



APPENDIX F FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

The future recommendations document aims to identify best practices and lessons learned related to engagement and outreach efforts throughout the planning process. It is intended to serve as a reference to inform future updates of the LHMP.

City and County of Honolulu 2025 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan: Future Recommendations

Prepared for:



City and County of Honolulu
Department of Emergency Management

Prepared by:



July 2025

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1 Summary of 2025 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Engagement Process.....	2
1.1 Planning Process Stakeholders.....	2
1.1.1 Decision Making Partners	7
1.1.2 Specialized Contributors	8
1.1.3 Public Participants.....	11
2 Stakeholder Input and Feedback Analysis	15
2.1 SCORE Analysis of Stakeholder Input.....	15
2.2 Lessons Learned and Recommendations for Best Practices.....	21
2.2.1 Integrate Technical Expertise with Relationship Building	21
2.2.2 Extend Relationship Investment Beyond Planning Cycles	21
2.2.3 Build Dedicated Community Engagement Capacity	21
2.2.4 Leverage Existing Community Infrastructure.....	22
2.2.5 Meet Communities Where They Already Gather	22
2.2.6 Recognize Different Degrees of "Local" Across O’ahu	22
3 From Lessons Learned to Goals: Implementation Framework for Future Engagement.....	23
3.1 Goal 1: Building Trust and Sustainable Partnerships	23
3.2 Goal 2: Developing Targeted Audiences and Specialized Programming.....	26
3.3 Goal 3: Enhancing Community Awareness and Risk Reduction	28
3.4 Implementation Considerations	29
4 Conclusion.....	31

Tables:

Table 1: Planning Process Stakeholders	4
Table 2: SCORE Analysis of Stakeholder Input	17

Figures:

Figure 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary Diagram	3
--	---

Page Intentionally Left Blank.

Executive Summary

This document summarizes outreach efforts undertaken to update the City and County of Honolulu's (City) 2025 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) and presents actionable recommendations for future engagement based on lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the process.

The 2025 LHMP incorporated outreach efforts designed to engage stakeholders at multiple levels while ensuring full compliance with federal regulations and best practices for hazard mitigation planning. The plan built upon work achieved and relationships formed during prior LHMP planning efforts, ensuring continuity of institutional knowledge and maintenance of established stakeholder connections.

The City's stakeholder engagement efforts included focus group meetings with stakeholders from different communities across O'ahu, public surveys, webinars, and social media outreach, all supported by regular coordination meetings with a Core Planning Team, Executive Steering Committee, and Hazard Mitigation Working Group (HMWG) composed of state and City officials. This approach helped identify priority hazards, vulnerable areas, and appropriate mitigation strategies that reflect the community's needs and capabilities.

Six lessons emerged from community feedback, highlighting the need to move beyond traditional planning cycles toward year-round relationship building with O'ahu's diverse geographic, cultural, and vulnerable populations. Sustained engagement creates the foundation for improved response and recovery during and after hazard events by establishing trust, facilitating accurate information sharing, and maintaining ongoing dialogue between residents and local officials.

This document identifies three goals:

- (1) Building trust and sustainable partnerships
- (2) Developing targeted audiences and specialized programming
- (3) Enhancing community awareness and risk reduction

These goals, associated recommendations, enhance future stakeholder engagement efforts along with proposed metrics and feedback mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating outreach effectiveness. The intent is to provide the City with approaches for maintaining the stakeholder connections established during the planning process and leveraging these relationships to strengthen overall community preparedness and hazard mitigation planning. Going forward, implementation of recommendations will require departmental assessment of staffing, budget, and timeline considerations to operationalize these community-driven recommendations into DEM's ongoing operations.

1 Summary of 2025 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Engagement Process

The 2025 LHMP employed a multi-tiered engagement strategy beginning in September 2023 and concluding in March 2025. Built upon the relationships formed during prior LHMP planning efforts, the 2025 LHMP engagement approach was designed to capture diverse perspectives and expertise while ensuring broad community participation throughout the planning process. This comprehensive approach recognized that effective hazard mitigation planning requires input from multiple stakeholder groups, each contributing unique knowledge, decision-making authority, and community connections essential to developing a robust and implementable plan.

The multi-tiered approach created numerous input points throughout the planning process, allowing for iterative feedback and refinement of plan components. Figure 1 on the following page illustrates the overall planning process structure and identifies formal meetings and milestone events in the LHMP update process. In addition to these meetings, engagement occurred with stakeholders via in-person site visits, virtual webinars, hybrid meetings, data requests, and online surveys.

1.1 Planning Process Stakeholders

The engagement framework was structured around three stakeholder categories, each serving distinct but complementary roles in the planning process. **Decision Making Partners** provided strategic oversight and final approval authority through the Core Planning Team and Executive Steering Committee. **Specialized Contributors** offered technical expertise and sector-specific knowledge through the Hazard Mitigation Working Group (HMWG), Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), Ad Hoc Members, and targeted Focus Groups representing different communities. **Public Participants** ensured that the broader community had multiple opportunities to provide input and feedback during plan development. Table 1 identifies the planning process stakeholders and their affiliated tiers of involvement.

The following sections provide more information on each stakeholder category, including their specific roles, contributions, and the engagement methods used to facilitate their participation. This information demonstrates the scope and breadth of stakeholder outreach efforts during the 2025 LHMP update. Many additional stakeholders contributed through formal and informal outreach efforts conducted by the Core Planning Team.

Table 1: Planning Process Stakeholders

Name	Title	Organization Abbreviation	Sector/Community Lifeline	Stakeholder Affiliation
Jennifer Walter	Acting Director	DEM	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Core Planning Team
Ian Keogh	Staff Officer—Recovery and Mitigation	DEM	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Core Planning Team
Molly Pierce	Public Information Officer	DEM	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Core Planning Team
Matt Gonser	Executive Director	CCSR	Climate Change/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Sarah Harris	Hazard Mitigation and Long-term Disaster Recovery Program Manager	CCSR	Climate Change/Safety and Security	Core Planning Team
Madeline Krueger	Coastal and Hazards Sea Grant Grau Fellow	CCSR	Climate Change/Safety and Security	Core Planning Team
Chase McDaniel	Flood and Resilience Specialist	CCSR	Emergency Management/Climate Change/Safety and Security	HMWG
Emily Makini	Equity Program Manager	CCSR	Emergency Management/Climate Change/Safety and Security	Outreach Partner
Andy Kawano	Director	BFS	Economic Development/Communications	Executive Steering Committee
John Hashimoto	Risk Management Officer	BFS	Economic Development/Communications	HMWG
Ernest Lau	Manager & Chief Engineer	BWS	Infrastructure/Water Systems	Executive Steering Committee
Erwin Kawata	Deputy Director	BWS	Infrastructure/Water Systems	HMWG
Megan Muramatsu	Budget Program Specialist	BWS	Infrastructure/Water Systems	HMWG
Raelynn Nakabayashi	BWS Executive Assistant	BWS	Infrastructure/Water Systems	HMWG
Anton Krucky	Director	DCS	Underserved Community and Socially Vulnerable Populations/Safety and Services	Executive Steering Committee
Aedward Los Banos	Deputy Director	DCS	Underserved Community and Socially Vulnerable Populations/Safety and Services	Executive Steering Committee
Derrick Ariyoshi	Program Administrator, Elderly Services	DCS	Underserved Community and Socially Vulnerable Populations/Safety and Services	HMWG
Dominic “Haku” Milles	Director	DDC	Economic Development/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Dennis Kodama	Assistant Chief of Facilities	DDC	Economic Development/Safety and Security	HMWG
Sandra Kunioka	DDC Program Coordination Chief	DDC	Economic Development/Safety and Security	HMWG
Terry Chan	Program Coordination Engineer	DDC	Economic Development/Safety and Security	HMWG
Timothy Trang	Civil Division	DDC	Economic Development/Transportation/Safety and Security	HMWG
Mitchell Wong	DES Trades Unit Supervisor	DES	Economic Development/Safety and Security	HMWG
Shawn Enos	Maintenance & Operations Superintendent	DES	Economic Development/Safety and Security	HMWG
Gene Albano	Director and Chief Engineer Designate	DFM	Infrastructure/Water Systems	Executive Steering Committee

Name	Title	Organization Abbreviation	Sector/Community Lifeline	Stakeholder Affiliation
Warren Mamizuka	Deputy Director	DFM	Infrastructure/Water Systems	Executive Steering Committee
Randall Wakumoto	Storm Water Quality Program Administrator	DFM	Infrastructure/Water Systems	HMWG
Tyler Sugihara	Chief of Road Maintenance	DFM	Infrastructure/Water Systems	HMWG
Stephen Courtney	Deputy Director	DIT	Infrastructure/Communications	Executive Steering Committee
Tony Velasco	Communications & Tech Division Chief	DIT	Infrastructure/Communications	HMWG
Keith Suzuka	Deputy Director	DLM	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Catherine Taschner	Director	DLM	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	HMWG
Edwin Matsuda	Flood Control & Dam Safety Section Head	DLNR	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	HMWG
Mike Walker	State Protection Forester	DLNR	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	HMWG
Carol Tyau-Beam	State NFIP Coordinator	DLNR	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	Hazard SME
Tony Koyamatsu	Flood Control & Dam Safety Officer	DLNR	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	Hazard SME
Casey Nagatoshi	Pandemic Response Expansion Project (PREP) Program Specialist	DOH	Health and Social Services/Health and Medical	Hazard SME
Diana Felton	Chief—Communicable Disease & Public Health (Nursing Division)	DOH	Health and Social Services/Health and Medical	Hazard SME
Judy Kern	Emergency Preparedness and Education Coordinator	DOH	Health and Social Services/Health and Medical	Hazard SME
Ryan A Nakata	District Engineer	DOT	Infrastructure/Transportation	Ad Hoc Member
Bryan Gallagher	Deputy Director	DPP	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Jiro Sumada	Deputy Director	DPP	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Dawn Kimura	Chief of Building Safety	DPP	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	HMWG
Franz Kraitz	Chief, Community Planning Branch	DPP	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	HMWG
Jim Hayden	DPP Geographic Information System Analyst V	DPP	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	HMWG
Michael Kat	Planner	DPP	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	HMWG
Laura Thielen	Director	DPR	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Terri Ann Koike	Natural Resources—Trees	DPR	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	HMWG
Jon Nouchi	Deputy Director	DTS	Infrastructure/Transportation	Executive Steering Committee
Craig Chung	Traffic Engineer	DTS	Infrastructure/Transportation	HMWG
Ian Crittenden	Assistant Chief Planner	DTS	Infrastructure/Transportation	HMWG

Name	Title	Organization Abbreviation	Sector/Community Lifeline	Stakeholder Affiliation
Roger Babcock, Jr.	Director	ENV	Infrastructure/Water Systems	Executive Steering Committee
Edmund Lung	Chief, Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Division	ENV	Infrastructure/Water Systems	HMWG
Jim Ireland	Director	HESD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Ad Hoc Member
Ian Santee	Deputy Director	HESD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Ad Hoc Member
Kathleen Higa	Planner VI	HESD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Ad Hoc Member
Jason Samala	Deputy Fire Chief	HFD	Emergency Management/Climate Change/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Sheldon Hao	Fire1	HFD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Craig Uchimura	Assistant Fire Chief	HFD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security/Hazardous Materials	HMWG
Keith Ito	Fire Captain	HFD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	HMWG
Kevin Auger	Deputy Director	HOU	Housing/Underserved Community and Socially Vulnerable Populations/Food, Hydration, and Shelter	Executive Steering Committee and HMWG
Clifford Ramson	MED/ Captain	HPD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Ad Hoc Member
Julian Tanioka	Sergeant	HPD	Emergency Management/Safety and Security	Ad Hoc Member
Elizabeth Pickett	Co-Executive Director	HWMO	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	HMWG
Krishna Jayaram	Deputy MD	Mayor's Office	Economic Development/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
John Bravender	Warning Coordination Meteorologist	NWS	Emergency Management/Communications	Hazard SME
Kevin Kodama	Senior Service Hydrologist	NWS	Emergency Management/Communications	Hazard SME
Amy Asselbaye	Director	OER	Economic Development/Safety and Security	Executive Steering Committee
Kymberly Sparlin	Executive Assistant	OER	Economic Development/Safety and Security	HMWG
Chip McCreery	Director	PTWC	Emergency Management/Communications	Hazard SME
Bradley Romine	Extension Faculty	UH	Health and Social Services/Health and Medical	Hazard SME
Dolan Eversole	Extension Agency	UH	Natural and Cultural/Safety and Security	Hazard SME

1.1.1 Decision Making Partners

The **Decision Making Partners** include the **Core Planning Team** and the **Executive Steering Committee** which have direct responsibility for hazard mitigation planning and implementation. The **Core Planning Team**, made up of the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) and the Office of Climate Change, Sustainability, and Resilience (CCSR), served as the central coordinating body with primary authority over plan development and strategic direction. The **Executive Steering Committee** provided strategic guidance and executive oversight, with executive-level agency representatives charged with informing plan direction and supporting implementation.

1.1.1.1 *Core Planning Team*

The **Core Planning Team**, jointly led by DEM and CCSR, functioned as the operational backbone of the 2025 LHMP update process. This central coordinating body maintained day-to-day oversight of plan development while making critical decisions about project direction, stakeholder engagement, and content development. The team's multifaceted role encompassed project management responsibilities—including schedule maintenance and deliverable review—alongside strategic functions such as identifying key contributors and shaping outreach approaches and content for the LHMP.

A pivotal early decision involved expanding participation beyond the stakeholder base from the 2020 LHMP. In September 2023, DEM reviewed the participating stakeholders from the 2020 LHMP and identified opportunities to broaden representation and expertise. A senior leader brief, conducted by DEM, regarding the LHMP update at a Cabinet meeting described the type of representation departments should provide to assist with the update process. The briefing served both to secure high-level buy-in and to clarify expectations for meaningful agency participation.

This expanded approach resulted in the Core Planning Team to include departments/agencies that were not part of the previous plan update. This included newer departments such as the Department of Land Management (DLM) and the Office of Economic Revitalization (OER), as well as departments that could help ensure greater consideration of social vulnerability, such as the Department of Community Services (DCS). DEM reached out to the identified key stakeholder groups during fall 2023 to conduct the first plan update meeting.

The Core Planning Team organized key stakeholders into two complementary structures: an **Executive Steering Committee** to provide senior-level guidance and oversight, and a **Hazard Mitigation Working Group** (HMWG) to contribute technical expertise and operational knowledge. Each will be described in more detail in the following sections. This organizational framework ensured that both strategic vision and practical implementation considerations informed plan development from the outset.

1.1.1.2 Executive Steering Committee

The **Executive Steering Committee** consists of executive-level representatives from City departments and is responsible for informing the strategic direction of the plan and providing support for its implementation. This high-level governance structure ensured that senior leadership remained engaged throughout the planning process and committed to supporting plan implementation following adoption.

The **Executive Steering Committee** members were charged with four primary responsibilities. First, they provided strategic guidance and executive oversight throughout the planning process to ensure plan development aligned with broader City priorities and initiatives. Second, they attended the initial HMWG meeting to provide input on plan strategies and the overall planning process. This further contributed to senior-level perspective on feasibility and resource considerations. Third, they participated in the final HMWG meeting to review and comment on final drafts of key plan elements, providing final executive review before plan finalization. Finally, they committed to providing senior-level support for plan implementation, ensuring that mitigation strategies would have the necessary organizational backing to move from planning to action.

1.1.2 Specialized Contributors

Specialized Contributors brought essential technical expertise and community knowledge to the planning process through three distinct engagement approaches. The **Hazard Mitigation Working Group** (HMWG) provided ongoing technical oversight and data validation throughout the 2025 LHMP update process. **Subject Matter Experts and Ad Hoc Members** offered targeted expertise on specific hazards and mitigation strategies without requiring full-time participation. **Focus Groups** facilitated deeper engagement with diverse community segments and specialized sectors to ensure comprehensive representation.

A defining priority for the 2025 LHMP update was meaningful engagement with advocates and service providers for vulnerable populations and communities with limited access to resources. This intentional focus ensured that the plan addresses vulnerabilities that may have disproportionate impacts.

1.1.2.1 Hazard Mitigation Working Group (HMWG)

The **HMWG** functioned as the technical engine of the planning process, bringing together subject matter experts (SMEs) and staff-level representatives from a range of departments and external partners from other governmental and non-governmental agencies. Members of the HMWG (individually and as a whole), as well as key stakeholders, met and communicated as needed to share information between March 2024 through March 2025.

The HMWG's composition reflected both continuity from previous planning efforts and strategic expansion to address emerging challenges. City and state agency representatives brought institutional knowledge and regulatory expertise, while external partners contributed specialized perspectives on critical infrastructure, community services, and regional coordination. This diverse membership enabled comprehensive review of plan elements while maintaining focus on implementable, locally relevant mitigation strategies.

The HMWG conducted reviews of the draft LHMP to provide expert input and ensure the content aligns with local concerns and priorities. Specific duties of HMWG members included the following:

- Reviewing and updating hazards of concern
- Assisting with developing and implementing a public and stakeholder outreach program
- Ensuring that data and information used in the LHMP update process are the best available
- Reviewing and updating hazard mitigation goals
- Reporting on progress of integration of prior LHMPs into other planning processes and operations
- Reporting on progress of mitigation actions identified in prior or existing LHMPs, as applicable
- Identifying, developing, and prioritizing appropriate mitigation actions
- Reviewing and commenting on plan documents prior to submission to Hawai'i Emergency Management Agency (HI-EMA) and FEMA
- Implementing and maintaining the LHMP update

This included meetings to identify hazards, assess risks, update inventories of critical facilities, and assist in updating mitigation goals and strategies. All members of the HMWG had the opportunity to review the draft LHMP, support interaction with other stakeholders, and assist with public engagement efforts. These activities provided continuity throughout the process to ensure incorporation of hazard vulnerability information and appropriate mitigation strategies.

1.1.2.2 Subject Matter Experts (SME) and Ad Hoc Members

Beyond the regular HMWG participants, the Core Planning Team engaged **Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)** and **Ad Hoc Members** to provide targeted input on specific hazards and mitigation approaches without requiring ongoing meeting participation. This allowed the planning team to access highly specialized knowledge while respecting experts' time constraints and focused areas of expertise.

These contributors played a crucial role in validating technical assumptions, providing data on specialized hazards, and reviewing mitigation strategies within their areas of expertise. Their

input proved particularly valuable for complex technical issues requiring specialized knowledge and for hazards affecting specific sectors or geographic areas where targeted expertise was essential for accurate risk assessment and effective mitigation planning.

1.1.2.3 Focus Groups

A priority for the LHMP update was to engage advocates and service providers for socially vulnerable populations and underserved communities through targeted **Focus Groups**. In collaboration with the HMWG, the following populations and communities were identified for targeted engagement during the planning process:

- Private sector and local businesses
- Representatives of the Pacific Islander community of Melanesian, Micronesian, or Polynesian descent
- Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs)
- Older adults (kūpuna)
- Historic and cultural resources SMEs

To effectively engage these communities, the project team conducted meetings with members of the HMWG to obtain further insights regarding historical effects of disasters on these communities, identify necessary resources, and determine optimal engagement strategies. The HMWG stakeholders assisted in facilitating outreach and meetings with these communities.

The project team met with the City's Office of Economic Revitalization (OER) to analyze opportunities for engagement with local businesses and the Pacific Islander community. OER underscored the necessity of building trust between governmental representatives and the community as well as the critical need for language accessibility in all communications. OER organized a meeting between the project team and the Micronesian Minister and Leaders Uut to explore potential support mechanisms from the City aimed at enhancing the hazard preparedness of the Pacific Islander community.

The Hawai'i Primary Care Association organized a meeting between the project team and representatives from FQHCs operating on O'ahu. FQHCs are nonprofit health clinics that deliver health care services to underserved populations. The primary concern expressed by these representatives was the possibility of public safety power shutoffs and the resulting implications for their capacity to provide care to patients, particularly those reliant on electrically powered medical devices. Concerns regarding loss of power were also expressed for high wind events, specifically in Waimānalo. Participants also noted concerns regarding funding required to maintain the ability to provide services and highlighted challenges experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic when funding was limited. The representatives expressed challenges related to the socially vulnerable populations they serve. This included communities (e.g., Waimānalo, West

Side, and North Shore) losing access to services due to road damage during disasters and challenges associated with emergency notifications and alerts for non-English speakers and socially isolated communities.

The Committee on Aging of the City's Elderly Affairs Division highlighted the intensification of pre-existing social vulnerabilities during emergencies and disasters. Participants expressed concerns regarding the significant proportion of older adults living in high-rise condominiums who may have difficulty evacuating in emergency situations if condominium elevators lose electrical power.

Acknowledging the significance of historical and cultural resources on O'ahu, the project team met with the Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting to evaluate the potential effects of hazards on these resources. These meetings highlighted that hazards such as flooding and high winds could severely impact these resources. It was also recognized that the lack of prior identification of many resources worsens these effects. Additionally, it was noted that older structures on the island may have been built with materials that are more vulnerable to such hazards.

Common themes identified during focus group meetings included language accessibility, transportation limitations, social isolation, power disruptions, and access to information. Participants offered additional insights regarding the underlying causes of specific vulnerabilities and proposed mitigation strategies aimed at addressing and reducing the associated risks. This comprehensive engagement approach ensured that the LHMP reflects the diverse needs and knowledge of all community segments, particularly those most vulnerable to hazard impacts.

Throughout the planning process, DEM emphasized the necessity of ongoing engagement with these targeted stakeholders to enhance hazard preparedness in communities that disproportionately experience the effects of disasters.

1.1.3 Public Participants

The **Public Participant** outreach was included as part of the 2025 LHMP update in order to assist with developing equitable outcomes and building awareness of hazard risks and mitigation strategies. The Core Planning Team included dedicated interactions with the general public via webinars, social media platforms, in-person events, and additional outreach methods. DEM produced an informational hazard mitigation brochure for distribution at community events to enhance awareness of the hazard mitigation planning process.

In addition to these dedicated opportunities, all HMWG meetings were open to the general public and advertised in compliance with the CRS Activity 510 requirements for developing a Floodplain Management Plan. Meetings were advertised on the DEM website.

1.1.3.1 O'ahu Prepared Webinar Series

DEM, in collaboration with CCSR, the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, the Honolulu Fire Department (HFD), the Hawai'i Wildfire Management Organization (HWMO), the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center (PTWC), and the National Weather Service (NWS), conducted a series of webinars to enhance public awareness of community risks and the LHMP update process. Starting in March 2024, these webinars were live-streamed via DEM's Facebook page to reach a broader audience. Participants could provide feedback and ask questions through interactive components. Each webinar was recorded and made available for public viewing.

A total of six webinars were live-streamed. The first webinar concentrated on the effects of climate change on O'ahu in relation to natural hazards, with information presented by CCSR. The second webinar addressed scientific aspects, safety protocols, and preparedness strategies associated with tsunamis, and was facilitated in conjunction with the PTWC. The third and fourth webinars were dedicated to hurricanes, emphasizing the risks they pose and potential mitigative measures, such as advancements in building codes and retrofitting of structures. NWS presented information on the formation of hurricanes and an outlook for the rainy season for O'ahu. The fifth and sixth webinars, conducted in partnership with the HFD and the HWMO, focused on wildfire risks and highlighted the benefits of the Firewise Communities program.

1.1.3.2 Public Survey Summary

An online community survey was developed to gauge concerns and priorities of the community as well as personal readiness and risk awareness. The survey asks quantifiable questions about perception of risk, knowledge of mitigation, and support of community programs. The questionnaire also asks several demographic questions to help analyze trends.

The survey was posted on the DEM's website in March 2024 and was available through April 2025 for public input. Approximately 44 responses were received. A summary of survey results appears later in this section, with full results provided in Appendix C to this LHMP.

Seventy-five percent of respondents have lived in Honolulu for 10 years or more. The remaining 25 percent of respondents have lived in Honolulu from 1 to 9 years.

Respondents identified hurricanes and wildland fires as the most significant hazards, ranking hurricanes as the primary concern, followed by flooding as the second concern, and wildland fires as the third. Additionally, one respondent cited nuclear attacks as a concern.

Approximately 60 percent of respondents indicated personal experience with a disaster within the past 5 years or knowledge of someone who had experienced one. Four respondents did not provide an answer, while 32 percent stated they had not encountered any disasters within the past 5 years. The types of disasters cited by respondents included health risks (pandemic),

wildland fires, climate change and sea level rise, earthquakes, floods, landslides, hurricanes, infrastructure failures, droughts, and hazardous materials incidents.

To help inform hazard mitigation actions, respondents were asked to identify their top three priorities for responding to disasters. The following were the top three priorities:

- Protecting critical facilities (hospitals, transportation networks, fire stations) (28.0 percent)
- Protecting and reducing damage to utilities (21.2 percent)
- Promoting cooperation among public agencies, citizens, and businesses (17.4 percent)

Respondents identified multiple sources upon which they rely for emergency and disaster-related information, including government agencies, employers, the American Red Cross, news media, academic institutions, and various nonprofit organizations. Despite availability of sources of information, only one respondent reported feeling “most prepared,” while the majority (47.7 percent) expressed their feeling as only somewhat prepared. Respondents were also queried about actions they had previously undertaken to prepare themselves and their families for disasters, as well as their perspectives on how the City can effectively support communities in the future.

1.1.3.3 Social Media Engagement

Social media served as a key supporting channel throughout the public engagement process, leveraging DEM's established Facebook presence (54,000 followers) and Instagram account (11,700 followers) to reach diverse community segments. The approach emphasized cross-promotion of engagement activities while providing accessible hazard education that complemented formal planning efforts.

Social media posts effectively drove participation in the O’ahu Prepared Webinar Series and public survey through targeted promotional campaigns. The social media approach emphasized visual, accessible content that translated complex hazard mitigation concepts into community-relevant messaging. Webinar announcements consistently generated strong engagement, with the inaugural "O’ahu's Natural Hazards and YOU" session achieving 17 reactions, 4 comments, and 10 shares. Hurricane and tsunami preparedness webinars performed particularly well, with posts receiving 24-28 comments and 8-12 shares, demonstrating significant community interest in hazard-specific educational content.

Social media effectively drove participation in other engagement activities, with posts promoting the public survey, webinar series, and draft plan review periods. Posts consistently included direct links to relevant resources, including the DEM website (honolulu.gov/dem), survey platforms, webinar registration pages, and supplementary educational materials. The integration of social

media with the overall engagement strategy created multiple touchpoints for community participation throughout the planning process.

Cross-promotion between platforms and integration with live events enhanced overall reach and effectiveness. Webinar announcements received advance promotion through multiple posts, day-of reminders, and follow-up posts with recordings and additional resources. Live webinar posts included real-time updates, agenda sharing, and resource distribution during events. This multi-touch approach ensured community members had multiple opportunities to engage with content and participate in planning activities, regardless of their initial point of contact with the information.

1.1.3.4 Public Review and Comment on Draft LHMP

The draft LHMP update was published on the DEM website on April 2025 for public review and comment. Availability of the LHMP and the public review period were advertised to the public via social media. Community members were able to provide comments through a survey hosted on the DEM website. The public comment period lasted approximately one month to allow the community time to review the document and offer comments to DEM.

Public comments raised concerns regarding the heightened vulnerability of older adults residing in condominium settings. The comments noted that the Hawai'i Council of Community Associations actively supports emergency planning and preparedness through advocacy, public education, and outreach efforts to address the unique challenges associated with condominium living and enhance the resilience of this population.

The HMWG reviewed public comments. All public comments received were forwarded to the appropriate agency and incorporated into the final LHMP as appropriate. The revised LHMP was submitted to HI-EMA and FEMA for review and approval.

2 Stakeholder Input and Feedback Analysis

Stakeholder input collected throughout the planning process provides valuable insights for improving mitigation efforts, in addition to future engagement efforts and sustaining community participation in hazard mitigation activities. This section analyzes feedback from participants across all engagement activities, organizing key themes and insights that emerged from stakeholder interactions.

These insights form the foundation for the lessons learned, goals and recommendations, and monitoring frameworks that follow, with particular emphasis placed on feedback regarding engagement methods, relationship-building approaches, and recommendations for maintaining ongoing participation in hazard mitigation efforts in those sections.

2.1 SCORE Analysis of Stakeholder Input

The analysis of stakeholder feedback revealed ten primary themes that reflect both stakeholder assets, potential mitigation priorities, and areas requiring focused attention for future engagement efforts.

The analysis utilizes the SCORE framework, which organizes feedback into five strategic categories: **Strengths** (positive aspects and assets identified), **Challenges** (gaps and limitations highlighted), **Options / Opportunities** (opportunities for improvement and action), **Response / Recommendations** (proposed recommendations), and **Effectiveness / Evaluation** (methods for measuring success and tracking implementation). Table 2 on the following pages organizes findings across the ten topic areas, with each row representing one of the ten topic areas. Each column represents one of the SCORE categories.

These themes represent the most significant areas of stakeholder input and provide insights into stakeholder needs, preferences, and recommendations for improving hazard mitigation and engagement across O'ahu's diverse communities.

Page Intentionally Left Blank.

Table 2: SCORE Analysis of Stakeholder Input

THEME	S Strengths Identified	C Challenges Identified	O Options / Opportunities for Improvement	R Response / Recommendations	E Effectiveness / Evaluation Measures
Interagency Coordination and Departmental Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing emergency management coordination structures provide foundational frameworks for expanded interagency collaboration Subject matter expert networks across departments and agencies offer technical expertise and specialized knowledge for comprehensive planning approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited coordination capacity during non-emergency periods reduces relationship building and collaborative planning effectiveness Departmental and agency resource constraints limit participation in sustained community engagement beyond immediate operational responsibilities Information sharing protocols require enhancement to support comprehensive community engagement coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced interagency coordination protocols can improve information sharing and collaborative community engagement planning Regular coordination meetings can maintain relationships and collaborative capacity between emergency periods Resource sharing agreements can leverage departmental and agency expertise and offer an opportunity to share community engagement responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish enhanced interagency coordination protocols with regular coordination meetings and information sharing systems Create resource sharing agreements leveraging departmental expertise Develop comprehensive coordination frameworks ensuring consistent community engagement approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track interagency coordination meeting participation and collaborative planning project completion rates across departments and agencies Monitor information sharing effectiveness and resource sharing agreement implementation success Assess community satisfaction with coordinated government engagement approaches and departmental responsiveness consistency
Community Partnerships and Relationship Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong existing networks have proven effective during prior hazard events Churches, schools, and cultural organizations serve as trusted communication hubs with existing credibility and regular community interaction Faith-based organizations, community nonprofits, and strong cultural networks serve as trusted leaders for information sharing with established credibility Diverse ethnic and place-based organizations provide existing outreach infrastructure that can be leveraged for emergency preparedness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trust building requires extended time investment and understanding of cultural communication styles and decision-making processes that differ from traditional engagement approaches Government information often fails to reach communities through their preferred communication channels and cultural intermediaries Some communities experienced challenges in previous interactions with government agencies around resilience initiatives, creating opportunities to build stronger collaborative relationships moving forward The transition from consultant-led to government-managed engagement presents opportunities for ongoing partnership development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging communities in their existing gathering spaces rather than requiring attendance at government facilities can increase participation and comfort levels Partnerships with community organizations offer pathways for building government-community trust through established relationships Cultural competency development for government staff can improve engagement effectiveness and relationship quality Extended "talk story" sessions can significantly improve relationship quality compared to standard meeting formats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish formal partnerships and year-round community engagement programs that extend beyond planning cycles through regular forums, consistent community presence, and ongoing collaboration and information sharing Create dedicated community liaison positions focused on relationship maintenance and cultural competency development Implement partnership strategies that engage communities where they already meet rather than creating new meeting requirements Develop culturally appropriate engagement protocols that respect communication styles and decision-making processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track formalized community partnerships established annually across geographic and cultural communities Monitor community leader participation continuity across multiple planning cycles Monitor community partnership development and information sharing effectiveness Conduct annual trust assessments with community representatives to measure relationship quality improvements over time Track participation rates and satisfaction levels within various communities across different engagement activities

THEME	S Strengths Identified	C Challenges Identified	O Options / Opportunities for Improvement	R Response / Recommendations	E Effectiveness / Evaluation Measures
Communication Systems and Language Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple established communication channels exist including community newsletters, social media platforms, and trusted intermediaries such as community health workers which could provide a foundation for expanded outreach Inter-agency communication networks and translation services provide foundational infrastructure for expanded multilingual outreach Successful resource fair models demonstrate effective approaches for providing multilingual information access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited accessibility accommodations exist for deaf, blind, and other populations with specialized communication needs Language barriers significantly increase vulnerability for non-English speaking populations Community confusion persists about emergency procedures, evacuation triggers, and available resources due to complex messaging and technical terminology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multilingual communication strategies utilizing simple language, symbols, and community-based translation can improve comprehension across diverse populations Existing community partner networks can support emergency preparedness information distribution to populations with specialized communication needs Information distribution partnerships with existing community newsletters and cultural organizations can increase reach and credibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create communication resources addressing diverse communities and cultural preferences Develop comprehensive multilingual communication strategies that utilize community interpreters and trusted local messengers Establish information distribution partnerships with existing community communication channels supplement department/agency messaging Create community feedback systems ensuring questions are tracked and responded to promptly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor message reach and engagement across different language and specialized communication communities through channel-specific metrics Assess community comprehension of emergency procedures through multilingual and culturally appropriate evaluation methods Track emergency communication system reliability during actual events and measure reduction in confusion-related emergency calls
Vulnerable Population Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trusted service provider networks already exist through building managers, social workers, healthcare staff, and community center personnel who have established relationships with vulnerable populations and understand their specific needs and preferences Existing services provide foundational infrastructure for expanded vulnerable population support programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many older adults live alone, lack internet connectivity, and prefer sheltering in place during emergencies Accessibility barriers exist for vulnerable populations with specialized communication and mobility needs Limited specialized resources exist for populations requiring medical equipment or complex care coordination during emergencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training existing trusted operators in emergency protocols can extend support network capacity without requiring new relationship building Specialized transportation and evacuation assistance programs can address mobility challenges for isolated populations Building self-reliance capabilities while providing appropriate support can empower vulnerable populations rather than creating dependency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create trusted operator training networks utilizing existing relationships with building managers, community center staff, and care providers Establish accessibility accommodation protocols for emergency communication, evacuation, and shelter operations Develop specialized programs and resources to build self-reliance capabilities for vulnerable populations while ensuring appropriate support systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor emergency contact network coverage and trusted operator training completion rates Assess disaster outcome improvements through reduced emergency medical calls and improved accessibility accommodation effectiveness Track participation rates in self-reliance and preparedness programs across different vulnerable populations Assess vulnerable household preparedness improvements
Hazard-Specific Preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing emergency response capabilities provide foundational infrastructure for expanded hazard-specific preparedness Community awareness of wildfire and flooding risks offers engagement opportunities for targeted preparedness education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-hazard scenarios require coordination across different response systems and community preparedness approaches Wildfire preparedness requires community-wide coordination beyond individual property responsibility such as vegetation management and evacuation planning Flooding impacts disproportionately affect vulnerable populations with limited resources for property protection and evacuation assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community-wide hazard mitigation projects can leverage collective resources and coordination for more effective risk reduction Hazard-specific preparedness education can build on existing community awareness while providing practical implementation guidance Neighborhood-level response planning can coordinate individual and community preparedness efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop community-wide hazard mitigation programs that coordinate individual property improvements with neighborhood planning Create hazard-specific preparedness education programs building on existing community awareness with practical implementation support Establish neighborhood response coordination systems that integrate individual household preparedness with community resource sharing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor hazard impact reduction through community preparedness improvements and response coordination effectiveness Track community participation in hazard-specific mitigation projects and preparedness programs across different risk areas Assess neighborhood response system development and resource sharing capacity during exercises and actual events
Power Systems and Critical Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing emergency response capabilities through utility partnerships and government coordination provide foundational infrastructure for expanded resilience planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power grid vulnerabilities significantly affect healthcare facilities and medical device-dependent residents during outages Hawaiian Electric's power shutoff programs lack comprehensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medical Baseline Program development can prioritize power restoration for vulnerable populations and critical facilities Community emergency power distribution networks can provide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner with utility companies to develop Medical Baseline Programs prioritizing power restoration for vulnerable populations Establish community emergency power distribution networks with pre- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor power outage frequency and restoration times for healthcare facilities and vulnerable populations Track community emergency power supply distribution effectiveness during outages

THEME	S Strengths Identified	C Challenges Identified	O Options / Opportunities for Improvement	R Response / Recommendations	E Effectiveness / Evaluation Measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal technical assistance availability through specialized programs offers resource support for infrastructure improvements Healthcare facilities maintain some backup power capacity and emergency protocols 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community service plans during extended outages Limited emergency power access exists for electricity-dependent populations in isolated areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> charging stations and battery supply programs during outages Proactive power shutoff communication protocols can include clear community service plans and resource coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> positioned resources and clear activation protocols Create proactive communication systems ensuring communities receive adequate notice and support during planned power shutoffs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure reduction in power outage-related medical emergencies and emergency service calls
Transportation and Geographic Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing transportation infrastructure through school districts and private companies provides potential partnership opportunities for emergency transportation capacity Emergency response coordination systems offer foundational frameworks for expanded transportation planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geographic isolation risks exist for rural communities during road damage events with limited alternative access routes Evacuation transportation capacity limitations particularly affect vulnerable populations Communities may become cut off from emergency services during infrastructure damage events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive emergency transportation planning can leverage partnerships with existing transportation providers and community organizations Specialized transportation assistance programs can address mobility barriers for vulnerable populations in isolated areas Community self-sufficiency protocols can prepare communities for potential isolation scenarios with pre-positioned resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop comprehensive emergency transportation plans including partnerships with multiple providers and community organizations Create specialized transportation assistance programs for mobility-challenged residents in isolated communities Establish community self-sufficiency protocols for potential isolation scenarios with resource pre-positioning and communication systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track emergency transportation capacity improvements and utilization rates during evacuations and exercises Monitor evacuation response times for isolated communities and accessibility accommodation improvements Assess community preparedness for transportation disruption scenarios through drills and resource adequacy evaluations
Built Environment and Shelter Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing shelter infrastructure provides foundational capacity for emergency shelters with opportunities for strategic expansion and improvement Community spaces offer potential for hardening and safe room creation through building code modifications and incentive programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient shelter capacity exists with community concerns regarding lack of local shelter options and geographic distribution inequities Limited Category 3 shelters and decentralized emergency supply depots reduce community resilience during extended events Accessibility limitations during flood events may prevent safe room access for mobility-challenged populations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe room creation potential exists in residential building community spaces through code modifications and incentive programs Community space hardening represents cost-effective resilience improvements with multiple community benefits Tiered shelter strategies can provide neighborhood-level options reducing transportation barriers during emergencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop tiered shelter strategies including neighborhood-level safe rooms and community resilience hubs with geographic equity considerations Create safe room incentive programs through building code modifications and incentives for multi-family properties Establish decentralized emergency supply networks with community-managed resource storage and distribution systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track safe room and hardened space creation rates annually across residential properties and geographic areas Monitor shelter capacity adequacy ratios by geographic area and population density with accessibility considerations Assess shelter utilization patterns during exercises and actual emergency events
Funding and Resource Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DCS federal grant authority for vulnerable populations provides foundational infrastructure for expanded community funding programs Existing funding mechanisms through federal mitigation programs offer resource support for community resilience initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited grant writing capacity across departments with staff handling grants as additional duties rather than specialized focus constrains effectiveness Funding timeline misalignments and procurement capacity constraints limit project implementation effectiveness Lack of city-level community funding mechanisms restricts local resilience initiative support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centralized grant management can serve multiple departments with dedicated professional staff and streamlined processes Community grant programs through DCS utilizing their unique charter authority can support local resilience initiatives Diversified funding strategies including multiple revenue sources can provide sustainable resource development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish centralized grant management can serve multiple departments with dedicated professional staff and streamlined application processes Create community grant programs for vulnerable population and community resilience funding Develop diversified funding strategies including federal grants, utility partnerships, and community development resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track annually secured granted funding totals and success rates across departments and community organizations Monitor project completion rates and timeline adherence for grant-funded initiatives with community benefit assessments Assess funding program sustainability through diversified revenue stream development and community organization capacity building
Historic and Cultural Resource Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department and agency expertise provides technical foundation for cultural resource vulnerability assessment and protection planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many historic structures may be adversely impacted by flooding, high winds, and other natural hazards due 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative cultural resource vulnerability assessments can combine technical expertise with community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop partnerships for collaborative cultural resource protection programs combining technical expertise with community knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track cultural resource vulnerability assessments completion and protection plan implementation across

THEME	S Strengths Identified	C Challenges Identified	O Options / Opportunities for Improvement	R Response / Recommendations	E Effectiveness / Evaluation Measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community knowledge offers valuable insights into traditional resource protection practices and cultural significance assessments 	<p>to the materials and construction methods employed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited comprehensive identification and documentation of cultural resources reduces protection planning effectiveness Cultural resource protection requires specialized knowledge and coordination between technical experts and community cultural practitioners 	<p>cultural knowledge for comprehensive protection planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community cultural education can build awareness of resource significance and protection responsibilities Cultural resource emergency response protocols can provide specialized protection procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish partnerships for community cultural education programs building awareness of resource significance and protection awareness Create cultural resource emergency response protocols with specialized protection procedures and community coordination systems 	<p>different resource types and geographic areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor community participation in cultural resource protection programs and traditional knowledge integration effectiveness Assess cultural resource protection outcomes during hazard events and community satisfaction with protection coordination

2.2 Lessons Learned and Recommendations for Best Practices

The SCORE analysis identifies several interconnected themes across the ten topic areas from the 2025 LHMP planning process. This section synthesizes the interconnected themes into six lessons learned and best practice recommendations for sustaining community engagement in hazard mitigation. These findings can help build stronger relationships with O'ahu's diverse communities. The following sections outline the goals and recommendations for future engagement and approaches for monitoring and evaluating effectiveness according to the six key lessons learned and best practices. While these subsections offer summary guidance, detailed approaches for each recommendation can be found in the SCORE table.

2.2.1 Integrate Technical Expertise with Relationship Building

Current emergency management capabilities provide strong technical foundations, but the engagement process revealed opportunities to enhance these capabilities with dedicated relationship-building expertise, cultural competency development, and expanded time allocation for community connection activities. Cultural competency extends beyond language translation to include understanding communication styles, decision-making processes, trust-building approaches, and community social structures. This integration strengthens both technical planning quality and community implementation capacity.

2.2.2 Extend Relationship Investment Beyond Planning Cycles

The engagement process demonstrated that authentic community partnership requires year-round presence and relationship maintenance that extends well beyond formal planning timelines. With the conclusion of the 2025 LHMP Update, there is a critical need to establish sustainable, long-term community engagement mechanisms that complement rather than replace existing planning processes. Moving forward, this means creating dedicated capacity for consistent community outreach, developing opportunities for community-identified priorities to be incorporated into planning decisions, and implementing transparent communication about how community input influences decision-making processes.

2.2.3 Build Dedicated Community Engagement Capacity

The engagement process revealed important distinctions between public information officer (PIO)/communication functions and dedicated community engagement roles. Rather than relying solely on the PIO to educate the entire community, the recommendation is to build capacity for a community liaison that can actively participate in community events like preparedness fairs alongside the PIO and communication staff. A dedicated community liaison position would help build and maintain ongoing relationships with local stakeholders, ensuring sustained engagement beyond crisis periods.

2.2.4 Leverage Existing Community Infrastructure

Build partnerships with existing community organizations, chambers, faith-based groups, and cultural networks that already have community trust and regular engagement rather than creating parallel meeting structures. Utilize community health workers, building managers, social service providers, and cultural leaders as trusted intermediaries for emergency preparedness information and relationship building.

2.2.5 Meet Communities Where They Already Gather

The most significant lesson from the engagement process involves supplementing traditional government meeting formats with community-centered approaches that respect existing social structures and gathering places. This has highlighted the need to identify where community members are already gathering and leverage existing meeting structures rather than creating new ones such as churches, community centers, cultural organizations, and neighborhood settings where trust relationships already exist.

2.2.6 Recognize Different Degrees of "Local" Across O'ahu

A key finding is the need to emphasize local perspectives, approaches, and participation. Effective emergency management on O'ahu requires understanding that "local" encompasses diverse geographic localities (rural, urban, isolated), cultural localities (Pacific Islander, ethnic communities, multigenerational households), and functional localities (existing meeting places, trust networks, service delivery points). Each locality requires tailored engagement approaches while contributing unique strengths to island-wide hazard preparedness.

3 From Lessons Learned to Goals: Implementation Framework for Future Engagement

Building on the six lessons learned from stakeholder input analysis, this section identifies three primary goals for sustaining and enhancing community engagement that can be pursued simultaneously while building upon each other. Rather than addressing each lesson in isolation, these goals integrate related lessons learned into comprehensive approaches that enhance DEM's relationship-building capacity, adapt to community diversity, and improve risk communication effectiveness. The three goals reflect key themes from stakeholder feedback and are outlined below. The following subsections provide additional information on each goal and include both implementation recommendations and corresponding evaluation metrics.

Goal 1: Building Trust and Sustainable Partnerships – developing internal capacity for sustained, culturally competent relationship building, as identified in sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3

Goal 2: Developing Targeted Audiences and Specialized Programming – adapting approaches to meet diverse community needs by meeting communities where they gather and recognizing different degrees of "local" across O'ahu, as identified in sections 2.2.5 and 2.2.6

Goal 3: Enhancing Community Awareness and Risk Reduction – leveraging existing community networks and infrastructure for information sharing and preparedness, as identified in section 2.2.4

3.1 Goal 1: Building Trust and Sustainable Partnerships

Stakeholder feedback consistently emphasized that effective community engagement requires sustained relationship investment and cultural competency development that extends far beyond traditional planning cycles. While current planning and public information approaches provide a strong technical foundation, the engagement process revealed opportunities to enhance these capabilities with dedicated relationship-building expertise, cultural competency development, and expanded time allocation for community connection activities. This goal addresses staffing, training, and process changes needed to transform engagement from episodic outreach to year-round partnership building, ensuring technical expertise is enhanced with dedicated relationship-building capabilities.

Objective: Establish long-term partnerships with stakeholders, service providers, and communities that builds trust and extends beyond planning cycles, prioritizing engagement with communities experiencing the highest risk levels and social vulnerability. Partnerships should support ongoing collaboration while accommodating the diverse geographic, cultural, and social communities across O'ahu.

Key Recommendations.

Partnership Development:

- Explore formal partnership agreements with community organizations, faith-based groups, healthcare providers, and cultural networks that outline mutual responsibilities, collaboration frameworks, and sustained engagement commitments
- Focus partnership development on rural communities vulnerable to isolation, urban areas with high social vulnerability, and cultural communities requiring specialized approaches

Staffing and Capacity Development:

- Consider establishing community liaison positions within DEM with cultural competency requirements, sustained relationship-building focus, and year-round engagement responsibilities that complement but remain distinct from PIO/communication functions
- Implement cultural competency training programs that extend beyond language translation to include understanding communication styles, decision-making processes, trust-building approaches, and community social structures

Sustained Engagement Processes:

- Develop year-round engagement programs including quarterly forums and regular participation in existing community events
- Create transparent communication processes that regularly update communities on how their input influences decision-making and ensure community-identified priorities can be incorporated into ongoing planning decisions
- Develop formal processes that combine technical planning expertise with community relationship insights to strengthen both planning quality and implementation capacity

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness.

Objective: Measure specific staffing, training, and process improvements for sustained, culturally competent relationship building.

Key Metrics:

Partnership Quality and Sustainability:

- Annual count of formal community partnerships established and maintained across geographic and cultural areas
- Number of formal partnership agreements established and renewed annually with community organizations, faith-based groups, healthcare providers, and cultural networks
- Count of sustained partnerships maintained for multiple years without interruption

- Annual community trust surveys measuring relationship improvements with emergency management
- Measure geographic and demographic diversity of community engagement participation to ensure broad representation

Staffing and Cultural Competency:

- Number of community liaison positions filled and average tenure in positions
- Number of staff completing cultural competency training annually and post-training assessment scores
- Community feedback surveys measuring improvements in cultural responsiveness and relationship quality (annual)

Sustained Engagement Implementation:

- Hours per month of community outreach conducted outside of planning periods
- Staff participation rates in community events and preparedness fairs quarterly
- Number of community-identified priorities incorporated into ongoing planning decisions annually
- Number of planning decisions that incorporate community relationship insights and stakeholder input
- Community leader participation rates in planning meetings, training events, and emergency responses

3.2 Goal 2: Developing Targeted Audiences and Specialized Programming

Stakeholder input revealed that O‘ahu's diverse communities require tailored engagement approaches that respect existing social structures and recognize the distinct characteristics of different localities. This goal focuses on adapting engagement methods to work within established community frameworks, acknowledging that effective engagement must be customized to geographic, cultural, accessible, and functional differences across O‘ahu.

Objective: Develop specialized engagement approaches and materials for diverse audiences, geographic areas, and stakeholder groups based on risk levels, cultural needs, and community preferences.

Key Recommendations.

Community Assessment and Customization:

- Conduct comprehensive vulnerability assessments to identify audiences requiring specialized engagement which may include considerations such as language, cultural background, accessibility needs, or geographic location
- Develop community-specific engagement approaches that acknowledge different infrastructure capabilities, cultural practices, and communication preferences across island communities
- Establish geographic equity frameworks ensuring rural and isolated communities receive proportionate engagement resources
- Create frameworks for incorporating unique community strengths into island-wide mitigation planning while ensuring each locality receives appropriate engagement resources and attention

Meeting Communities Where They Gather:

- Implement community-centered meeting formats that respect local social structures, decision-making processes, and communication preferences while adapting to diverse community gathering schedules

Capacity Building and Training:

- Create targeted training programs and materials which could include things such as multilingual engagement, trusted local messengers, culture specific protocols, accessibility accommodations, and/or multiple engagement formats

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness.

Objective: Evaluate the effectiveness of specialized engagement approaches, materials, and programming for specific audiences and vulnerable populations.

Key Metrics:

Recognizing Different Degrees of "Local" Across O'ahu:

- Number of vulnerability assessments completed covering language, cultural background, accessibility needs, and geographic location
- Count of community-specific engagement approaches developed and implemented across different localities
- Number of rural and isolated communities receiving proportionate engagement resources (tracked against population and risk levels)
- Number of unique community strengths identified and incorporated into hazard preparedness planning annually

Meeting Communities Where They Gather:

- Number of community-centered meetings held in existing community venues (churches, community centers, cultural organizations)
- Percentage of engagement outreach that adapt to community gathering schedules
- Participation rate comparisons between existing community venues and government-hosted events
- Community feedback scores on meeting format appropriateness and respect for local social structures

Specialized Programming Effectiveness:

- Track participation rates in specialized programs (kupuna workshops, multigenerational planning, cultural training) across target audiences
- Geographic equity assessments measuring engagement resource distribution and participation across rural, urban, and isolated communities
- Cultural community satisfaction with specialized engagement approaches and traditional knowledge integration
- Vulnerable population program effectiveness measured through improved preparedness and reduced emergency incidents
- Collect community feedback on communication clarity, cultural appropriateness, and accessibility across different languages and communication styles

3.3 Goal 3: Enhancing Community Awareness and Risk Reduction

Stakeholders consistently highlighted the wealth of existing community organizations, trusted intermediaries, and established communication networks that can be leveraged for hazard mitigation rather than creating new systems. This goal emphasizes building upon the social infrastructure that already exists and has community trust, focusing on partnership development and information sharing through established relationships rather than parallel government-created channels.

Objective: Increase community awareness of hazard risks and expand participation in mitigation efforts through accessible information, systems, and utilizing established trusted intermediaries.

Key Recommendations.

Risk Information Systems:

- Develop a consolidated risk information database allowing residents to input their address and receive property-specific hazard reports and mitigation guidance
- Create accessible risk information resources that can be shared through existing community channels rather than requiring new technology adoption

Information Sharing Through Existing Networks:

- Create information sharing protocols that work through existing community trust relationships and established communication channels rather than requiring new technology adoption or meeting attendance
- Develop accessible risk information resources and educational materials designed for delivery through community intermediaries, utilizing visual tools, multilingual materials, and community-specific examples

Targeted Educational Campaigns:

- Develop targeted educational campaigns that work within existing community meeting formats, utilizing visual tools, multilingual materials, and community-specific examples
- Create accessibility accommodations for seniors, individuals with disabilities, and socially isolated populations through multiple engagement channels and formats.
- Focus engagement on high-hazard areas including wildfire-prone regions, flood zones, and tsunami evacuation areas while building upon existing community awareness

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness.

Objective: Measure community awareness improvements and participation levels in mitigation activities across different populations and geographic areas.

Key Metrics:

Risk Information Systems:

- Upon completion, assess utilization rates of risk database utilization and user satisfaction across different communities
- Number of residents accessing property-specific hazard information annually

Information Sharing Through Existing Networks:

- Number of formal information sharing agreements established with community organizations annually
- Count of trusted intermediaries (community health workers, building managers, social service providers, cultural leaders) actively distributing emergency preparedness information
- Percentage of hazard information distributed through existing community channels versus direct government distribution
- Community comprehension assessments of hazard risks conducted through culturally appropriate evaluation methods within established community settings

Targeted Educational Campaigns:

- Number of educational campaigns implemented annually in each high-hazard area type (wildfire, flood, tsunami zones)
- Number of community organizations participating in educational campaign delivery
- Number of residents reached through targeted campaigns in high-hazard areas (tracked by campaign type and geographic area)
- Pre- and post-campaign knowledge assessment scores measuring hazard awareness improvements in targeted communities

3.4 Implementation Considerations

While this document outlines three goals for future engagement activities, successful implementation requires DEM to conduct internal planning across several key areas that balance stakeholder engagement with organizational capacity, as outlined below.

Resource Assessment Required

- **Staffing:** Evaluate current capacity for community liaison functions and cultural competency training needs

- **Budget:** Determine funding requirements for year-round engagement programs and formal partnership development
- **Timeline:** Establish implementation phases based on departmental priorities and available resources

Operational Integration

- **Program Alignment:** Map recommendations against existing public education activities
- **Legal Review:** Assess formal partnership agreements for compliance and liability considerations
- **Performance Systems:** Establish baseline metrics and tracking mechanisms for recommended evaluation measures

Strategic Decisions

- **Geographic Prioritization:** Determine which communities to engage first based on risk levels and resource availability
- **Partnership Scope:** Define the extent and formality of community partnership agreements
- **Success Thresholds:** Set specific targets for participation rates, partnership numbers, and engagement frequency

4 Conclusion

The 2025 LHMP engagement process revealed substantial stakeholder assets and opportunities for strengthening emergency management through authentic partnership. SCORE analysis demonstrates that O‘ahu possesses established stakeholder networks, cultural knowledge, and social capital that can enhance hazard preparedness when integrated with professional emergency management capabilities.

Moving forward requires implementing six lessons learned from stakeholder engagement: integrating technical expertise with relationship building, extending relationship investment beyond planning cycles, building dedicated engagement capacity, leveraging existing stakeholder infrastructure, meeting stakeholders where they already gather, and recognizing different degrees of "local" across O‘ahu. These lessons translate into three strategic engagement goals that transform stakeholder interaction from administrative requirement to strategic partnership.

Building trust and sustainable partnerships establishes the staffing, training, and formal agreements needed for year-round stakeholder engagement.

Developing targeted audiences and specialized programming adapts engagement approaches to O‘ahu's diverse geographic, cultural, and functional localities while respecting existing social structures.

Enhancing stakeholder awareness and risk reduction leverages established networks and trusted intermediaries rather than creating parallel engagement systems.

Implementation requires moving beyond traditional planning cycles to establish year-round engagement capacity, develop cultural competency among staff, and create partnership infrastructure that works through existing stakeholder networks. These changes will enable DEM to operate collaboratively with O‘ahu's diverse stakeholders, incorporating local knowledge and cultural wisdom into comprehensive hazard mitigation planning.

Page Intentionally Left Blank.