

Appendix

Table A1. Select Participant Background Information

Description	N	Percentage
Men	8	32
Women	8	32
65+ years old	3	12
Chronic health conditions	5	20
Living in an at-risk area	2	8
Have cistern	4	16
Have generator	6	24
Have solar energy	3	12
Have health insurance	9	36
Have home insurance	5	20

Note. Responses were voluntary. Percentages based on an N of 25, but some respondents did not provide information.

Table A2. Project Objectives, Activities, Outputs, and Dates

Objective	Activities	Outputs	Dates
Project Setup and Planning	The research team collaborated with CBOs to align research goals, agenda, and logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kick-off presentation ● Scope of work ● Participant recruitment criteria 	February 1 - March 8
Plan for Co-Design	The research team integrated Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program principles and design research to prepare for co-design sessions with CBOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 3 co-design sessions (discussion & activities guide) 	March 8 - 27
Co-Design and Recruitment	The research team and CBO leaders conducted three co-design workshops to develop and refine the different aspects of the tabletop exercises. CBO leaders also recruited resident and municipal representative participants based on co-created standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Workshop setup presentation ● Exercise modules (scenario + discussion guide) ● Data & prototype for exercise ● Participant role profiles ● Evaluator's guide ● Participant debriefing guide ● Post-exercise survey form 	March 27 - April 19
Tabletop Exercises	The research team conducted one tabletop exercise in each of the three communities. Modifications of the workshop materials were made based on feedback and lessons learned from completed workshops.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Notes ● Modified workshop materials ● Audio recordings ● Transcripts & translation 	May 3 - 5
Synthesis and Writeups	The research team reviewed, annotated, and synthesized notes and transcripts from the workshops and prepared a written report.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Synthesis ● Report 	May 5 - July 14
Disseminate Results	The research team prepared a presentation to share findings and lessons with workshop participants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Presentation ● Summary writeup ● After-action report 	June 26 - July 14

Table A3. Participant Evaluation of the Tabletop Exercises

Assessment Statement	Average Level of Agreement with Statement ^a
The exercise was well-structured and organized	4.84
The facilitator(s) was knowledgeable about the material, kept the exercise on target, and was sensitive to group dynamics	4.88
I felt supported to share and discuss my ideas openly in the small discussion group	4.94
I felt supported to share and discuss my ideas openly in the large discussion group	4.96
I felt encouraged to participate in the decision-making process	4.92
I have learned new things about disaster management from other members of my group	4.88
The ideas I proposed were incorporated into the decision-making process	4.80
The ideas I proposed were incorporated into the final response and results	4.88

Note. Average level of agreement based on Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neither agree or disagree, 2=disagree, and 1=strongly disagree. N = 25.

Table A4. Participant Views of re+connect’s Potential Usefulness for Residents

Assessment Statement	Average Level of Agreement with Statement
Increase residents’ awareness of community disaster management needs and measures	4.91
Increase in positive attitudes toward engaging in disaster planning and risk reduction	4.95
Increase in interactions with other community members	4.94
Increase in civic engagement activities (attending meetings, contact with decision-makers, voting)	4.95
Increase in levels of trust in neighbors and the local community	4.89
Improve trust for their communities and government/agencies	4.90
Improve access to disaster relief resources and services in an equitable and effective manner	4.95
Bridge the gap for residents with special needs	4.82
Reduce time between event onset and service/resource delivery	4.83
Improve residents’ access to and participation in the decision-making process	4.89

Note. Average level of agreement based on Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neither agree or disagree, 2=disagree, and 1=strongly disagree. Statements in bold were identified as the most important. N = 25.

Table A5. Participant Views of re+connect’s Potential Usefulness for Disaster Management Agencies and Community Groups

Assessment Statement	Average Level of Agreement with Statement^a
Improved understanding of community needs	5.00
Easier to connect and coordinate with other organizations	4.90
Easier to connect and coordinate with residents	4.94
Increased interactions with other organizations	4.88
Greater trust with other organizations	4.82
Greater trust with residents	4.83
Improved disaster management planning and preparedness with access to community information and decision-making support	4.95
More inclusive and equitable decision-making process	5.00
Increased access to funding/resources for disaster management activities (preparation, recovery, etc.)	4.95
More equitable and effective resource allocation and distribution	4.95

Note. Average level of agreement based on Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neither agree or disagree, 2=disagree, and 1=strongly disagree. Statements in bold were identified as the most important. N = 25.