Challenges and Opportunities in Incorporating Volunteers in Flood Rescue Operations: Perspectives of Emergency Managers (EMs)



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSIT Hazard Reduction & Recovery Center

Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning | Hazard Reduction and Recovery Center | Texas A&M University

Introduction

Introduction:

Coordination of volunteer convergence, especially spontaneous volunteers, is a known challenge for emergency management (EM). While previous studies focus on volunteer motivation and volunteer management challenges across all disaster response tasks, we focus on volunteer search and rescue (SAR) coordination. Volunteer assistance in SAR is particularly undervalued and underutilized due to coordination, liability, and capacity challenges. Yet, with increasing disaster frequency and impacts, local volunteer resources must be systematically integrated into formal emergency SAR protocols to support growing needs.

We advance volunteer convergence research by describing emergency managers' perspectives on working with SAR volunteers and groups. The goal is to support EM in harnessing spontaneous disaster volunteers as strategic, long-term partners rather than temporary assets.

Research Question:

What are the challenges and opportunities observed by emergency manager's (EMs) in incorporating spontaneous volunteers or volunteer teams in flood SAR operations?

Methodology

Data Collection:

- Semi-structured interviews with 26 emergency managers (EMs) who worked with volunteers during flood rescue operations.
- EMs operating in areas impacted by Hurricanes Harvey (2017), Irma (2017), Florence (2018), Ida (2021), and Tropical Storm Imelda (2019) (see Table 1). All county and city EMs in areas affected by these disasters were identified and contacted for interviews. Snowball sampling expanded the sample. Data collection occurred from 2018-2022, and continued until data saturation was reached.

Table 1. Locations of Emergency Managers Interviewed

Louisiana		Texas		Florida	North Carolina	
Parishes	Cities	Counties	Cities	Cities	Counties	Citie
East Baton Rouge <i>,</i> Terrebonne	New Orleans, Zachary	Liberty, Galveston, Montgomery	Texas City, Friends- wood	Orange	Craven, Alamance, Madison	New Gree

- Interview topics included:
 - Experience with SAR volunteers and volunteer SAR groups;
 - Communication and coordination strategies with SAR volunteers;
 - EM understanding of volunteer SAR groups operations;
 - EM support for SAR volunteers;
 - Effectiveness of volunteer SAR; and
 - Perspectives on challenges and benefits of volunteer SAR.

Analysis:

- Performed using Atlas.ti.
- Grounded theory approach with descriptive coding.
- Codes/ sub-codes as I) Challenges; II) Opportunities; III) Both.
- Eight categories emerged.
- Categories explained in analysis using: I) 'Assertion development' technique with 'low-level inferences' II) Coded quotations from the interview transcripts.



Haider Waseem Anwar and Michelle Meyer, PhD

Narratives of Emergency Managers on Volunteer SAR

Capacity Issues:

- convergence

Efficiency and Commitment:

- commitment to the task

Resource Management:

- Need for local integration
- vests available)

Institutional Barriers:

Strong Values:

uncertainty

Coordination and Communication:

Social Media and Technology:

- rescue operation

Liability, Safety, and Injury:

- responsibility

Emergency managers see both the benefit of the resources that SAR volunteers and groups bring to large-scale disasters and appreciate volunteers' drive to help. EMs, though, saw numerous challenges related to communication styles, EM capacity to manage volunteer convergence, cross-jurisdiction integration of volunteers, social media, volunteer efficiency, and liability.

Further research should assess: differing perspectives on organized volunteer groups that converge - such as "Cajun Navies" - and individual spontaneous volunteers; how to address liability and vetting concerns; how to manage communication, and how to improve EM volunteer management capacity.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1851493 and 1760344. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.



Science Foundation

• SAR volunteers offer needed resources in large disasters, yet integration remains chaotic due to EM capacity to manage volunteer

Need for proactive volunteer mobilization

• Without integration, EMs questioned some volunteers efficiency and

 Self-deployment undermined command and control, resulting in what EMs felt was inappropriate activities

• Need for adequate resource allocation

• Resource mis-match (i.e. number of seats in a boat versus number of

• Poor interagency collaboration about volunteers

• Volunteers lack of knowledge about jurisdictional lines

Volunteers have a strong sense of compassion to tackle risk and

 Lack of communication methods during rescue operations • Duplication of effort and misidentification of where need is

 Some volunteer groups show effective use of technology/ apps to enhance their internal coordination

• Yet social media misinformation undermines efficiency of the whole

• EMs concerned about accountability for property damage, injuries, and fatalities when volunteers are operating

• Without vetting volunteers, EMs were concerned with legal

Conclusions and Further Research