($802 million) and Warrenton ($779 million). Countywide building replacement costs for each tsunami zone are $2.9 billion (M1), $3.8 billion (L1), and $4.7 billion (XXL1) (**Table 3-4**).

Damage caused by the earthquake shaking is presented in **Figure 3-4** (*middle left*) for each tsunami zone, along with the community-wide earthquake-related damage (cyan bars); the latter data thus reflect the earthquake damage across the entire community urban growth boundary. As can be seen in **Table 3-4**, the costs associated with the earthquake damage is estimated to range from $838 million (M1) to $1.3 billion (XXL1), across the three tsunami zones. As can be seen from **Table 3-4** and **Figure 3-4** (cyan bars), the community-wide damage losses range from a high of $459 million in Astoria to ~$8 million in Arch Cape; earthquake damage losses in Warrenton and Seaside are, respectively, $362 and $347 million. Thus the countywide damage losses outside the tsunami zones are the difference between those inside a tsunami zone and the countywide totals (may be determined from **Table 3-4**), which equates to ~$1 billion (M1), $793 million (L1), and $580 million (XXL1) in losses outside of the tsunami zones. These data become important when considering the total damage losses caused by the combined tsunami/earthquake damage losses. The decrease in damage losses outside the tsunami zones is indicative of the increasing inundation (and tsunami caused damage) as one moves from M1 to XXL1.

Combined earthquake and tsunami damage for each tsunami zone are included in **Table 3-4** and **Figure 3-4** (*middle right*). These results indicate losses that range from $2 billion (M1) to $4.3 billion across the county. Factoring in the additional earthquake losses outside the tsunami zones and described above, our analyses indicate that Clatsop County could experience ~$3 billion in damage for an M1 scenario, $3.87 billion for L1, and $4.92 billion for an XXL1 size event. Note that these estimates exclude building content losses, such that the numbers may be viewed as minimal estimates.

As can be seen from **Table 3-4**, the earthquake building loss ratio accounts for about one third of the total building damage in Clatsop County. Incorporating damage caused by the tsunami results in destruction levels for an M1 event that range from ~43% (Astoria) to 92% at Seaside (**Figure 3-4**, *bottom left*). For a maximum considered XXL1 size event, **Table 3-4** indicates 78% destruction of Arch Cape and near complete destruction at Gearhart, Jeffers Garden, and Seaside. These data reflect the large hydraulic forces associated with the tsunami and the prevalence of light-frame construction material (i.e., wood frame) on the Oregon coast.

Finally, **Table 3-4** and **Figure 3-4** (*bottom right*) indicate that the weight of debris generated countywide could range from ~535,000 tons (M1) to ~1,133,000 tons (XXL1). This equates to ~53,000 dump trucks for M1 to as much as 110,000 dump trucks for an XXL1 event. These estimates are almost certainly on the low end, as they do not include debris associated with content from buildings (personal items, business equipment, etc.), road rip-ups, vehicles, and vegetation.

Table 3-4. Earthquake- and tsunami-induced building damage and debris estimates by community zone, and for the entire community. Combined earthquake and tsunami building loss is expressed for each respective tsunami zone.

	Number of Buildings by Tsunami Zone			Building Replacement Cost by Tsunami Zone[1] ($ Million)			Earthquake Building Loss by Tsunami Zone[2] ($ Million)			Earthquake Building Loss by Community[3]		Combined Earthquake and Tsunami Building Loss ($ Million)			Combined Earthquake and Tsunami Building Loss (%)			Combined Earthquake and Tsunami Building Debris (Tons)		
Community	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**($ Million)**	**Building Loss Ratio**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**
Astoria	352	694	902	345	680	802	106	196	226	459	57%	147	373	688	43%	55%	86%	24,799	67,875	134,763
Jeffers Garden	457	457	457	107	107	107	32	32	32	32	30%	82	103	107	77%	97%	100%	20,783	26,956	28,326
Warrenton	1660	1946	2366	561	642	779	250	270	308	362	47%	328	475	693	58%	74%	89%	102,962	145,591	210,235
Gearhart	738	1298	1627	209	361	474	53	81	109	109	23%	144	315	473	69%	87%	100%	38,623	84,345	130,880
Seaside	3633	3733	3866	1,224	1,277	1,329	297	321	330	347	26%	1,125	1,247	1,318	92%	98%	99%	293,525	330,396	357,498
Cannon Beach	740	1441	1686	287	448	524	71	95	110	125	24%	187	381	490	65%	85%	93%	39,315	87,901	117,577
Arch Cape	140	194	311	32	43	68	3	4	7	8	12%	15	26	53	47%	59%	78%	3,740	6,761	14,133
Other[4]	432	1096	2328	107	270	551	25	51	142	366	66%	47	155	440	44%	57%	80%	11,593	41,159	125,594
Clatsop County Total	8,152	10,861	13,650	2,870	3,828	4,716	838	1,050	1,264	1,844	35%	2,074	3,076	4,337	62%	77%	91%	535,340	791,008	1,133,125

Notes:

[1] Total cost to replace buildings in each tsunami zone;

[2] Earthquake building losses defined for each tsunami zone;

[3] Earthquake building losses defined for the entire community (inside and outside the tsunami zone);

[4] Denotes all other areas impacted by a Cascadia earthquake and tsunami.

Figure 3-4. Community overview showing number of buildings per tsunami zone, total replacement costs (millions), earthquake losses (millions), combined tsunami and earthquake losses (millions) and expressed as a ratio, and debris generated (weight).



3.3 Earthquake-Caused Injuries and Fatalities

Our Hazus analyses indicate that injuries from a CSZ earthquake greatly outnumber fatalities (**Table 3-5**). Modeled injuries experienced by permanent residents are expected to be highest in Astoria, followed by Warrenton and Seaside. Conversely, injuries to visitors are likely to be highest in Seaside and Cannon Beach. Of the total number of injuries identified (~850), Hazus estimates ~160 people will require hospitalization. The low casualty estimates associated with the earthquake are likely due to the prevalence of wood frame construction. However, we note that even if injuries are minor, impacted persons may delay evacuation from a tsunami zone while they tend to injuries. The larger number of resident injuries observed in Astoria is likely due to landsliding, liquefaction and lateral spreading effects, leading to building failure.

Table 3-5. Earthquake-induced injuries and fatalities determined for each community and expressed as a total for the county.

		Permanent Residents				Temporary Residents[2]			
		Level 1:	**Level 2:**	**Level 3:**	**Level 4:**	**Level 1:**	**Level 2:**	**Level 3:**	**Level 4:**
Community	**Total Population**	*Minor Injuries*	*Injuries Requiring Hospitalization*	*Life-Threatening Injuries*	*Deaths*	*Minor Injuries*	*Injuries Requiring Hospitalization*	*Life-Threatening Injuries*	*Deaths*
Astoria	12,275	99	20	1	2	24	5	0	1
Jeffers Garden	564	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warrenton	8,307	83	19	1	2	8	2	0	0
Gearhart	5,950	12	2	0	0	47	11	1	2
Seaside	15,959	81	18	2	3	88	19	2	3
Cannon Beach	8,930	14	3	0	0	68	14	1	2
Arch Cape	1,545	1	0	0	0	6	1	0	0
Other[1]	16,041	132	29	2	3	23	5	0	0
Total	69,571	428	92	6	10	264	57	4	8

Notes:

See **Table 2-3** for a more complete description of Hazus-defined injury levels.

[1] Denotes all other areas impacted by a Cascadia earthquake and tsunami.

[2] Assumes 100% occupancy of second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds.

3.4 Tsunami-Caused Injuries and Fatalities

Casualty numbers (injuries plus fatalities) attributed to a Cascadia tsunami is presented in **Table 3-6** and graphically in **Figure 3-5**. Overall, our Hazus modeling indicates that tsunami related casualties will greatly exceed earthquake related casualties, especially when accounting for the combined permanent resident and visitor populations. Of particular note, injuries caused by the tsunami average about 6% (+/-5%) of the total number of casualties, indicating that tsunami related deaths account for the bulk of the total number of casualties (**Table 3-7**). This is because the Hazus tsunami casualty model estimates that people that do not escape from the tsunami zone are much more likely to die than be injured and survive. Those that are injured are largely confined to a small narrow band where the tsunami flow depth falls below 6 feet (see Section 2.6.2.5).

As can be seen in **Table 3-6** and **Figure 3-5**, modeled tsunami casualties vary widely between communities. This is due to many factors, but most important is the relative distance to high ground. Thus, for the M1 scenario, estimated fatalities are confined mainly to the communities of Seaside (~3,260 resident/7,080 visitor) and Warrenton (460 resident/590 visitor), with few killed in the remaining communities. Note that Hazus modeling suggests no fatalities in Astoria, 1 in Arch Cape, 7 in Cannon Beach and 4 in Gearhart for an M1 tsunami event; these numbers likely fall within the margin of error in the Hazus modeling. Other than Seaside, Warrenton and Jeffers Garden, low casualties associated with the M1 scenario in the majority of the communities is indicative of the fact that high ground is located close to the population centers allowing for quick access to high ground.

The number of fatalities associated with the maximum-considered XXL1 tsunami scenario increase dramatically, ranging from a few hundred (e.g., Jeffers Garden) to as many as 11,900 in Seaside (**Table 3-6**). Of the latter, the bulk of those killed (67%) are likely to be visitors. Differences in fatalities between the M1 and XXL1 scenarios at Seaside is ~1,500 people and is a testament to the high degree of risk observed at Seaside under all three tsunami scenarios.

The large number of potential fatalities in the communities of Seaside and Gearhart is entirely due to the significant travel distances required to reach high ground in the eastern foothills of southern Clatsop Plains. It is for this reason that the community of Gearhart designated several areas of "optional" high ground nearer to downtown Gearhart that are deemed safe under the L1 tsunami scenario and could be used by locals instead of trying to evacuate to the east. As a reminder, the L1 scenario encompasses 95% of the expected inundation modeled by DOGAMI tsunami inundation scenarios. As can be seen in **Table 3-6** the Hazus modeling suggests that ~30 people are likely to be killed in the L1 scenario. Unfortunately, Seaside does not have any similar comparable areas of optional high ground as the L1 scenario inundates most of the community.

Combined, we estimate that countywide fatalities could range from ~11,500 (M1) to as high as 21,500 (XXL1), with the bulk of the fatalities (~67%) likely coming from the temporary visitor population. Given that these casualty estimates are for seven Clatsop communities alone, total deaths caused by even an M1 CSZ tsunami when accounting for all 38 communities on the Oregon coast could well exceed OSSPAC's original estimate of ~5,000 people (OSSPAC, 2013). For context, tsunami casualties provided by OSSPAC (2013) are based on an M1 (medium) tsunami earthquake scenario, which covers ~79% of the DOGAMI tsunami inundation scenarios and did not consider the temporary visitor population. Based on our analyses, we find ~3,700 fatalities within the resident population for the M1 scenario, along with an additional ~7,700 fatalities within the visitor population. Accordingly, results presented here suggest that estimates by OSSPAC (2013) are low.

Figure 3-5 presents a graphical summary of the estimated fatalities and displaced population for all three tsunami scenarios. Casualties are presented on the left of **Figure 3-5**, while estimates of the displaced population are on the right. The permanent resident population reflects the following color scheme: purple (M1), gold (L1), and yellow (XXL1). We provide contrasting cool colors to characterize different visitor occupancy levels (we assume 10% [dark blue], 50% [cyan], and 100% [pale blue] scenarios). Because the permanent resident population is easiest to define in our population model, we argue that this likely reflects a low-end estimate of fatality numbers associated with each of the three tsunami events. This is shown in **Figure 3-5** by the left edge of the dark blue bars. Conversely, the resident plus visitor population (assuming 100% occupancy), is characterized by the length of the entire bar (right edge of the pale blue shaded region). Accordingly, the area in between reflects the uncertainty associated with the visitor population that could be present in the tsunami zone within each of the communities. One could speculate on visitor occupancy by developing scenarios that vary from 10% (e.g., winter occupancy conditions, dark blue shading) or 50% (an average visitor occupancy, cyan shading) to better define the potential number of fatalities and displaced people. Refining such estimates, guided by local input, would help clarify a range of possible scenarios leading to more informed evaluations. As noted previously, the large number of fatalities determined for Seaside in all three scenarios (**Figure 3-5**, *left*) is indicative of the fact that high ground, and hence safety from the tsunami, is some distance away. Conversely, the much lower casualty numbers in the majority of the communities are due to the fact that high ground is close by, enabling more people to reach safety in time. Regardless of differences in local geography, it is evident from **Figure 3-5** that the number of fatalities associated with even an M1 size event (especially when factoring in the temporary visitor population) has the potential to be large when scaled up for the rest of the Oregon coast.

For the displaced population (**Figure 3-5**, *right* and **Table 3-8**), we can make similar assumptions about the local population groups. Apparent from the figure is the extremely large number of displaced visitors that each community could potentially have to deal with. This is most apparent for Cannon Beach, Warrenton, and Seaside, each of which might potentially have to deal with several thousand people, many of whom would be nonresidents. Furthermore, although the numbers of displaced increase significantly from M1 (~17,690) to XXL1 (~27,530) (**Table 3-8**), our Hazus results demonstrate that even a medium (M1) event would results in the displacement of many thousands of people. These numbers are direct reflection of the fact that each of these communities are major tourist destinations with large numbers of motels, hotels, and vacation homes located in the tsunami zone. The low number of displaced people in Gearhart under the XXL1 scenario (**Figure 3-5**, *right*) is indicative of the fact that many people in this community could be killed, since the nearest high ground under this scenario is well to the east. As can be seen from the figure, fatality estimates for the L1 tsunami inundation scenario at Gearhart are small due to its close proximity to a series of optional high-ground "islands" within the community, while the numbers of displaced increase significantly. These results demonstrate large differences between the effects of an XXL1 size event versus an L1 tsunami in this one community alone.

Finally, the assumptions and observations described previously about tsunami casualties are predicated on the fact that people will evacuate from the tsunami zone within 10 minutes from the start of earthquake shaking. If people respond slowly and take an additional 5-minute delay (i.e., a 15-minute departure time), the casualty numbers will increase significantly (**Table 3-7**). As can be seen from the table, a 5-minute difference in the departure delay could cause the number of casualties to increase by a further 6,500 people. Thus, efforts directed at reducing human response times are critical for reducing overall casualties.

Table 3-6. Estimated injury and fatalities associated with three CSZ tsunami scenarios, based on a 2 AM summer weekend scenario by community. Tsunami injury and fatality estimates assume a departure time of 10 minutes after the start of earthquake shaking. Assumes 100% occupancy of second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds.

	Number of Permanent Residents by Tsunami Zone			Estimated Number of Temporary Residents by Tsunami Zone[1]			Injuries and Fatalities to permanent Residents by Tsunami Scenario			Injuries and Fatalities to Temporary Residents by Tsunami Scenario[1]			Injuries and Fatalities to Permanent Residents by Tsunami Scenario, Percent[2]			Injuries and Fatalities to Temporary Residents by Tsunami Scenario, Percent[3]		
Community Zone	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**
Astoria	1,026	1,700	2,230	1,168	1,532	1,581	0	0	1	0	1	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Jeffers Garden	473	473	473	144	144	144	157	172	216	0	0	1	33%	36%	46%	0%	0%	0%
Warrenton	3,349	3,809	4,583	1,229	2,296	3,431	459	506	1,008	586	640	797	14%	13%	22%	48%	28%	23%
Gearhart	643	1,186	1,447	1,251	3,220	4,532	3	17	1,240	1	14	4,491	0%	1%	86%	0%	0%	99%
Seaside	5,394	5,980	6,272	9,367	9,476	9,515	3,261	3,582	3,935	7,085	7,429	7,959	60%	60%	63%	76%	78%	84%
Cannon Beach	415	917	1,141	3,478	5,864	6,981	1	4	84	6	25	677	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	10%
Arch Cape	88	125	216	579	790	1,240	0	2	6	1	8	40	0%	1%	3%	0%	1%	3%
Other	491	1,449	3,078	162	893	2,185	5	14	440	0	12	622	1%	1%	14%	0%	1%	28%
Clatsop County Total	11,880	15,638	19,440	17,377	24,215	29,610	3,888	4,294	6,930	7,681	8,129	14,588	14%	14%	30%	16%	14%	31%

Notes:

[1] Assumes 100% occupancy of second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds.

[2] Casualties expressed as percentage of those injured or killed in the tsunami zone relative to the total number of community-wide permanent residents.

[3] Casualties expressed as percentage of those injured or killed in the tsunami zone relative to the total number of community-wide temporary residents, assuming 100% occupancy.

Table 3-7. Injury and fatality estimate for an XX-Large tsunami for two median departure times. Tsunami Injury ratio is the number of tsunami injuries divided by total number of tsunami casualties.

Community Zone	Number of Permanent Residents	Total Number of Residents (Permanent + Temporary[1])	10-Minute Departure Injuries	10-Minute Departure Fatalities	10-Minute Departure Total	10-Minute Departure Injuries Ratio	15- Minute Departure Injuries	15- Minute Departure Fatalities	15- Minute Departure Total	15- Minute Departure Injuries Ratio[2]
Astoria	9,768	12,275	0	2	2	12%	20	440	461	4%
Jeffers Garden	473	617	8	209	217	4%	9	338	347	3%
Warrenton	5,554	9,348	56	1,749	1,805	3%	104	3,338	3,442	3%
Gearhart	1,447	5,980	82	5,648	5,730	1%	71	5,779	5,850	1%
Seaside	6,774	16,434	265	11,629	11,894	2%	225	12,927	13,153	2%
Cannon Beach	1,466	9,136	44	717	762	6%	119	2,332	2,451	5%
Arch Cape	241	1,545	7	39	46	16%	22	334	357	6%
Other	12,298	16,118	38	1,023	1,062	4%	63	1,918	1,981	3%
Clatsop County Total	38,021	71,454	501	21,016	21,517	6%	635	27,407	28,041	3%

Notes:

[1] Assumes 100% occupancy of second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds.

Figure 3-5. (left) Estimated fatality numbers by community for M1, L1, and XXL1 tsunami events assuming various visitor occupancy levels; (right) Estimates of the displaced population in each community assuming various occupancy levels.



Table 3-8. Displaced population by tsunami zone.

	Displaced Population by Tsunami Scenario		
Community Zone	**Medium**	**Large**	**XX-Large**
Astoria	2,194	3,230	3,808
Jeffers Garden	460	445	400
Warrenton	3,532	4,959	6,209
Gearhart	1,890	4,374	250
Seaside	4,413	4,447	3,893
Cannon Beach	3,885	6,753	7,361
Arch Cape	666	906	1,411
Other	648	2,316	4,202
Clatsop County Total	17,688	27,429	27,533

[1] Permanent plus temporary population. For the temporary population we assume 100% occupancy of second homes, vacation rentals, condominium units, bed and breakfast facilities, hotels, motels, and campgrounds.

3.5 Essential Facilities and Key Infrastructure

Table 3-9 provides a summary list of critical facilities and key infrastructure located in the M1, L1, and XXl1 tsunami hazard zones in each Clatsop County community.

Table 3-9. Critical facilities and key infrastructure in coastal Clatsop County tsunami inundation zones.

Community and Facilities	Description	Category	Tsunami Zone M1	Tsunami Zone L1	Tsunami Zone XXL1
Astoria	Astoria Senior High School	school	—	x	x
	Clatsop Community College	school	x	x	x
	Columbia Memorial Hospital	hospital	—	—	x
	Parks Medical Limited LLC	hospital	—	x	x
	Providence Heart Clinic North Coast - Astoria	hospital	—	—	x
	Astoria Police Dept.	police department	x	x	x
	Clatsop County Sheriff Department	police department	—	—	x
	Oregon State Police	police department	x	x	x
	Astoria Fire Dept.	fire department	x	x	x
	Astoria Fire Station #2	fire department	—	x	x
	Astoria City Hall	city hall	—	x	x
	Astoria Public Works	public works	x	x	x
	Astoria Wastewater Treatment	wastewater treatment	—	x	x
	Tongue Point Naval Air Station	naval facility	—	x	x
Jeffers Garden	Lewis & Clark RFPD	fire department	x	x	x
	Youngs River-Lewis & Clark Water District	water treatment/water district	x	x	x
	Miles Crossing Sanitary Sewer District	wastewater treatment	x	x	x
Warrenton	Warrenton Grade School	school	—	x	x
	Warrenton High School	school	—	x	x
	CMH Medical Group Urgent Care	hospital	—	—	x
	Providence Medical Clinic - Warrenton	hospital	x	x	x
	Warrenton Police Dept.	police department	x	x	x
	Warrenton Fire Dept.	fire department	x	x	x
	Warrenton Public Works	public works	x	x	x
	Port of Astoria	port	x	x	x
	U.S. Coast Guard - Air Station Astoria	U.S. Coast Guard station	x	x	x
Gearhart	Gearhart Elementary School	school	x	x	x
	Pacific Medical and Surgical Group	hospital	x	x	x
	Gearhart Police Dept.	police department	x	x	x
	Gearhart Volunteer Fire	fire department	x	x	x
	Gearhart City Hall	city hall	x	x	x
Seaside	Broadway Middle School	school	x	x	x
	Seaside Head Start	school	x	x	x
	Seaside Heights Elementary School	school	x	x	x
	Seaside High School	school	x	x	x
	Seaside Providence Hospital	hospital	—	x	x
	Seaside Police Dept.	police department	x	x	x
	Seaside Fire and Rescue	fire department	x	x	x
	Seaside Public Works	public works	x	x	x
	Seaside Water Treatment	water treatment/water district	x	x	x
Cannon Beach	Cannon Beach Elementary	school	x	x	x
	Providence Health System - Oregon	hospital	x	x	x
	Cannon Beach Police Dept.	police department	x	x	x
	Cannon Beach Fire and Rescue	fire department	—	x	x
	Cannon Beach City Hall	city hall	x	x	x
Arch Cape	Cannon Beach Fire and Rescue Arch Cape	fire department	x	x	x
Other	Gearhart Rural Fire District	fire department	—	—	x
	John Day-Fern Hill Fire Station	fire department	—	—	x
	Arch Cape Sanitary District	wastewater treatment	—	x	x
	Shoreline Sanitary District	wastewater treatment	—	x	x
	Camp Rilea - National Guard Training Center	national guard	—	—	x
	Oregon Military Department	military facility	—	x	x

3.6 Social Characteristics

We used the American Community Survey (ACS) social characteristic data to identify some societal characteristics for each community in Clatsop County. Of specific interest are those households speaking Spanish and individuals with disabilities. Both datasets are important because they have a direct bearing on tsunami outreach and education (e.g., providing material that has been translated) and in terms of identifying those with disabilities who may need additional assistance with developing evacuation plans or actual evacuation. As noted previously, a limitation of these data is that they span the entire community and are not at a resolution that would allow us to better define these statistics by tsunami zone. Additional information relating to the use of ACS data may be found in Appendix A of Bauer and others (2020).

Table 3-10 identifies the number of Spanish-speaking (and other languages) households in coastal Clatsop County. Overall, Spanish-speaking households are highest in Astoria, Warrenton, and Seaside, while Astoria has the largest group of Spanish households that speak limited English. Astoria also has the largest group of households speaking other languages.

Table 3-11 presents information on the percentages of people with disabilities in coastal Clatsop County. Overall, these results indicate the proportion of the local population with disabilities ranges from a low of ~13% in Warrenton to highs of 27% in Seaside and 33% in Jeffers Garden. Of particular concern is the relatively large number of individuals with vision, cognitive, or ambulatory disabilities in Seaside and Jeffers Garden. Cannon Beach has ~13% of its population classified as needing ambulatory care. These results point to the need to better understand those with disabilities in the tsunami zone, as many of these people will almost certainly need help evacuating from the tsunami zone. Because the ACS data are not sufficiently detailed, not all of these individuals may reside in the tsunami zone; local emergency managers may wish to assess specific community needs.

Table 3-10. Household spoken language statistics. Data taken from American Community Survey 2013-2017 5-year estimates.

Community	Number of Households Speaking Spanish	Percent of Households Speaking Spanish with MoE	Number of Limited English-Speaking, Spanish Households	Number of Limited English-Speaking, Other Language Households
Astoria	279	6.1% ± 2.1%	64	116
Jeffers Garden	—	—	—	—
Warrenton	152	7.6% ± 3.6%	25	25
Gearhart	34	5.3% ± 3.8%	—	—
Seaside	140	4.8% ± 2.8%	39	60
Cannon Beach	49	7.2% ± 4.3%	36	36
Arch Cape	—	—	—	—
Clatsop County	768	4.8% ± 0.9%	172	266

Note: MoE denotes margin of error.

Table 3-11. Number of individuals with disabilities (by type) for coastal Clatsop County. Data taken from American Community Survey 2013–2017 5-year estimates. Note: An individual with a disability may have more than one difficulty.

Community	Total Number of Individuals*	Number of Individuals* with a Disability	Percent of Individuals with a Disability	Hearing	Vision	Cognitive	Ambulatory	Self Care	Independent Living
Astoria	9,315	1,743	18.7% ± 2.4%	7.1% ± 1.6%	3.8% ± 1.3%	6.4% ± 1.7%	10.7% ± 2.2%	2.6% ± 1.0%	5.1% ± 1.8%
Jeffers Garden	285	95	33.3% ± 19.7%	4.6% ± 7.7%	10.2% ± 13.6%	16.8% ± 17.3%	7.3% ± 8.4%	8.4% ± 6.0%	9.9% ± 7.4%
Warrenton	5,105	686	13.4% ± 2.9%	4.5% ± 1.6%	1.9% ± 0.9%	5.9% ± 2.4%	7.8% ± 2.0%	2.2% ± 1.3%	4.3% ± 1.8%
Gearhart	1,552	294	18.9% ± 4.9%	7.0% ± 2.7%	2.0% ± 1.3%	9.2% ± 4.7%	5.9% ± 2.6%	1.9% ± 1.1%	7.2% ± 3.0%
Seaside	6,522	1,762	27.0% ± 4.3%	8.4% ± 2.9%	7.0% ± 3.0%	13.8% ± 3.6%	13.3% ± 3.2%	5.3% ± 2.3%	11.8% ± 3.7%
Cannon Beach	1,517	313	20.6% ± 5.8%	5.7% ± 2.9%	3.3% ± 1.9%	7.8% ± 3.4%	12.8% ± 4.6%	2.4% ± 1.9%	10.5% ± 4.0%
Arch Cape	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clatsop County	37,244	7,099	19.1% ± 1.4%	6.5% ± 0.8%	3.4% ± 0.6%	7.6% ± 1.0%	10.0% ± 1.1%	3.4% ± 0.6%	7.3% ± 1.0%

* Permanent residents as defined from ACS.

4.0 DISCUSSION

This study extends the original work undertaken by Bauer and others (2020) by implementing the 2017 FEMA Hazus methods on a countywide basis in order to estimate building loss and casualties from a catastrophic CSZ earthquake and tsunami. The approach used the best available information on the CSZ earthquake (Mw 9.0, Madin and Burns, 2013) and resultant XXL1 tsunami (Priest and others, 2013e), together with a detailed building database and a population model that accounts for both permanent and temporary residents (2 AM occupancy). While previous studies evaluated statewide casualty estimates for permanent residents (OSSPAC, 2013), our study significantly expands on this initial work by evaluating in more detail expected impacts that could occur throughout Clatsop County. In particular, the present study extends the population model to include new information that evaluates the temporary visitor population, types of housing that permanent and temporary residents occupy, and their relative distances to safety outside of the tsunami zone. Such information is critically important because communities on the Oregon coast presently do not have adequate information on the likely socioeconomic effects of a CSZ earthquake and accompanying tsunami. Accordingly, it is hoped that the information presented in this report may be used to assist with community pre- and post-disaster planning, including addressing such needs as the development of tsunami evacuation wayfinding signage plans, mass-care planning, debris removal plans, and individual community tsunami evacuation facilities improvement plans[9].

Building damage: Our analyses reveal that the earthquake alone accounts for significant community-wide building losses that range from ~$8 million in Arch Cape to $459 million in Astoria (**Table 3-4**). These variations reflect differences in the type and age of building construction among the communities, the size of the community and density of buildings, and the number of buildings established in terrain that may be subject to landslides or be on liquefiable soils. Countywide losses in coastal Clatsop County caused by a CSZ earthquake are projected to reach ~$1.8 billion.

Damage to buildings from the tsunami is expected to be catastrophic — the smallest amount of earthquake/tsunami destruction this analysis predicts is ~47% for the M1 scenario at Arch Cape to virtually 100% loss in the communities of Gearhart, Jeffers Garden, and Seaside in an XXL1 size event. Much of this destruction can be attributed to the prevalence of light-frame (mainly wood) construction, which is very vulnerable to tsunami damage. In addition, these communities are built on low-lying coastal plains or estuary deposits that are completely inundated in an XXL1 event. Combined earthquake and tsunami damage indicate that Clatsop County could experience ~$3 billion in damage for an M1 scenario, $3.9 billion for L1, and $4.9 billion for an XXL1 size event. Note that these estimates exclude building content losses, such that the numbers may be viewed as minimum estimates.

Building debris: Debris generated from the destruction of these of buildings will be scattered throughout the tsunami zone. Planners should consider that buoyant debris within the tsunami zone will be redistributed and may accumulate around low points, which often include key transportation routes (Park and Cox, 2019). Our analyses indicate that the debris produced from building damage could range from ~535,000 tons (M1) to ~1,133,000 tons (XXL1). This equates to ~53,000 dump trucks for M1 to as much as 110,000 dump trucks for an XXL1 event. These estimates are almost certainly on the low end, as they do not include debris associated with content from buildings (personal items, business equipment etc.), road rip-ups, vehicles, and vegetation. Nonetheless, the amount of debris listed here provides a starting point for communities as they begin the process of developing earthquake/tsunami debris plans.

[9] https://www.oregon.gov/LCD/Publications/TsunamiLandUseGuide_2015.pdf

Injuries and fatalities: Our analyses indicate that the permanent resident population present in coastal Clatsop County varies from ~11,880 (M1), ~15,640 (L1) to ~19,440 (XXL1). Including the temporary (visitor) population of these communities increases the overall coastal population substantially. Our Hazus analyses presented in **Table 3-1** suggest that the temporary visitor population could potentially add an additional 17,380 people (M1) to as much as 29,600 (XXL1). While reinforcing the importance of these communities as major recreational coastal destinations, the results also highlight the tremendous burden that each community could potentially face following a CSZ earthquake and tsunami to address the needs of both the permanent and temporary populations. However, these totals assume that every lodging facility is fully booked and in use at the time of the event. Regardless, the point remains that there is a high probability that a significantly large number of displaced temporary visitors, in addition to the displaced permanent residents, will need emergency care and support following a Cascadia event. Further refinements to these numbers are therefore critical for communities to develop short-term mass-care plans and for state and federal agencies to develop their long-term plans.

Our Hazus casualty results estimate the number of people killed in the tsunami zones could reach ~11,000 people (M1), ~12,400 (L1), and as many as 21,000 in an XXL1 event, well exceeding estimates provided in the Oregon Resilience Plan, which ranged from 600 to ~5,000 fatalities for the entire coast (OSSPAC, 2013). Of note, the results from OSSPAC were based on an M1 event that accounts for 79% of the expected inundation scenarios. Thus, the M1 results presented here are more closely aligned with the same size earthquake event using in the OSSPAC modeling, while the estimated fatalities are probably significantly higher based on updated results for one county alone. Accordingly, it is apparent that coast-wide tsunami fatality estimates for even an M1 tsunami could be substantial, potentially even approaching or exceeding levels observed in the 2011 Tōhoku, Japan event.

To assist the public, considerable hazard related information has been developed over the past decade to enable coastal communities and visitors make informed decisions. These include detailed evacuation maps for every coastal community that are available in print and online (e.g., http://nvs.nanoos.org/TsunamiEvac). In addition, recent tsunami evacuation modeling undertaken by DOGAMI has helped clarify where people need to evacuate to and how fast they need to travel to reach safety. These efforts demonstrate the simple fact that for every community:

Casualties attributed to a CSZ tsunami can be substantially reduced if people undertake the following simple steps:

1. ***Practice their evacuation routes;***
2. ***Evacuate as soon as possible after the earthquake; and***
3. ***Travel as fast as possible (e.g., a fast walk, jog, or run) to safety.***

Building a culture of tsunami awareness on the Oregon coast that reduces the potential injury and fatality rate can be accomplished through concerted education/outreach campaigns, developing school curricula on tsunami hazards, improving signage, and implementing frequent evacuation drills reminding people of where they need to go. Oregon Emergency Management has developed a guidance document for how to organize and hold a tsunami evacuation drill (OEM, 2017), providing a valuable starting point for coastal communities intending to pursue this option.

We quantified impacts to both temporary and permanent populations in our injury and fatality estimates for two reasons: First, planners can apply their own judgment to their community's population at off-peak times, such as assuming that wintertime temporary population is 10%–50% of peak summertime (e.g., **Figure 3-5**), and second, tsunami preparation and education awareness levels of permanent residents versus temporary populations are likely to differ. For example, temporary populations generally have little to no knowledge of the hazard, evacuation procedures, or optimal routes to safety and are more likely to engage in counterproductive milling behaviors that will lead to greater risk of death. In contrast, we hypothesize that permanent residents are generally better prepared (are generally aware of the hazard and their evacuation routes) and are less likely to mill following an earthquake. Again, planners can apply their own judgment on the level of preparedness, including departure times and evacuation speeds, between the groups, to better refine the estimates of injuries and fatalities that may occur in their community.

Depending on the community, the temporary population on average may be closer to the ocean, and thus farther away from safety, compared with the permanent resident population. Market forces often drive such housing arrangements (Raskin and Wang, 2017). This is the case in a number of communities such as Seaside or Cannon Beach, where hotels, motels, and rental homes are located closest to the beach. This sets up a problematic situation where a presumed less-informed group is farther away from safety and may take longer to depart, with resultant higher proportion of fatalities compared to the permanent residents.

However, even with permanent residents, our assumptions of individuals' preparation and awareness may not match actual preparedness. For example, we assume a 10-minute departure time after the earthquake begins. Grumbly and others (2019) noted that permanent residents in a Washington coastal town underestimated the distance to tsunami safety and were often not aware of the optimal route to safety at different locations in their community. The City of Seaside survey data gathered by Buylova (2018) pointed to a pressing need for continued education on the tsunami threat. That study targeted primary and secondary homeowners but did not sample vacationers. Regarding the initiation of evacuation, 29.6% of survey respondents indicated that they would likely wait for confirmation of a tsunami prior to evacuation. However, about half the population indicated they were unlikely or very unlikely to wait for tsunami confirmation (24.3% and 22.8%, respectively). Many of the respondents (78 out of 207, or 38%) indicated they would attempt to evacuate by driving, which would be problematic given Seaside's constrained road evacuation network. Oregon state and county emergency management officials strongly discourage vehicular travel following an earthquake and instead emphasize travel on foot. The top three behaviors respondents said they would very likely assume after a major earthquake is evacuating to higher ground immediately following the earthquake (51%), contacting loved ones (49.5%), and checking social media and television (40.3%).

The underlying field survey data used in Buylova's (2018) study provided further insights into education challenges. Among the 209 respondents, 17% did not correctly identify their home as being in or out of the tsunami zone. Most of those who responded incorrectly (16%) identified their house as outside the tsunami zone, although their house was actually inside the tsunami zone. Only a small portion of the residents identified themselves as secondary homeowners (5% respondents), and no significant difference was observed in perceptions or in plans between the two groups. Continued tsunami education and outreach are critically important for local residents as well as visitors in order to build the necessary culture of awareness needed to survive such a disaster; education and outreach can be achieved through awareness programs at local, state, and federal levels.

Displaced population: Given the near-complete destruction of buildings within the tsunami zone (**Table 3-8**), planners should assume that all people who were in the area impacted by the tsunami and who successfully evacuated will need short-term (days to weeks) and perhaps even longer-term shelter (weeks to months for permanent residents who previously resided in the tsunami zone). The large influx of temporary visitors in the summertime will increase demands on mass care facilities, placing even greater strain on local, state, and federal emergency managers.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Utilizing the FEMA Hazus model, this study has evaluated the degree of impact associated with three CSZ tsunami scenarios in order to document potential building losses, debris weight, fatalities and injuries, and estimated numbers of the displaced populations. The overarching goal of this work is to assist communities in their overall hazard preparation by identifying some of the expected challenges that will occur when the next great earthquake occurs on the CSZ and a tsunami is triggered. Great care has been taken as part of this study to address the needs of local communities. Discussions with local community planners undertaken by Bauer and others (2020) helped frame the overall study approach and assumptions applied in our Hazus modeling.

Education

Our analyses have improved estimates of fatalities and identified the presence of potentially very large temporary visitor populations, variations in the spatial concentration of both population groups within each community, and potential challenges facing those with physical or mental disabilities. Addressing these factors will be an important part of education and outreach at both the local and state level.

Our community-based information on the types of lodging visitors may occupy (e.g., motel, vacation rental, second home, or tent) and where these lodgings are predominantly located provide insights about the potential challenges that may face a community. Such information may help local communities better target their tsunami education/outreach activities and messaging to address the lack of hazard awareness by visitors, while also meeting the unique needs of the residential community. For example, ~85% people visiting Gearhart are likely to end up in single-family vacation or second homes that are farther from high ground. Similarly, in the communities of Seaside and Cannon Beach, the bulk of the visitors stay in vacation homes (53% and 65%, respectively). This contrasts with places like Warrenton, where most visitors camp (e.g., Fort Stevens State Park).

Besides vacation homes, our analyses demonstrate that several communities have significant numbers of hotel/motels located in the tsunami zone. These include Seaside and Cannon Beach, where hotel and motels account for, respectively, 33% and 26% of the visitor population. In the case of Seaside, high ground is some distance away. Thus, tsunami education and outreach targeting each of these lodging groups becomes essential in order to mitigate against the potentially large loss of life likely to occur without such measures.

Two key approaches are presently in place to begin to address such needs:

1) The first is the development by Oregon Emergency Management of the “Tsunami Safe” program (*Hospitality begins with Safety*). This effort focuses on increasing tsunami awareness among hospitality industry employees, including providing key tsunami and safety instructions that may be disseminated to hotel/motel guests. Trained hospitality staff can provide accurate messaging to the public before and during an event and, importantly, are able to help guide people out of the inundation zone. Evacuation guidance presupposes that hospitality staff at every establishment know exactly where their nearest point of high ground is located.
2) To address evacuation information needs, DOGAMI staff in partnership with the Northwest Association of Networked Ocean Observing System (NANOOS) developed a “print-your-own-tsunami-brochure” tool that is integrated in the NANOOS Visualization System (NVS) tsunami evacuation portal (http://nvs.nanoos.org/TsunamiEvac). This tool allows any individual or

business to develop their own custom evacuation brochure for any location on the Oregon coast. More recently, DOGAMI has initiated the development of higher-resolution tsunami evacuation neighborhood maps[10] that can be printed with conventional printers. It is thus conceivable that hotel/motel rooms could display tsunami evacuation maps in a manner similar to the fire escape exit maps required in every room. Increasing local awareness of these tools should thus be integrated in any future planned outreach activity.

Finally, building a culture of awareness is needed to survive the next CSZ tsunami. Such effort could include funds to post and maintain tsunami wayfinding signage of sufficient density along core evacuation routes and funds to establish and support tsunami coordinators in every county. Tsunami coordinators could assist with identifying locations of people with disabilities, work with the local hotel/motel industry to develop appropriate evacuation map products, and perform outreach at the grassroots level.

Mitigation

Tsunami evacuation modeling throughout coastal Clatsop County demonstrates that improving existing evacuation trails for unimpeded passage— along with increased saturation of tsunami wayfinding signage — will help save lives. Of particular importance is having a sufficiently dense network of signs (either posted and/or on road/path surfaces) that direct people along core routes to areas outside the tsunami zone. Such efforts, guided by our evacuation modeling results. are presently being implemented in both Seaside and Cannon Beach. In both communities, a "beach to safety" plan has been developed for core evacuation routes and signage consisting of posted signs; thermoplastic signage on roads and paths is being implemented. Signs of this nature need to be spaced sufficiently close together and illuminated at night so that the signage may be easily seen at all times. Consideration should also be directed at barriers that may impede rapid evacuation. For example, downed power lines could pose a significant barrier to safe evacuation if the wires remain live following the earthquake. Communities could initiate conversations with local utility districts to assess if power can be immediately shut down during a major earthquake, or alternatively over time move toward locating new power lines underground and relocating existing power lines.

We recommend and encourage local communities practice periodic tsunami evacuation drills, ideally on at least an annual basis, to instill a culture of tsunami hazard awareness for residents and visitors. Studying an evacuation map is not the same as actually walking an evacuation route. Although we recognize that such an approach may be disruptive to the local economy and difficult to organize, holding periodic drills will save lives. Such a culture is in practice in the Japanese way of life and likely helped save many thousands of lives during the catastrophic tsunami event on March 11, 2011 (e.g., Nakaya and others, 2018; Sun and Yamori, 2018).

Mitigation options to improve evacuation may also include facility improvements such as seismic retrofits of key bridges or the construction of vertical evacuation structures. Although seismically retrofitting bridges is especially important for evacuation in several communities studied here (e.g., Seaside, Cannon Beach, and Warrenton), as well as for post-disaster recovery, consideration of vertical evacuation towers in targeted locations may save many more lives. Of the communities examined here, Seaside has the greatest exposure, and thus risk, given that community's susceptibility to all three tsunami inundation scenarios. Its sizeable resident and visitor populations can be expected to experience large numbers of casualties in a CSZ event. Besides Seaside, we recognize the high risk facing Gearhart in an XXL1 event, such that one or more vertical evacuation structures would greatly benefit that community as well.

[10] https://www.oregongeology.org/tsuclearinghouse/pubs-evacbro_neighborhoods.htm

In many communities, people reside in older manufactured housing. Manufactured houses installed prior to 2003 are subject to slipping off their foundations during the earthquake shaking (OBCD, 2002; SPA Risk, 2014; Maison and Cobeen, 2016; EERI, 2014), potentially blocking or compromising egress. Even if a manufactured house is relatively close to high ground, compromised egress may hinder timely evacuation. Seismic upgrades of such structures to current building standards may be cost-prohibitive. FEMA (2012b, Section D) advises having large crowbars and sledgehammers stored near potentially compromised primary door(s) to facilitate emergency exiting. Such tools may provide manufactured housing occupants with a low-cost solution for rapidly exiting their structure in the critical time interval between earthquake cessation and tsunami arrival.

Response

Our analyses demonstrate that destruction of buildings in the tsunami zone will be virtually complete, whether it is an M1 or XXL1 scenario. Accordingly, all Oregon coastal communities will need to be prepared to shelter large numbers of people who escape the tsunami. The need for shelter is likely to last many weeks until tsunami evacuees can be relocated. This will be especially challenging for communities with potentially large numbers of temporary residents, all of whom are unlikely to be able to return to their permanent homes for at least several weeks, given the anticipated disruption to the regional transportation network and fuel supply (ODOT, 2014; ODOE, 2017). As demonstrated here, depending on the time of year the number of displaced persons could range from several hundred (e.g., Arch Cape) to thousands (e.g., Seaside, in a worst case summer scenario with every vacancy filled).

Mass casualties will vary significantly from community to community due to exposure and access to high ground. Overall, injuries caused by the tsunami alone were found to be low, averaging about 6% across the coastal communities. This finding is not unexpected because the overwhelming majority of people who are unable to evacuate in time and are caught by the tsunami are killed. Combined earthquake and tsunami related injuries presented here could range from several hundred people to ~1,600 people in Clatsop County. Given that there are about 483 licensed beds at the 11 coastal hospitals (OSSPAC, 2013), these facilities can be expected to be overwhelmed. Aside from a capacity issue, Wang (2018) examined approaches for coastal hospitals to better prepare for Cascadia, including improving building seismic resiliency, establishing a resilience network where knowledge and training could be shared, and evaluating and planning for fuel and water needs. In addition to these suggestions, mass care planning is necessary to prepare coastal hospitals for a potential surge in injuries following Cascadia. To that end, further work is required to better refine these casualty numbers.

Recovery

A CSZ earthquake and tsunami will be catastrophic to both the state and local economies. At the local level, these impacts will vary substantially. Quantifying such economic impacts is well beyond the scope of this investigation. Nevertheless, we can speculate on several likely scenarios. Overall, building destruction in coastal Clatsop County could yield an estimated 535,000 tons of debris in the M1 scenario, increasing to 791,000 tons for L1 and 1.1 million tons in an XXL1 event. These estimates are almost certainly on the low end, as they exclude the content volume within buildings (e.g., personal and business-related items), vehicles, and other forms of debris. The estimated building replacement cost for coastal Clatsop County is likely to exceed $3 billion in an M1 event, $3.9 billion in L1, increasing to $4.9 billion in an XXL1 earthquake and tsunami.

Because wood-frame construction predominates in many Oregon coastal communities, the majority of such buildings in the tsunami zone will probably be completely destroyed by the tsunami. This means that for Clatsop County there is likely to be a significant shortage of suitable housing in the months and perhaps years following the disaster. In the absence of housing, tsunami refugees will likely migrate away from such communities, further decimating the local economy. The housing situation will likely be compounded by the altered coastal landscape due to subsidence effects caused by the earthquake. For example, the XXL1 earthquake deformation model estimates that the coastline could drop by 11 ft in Clatsop County; an M1 event would yield about 5 ft of subsidence (data derived from Witter and others, 2011). Such changes will inevitably lead to accelerated rates of coastal erosion along with increased incidences of coastal flooding in low-lying areas. These changes can be expected to be significant in the weeks to months following the event, with further change progressively decreasing over time as the coastline re-equilibrates to the new sea level regime.

Finally, our analyses indicate that many buildings in the tsunami zone are outside existing coastal or riverine FEMA flood zones. As a result, owners are not required by federally backed mortgage lenders to carry flood insurance. However, flood insurance is available to all building owners in the tsunami zone through the National Flood Insurance Program, which covers building loss due to a tsunami (FEMA, 2018), and can aid in community recovery. More information on the National Flood Insurance Program can be obtained from https://www.fema.gov/national-flood-insurance-program/How-Buy-Flood-Insurance.

Vulnerable Populations

We provided population estimates from American Community Survey (ACS) data for selected population groups that may have special challenges understanding preparedness messages or evacuating (Section 2.9). The ACS estimates are for the entire community, including people outside the tsunami zone, so the total number of individuals identified in this report is likely to be on the high end compared with those actually in the tsunami zone. Planners wanting to further understand the specific locations of vulnerable populations are encouraged to discuss the situation with their local public health preparedness coordinators. Other resources include the emPOWER database[11] that tracks electricity-dependent Medicare populations and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)[12], which tracks health-related risk behaviors, chronic health conditions, and use of preventive service by U.S. residents. Although our focus in this study was on quantifying casualties from a local tsunami, such information on vulnerable populations can also be useful when planning evacuation from distant-source tsunamis.

Finally, our model does not account for populations living in the tsunami zone who are currently experiencing homelessness. However, homeless encampments are likely present in the tsunami zones of many Oregon coastal communities, and outreach messaging can include this population.

6.0 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was funded under award #NA18NWS4670076 by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) through the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program. Many individuals contributed to this report. Matthew Williams (DOGAMI) supplied detailed building data for Clatsop County. Ian Madin (DOGAMI) provided early review comments on the tsunami casualty model. We are also grateful to Laura Gabel and Yumei Wang (DOGAMI) and Dr. Nate Wood (USGS), who provided many constructive comments.

[11] https://empowermap.hhs.gov/

[12] https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/index.html

7.0 REFERENCES

Atwater, B.F., and others, 2005, The orphan tsunami of 1700—Japanese clues to a parent earthquake in North America: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1707, 144 p. https://doi.org/10.3133/pp1707

Bauer, J., 2016, Adapting Hazus-MH methods for large-scale risk assessments in Oregon, paper presented at the 9th Annual Hazus User Group Conference, Charleston, S.C., November 7–9, 2016, http://www.hazusconference.com/agenda/papers/Tuesday-1615.pdf

Bauer, J.M., Burns, W.J., and Madin, I.P., 2018, Earthquake regional impact analysis for Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-18-02, 90 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-18-02.htm

Bauer, J.M., Allan, J.C., Gabel, L.S., O'Brien, F.E., and Roberts, J.T., 2020, Analysis of earthquake and tsunami impacts for people and structures inside the tsunami zone for five Oregon coastal communities: Gearhart, Rockaway Beach, Lincoln City, Newport, and Port Orford: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-20-03, 185 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-20-03.htm

Burns, W.J., Mickelson, K.A., and Madin, I.P., 2016, Landslide susceptibility overview map of Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-16-02. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-16-02.htm

Buylova, A., 2018, Risk perceptions and behavioral intentions: responses to the threat of Cascadia subduction zone earthquakes and tsunamis: Corvallis, Oreg., Oregon State University, PhD. dissertation, 141 p. https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/graduate_thesis_or_dissertations/44558k63s

Charest, A.C. (ed.), 2017, Square foot costs with RSMeans data: Rockland, Md., Gordian Group, Inc., 563 p.

Dean Runyan Associates, 2018, Oregon travel impacts statewide estimates, 1992-2017: prepared for the Oregon Tourism Commission

Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), 2015, Preparing for a Cascadia subduction zone tsunami: a land use guide for Oregon coastal communities: Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, 109 p. https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/Publications/TsunamiLandUseGuide_2015.pdf

Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI), 2014, M 6.0 South Napa earthquake of August 24, 2014: Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, EERI Special Earthquake Report, October 2014, 27 p. http://learningfromearthquakes.org/2014-08-24-south-napa/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=45

FEMA, 2003, NEHRP Recommended provisions for seismic regulations for new buildings and other structures; FEMA 450-1, Part 1: Provisions: Washington, D.C., Federal Emergency Management Agency, 308 p. https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1532-20490-4965/fema_450_1_provisions.pdf

FEMA, 2010, Hazus-MH MR5 Advanced Engineering Building Module (AEBM) technical and user's manual: Washington, D.C., Federal Emergency Management Agency, 119 p. https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1820-25045-1705/hzmh2_1_aebm_um.pdf

FEMA, 2011, Hazus®-MH 2.1 Technical manual, Earthquake model: Washington, D.C., Federal Emergency Management Agency, 718 p. https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1820-25045-6286/hzmh2_1_eq_tm.pdf

FEMA, 2012a, Seismic performance assessment of buildings, vol. 1 — Methodology: FEMA P-58-1, September 2012, 278 p.

FEMA, 2012b, Reducing the risks of nonstructural earthquake damage: FEMA E-74, December 2012, 885 p. https://www.fema.gov/fema-e-74-reducing-risks-nonstructural-earthquake-damage.

FEMA, 2013, Tsunami methodology technical manual: National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C., 223 pp

FEMA, 2015a, NEHRP recommended seismic provisions for new buildings and other structures, Volume 1; Part 1, Provisions; Part 2, Commentary: Washington, D.C., National Institute of Building Sciences, Building Seismic Safety Council, Federal Emergency Management Agency FEMA P-1050-1, 555 p. https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/107646

FEMA, 2015b, Rapid visual screening of buildings for potential seismic hazards: a handbook: Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA P-154, 3rd ed., Washington, D.C., 388 p. https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1426210695633-d9a280e72b32872161efab26a602283b/FEMAP-154_508.pdf

FEMA, 2017, Hazus tsunami model technical guidance: Washington, D.C., Federal Emergency Management Agency, 111 p. https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/24609

FEMA, 2018, Be prepared for a tsunami: Washington, D.C., Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA V-1011, 2 p. https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/24609

Gabel, L.L., and Allan, J.C., 2016, Local tsunami evacuation analysis of Warrenton and Clatsop Spit, Clatsop County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-16-08, 62 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-16-08.htm

Gabel, L.L., and Allan, J.C., 2017, Local tsunami evacuation analysis of Rockaway Beach, Tillamook County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Open-File Report O-17-06, 56 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-17-06.htm

Gabel, L.L., O'Brien, F. and Allan, J.C., 2018a, Local tsunami evacuation analysis of Pacific City, Tillamook County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Open-File Report O-18-06, 59 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-18-06.htm

Gabel, L.L., O'Brien, F. and Allan, J.C., 2018b, Tsunami Evacuation Analysis of Florence and Reedsport, Lane and Douglas Counties, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-18-05, 95 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-18-05.htm

Gabel, L.L., O'Brien, F., and Allan, J.C., 2019a, Tsunami evacuation analysis of Newport, Lincoln County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Open-File Report O-19-05, 61 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-19-05.htm

Gabel, L.L., O'Brien, F., Bauer, J., and Allan, J.C., 2019b, Tsunami evacuation analysis of communities surrounding the Coos Bay estuary: Building community resilience on the Oregon coast: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Open-File Report O-19-07, 60 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-19-07.htm

Gabel, L.L., O'Brien, F., Bauer, J., and Allan, J.C., 2019c, Tsunami evacuation analysis of Lincoln City and unincorporated Lincoln County: Building community resilience on the Oregon coast: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-19-06, 105 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-19-06.htm

Gabel, L.L., O'Brien, F., Bauer, J., and Allan, J.C., 2019d, Tsunami evacuation analysis of some unincorporated Tillamook County communities: Building community resilience on the Oregon coast: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-19-08, 68 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-19-08.htm

Gabel, L.L., Allan, J.C., and O'Brien, F., 2020a, Tsunami evacuation analysis of Port Orford, Curry County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-20-05, 34 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-20-05.htm

Gabel, L.L., O'Brien, F., and Allan, J.C., 2020b, Local tsunami evacuation analysis of Nehalem Bay, Tillamook County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-20-07, 53 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-20-07.htm

Goldfinger, C., and others, 2012, Turbidite event history: methods and implications for Holocene paleoseismicity of the Cascadia subduction zone: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1661-F. 178 p. https://doi.org/10.3133/pp1661F

Goldfinger, C., and others, 2017, The importance of site selection, sediment supply, and hydrodynamics: a case study of submarine paleoseismology on the Northern Cascadia margin, Washington USA: Marine Geology, v. 384, p. 4-46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2016.06.008

González-Riancho Calzada, P., Aliaga, B., Hettiarachchi, S., González Rodríguez, E.M., and Medina Santamaría, R., 2015, A contribution to the selection of tsunami human vulnerability indicators: conclusions from tsunami impacts in Sri Lanka and Thailand (2004), Samoa (2009), Chile (2010) and Japan (2011): Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, v. 15, no. 7, p. 1493–1514. https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-15-1493-2015

Goto, K., Chagué-Goff, C., Goff, J., and Jaffe, B., 2012, The future of tsunami research following the 2011 Tohoku-oki event: Sedimentary Geology, v. 282, p. 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sedgeo.2012.08.003

Grumbly, S.M., Frazier, T.G., and Peterson, A.G., 2019, Examining the impact of risk perception on the accuracy of anisotropic, least-cost path distance approaches for estimating the evacuation potential for near-field tsunamis: Journal of Geovisualization and Spatial Analysis, v. 3, no. 1, p. 3. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41651-019-0026-1

Johnston, D., Becker, J., McClure, J., Paton, D., McBride, S., Wright, K., Leonard, G., and Hughes, M., 2013, Community understanding of, and preparedness for, earthquake and tsunami risk in Wellington, New Zealand, Chap. 8, *in* Joffe, H., Rossetto, T., and Adams, J. (eds.), Cities at risk, living with perils in the 21st century: Springer, Dordrecht, Advances In Natural And Technological Hazards Research, v. 33, p. 131-148.

Jones, J.M., Ng, P., and Wood, N.J., 2014, The Pedestrian Evacuation Analyst: geographic information systems software for modeling hazard evacuation potential: Techniques and Methods 11-C9, U.S. Geological Survey. 25 p. https://dx.doi.org/10.3133/tm11C9

Kircher, C. A., 2002, Development of new fragility function betas for use with Shake Maps: Palo Alto, Calif., Kircher & Associates Consulting Engineers, summary report, Nov. 30, 2002.

Kircher, C. A., Whitman, R. V., and Holmes, W. T., 2006, HAZUS earthquake loss estimation methods: Natural Hazards Review, v. 7, no. 2, 45–59.

Koyama, M., and others, 2012, An analysis of the circumstances of death in the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake: Sociedade Portuguesa de Engenharia Sismica (SPES), Proceedings of the 15th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Lisbon, September 24-28, 2012, p. 5646.

Lewis, D., 2007, Statewide seismic needs assessment: Implementation of Oregon 2005 Senate Bill 2 relating to public safety, earthquakes, and seismic rehabilitation of public buildings: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-07-02. 140 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-07-02.htm

Madin, I.P., and Burns, W.J., 2013, Ground motion, ground deformation, tsunami inundation, coseismic subsidence, and damage potential maps for the 2012 Oregon Resilience Plan for Cascadia subduction zone earthquakes: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-06. http://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-06.htm

Maison, B., and Cobeen, K., 2016, Analytical study of mobile home response to the 2014 South Napa Earthquake: Earthquake Spectra, v. 32, no. 1, p. 1-22.

Mostafizi, A., Wang, H., Cox, D., Cramer, L.A., and Dong, S., 2017, Agent-based tsunami evacuation modeling of unplanned network disruptions for evidence-driven resource allocation and retrofitting strategies: Natural Hazards, v. 88, no. 3, p. 1347-1372.

Nakaya, N., and others, 2018, Effect of tsunami drill experience on evacuation behavior after the onset of the Great East Japan Earthquake: International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, v. 28, p. 206-213.

Nelson, A.R., Kelsey, H.M., Hemphill-Haley, E., and Witter, R.C., 1996, A 7500-yr lake record of Cascadia tsunamis in southern coastal Oregon: Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs, 28, no. 5, p. 95.

Nelson, A.R., Kelsey, H.M., and Witter, R.C., 2006, Great earthquakes of variable magnitude at the Cascadia subduction zone: Quaternary Research, v. 65, no. 3, p. 354-365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yqres.2006.02.009

OBCD, 2010, Oregon manufactured dwelling installation specialty code: Oregon Department of Consumer and Business Services, Building Codes Division, 67 p. http://www.oregon.gov/bcd/codes-stand/Documents/md-2010omdisc-codebook.pdf

ODOE, 2017, Oregon fuel action plan: Oregon Department of Energy, 92 p. http://www.oregon.gov/energy/facilities-safety/safety/Documents/Oregon-Fuel-Action-Plan.pdf

ODOT, 2014, Oregon highways seismic plus report: Oregon Department of Transportation, 111 p. https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Bridge/Docs_Seismic/Seismic-Plus-Report_2014.pdf

OED, 2018, Annual geocoded QCEW data file: user's guide and data dictionary: Salem, Oreg., Oregon Employment Department, 10 p.

OEM, 2017, Tsunami evacuation drill guidebook: how to plan a community-wide tsunami evacuation drill: Salem, Oreg., Oregon Emergency Management, 48 p. https://www.oregon.gov/oem/Documents/Tsunami_Evacuation_Drill_Guidebook.pdf

Olsen, A.H., and Porter, K.A., 2011, What we know about demand surge: brief summary: Natural Hazards Review, v. 12, no. 2, p. 62-71. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000028

OMB, 2017, North American industry classification system: Washington, D.C., Office of Management and Budget, 963 p. https://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/2017NAICS/2017_NAICS_Manual.pdf

OSSPAC, 2013, The Oregon resilience plan: reducing risk and improving recovery for the next Cascadia earthquake and tsunami: Salem, Oreg., Oregon Seismic Safety Policy Advisory Commission. 341 p. https://www.oregon.gov/gov/policy/orr/Documents/Oregon_Resilience_Plan_Final.pdf

Park, H., and Cox, D.T., 2019, Effects of advection on predicting construction debris for vulnerability assessment under multi-hazard earthquake and tsunami: Coastal Engineering, v. 153, p. 103541.

Peterson, C.D., Darienzo, M.E., Doyle, D. and Barnett, E., 1995, Evidence for coseismic subsidence and tsunami inundation during the past 3000 years at Siletz Bay, Oregon, in Priest, G.R. (ed.), Explanation of mapping methods and use of the tsunami hazard map of the Siletz Bay area, Lincoln County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-95-5, p. 45–69. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/O-95-05.pdf

Priest, G.R., and others, 2009, Tsunami hazard assessment of the northern Oregon coast: a multi-deterministic approach tested at Cannon Beach, Clatsop County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Special Paper 41. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/sp/SP-41.zip

Priest, G.R., and others, 2013a, Tsunami animations, time histories, and digital point data for flow depth, elevation, and velocity for the Bandon Project Area, Coos and Curry Counties, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-14. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-14.htm

Priest, G.R., and others, 2013b, Tsunami animations, time histories, and digital point data for flow depth, elevation, and velocity for the Central Coast Project Area, Coos, Douglas, Lane, and Lincoln Counties, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-16. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-16.htm

Priest, G.R., and others, 2013c, Tsunami animations, time histories, and digital point data for flow depth, elevation, and velocity for the Clatsop Project Area, Clatsop County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-18. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-08.htm

Priest, G.R., and others, 2013d, Tsunami animations, time histories, and digital point data for flow depth, elevation, and velocity for the Coos Bay Project Area, Coos County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-15. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-15.htm

Priest, G.R., and others, 2013e, Tsunami animations, time histories, and digital point data for flow depth, elevation, and velocity for the South Coast Project Area, Curry County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-13. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-13.htm

Priest, G.R., and others, 2013f, Tsunami animations, time histories, and digital point data for flow depth, elevation, and velocity for the Tillamook Project Area, Tillamook County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-17. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-07.htm

Priest, G.R., and others, 2013g, Tsunami inundation scenarios for Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-13-19. http://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-13-19.htm

Priest, G.R., Zhang, Y., Wang, K., Goldfinger, C., and Stimely, L.L., 2014a, Tsunami digital point data for vorticity, minimum flow depth, and momentum flux for the Bandon project area, Coos and Curry Counties, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-14-04. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-14-04.htm

Priest, G.R., Zhang, Y., Wang, K., Goldfinger, C., and Stimely, L.L., 2014b, Tsunami digital point data for vorticity, minimum flow depth, and momentum flux for the Central Coast project area, Coos, Douglas, Lane, and Lincoln Counties, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-14-06. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-14-06.htm

Priest, G.R., Zhang, Y., Wang, K., Goldfinger, C., and Stimely, L.L., 2014c, Tsunami digital point data for vorticity, minimum flow depth, and momentum flux for the Clatsop project area, Clatsop County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-14-08. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-14-08.htm

Priest, G.R., Zhang, Y., Wang, K., Goldfinger, C., and Stimely, L.L., 2014d, Tsunami digital point data for vorticity, minimum flow depth, and momentum flux for the Coos Bay project area, Coos County: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-14-05. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-14-05.htm

Priest, G.R., Zhang, Y., Wang, K., Goldfinger, C., and Stimely, L.L., 2014e, Tsunami digital point data for vorticity, minimum flow depth, and momentum flux for the South Coast project area, Curry County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-14-03. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-14-03.htm

Priest, G.R., Zhang, Y., Wang, K., Goldfinger, C., and Stimely, L.L., 2014f, Tsunami digital point data for vorticity, minimum flow depth, and momentum flux for the Tillamook project area, Tillamook County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open-File Report O-14-07. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-14-07.htm

Priest, G.R., Stimely, L.L., Wood, N.J., Madin, I.P., and Watzig, R.J., 2015, Beat-the-wave evacuation mapping for tsunami hazards in Seaside, Oregon, USA: Natural Hazards, v. 80, p. 1031-1056. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-2011-4

Raskin, J., and Wang, Y., 2017, Fifty-year resilience strategies for coastal communities at risk for tsunamis: Natural Hazards Review, v. 18, no. 1, p. B4016003.

Rossiter, K., 2011, What are census blocks? [Census.gov, Newsroom, Census Blogs, Random Samplings blog posting]. Available at: https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2011/07/what-are-census-blocks.html. Accessed October 2020.

Satake, K., Wang, K.L., and Atwater, B.F., 2003, Fault slip and seismic moment of the 1700 Cascadia earthquake inferred from Japanese tsunami descriptions: Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 108, no. B11, p. 2535. https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JB002521

SPA Risk LLC, 2014, Mobile homes in earthquake: how to protect your home and family, 2 p. http://www.sparisk.com/pubs/SPA-2014-Mobile-Homes-in-Earthquakes.pdf

Sun, Y., and Yamori, K., 2018, Risk management and technology: case studies of tsunami evacuation drills in Japan: Sustainability, v. 10, no. 9, p. 2982.

Suppasri, A., and others, 2016, An analysis of fatality ratios and the factors that affected human fatalities in the 2011 Great East Japan tsunami: Frontiers in Built Environment, v. 2, p. 32. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2016.00032

U.S. Census Bureau, 2018, Understanding and using American Community Survey data: what all data users need to know: U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., 84 p. Issued July 2018. Available at: https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2018/acs/acs_general_handbook_2018.pdf

Wang, Y., 2018, Oregon Coastal Hospitals Preparing for Cascadia: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open File Report O-18-03, 97 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/p-O-18-03.htm

Wang, H., Mostafizi, A., Cramer, L.A., Cox, D., and Park, H., 2016, An agent-based model of a multimodal near-field tsunami evacuation: decision-making and life safety: Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies, v. 64, p. 86-100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2015.11.010

White, E., 2018, Economic activity from recreation use of Oregon State Park properties—system report: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, 34 p. https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/PLANS/docs/scorp/2019-2023SCORP/2018HealthBenefitsEstimatesforOregonians.pdf

Williams, M.C., Appleby, C.A., Bauer, J.M., and Roberts, J.T., 2020, Natural hazard report for Tillamook County, Oregon, including the cities of Bay City, Garibaldi, Manzanita, Nehalem, Rockaway Beach, Tillamook, and Wheeler and the unincorporated communities of Neskowin, Oceanside, Netarts, and Pacific City: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Interpretive Map 58, 95 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ims/p-ims-058.htm

Witter, R.C., Kelsey, H.M., and Hemphill-Haley, E., 2003, Great Cascadia earthquakes and tsunamis of the past 6700 years, Coquille River estuary, southern coastal Oregon: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 115, p. 1289-1306.

Witter, R., and others, 2011, Simulating tsunami inundation at Bandon, Coos County, Oregon, using hypothetical Cascadia and Alaska earthquake scenarios: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Special Paper 43, 57 p. https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/sp/p-SP-43.htm

Witter, R.C., Zhang, Y., Wang, K., Goldfinger, C., Priest, G.R., and Allan, J.C.,, 2012, Coseismic slip on the southern Cascadia megathrust implied by tsunami deposits in an Oregon lake and earthquake-triggered marine turbidites: Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 117, no. B10, 10303. https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JB009404

Witter, R., and others, 2013, Simulated tsunami inundation for a range of Cascadia megathrust earthquake scenarios at Bandon, Oregon, USA: Geosphere, v. 9, no. 6, p. 1783-1803.

Wood, N., Jones, J., Schmidtlein, M.C., Schelling, J., and Frazier, T., 2016, Pedestrian flow-path modeling to support tsunami evacuation and disaster relief planning in the U.S. Pacific Northwest: International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, v. 18, p. 41-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.05.010

Wood, N.J., and Schmidtlein, M.C., 2012, Anisotropic path modeling to assess pedestrian evacuation potential from Cascadia-related tsunamis in the US Pacific Northwest: community clusters of tsunami vulnerability in the US Pacific Northwest: Natural Hazards, v. 62, no. 2, p. 26.

Wood, N.J., and Schmidtlein, M.C., 2013, Community variations in population exposure to near-field tsunami hazards as a function of pedestrian travel time to safety: Natural Hazards, v. 65, p. 1603-1628. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-012-0434-8

8.0 APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY PROFILES

Appendix A includes additional summary information specific to each community. These data include the effects of both the earthquake and accompanying tsunami (M1, L1, and XXL1) that can inform preparation, recovery, and mitigation planning.

A) **Area analyzed:** We summarized data when possible within the community's designated urban growth boundary (UGB). Planners considered the UGB as a more inclusive and useful aggregation unit. However, some data are available only at the city limits level, specifically the most current population estimates and U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey data. For unincorporated communities, we used a geospatial layer of unincorporated communities compiled by the Department of Land Conservation and Development. The summary community profile maps highlight several datasets including the boundary used for analysis (UGB or city limits depending on data availability), building placements and tsunami zone. In addition, the maps include the results of the evacuation modeling (path distances) based on a 4 ft per second (walk) evacuation speed (with 10-minute delay) out of the inundation zone. We distinguish the chance of successful evacuation (green lines) versus increased likelihood of fatality (red lines). In all cases, the likelihood of successful evacuation improves significantly if individuals increase their evacuation speed or leave sooner.

B) **Population demographics:** These data reflect the permanent (resident) population within each respective tsunami zone (M1, L1, and XXL1), expressed as absolute numbers and as a percentage of the total community population. A conservative estimate of the number of temporary visitors is also presented, assuming 100% occupancy of vacation homes, hotel/motels, and camping areas. Additional demographic information of the permanent (resident) population distinguishes those <65 years and those over 65 years of age.

C) **Distance to safety:** Distance to safety plots show the number of permanent and temporary residents as a function of distance to safety. The closer a person is to safety (i.e., right side of the figure) the greater the chance of successful evacuation. The distance to safety figure includes a 4 ft per second (walk) threshold line (vertical dash black line). Left of this line, the model assumes people will not be able to evacuate out of the inundation zone in time, while those to the right have a greater chance of surviving. We also include a 2 standard deviation gray dash line that highlights uncertainty in the 4 fps threshold, which is a function of the wave arrival time. Finally, we include a cumulative percent curve to further define the proportion of people relative to safety in the community.

D) **Distance to safety and building type:** This figure is similar to C), with the exception that it now defines the tendency of people (permanent and temporary) to be in particular building types. Here we distinguish between the following building types: single-family residential, manufactured housing, multi-family residential, hotel/motel, and mobile (e.g., tent, RV etc.). These data define where people tend to be predominantly located. For example, many coastal hotel/motels tend to be located close to the ocean and are mostly used by visitors.

E) **Building losses:** The effects of a M_w 9.0 Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake and accompanying tsunami (M1, L1, and XXL1) in terms of economic losses and debris generated are included in this figure. For each tsunami zone, we define the number of buildings in the zone and the building replacement cost. Earthquake losses are defined for the tsunami zone and as a total for the entire community. These data are then combined with the tsunami losses calculated by Hazus. Finally, the weight of debris generated by the tsunami is also presented. As a reminder, these data do not include the weight of content in buildings and therefore reflect a minimum value.

F) **Fatalities and displaced population:** To standardize tsunami injury and fatality estimation across all communities, we assume the population, as a group, evacuates at 4 feet per second (2.7 miles per hour), which is regarded as a moderate walk. In all cases, we factor in a 10-minute evacuation delay prior to getting underway that accounts for ~3 minutes of expected earthquake shaking and up to 7 minutes for people to organize themselves, leave the building, and begin to evacuate. For each community, we provide graphical representations of the modeled fatalities, for both permanent and temporary residents. For the temporary population we assume 10%, 50%, and 100% occupancy estimates. The displaced population is defined as the difference between the local (permanent) population and the fatalities (for permanent and temporary). Planners can apply their own judgment as to the occupancy levels associated with the temporary visitors and adjust downward from the 100% occupancy estimate.

Astoria - M1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)













Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	150
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	0
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	0
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	0
Displaced Population - Permanent	1,026
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	2,194

Astoria - L1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.

B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	150
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	0
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	0
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	0
Displaced Population - Permanent	1,699
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	3,230

Astoria - XXL1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)













Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	150
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	0
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	1
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	1
Displaced Population - Permanent	2,229
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	3,809

Jeffers Garden - M1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	7
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	7
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	150
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	0
Displaced Population - Permanent	323
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	466

Jeffers Garden - L1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	7
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	7
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	165
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	0
Displaced Population - Permanent	308
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	452

Jeffers Garden - XXL1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	7
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	8
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	208
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	1
Displaced Population - Permanent	265
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	408

Warrenton - M1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)













Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	112
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	38
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	439
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	569
Displaced Population - Permanent	2,910
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	3,570

Warrenton - L1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.







C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	112
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	35
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	485
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	626
Displaced Population - Permanent	3,324
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	4,994

Warrenton - XXL1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)













Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	112
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	56
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	972
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	777
Displaced Population - Permanent	3,611
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	6,264

Gearhart - M1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	74
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	1
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	2
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	1
Displaced Population - Permanent	641
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	1,891

Gearhart - L1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	74
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	4
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	15
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	12
Displaced Population - Permanent	1,171
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	4,379

Gearhart - XXL1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)













Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	74
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	82
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	1,212
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	4,436
Displaced Population - Permanent	235
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	331

Seaside - M1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	209
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	283
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	3,151
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	6,914
Displaced Population - Permanent	2,243
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	4,696

Seaside - L1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	209
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	276
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	3,471
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	7,262
Displaced Population - Permanent	2,509
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	4,723

Seaside - XXL1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	209
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	265
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	3,833
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	7,796
Displaced Population - Permanent	2,439
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	4,158

Cannon Beach - M1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	100
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	1
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	1
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	5
Displaced Population - Permanent	414
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	3,886

Cannon Beach - L1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	100
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	5
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	3
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	20
Displaced Population - Permanent	914
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	6,758

Cannon Beach - XXL1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	100
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	44
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	78
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	639
Displaced Population - Permanent	1,063
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	7,405

Arch Cape - M1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	9
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	0
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	0
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	1
Displaced Population - Permanent	88
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	666

Arch Cape - L1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	9
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	2
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	1
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	7
Displaced Population - Permanent	124
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	908

Arch Cape - XXL1

Casualty estimates assume a MODERATE WALK travel speed (4 ft per second)

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Description	Total
Earthquake Injuries (Entire Community)	9
Tsunami Injuries - Permanent + Temporary	7
Tsunami Fatalities - Permanent	5
Tsunami Fatalities - Temporary @ ~100% occupancy	34
Displaced Population - Permanent	211
Displaced Population - Permanent + Temporary	1,418