TEAM PATHFINDERS CRITICAL THINK PIECE

Incorporating The Human Cost Of Flooding In Corps Project Analyses

SEPTEMBER 2006

Team Pathfinders

Barbara Blumeris, New England District, NAD **(978)** 318-8737 Barbara.R.Blumeris@usace.army.mil Randy Campbell, Huntington District, LRD **(304) 399-5825** RandyC@lrh.usace.army.mil Dana Needham, Little Rock District, SWD **(501) 324-7343** Dana.O.Needham@usace.army.mil Jeremy Weber, Portland District, NWD **■**(503) 808-4735 Jeremy.J.Weber@usace.army.mil

Team Pathfinders Critical Think Piece

This critical think piece will discuss Corps policy on flood damage reduction project justification and examine the considerations of the human cost of flooding (HCoF).

National Flood Problems

- 94 Million Acres identified in 100-year flood plain
- Over 20,000 Communities flood prone
- 15% have any flood protection
- 30% of at risk structures carry flood insurance
- 25% of structures along coastlines subject to erosion over the next 60 years

We do not have a national Flood Protection Policy

Floods and Hurricanes Have Been Around for a Long Time



They Were Part of Early North American History



And US History



Flooding







The Galveston, Texas, hurricane of 1900 remains one of the worst natural disasters in American history. More than 8,000 people perished September 8, 1900 when the Category 4 hurricane barreled into Galveston. Would this happen today? It's possible. Even though there have been great advances in weather forecasting and protective measures have been put in place, many people in the United States live in high risk areas.



Hurricane Andrew

Hurricane Andrew came booming ashore in 1992 in South Florida, causing losses of \$27 billion; human casualties were relatively light, but human suffering and displacement were significant.

Hurricane Katrina

- More than 1,300 dead and many more missing
- Estimated \$100 billion in damages
- 41 miles of levees/floodwalls severely damaged
- 128 miles of levees/floodwalls minor damage
- 732,000 acre-ft floodwater removed (including Hurricane Rita)







The Corps' current role



Reconstruction
New Construction
Floodplain Management
Etc.



The Corps' Flood Damage Reduction Infrastructure Has Provided Protection to Millions



But ... We Have Not Solved the Flood Challenge

• 70 Years of "Flood Control" or "Flood Damage Reduction"

- 38 Years of Flood Insurance
- Increasing Flood Damages
 - Average annual losses \$6 Billion (BK)
- Inadequate Protection
- Inadequate Maintenance







Trend line indicates increasing overall number of storms per year since 1850.*

* Does not include record breaking year of 2005.

U.S. Natural Disasters that Caused the Most Death and Damage to Property

Current Corps Policy

- Principles and Standards 1965
 Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Resources Implementation Studies (P&G) – Water Resources Council (1983)
 Established the National Economic Development Account (NED) for project justification
- Also allows for EQ, RED, and OSE accounts

Guidance Beyond Ned

The Water Resources Development Act (1986) - "... the well-being of the people of the United States...and the prevention of the loss of life..." The National Environmental Policy Act (1969) Collaborative planning draft interim implementation procedures (2006) Congress directs Corps not to apply traditional NED Analysis to Hurricane Katrina alternative analysis

What is the Human Cost of Flooding...How do we quantify it??

HCoF Categories

Number of lives saved Cost to society due to loss of wage earner Cost of displacement Disruption to family structure Disruption of business Cost of medical treatment Increased illness/injury/disabilities Social impacts Increased divorce rate Increased child abuse/neglect

Disruption to family structure

Human cost of business disruption

Overcapacity and strain on surviving infrastructure/services

Costs involving reduction of bio-hazards (water and air pollutants)

Costs involving biological entities treatment for disease-carrying insects

How Do We Value Human Life?

WILLINGNESS TO PAY MODEL LOSS OF EARNING POTENTIAL FOR AN INDIVUAL EXAMPLES:

- OXFAM International -- \$2.40/Based on cost to purchase sufficient bullets to kill an opponent in Baghdad
- U.S. EPA -- \$3.7 million/EPA calculated based on increase in pay provided to workers in higher risk jobs
- U.S. DOT -- \$3 million/Loss of life through traffic signals
- U.S. Courts Human capitol model; \$ Value varies by income and age

Human Life Value Calculator

http://www.dinkytown.net/java/HumanLifeValue.html

Where to include the HCoF in Corps Analyses...What are the implications?

Where to account for it...

We always consider the no-action alternative
 Leave HCoF in OSE account
 Advantages – easy, status quo, not controversial
 Disadvantages – lack of true and complete economic analysis, leaves public at risk, no account for changing climate conditions, failure to learn from past lessons (Katrina)

Where to account for it...

Leave in OSE, *but* truly weigh it!

NED + OSE

Advantages Provide greater level of protection than **NED** alone ■ Increase in nonstructural projects (easier to justify) Not a radical change Increase flood

Disadvantages Increases cost Who pays for it? Recommending projects with lower benefits to cost ratios Little support from ASA(CW) and OMB

OSE Over NED

OSE Over NED

Advantages Protection/ environmental justice Easier to justify nonstructural projects Not a radical change (Section 202) Increase flood hazard awareness Watershed based

Disadvantages Ability to pay analysis Recommending projects with lower benefit to cost ratios Potential BCR less than 1; requiring Congressional authorization (individually or programmatically)

Include HCoF in NED

- Advantages
 - Accounts for all benefits and costs
 - Should provide the correct level of protection
 - Environmental justice
 - Leads to better decisions on Federal expenditures

- Disadvantages
 - Monetizing human life is controversial
 - Seemingly radical change from norm
 - Increase cost of projects—more projects to be built
 - How to prioritize projects
 - Changes justification threshold?

Recommendations?

HCoF must be seriously considered; current Corps analysis could be improved
Team recommends inclusion of HCoF in NED
If a national flood policy is developed, HCoF will need to be included.
The same methodologies for computing benefits and

costs across the board for all Federal agencies

Meanwhile, back on the Farm...

The public waits...

TEAM PATHFINDERS

Barbara Blumeris, New England District, NAD **(978)** 318-8737 Barbara.R.Blumeris@usace.army.mil Randy Campbell, Huntington District, LRD **(304) 399-5825** RandyC@lrh.usace.army.mil Dana Needham, Little Rock District, SWD **(501) 324-7343** Dana.O.Needham@usace.army.mil Jeremy Weber, Portland District, NWD **■**(503) 808-4735 Jeremy.J.Weber@usace.army.mil