Appendix C:

Economic Analysis of Natural Hazard Mitigation Projects

This appendix outlines three approaches for conducting economic analysis of natural hazard mitigation projects. It describes the importance of implementing mitigation activities, different approaches to economic analysis of mitigation strategies, and methods to calculate costs and benefits associated with mitigation strategies. Information in this section is derived in part from the *State Hazard Mitigation Plan*, created by the Interagency Hazards Mitigation Team (Oregon State Police – Office of Emergency Management, 2000); and FEMA Publication 331, *Report on Costs and Benefits of Natural Hazard Mitigation*.

This appendix is not intended to provide a comprehensive description of benefit/cost analysis, nor is it intended to provide the details of economic analysis methods that can be used to evaluate local projects. This appendix is intended to raise benefit/cost analysis as an important issue and to provide some background on how economic analysis can be used to evaluate mitigation projects.

Why Evaluate Mitigation Strategies?

Mitigation activities reduce the cost of disasters by minimizing property damage, injuries, and the potential for loss of life, and reduce emergency response costs. Evaluating natural hazard mitigation provides decision makers with an understanding of the potential benefits and costs of an activity, as well as a basis upon which to compare alternative projects.

Evaluating mitigation projects is a complex and difficult undertaking, influenced by many variables. Natural disasters affect entire communities – its individuals, businesses, and essential services such as fire, police, and utilities. While some of the direct and indirect costs of disaster damages are quantifiable, some costs are not monetary and cannot be quantified in dollars. Negative impacts of events with no true monetary value can undulate throughout the community, increasing the disaster's social and economic consequences.

While not easily accomplished, assessing the positive and negative impacts from mitigation activities and obtaining an instructive cost/benefit analysis holds value from a public policy perspective. If such assessment and analysis were not completed, then it is more

difficult to achieve an objective understanding of the reasons to pursue various mitigation options.

What Are Some Economic Analysis Approaches for Mitigation Strategies?

The approaches used to identify the benefits and costs associated with natural hazards mitigation strategies or actions fall into three general categories: benefit/cost analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, and the STAPLE/E approach. The distinction between the three methods is how relative costs and benefits are measured. In addition, there are varying approaches to assessing the value of mitigation for public sector and private sector activities.

Benefit/Cost Analysis

Benefit/cost analysis is a key mechanism used by the Oregon Office of Emergency Management (OEM), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and other state and federal agencies in evaluating hazard mitigation projects. The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, Public Law 93-288 requires benefit/cost analysis, as amended.

Benefit/cost analysis is used in natural hazards mitigation to show if the benefits to life and property protected through mitigation efforts exceed the cost of the mitigation activity. Conducting benefit/cost analysis for a mitigation activity can assist communities in determining whether a project is worth undertaking now in order to avoid disaster-related damages later. Benefit/cost analysis is based on calculating: (1) the frequency and severity of a hazard, (2) avoided future damages, and (3) risk.

In benefit/cost analysis, all costs and benefits are evaluated in terms of dollars, and a net benefit/cost ratio is computed to determine whether a project should be implemented. For example, if net benefits exceed net costs, then the project is worth pursuing. A project must have a benefit/cost ratio greater than 1 in order to be funded.

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Cost-effectiveness analysis evaluates how best to spend a given amount of money to achieve a specific goal. This type of analysis, does not necessarily measure costs and benefits in terms of dollars. Determining the economic feasibility of mitigating natural hazards can be organized according to the perspective of persons or entities with an economic interest in the outcome. Economic analysis approaches are covered for both public and private sectors as follows.

Investing in Public Sector Mitigation Activities

Evaluating mitigation strategies in the public sector is complicated because it involves estimating all of the economic benefits and costs regardless of who realizes them, which potentially means the benefits and costs to a large number of people and economic

entities. As previously stated, some benefits cannot be evaluated monetarily, but still affect the public in profound ways. Economists have developed methods to evaluate the economic feasibility of public decisions that involve a diverse set of beneficiaries and non-market benefits.

Investing in Private Sector Mitigation Activities

Private sector mitigation activities tend to occur based on one of two approaches. The activity may be mandated by a regulation or standard, or it may be economically justified on its own merits. A building or land owner, whether a private entity or a public agency required to conform to a mandated standard may consider the following options:

1. Request cost sharing from public agencies;
2. Dispose of the building or land either by sale or demolition;
3. Change the designated use of the building or land and change the hazard mitigation compliance requirement; or
4. Evaluate the most feasible alternatives and initiate the most cost-effective hazard mitigation alternative.

The sale of a building or land triggers another set of concerns. Real estate disclosure laws require sellers of real property to disclose to prospective purchasers known defects and deficiencies in the property, including structural weaknesses and hazards. Correcting deficiencies can be expensive and time consuming, but such deficiencies can prevent the sale of the property. The buyer and seller can negotiate conditions of the sale and price due to known defects and deficiencies in the property.

STAPLE/E Approach

Conducting detailed benefit/cost or cost-effectiveness analysis for every possible mitigation activity could be very time consuming and may not be practical. There are alternative approaches for conducting a swift evaluation of the proposed mitigation activities to identify mitigation activities that merit a more detailed assessment. One of these methods is the STAPLE/E Approach.

Using STAPLE/E criteria, steering committees can quickly and systematically evaluate mitigation activities. These criteria require the committee to assess the mitigation activities based on Social, Technical, Administrative, Political, Legal, Economic, and Environmental (STAPLE/E) constraints and opportunities of implementing the particular mitigation item in the community.

The second chapter in FEMA's how-to guide, "Developing the Mitigation Plan – Identifying Mitigation Actions and Implementation Strategies," as well as the "State of Oregon Local Natural Hazard Mitigation Plans: An Evaluation Process" outline some specific considerations in analyzing each aspect. The following are

suggestions for how to examine each element of the STAPLE/E Approach from the "State of Oregon Local Natural Hazard Mitigation Plans: An Evaluation Process."

Social: Community development staff, local non-profit organizations, or a local planning board can help answer the following questions:

- Is the proposed action socially acceptable to the community?
- Are there equity issues involved that would result in one segment of the community being treated unfairly?
- Would the action cause social disruption?

Technical: The city or county public works staff and building department staff can help answer the following questions:

- Would the proposed action work?
- Would the proposed action create more problems than it solves?
- Does the proposed action solve a problem or only a symptom of the problem?
- Is the proposed action the most useful action in light of other community goals?

Administrative: Elected officials or the city or county administrator, can help answer the following questions:

- Could the community implement the action?
- Is there someone to coordinate and lead the effort?
- Is there sufficient funding, staff, and technical support available?
- Are there on-going administrative requirements that must be met?

Political: Consult the city council or county board of commissioners, city or county administrator, and local planning commissions to help answer the following questions:

- Is the action politically acceptable?
- Is there public support to implement and to maintain the project?

Legal: Include legal counsel, land use planners, risk managers, and city council or county board of commission members, among others, in answering the following questions:

- Is the community authorized to implement the proposed action? Is there a clear legal basis or precedent for this activity?

- Are there legal side effects? Could the activity be construed as a taking?
- Is the proposed action allowed by the comprehensive plan, or must the comprehensive plan be amended to allow the proposed action?
- Will the community be liable for action or lack of action?
- Will the activity be challenged?

Economic: Community economic development staff, civil engineers, building department staff, and the county assessor's office can help answer the following questions:

- What are the costs and benefits of this action?
- Do the benefits exceed the costs?
- Are initial, maintenance, and administrative costs considered?
- Has funding been secured for the proposed action? If not, what are the potential funding sources (public, non-profit, and private)?
- How will this action affect the fiscal capability of the community?
- What burden will this action place on the tax base or local economy?
- What are the budget and revenue effects of this activity?
- Does the action contribute to other community goals, such as capital improvements or economic development?
- What benefits will the action provide? (This can include dollar amount of damages prevented, number of homes protected, credit under the CRS, potential for funding under the HMGP or the FMA program, etc.)

Environmental: Watershed councils, environmental groups, land use planners and natural resource managers can help answer the following questions:

- How would the action impact the environment?
- Would the action need environmental regulatory approvals?
- Would the action meet local and state regulatory requirements?
- Would endangered or threatened species likely to be affected?

The STAPLE/E approach is helpful for conducting a swift analysis of mitigation projects. Most projects that seek federal funding require more detailed benefit/cost analyses.

When to use the Various Approaches

It is important to realize that various funding sources require different types of economic analyses. The following figure is to serve as a guideline for when to use the various approaches.



Implementing the Approaches

Benefit/cost analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, and the STAPLE/E approach are important tools in evaluating whether or not to implement a mitigation activity. A framework for evaluating alternative mitigation activities is set forth below.

Estimating the costs and benefits of a hazard mitigation strategy can be a complex process.

Employing the services of a specialist can assist in this process.

1. **Identify the Alternatives**
   Activities to reduce the risk from natural hazards can include structural projects to enhance disaster resistance, education and outreach, and acquisition or demolition of exposed properties, among others. Different mitigation projects can assist in minimizing risk to natural hazards, but accomplish this at varying economic costs.

2. **Calculate the Costs and Benefits**
   Choosing economic criteria is essential to systematically calculating costs and benefits of mitigation projects and selecting the most appropriate alternative. Potential economic criteria with which to evaluate alternatives include:

   - ***Determine the project cost.*** This may include initial project development costs and repair and operating costs of maintaining projects over time.
   - ***Estimate the benefits.*** Projecting the benefits resulting from a project can be difficult. Expected future returns from the mitigation effort depend on the correct specifications of the risk and the effectiveness of the project, which may not be well known. Expected future costs depend on the physical durability and

potential economic obsolescence of the investment. This is difficult to project. These considerations will also provide guidance in selecting an appropriate salvage value. Future tax structures and rates must be projected. Financing alternatives must be researched, and they may include retained earnings, bond and stock issues, and commercial loans.

- ***Consider costs and benefits to society and the environment.*** These are not easily measured, but can be assessed through a variety of economic tools including existence value or contingent value theories. These theories provide quantitative data on the value people attribute to physical or social environments. Even without hard data impacts of structural projects to the physical environment or to society should be considered when implementing mitigation projects.
- ***Determine the correct discount rate.*** Determination of the discount rate can be merely the risk-free cost of capital, but it may include the decision maker's time preference and also a risk premium. Consideration should be given for including inflation.

3. Analyze and Rank the Alternatives

Once costs and benefits have been quantified, economic analysis tools can rank the alternatives. Two methods for determining the best alternative given varying costs and benefits include net present value and internal rate of return.

- ***Net present value.*** Net present value is the value of the expected future returns of an investment less the value of expected future cost expressed in today's dollars. If the net present value is greater than the project costs, the project may be determined feasible for implementation. Selecting the discount rate, and identifying the present and future costs and benefits of the project calculates the net present value of projects.
- ***Internal Rate of Return.*** Using the internal rate of return method to evaluate mitigation projects provides the interest rate equivalent to the dollar returns expected from the project. Once the rate has been calculated, it can be compared to rates earned by investing in alternative projects. Projects may be feasible to implement when the internal rate of return is greater than the total cost of the project.

Once the mitigation projects are ranked on the basis of economic criteria, decision makers can consider other factors, such as risk, project effectiveness, and economic, environmental, and social returns in choosing the appropriate project for implementation.

How Are Benefits of Mitigation Calculated?

Economic Returns of Natural Hazard Mitigation

Estimating economic returns, which accrue to property owners as a result of natural hazard mitigation, is difficult. Owners evaluating

the economic feasibility of mitigation should consider reductions in physical damages and financial losses such as the following:

- Building damages avoided
- Content damages avoided
- Inventory damages avoided
- Rental income loss avoided
- Relocation and disruption expenses avoided
- Proprietor's income losses avoided

These factors can be estimated using observed prices, costs, and engineering data. The difficult part is correctly determining the effectiveness of the hazard mitigation project and the resulting reduction in damages and losses. Equally as difficult is assessing the probability that an event would occur. The damages and losses should only include those borne by the owner. The salvage value of the investment could be important in determining economic feasibility. This is important because most businesses depreciate assets over a period of time.

Additional Costs from Natural Hazards

Property owners should also assess changes in a broader set of factors that can change as a result of a large natural disaster. These are usually indirect effects, but they can have a very direct effect on the economic value of the owner's property. They can be positive or negative, and include changes in the following:

- Commodity and resource prices
- Availability of resource supplies
- Commodity and resource demand changes
- Building and land values
- Capital availability and interest rates
- Availability of labor
- Economic structure
- Infrastructure
- Regional exports and imports
- Local, state, and national regulations and policies
- Insurance availability and rates

Changes in the assets listed above are difficult to estimate and require models that are structured to estimate total economic impacts. Total economic impacts are the sum total of direct and indirect economic impacts. Many models exist to estimate total economic impacts of changes in an economy. Decision makers should understand the total

economic impacts of natural disasters in order to calculate the benefits of a mitigation activity. This suggests that understanding the local economy is an important first step in being able to understand the potential impacts of a disaster, and the benefits of mitigation activities.

Additional Considerations

Conducting an economic analysis for potential mitigation activities can assist decision makers in choosing the most appropriate strategy for their community to reduce risk and prevent loss from natural hazards. Economic analysis can also save time and resources from being spent on inappropriate or unfeasible projects. Several resources and models are listed on the following page that can assist in conducting an economic analysis for natural hazard mitigation activities.

Benefit/cost analysis is complicated, and the numbers may divert attention from other important issues. It is important to consider the qualitative factors of a project associated with mitigation that cannot be evaluated economically.

There are alternative approaches to implementing mitigation projects. Many communities are looking towards developing multi-objective projects. With this in mind, opportunity arises to develop strategies that integrate natural hazards mitigation with projects related to watersheds, environmental planning, community economic development, and small business development, among others. Incorporating natural hazard mitigation with other community projects can increase the viability of project implementation.

Resources

University of California, Berkeley. *Methodologies for Evaluating the Socio-Economic Consequences of Large Earthquakes.* Task 7.2 Economic Impact Analysis, CUREe Kajima Project. Project Team: Robert A. Olson, VSP Associates, Team Leader; John M. Eidinger, G&E Engineering Systems; Kenneth A. Goettel, Goettel & Associates, Inc.; Gerald L. Horner, Hazard Mitigation Economics, Inc. 1997.

United States. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Benefit/Cost Analysis of Hazard Mitigation Projects.* Riverine Flood, Version 1.05, Hazard Mitigation Economics, Inc. 1996.

United States. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Report on Costs and Benefits of Natural Hazard Mitigation.* Publication 331. 1996.

Goettel, Kenneth A., and Gerald L. Horner. *Earthquake Risk Analysis Volume III: The Economic Feasibility of Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings in the City of Portland.* Submitted to the Bureau of Buildings, City of Portland, Oregon. August 30, 1995.

Goettel, Kenneth A., and Gerald L. Horner. *Benefit/Cost Analysis of Hazard Mitigation Projects Volume V, Earthquakes.* Prepared for FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Branch. October 25, 1995.

Horner, Gerald L. *Benefit/Cost Methodologies for Use in Evaluating the Cost Effectiveness of Proposed Hazard Mitigation Measures.* Prepared for Oregon State Police, Office of Emergency Management. July 1999.

Interagency Hazards Mitigation Team. *State Hazard Mitigation Plan.* Oregon State Police, Office of Emergency Management. 2000.

Risk Management Solutions, Inc. *Development of a Standardized Earthquake Loss Estimation Methodology, Volumes I and II.* Nation Institute of Building Sciences. 1994.

VSP Associates, Inc. *A Benefit/Cost Model for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings, Volumes I & 2.* FEMA Publication Numbers 227 and 228. 1991.

VSP Associates, Inc. *Benefit/Cost Analysis of Hazard Mitigation Projects: Section 404 Hazard Mitigation Program and Section 406 Public Assistance Program, Volume 3: Seismic Hazard Mitigation Projects.* 1993.

VSP Associates, Inc. *Seismic Rehabilitation of Federal Buildings: A Benefit/Cost Model, Volume 1.* FEMA Publication Number 255. 1994.