INTRODUCTION TO THE LIFE SAFETY RISK INDICATOR (LSRI)

Jason Needham, P.E. USACE Risk Management Center





Efficient methodology to "answer" the question:

How much will a proposed flood risk management project reduce risk to life?



LIFE SAFETY, LSRI, AND YOU!



- The FY25 budget development process will use LSRI results to screen feasibility studies, PED and construction work packages to identify those for which *life safety benefits* might play a role in justifying funding.
 - Not a new requirement
 - LSRI or LSHI (Life Safety Hazard Indicator) has been required for budgeting* for many years
 - Consistent, defendable results were difficult to obtain from previous methods
- LSRI 2.0 leverages consequence methodology and framework of LST 2.0.
- Support initial understanding of life safety in flood and coastal storm risk management studies





WHAT CHALLENGES HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED WHEN IT COMES TO ESTIMATING LIFE SAFETY RISK?



5

Click on the Annotation option \mathcal{M} in the top right-hand corner of your screen (to the left of the participant list if open) and then use the Pencil Tool or checkmark to mark your response.



RISK AND THE LSRI





Problem Statement:

What is the lowest level-of-effort that can be applied to generate credible risk results?







LSRI = Life Safety Risk Indicator ≈ Expected Annual Life Loss Reduced





LIFE LOSS ESTIMATION BASICS

Life loss calculation essential elements:

- Initial distribution of people
- Redistribution of people
 - > Warning
 - Response
 - Evacuation potential
- Flood characteristics
 - Arrival time, depth, velocity
- Shelter provided by final location
- Fatality rates
- Indirect life loss







LIFE LOSS ESTIMATION BASICS



Life loss calculation essential elements:

- Initial distribution of people
- Redistribution of people
 - > Warning
 - Response
 - Evacuation potential
- Flood characteristics
 - > Arrival time, depth, velocity
- Shelter provided by final location

NSI 2.0

User inputs for:

- 1. Evacuation Planning
- 2. Community Awareness
- 3. Flood Warning Effectiveness
- 4. Hazard Advance Notice

Simplified HEC-RAS

Simplified LifeSim

Fatality rates





EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS



ock Island District

CEDAR RAPIDS FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT CONSTRUCTION STATUS





• Recommended alternative provides protection along the east bank of the Cedar River. It includes earthen levees, floodwalls, and closure structures for a total length of 3.15 miles.



CEDAR RAPIDS PROJECT AREA









STRUCTURE INVENTORY/PAR



Project Area Information

Base Data

Day population in Project Area	18,3
Night population in Project Area	3,7
Number of Structures in Project	1,4
Property Value in Project Area (\$1000s)	3,756,0

Index Factors

Population Day Index Factor *

Population Night Index Factor *

Property Value Index Factor *

Indexed Data (Used In Compute)

Daytime Population Estimate	18,366
Nighttime Population Estimate	3,772
Number of Structures in Project	1,455
Area Property Value in Project Area	3,756,09
(\$1000s)	

1.0

1.0

	Map Structure Summary					River Centerline	Project Area	NSI Structures
		POPULATION			STRUCTURE			
8,366	DAMAGE CATEGORY	UNDER 65 DAY	OVER 65 DAY	UNDER 65 NIGHT	OVER 65 NIGHT	# STRUCTURES	STRUCTURAL VALUE (\$1000S)	CONTENT VALUE (\$1000S)
3,772	Residential	1,644	557	2,402	580	603	283,315	179,526
56,098	Public	1,567	34	32	0	80	77,230	87,108
	Commercial	13,076	660	686	29	688	1,242,788	1,474,106
	Industrial	791	37	41	2	84	167,302	244,724
1.0	Total	17,078	1,288	3,161	611	1,455	1,770,635	1,985,463

Number of Stories Construction Type Foundation Height



Comments







LSRI INPUTS

- AEP start of damages
 - 10-yr event (approximately)
 - Private levees
- AEP design event
 - 750-yr event (2008 flood)
- Design event hydrograph





LSRI INUNDATION









CONSEQUENCE RESULTS



EXPAND ALL		
Evacuation Planning		
Which category best describes the emergency evacuation planning for the community of the communities located in the leveed area?	Flood Specific	~
Comments (0 characters)		
Community Awareness		
Which category best describes the flood risk awareness of the community or communities located in the leveed area?	Very Aware	~
Comments (0 characters)		
Flood Warning Effectiveness		
Which category best describes the flood warning capabilities of the community or communities in the leveed area?	Fast	~
Comments (0 characters)		
Hazard Advanced Notice		
How would you describe the amount of warning time available prior to first structure getting wet?	Moderate	~
Comments (0 characters)		

PARAMETER	DAY	NIGHT		
PAR	8,358	5,693		
Exposed PAR	155	110		
Exposed %	1.85%	1.92%		
Life Loss	1 1			
Life Loss (Exposure Weighted)	1.00			
Fatality Rate	0.01% 0.02%			
Life Loss as % of PAR	0.02%			
Weighted Fatality Rate (% of Exposed PAR)	0.79%			
Property Damages	\$760M			
# Structures Inundated	785			



LSRI RESULTS – CEDAR RIVER CEDAR RAPIDS



Table B-73c. Summary of Annual Charges for Alternative 4C(Oct 2010 prices, 4-1/8% Discount Rate, 50-Year Evaluation Period)

Description	Amount
Estimated NED Cost	98,543,755
Interest During Construction	8,864,157
Total Economic Costs	107,407,912
Annual Interest & Amortization	5,107,353
Annual Operation & Maintenance ¹	17,679
Total Annual Charges	5,125,032

LSRI and CSSL Inputs		Results	
AEP for Damage 🕄	0.02	LSRI 🕄	0.01
AEP for Design 🕄	0.00133	CSSL 🕄	\$549,012,533.48
Exposure Weighted Life Loss	1		
Annualized Project Cost 🕄	\$5,125,032.00		



NORFOLK CSRM PLAN





LEGEND

Structural Flood Risk Management Measures

- Ghent-Downtown-Harbor Park
- Pretty Lake Surge Barrier
 - Lafayette Outer Surge Barrier
 - Broad Creek Surge Barrier

Structural Measures Risk Management Area

Hatched Area Indicates Non-Structural Measures

- Ghent-Downtown-Harbor Park
 Pretty Lake Surge Barrier
 Lafayette Outer Surge Barrier
 Broad Creek Surge Barrier
 Campostella-Berkley Non-Structural Measures Area
 Critical Infrastructure
 Evacuation Route
 Navy Base
 Water
 - Major Road
 - Railroad



PRETTY LAKE SURGE BARRIER

Project Area Information

Base Data	
Day population in Project Area	17,624
Night population in Project Area	24,417
Number of Structures in Project Area	8,186
Property Value in Project Area (\$1000s)	3,323,478

Index Factors

Population Day Index Factor *	1.0
Population Night Index Factor *	1.0
Property Value Index Factor *	1.0

Indexed Data (Used In Compute)

Daytime Population Estimate	17,624
Nighttime Population Estimate	24,417
Number of Structures in Project Area	8,186
Property Value in Project Area (\$1000s)	3,323,478





PRETTY LAKE SURGE BARRIER

20

PARAMETER	DAY	NIGHT		
PAR	5,257	5,257		
Exposed Population	248	248		
% of PAR Exposed	4.72%	4.72%		
Life Loss	0	0		
Fatality Rate	0.00%	0.00%		
Life Loss (Exposure Weighted)	0.00			
Life Loss as % of PAR	0.00%			
Weighted Fatality Rate (% of Exposed PAR)	0.00%			
Property Damages	\$146M			
# Structures Inundated	1,692			



\bigstar	
U.S.ARMY	Í

RESULTS – PRETTY LAKE



Project Information Consequences Ri	sk			
LSRI and CSSL Inputs		Results		
AEP for Damage 🕄	1.000e-1	LSRI 🕄	0.000	
AEP for Design 🕄	1.400e-2	CSSL 🕄	N/A	1
Exposure Weighted Life Loss 🕄	0			
Annualized Project Cost 🕄	\$3,219,000.00			



BROAD CREEK STRUCTURAL



Base Data

Day population in Project Area	33,904
Night population in Project Area	19,600
Number of Structures in Project	6,694
Property Value in Project Area (\$1000s)	7,381,287

Index FactorsPopulation Day Index Factor *1.0Population Night Index Factor *1.0Property Value Index Factor *1.0

Indexed Data (Used In Compu	te)
Daytime Population Estimate	33,904
Nighttime Population Estimate	19,600
Number of Structures in Project	6,694
Area Property Value in Project Area (\$1000s)	7,381,287





BROAD CREEK STRUCTURAL



PARAMETER	DAY NIGHT				
PAR	9,056	7,960			
Exposed Population	1,642	1,508			
% of PAR Exposed	18.13%	18.94%			
Life Loss	4	2			
Fatality Rate	0.04% 0.03%				
Life Loss (Exposure Weighted)	2.90				
Life Loss as % of PAR	0.03%				
Weighted Fatality Rate (% of Exposed PAR)	0.18%				
Property Damages	\$404M				
# Structures Inundated	2,39	96			



\bigstar	
U.S.ARMY	

RESULTS - BROAD CREEK STRUCTURAL

Project Information Consequences Risk					
LSRI and CSSL Inputs			Results		
AEP for Damage 🕄	1.000e-1		LSRI 🕏	0.120	
AEP for Design 🕄	1.400e-2]	CSSL 🕄	\$65,797,915.00	
Exposure Weighted Life Loss 🕄	2.9				
Annualized Project Cost 🕄	\$8,205,000.00				

Only include those structures to which nonstructural measures would be applied.

Night population in Project Area	852
Number of Structures in Project Area	286
Property Value in Project Area (\$1000s)	106,336

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

1.0

1.0

Index	Factors	

Population Day Index Factor *

Population Night Index Factor *

Property Value Index Factor *

Indexed Data (Used In Compute) Davtime Population Estimate

Nighttime Population Estimate	
Number of Structures in Project Area	
Property Value in Project Area (\$1000s)	106

	<u>IIIIIary</u>					River Centerline	Project Area	NSI Structures
		P	PULATION			STR	UCTURE	
DAMAGE CATEGORY	UNDER 65 DAY	OVER 65 DAY	UNDER 65 NIGHT	OVER 65 NIGHT	# STRUCTURES	STRUCTURAL VALUE	(\$1000S) CONT	ENT VALUE (\$1000S)
Residential	391	100	741	110	276	58,860	42,9	905
Public	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Commercial	3	0	0	0	6	2,093	2,09	93
Industrial	4	1	1	0	4	192	192	
Total	398	101	742	110	286	61,145	45,	191

Number of Stories Construction Type Foundation Height

PARAMETER	DAY	NIGHT		
PAR	776	776		
Exposed PAR	234	233		
Exposed %	30.15%	30.03%		
Life Loss	6	5		
Life Loss (Exposure Weighted)	5.4	.5		
Fatality Rate	0.77%	0.64%		
Life Loss as % of PAR	0.70%			
Weighted Fatality Rate (% of Exposed PAR)	2.33%			
Property Damages	\$39M			
# Structures Inundated	25	9		

Assumes all structures are floodproofed/raised to such an extent that would prevent damages and loss of life up to the design event.

SRI and CSSL Inputs		Results			
AEP for Damage 🕄	0.1		LSRI 🕄	0.23	
AEP for Design 🕄	0.014		CSSL 🕄	\$17,819,500.75	
Exposure Weighted Life Loss 🕄	5.45				
Annualized Project Cost 🕄	\$4,176,000.00				

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

jason.t.needham@usace.army.mil

