

**INDEPENDENT STUDY TO
ASSESS FUTURE SAVINGS
FROM MITIGATION
ACTIVITIES**

VOLUME I: FINAL REPORT

March 2005



Applied Technology Council

**INDEPENDENT STUDY TO
ASSESS FUTURE SAVINGS
FROM MITIGATION
ACTIVITIES**

VOLUME I: FINAL REPORT:

PREPARED FOR:

**Multihazard Mitigation Council
National Institute of Building
Sciences**

PREPARED BY:

**Applied Technology Council
FEMA Contract No.
EMW-1998-CO-0217
Task Order 010**

March 2005



Applied Technology Council

Acknowledgements

The following people contributed to this report.

PROJECT TEAM

Project Manager: Thomas R. McLane, Applied Technology Council, Arlington, VA
Project Director: Ronald T. Eguchi, ImageCat, Inc., Long Beach, CA
Community Studies Leader: Elliott Mittler, Consultant, Woodland Hills, CA
Community Studies Co-Leader: Craig Taylor, Natural Hazards Management, Inc., Torrance, CA
National Benefit-Cost Analysis Leader: Adam Z. Rose, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
National Benefit-Cost Analysis Co-Leader: Keith Porter, Consultant, Pasadena, CA
Corey Barber, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA
Jawhar Bouabid, PBS&J, Atlanta, GA
Linda B. Bourque, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA
Stephanie Chang, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC Canada
Nicole Dash, University of North Texas, Denton, TX
James Delahay, LBYD, Inc., Birmingham, AL
Charles Huyck, ImageCat, Inc., Long Beach, CA
Christopher Jones, Consultant, Durham, NC
Megumi Kano, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA
Karl Kappler, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA
Lukki Lam, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA
Rebecca Quinn, Consultant, Annapolis, MD
Christopher Rojahn, Applied Technology Council, Redwood City, CA
Archana More Sharma, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA
Kenneth Strzepek, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO
John Whitehead, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC
Michele M. Wood, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA
Kathryn Woodell, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA
Bo Yang, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

INTERNAL PROJECT REVIEW TEAM

Chair: William Petak, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA
David Brookshire, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
Stephanie King, Weidlinger Associates, Inc., Los Altos, CA
Dennis Mileti, University of Colorado at Boulder, Rancho Mirage, CA
Doug Plasencia, AMEC Earth and Environmental, Tempe, AZ
Zan Turner, City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

CONSULTANTS

James R. McDonald, McDonald-Mehta Engineers, Lubbock, TX
Bruce Miya, Consultant, Salt Lake City, UT
Douglass Shaw, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

CONTRIBUTORS OF DATA AND SOURCE MATERIALS

Alan Escobar, Small Business Administration, Washington, DC
Jeffrey Jensen, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Executive Summary	ix
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose and Background	1
1.2 Federal Mitigation Programs	2
1.3 Study Objectives	2
1.3.1 Benefit-Cost Analysis of FEMA Mitigation Grants	3
1.3.2 Community Studies	3
1.4 Study Characteristics	4
1.5 Organization of Report	4
2.0 Principles and Definitions	7
2.1 Benefit-Cost Analysis	7
2.1.1 Measures of Costs	8
2.1.2 Measures of Benefits	9
2.2 Loss Estimation Modeling	10
2.2.1 Basic Components	11
2.2.2 HAZARDS US-MULTIHAZARD (HAZUS-MH)	12
2.3 Benefit Transfer Methods	13
2.4 Case Study Principles	14
2.5 Definitions	15
2.5.1 Process and Project Activities	15
2.5.2 Synergistic Activities	16
3.0 Data Collection, Processing and Analysis	19
3.1 Existing Data Sources	19
3.1.1 FEMA NEMIS Database	19
3.1.2 FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Files	22
3.1.3 Project Impact Report Files	23
3.1.4 Other Files	24
3.2 Other Primary Datasets	24
3.2.1 Community Studies	24
3.2.2 Benefit-Cost Analysis of FEMA Grants	31
4.0 Methods of Analysis	33

4.1	Parallel Study Components.....	33
4.2	HAZUS-MH and Other Loss Estimation Methodologies	34
4.2.1	Direct Property Damage (Stock Loss)	34
4.2.2	Business Interruption (Flow Loss).....	35
4.2.3	Societal Impacts	39
4.3	Supplemental Methodologies	43
4.3.1	Direct Property Loss—Flood	43
4.3.2	Direct Property Loss—Tornado	45
4.3.3	Business Interruption Loss—Utilities.....	46
4.3.4	Environmental and Historic Benefits.....	46
4.3.5	Process Grants	47
4.3.6	Other.....	51
4.4	Community Studies Analysis.....	51
4.4.1	Purposive Sampling Techniques	52
4.4.2	Field Research	54
4.4.3	Interview Guides.....	57
4.4.4	Benefit-Cost Analysis for Community Studies	57
4.5	Benefit-Cost Analysis of FEMA Mitigation Grants	58
4.5.1	Stratified Sample	58
4.5.2	Calculating Benefit-Cost Ratios for Sample Activities.....	58
4.5.3	Extrapolating Benefits and Costs from Sample to Population.....	59
4.5.4	Potential Future Savings to the Federal Treasury	59
4.5.5	Analyzing Model Sensitivity and Uncertainty	62
5.0	Community Studies Results.....	65
5.1	Sample Communities.....	65
5.2	Community Descriptions.....	67
5.2.1	Freeport New, York.....	67
5.2.2	Hayward, California	73
5.2.3	Horry County, South Carolina	79
5.2.4	Jamestown, North Dakota	84
5.2.5	Jefferson County, Alabama	89
5.2.6	Multnomah County, Oregon	94
5.2.7	City of Orange, California	97
5.2.8	Tuscola County, Michigan	101
5.3	Mitigation Activities Undertaken.....	106
5.3.1	FEMA-Funded Mitigation Activities	106
5.3.2	Synergistic Activities or Effects.....	107
5.4	Benefit-Cost Results	109

5.4.1	Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Grants	109
5.4.2	Project Impact Grants	117
5.4.3	Spin-Off Activities Resulting from Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Grants	121
5.4.4	Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Process Grants	123
5.5	Non-Quantifiable Benefits	124
5.6	Summary	125
6.0	Benefit-Cost Analysis of FEMA Mitigation Grants	127
6.1	Project Selection	127
6.2	Stratified Sample	128
6.3	Sample Results	129
6.3.1	Sampled Project Grants	129
6.3.2	Sampled Process Grants	135
6.4	Extrapolation of Sample Results to Population	137
6.4.1	Breakdown of Results	138
6.4.2	Deaths and Injuries	139
6.4.3	Net Benefits to Society	140
6.4.4	Impacts on the Federal Treasury	140
6.5	Sensitivity Analysis—Tornado Diagrams	141
6.5.1	Earthquake Project Grants	143
6.5.2	Wind Project Grants	144
6.5.3	Flood Project Grants	144
6.6	Other Sensitivity Analyses	146
6.7	Combining Sampling Uncertainty and Modeling Uncertainty	146
6.8	Conclusions	147
7.0	Study Findings	149
	References	151
	Glossary	157