


# POST CYCLONE MONICA SURVEY

**MAY 2006**

**Centre for Disaster Studies**

**James Cook University**

**Bureau of Meteorology**



## POST CYCLONE MONICA SURVEY MAY 2006

### Summary

- The experience of Cyclone Monica has not undermined peoples' confidence in cyclone warnings and preparation
- Nearly everyone prepared for the cyclone
- People were

## **Background to Cyclone Monica**

Cyclone Monica was first declared a cyclone in the Coral Sea on April 17<sup>th</sup> 2006. It moved westward crossing the Queensland coast south of Lockhart River on April 19<sup>th</sup> as a category 3. It left the west side of Cape York the next day still a tropical cyclone and tracked north west across the Gulf of Carpentaria intensifying to a category 5 as it neared Nhulunbuy on April 23<sup>rd</sup>. However it remained offshore for the next day, skirting the

Flood waters cut the Arnhem Highway at the Adelaide River and Cox Peninsula Road at Berry Creek. The town bore at Oenpelli was covered with flood water, cutting off the town water supply.

Very heavy rainfall (>100mm) was recorded in parts of the western Arnhem District on 23 and 24 April, in the Darwin-Daly District on 24 and 25 April, and in the Victoria River District on 26 April.

TC Monica was the strongest tropical cyclone on record to affect the Northern Territory. Monica's estimated maximum intensity was stronger than TC Tracy in 1974, TC Neville in 1992 and TC Ingrid in 2005. Monica was an unusual late season tropical cyclone and was the first cyclone to affect the NT area of responsibility in the 2005/06 season.”

BoM website <http://www.bom.gov.au/announcements/sevwx/nt/nttc20060417.shtml> accessed 13/6/6.

A primary issue of cyclone Monica was the reaction of an urban population to preparation for a very severe cyclone that eventuated as a minor event with minimal impact. However, it must be borne in mind that even as late as 12 hours out the uncertainty in the forecast TC track (map) indicated that there was a chance that Darwin would be directly impacted by a severe cyclone.

## **Post Cyclone Monica Survey**

The Centre for Disaster Studies was approached by the Bureau of Meteorology to conduct a brief survey to gauge the reactions of residents to preparation for a severe event that fortunately did not transpire. This was carried out as a brief telephone survey of Darwin residents between 6<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> May. The Bureau had been keen on a separate survey of residents in Arnhem Land communities who were more directly impacted by the cyclone. Unfortunately there are many logistical problems with carrying out telephone surveys in remote locations, and insufficient funds for face to face surveys of the type we had just completed in the Cyclone Larry impact communities. Thus telephone numbers were randomly generated for suburbs of Darwin. These were contacted until surveys of 200 households had been completed (201). A random coverage of Darwin was achieved, but as in all such surveys based on landlines there is a bias against households that are privately listed and those (often lower socio-economic groups) that do not have a telephone. Mobile numbers were not contacted. Nearly all households in the urban area have a phone and as the questionnaire was aimed at household preparation activities the coverage is sufficient to indicate general patterns of behaviour, but does not lend itself to sophisticated statistical tests. Telephone surveyors all had knowledge of Darwin suburbs and previous research experience. Responses were overall positive and helpful.

Responses were partly pre-coded to aid consistency of responses and were mostly entered into the database as coded answers in order to generate simple tables. Telephone surveys are most successful when kept brief and simple, although inevitably the depth of data is reduced. A questionnaire survey was developed in 2005 and used in Port Douglas after category 5 Cyclone Ingrid had threatened the Queensland coast before landfalling in



**Table 3. Preparation by Previous Cyclone Experience**


<b>Preparation</b>	<b>Previously experienced a cyclone</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	
Yes	130	56	186
No	13	2	15
<b>Total</b>	143	58	201

**Table 4. Cyclone Education by Gender**

<b>Cyclone Education</b>	<b>Gender</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	
Yes	56	73	129

**Table 6. Things to do Differently Next Time**

Things to do differently	Count	Col %
Nothing different	130	64.7%
Prepare earlier	35	17.4%
Delay preparations	2	1.0%
Take it more seriously	6	3.0%
Prepare as normal	4	2.0%
Buy extra items	14	7.0%
Review more websites	1	.5%
Leave Darwin	7	3.5%
Refuse to leave home **	1	.5%
Go to evacuation Centre	1	.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



**Figure 2. Preparations Next Time**

Note: “Nothing” means nothing different

T

Text Time by Gender

Male		Female		
Count	Col %	Count	Col %	%



**Table 9. Information Source**

<b>Information Source</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Col %</b>
TV	14	7.0%
Radio	2	1.0%
Friends & relatives	1	.5%
Emergency Services	1	.5%
Internet	15	7.5%
Other sources	3	1.5%
Multiple sources	165	82.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 10. Information Source By Gender**

<b>Information Source</b>	<b>Gender</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	
TV	8	6	14
Radio	2	0	2
Friends & relatives	1	0	1
Emergency Services	0	1	1
Internet	6	9	15

0.48001

exclusively. This follows through into the next question as to which is the preferred site. Only the United States Navy website is a very minor alternative.

**Figure 3. Use of Internet Sites**

**Table 12. Internet Sites Used and Table 13. Preferred Internet Site**

<b>Internet Sites</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Preferred site</b>	<b>Count</b>
bom	102	bom	103
checked with neighbours	1	don't know	9
don't know	4	n/a	78
msn weather	1	none	5
none	79	U.S. Navy	6
U.S. Navy, bom	14	<b>Total</b>	201
<b>Total</b>	201		

**Question 7 and 8.**

**7. Did you look at the cyclone forecast map on the Bureau website or did you see them on TV?**

**8. If you saw the cyclone track forecast map what did you think the grey zone meant?**

Use of the forecast map is high, but there is no important difference either by gender or previous cyclone experience.

**Table 14. Use of Forecast Map**

<b>Forecast Map</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Col %</b>
Yes	186	92.5%
No	15	7.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 15. Use of Forecast Map By Gender**

<b>Forecast Map</b>	<b>Gender</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	
Yes	78	108	186
No	8	7	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>201</b>

**Table 17. Understanding Forecast Map**

Grey Zone	Count	Col %
Forecast track	56	27.9%
Don't know	92	45.8%
Don't remember	15	7.5%
Incorrect answer	23	11.4%
Guessed correctly	10	5.0%
Used legend	5	2.5%
<b>Total</b>	201	100.0%

**Table 18. Understanding Forecast Map by Gender**

Grey Zone	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Forecast track	24	27.9%	32	27.8%	56	27.9%
Don't know	36	41.9%	56	48.7%	92	45.8%
Don't remember	4	4.7%	11	9.6%	15	7.5%
Incorrect answer	14	16.3%	9	7.8%	23	11.4%
Guessed correctly	6	7.0%	4	3.5%	10	5.0%
Used legend	2	2.3%	3	2.6%	5	2.5%
<b>Total</b>	86	100.0%	115	100.0%	201	100.0%

**Table 19. Understanding Forecast Map by Previous Cyclone Experience**

Grey Zone	Previously experienced a cyclone		Total
	Yes	No	
Forecast track	39	17	56
Don't know	68	24	92
Don't remember	11	4	15
Incorrect answer	17	6	23
Guessed correctly	6	4	10
Used legend	2	3	5
<b>Total</b>	143	58	201

**Question 9.**


**9. Were the text messages issued by the Bureau of Meteorology and read out on TV or radio clear and understandable?**

There is universal acclaim for the intelligibility and clarity of the Bureau of Meteorology me



**Table 24. Perception of Cyclone Likelihood. Mean**

	No.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Likelihood of cyclone this decade	201	1.41	.814



**Figure 4. Perceived Likelihood of Further Cyclones this Decade**

**Table 25. Perception of Cyclone Likelihood by Gender**

	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	

There is no difference by gender. Of those who had not previously experienced a cyclone the expectation was slightly mo





Figure 5. Future Preparations

Table 29. Likely Preparations Next Time By Gender

		Gender	
		M	







**Figure 6. Rating of BoM Warnings**

**Table 34. Rating of BoM Warnings by Previous Cyclone Experience**

Rating of BoM warnings	Previously experienced a cyclone		Total
	Yes	No	
Excellent	48	29	77
Very good	63	18	81

although it does not contain that word, but it does come after previous questions that related to information and warnings. However, clearly information is a dominant theme - people want more information, more frequent information, more types of information and so on.

The next table, Table 36, replicates the themes of Table 35 with an emphasis on information, but specifically oriented towards the warnings and information that come from the Bureau of Meteorology. Whether or not some of these comments are realistic is beside the point as these were the responses from the survey. However, 58% had nothing to add and a further 17% gave praise. Of the rest of the comments, which are mostly about more information, the strongest (9%), was for more regular updates.

**Table 35. Improvements for Next Time**

<b>Things to be done differently next time</b>	<b>Count</b>
More accurate info	1
Consistency – radio/TV/pay TV	3
Better category info	1
Check on neighbours	2

**Table 36. General Comments on BoM Information**

<b>Comments on BoM information</b>	<b>Preparation</b>
None	116
OK	3
Good	20
Excellent	10
Better images on TV & internet	1
Caused some panic	1
Quite comprehensive	3
Has improved over the years	1
Inconsistent/complex/more	1
Info accessible and clear	1
Info constant	2
Info on cyclone scattered	1
Like new tracking system	1
More accuracy on cyclone location	1
More details in maps/location	1
More info	1
More info for newcomers	1
More info for remote locations	2
More notice on flooding	1
More public education	1
More regular updates	18
More user friendly info	1
Need more correct info	1
Other languages available	1
Overrated	1

preparation of residential dwellings, against a lack, or even negligence, where workplaces are concerned. It is surprising that a category 1 cyclone sho

## Appendix. Telephone Survey Questionnaire



### POST CYCLONE MONICA SURVEY MAY 2006

**1. What did you do to prepare as the cyclone warnings intensified?**

Yes or No

**2. Did public education campaigns, such as on TV and radio, and pre cyclone season advice have an influence on your preparations?**

Yes or No

**3. What things would you do differently if you are threatened by a severe cyclone again?**

List first thing

**4. Where or who did you get information from about cyclone Monica?**

1. From the TV      2. From radio      3. From friends and relatives  
4. From the Emergency Services      5. From the council      6. From your employer  
7. From your own knowledge and experience      8. Internet      9. Other source

**5. If you used the internet which sites did you use?**

Name them

**6. Which internet site did you prefer?**

Name it

**7. Did you look at the cyclone forecast map on the Bureau website or did you see them on TV?**

Yes or No

**8. If you saw the cyclone track forecast map what did you think the grey zone meant?**

**9. Were the text messages issued by the Bureau of Meteorology and read out on TV or radio clear and understandable?**

Yes No

**10. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is very likely and 5 is very unlikely please rate the likelihood of another cyclone affecting this area in the next 10 years.**

Very likely      1      2      3      4      5      Very unlikely

**11. As Monica weakened very quickly, how do you feel about preparing for a major cyclone next time? On a scale of 1 - 5, where 1 you are far more likely to make comprehensive cyclone preparations next time there is a major cyclone threat in your area. and 5 = you are far less likely.**

1	2	3	4	5
Much more likely	More likely	About the same	Less likely	Much less likely