Integrating Natural Hazards in the Planning Process

Risk Control Planning Workbook

Linda Noson

for the

Sri Lanka Urban Multi-Hazard Disaster Mitigation Project

January 2000

adpc
Asian Disaster Preparedness Center

The **Sri Lanka Urban Multi-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project** was launched in September 1997 under the Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program. The objective of the Sri Lanka national demonstration project is to reduce the vulnerability of the Ratnapura municipality. The project, implemented by the Centre for Housing, Planning and Building in partnership with the National Building Research Organisation and the Urban Development Authority, demonstrated a methodology for identifying hazards and for selecting appropriate strategies to avoid or reduce hazard related losses. The project assisted municipal officials to develop improved tools and skills in development planning and risk management. Activities under the demonstration phase of the project included hazard and vulnerability mapping, risk analysis, strategic planning, policy and procedural changes, training and professional development, and networking.





This paper is published under the Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program for sharing knowledge and experiences from national demonstration projects on disaster mitigation in target countries of Asia. It is made available by the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, Bangkok, Thailand, with minimal editing. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of Asian Disaster Preparedness Center or the U.S. Agency for International Development. Publication of this paper was made possible through support provided by the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, United States Agency for International Development, under the terms of Cooperative Agreement No. 386-A-00-00-00068.

The contents of this paper may be freely quoted with credit given to the implementing institution, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center and to the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Integrating Natural Hazards in the Planning Process
Risk Control Planning Workbook

Linda Noson

for the

Sri Lanka Urban Multi-Hazard Disaster Mitigation Project

January 2000



Asian Disaster Preparedness Center

Bangkok, Thailand

www.adpc.ait.ac.th

Acknowledgements

It is with pleasure that ADPC presents the first of a series of papers to be published by the Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program (AUDMP), one of the regional programs managed by the ADPC. The AUDMP being implemented in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka, has demonstrated successful methodologies and approaches in mitigating the impact of the disasters in the region. During implementation of the national demonstration projects, there has been continuous building of knowledge and experience emanating from the country projects. The national demonstration projects have produced wealth of knowledge in the form of hazard maps, reports, proceedings, review of policies, documentation of various events and activities, etc.

The purpose of making the papers available in the present form is to share the knowledge and experiences with those promoting mitigation in their respective constituencies at community, city and national levels and to help them learn from the experiences of the national demonstration projects.

The present paper was originally produced by Ms. Linda Noson of Linda Noson Associates, USA who was hired as ADPC consultant on the request of the Centre for Housing, Planning and Building, the implementing institution of Sri Lanka Multi-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project, to develop and finalize this Risk Based Mitigation Planning Workbook.

ADPC congratulates the Centre for Housing, Planning and Building and its partner institutions, including National Building Research Organisation and Urban Development Authority for successfully implementing the demonstration project and wish them success during the replication phase of the project to further continue their efforts in reducing loss of lives and damage of properties from devastating disasters.

I also take this opportunity to thank Ms. Linda Noson for contributing to the workshop organized for planners from the UDA and for developing this Workbook.

We hope that you will find this paper useful and we look forward to receiving your comments on this new initiative.

Dr. Suvit Yodmani Executive Director Asian Disaster Preparedness Center Bangkok, Thailand

January 2000

Preface

The Risk Control Planning Workbook supported the delivery of a workshop held on 21 & 22 January 1999 for planners of the Urban Development Authority (UDA) of Sri Lanka. The workshop was held at the Centre for Housing, Planning and Building (CHPB) of the Ministry of Urban Development, Hosuing and Construction of Sri Lanka. The workshop was organized by the Sri Lanka Urban Mulit-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project (SLUMDMP), which is a collaboration of the Urban Development Authority (UDA), National Building Research Organisation (NBRO) and Centre for Housing, Planning and Building (CHPB). The workshop was attended by over 70 planners from the UDA, NBRO and local authorities. The UDA is the central agency in Sri Lanka providing the planning assistance to local authorities. The workshop provided an opportunity for planners to learn about the impacts of natural hazards on communities, share information on local efforts to incorporate natural hazards into the planning process and to learn new approaches.

I wish to extend my gratitude to the ADPC for providing a consultant, viz. Ms. Linda Noson of AGRA Earth & Environmental, for preparing this workbook.

Ms. Noson initially designed the methodology for Risk Based Mitigation Planning Approach, which was finalized at an earlier workshop held in July 1998 at the CHPB for a simliar target group and was published by the SLUMDMP.

I am grateful to Ms. Noson for preparing the Risk Control Planning Workbook for the use of planners in integrating natural hazards into the planning process.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the project partners UDA, NBRO, CHPB and staff involved in the project activities for their contribution, continued support and encouragement.

Publication of the Risk Control Planning Workbook is yet another achievement of the SLUMDMP, which welcomes any constructive suggestions and comments for further improvements if necessary.

Geethi Karunaratne Project Director Sri Lanka Multi-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project

January 2000

Introductory Note

There are three dimensions to risk discussed in this workbook: (1) elements exposed to harm (exposure inventory), (2) the nature of the hazard having potential to cause harm, and (3) the vulnerability of the exposure inventory to hazard impacts. Together these three elements define the risk problem. Developing countries are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of natural hazards. According to the United Nations Human Development Report (UNDP, 1994), "in the 45 least developed countries, 46% of the population lacked access to health services, 55% lacked safe drinking water, the average daily calorie supply per capita was 91% of requirements, and 64% lived in absolute poverty". Hazard impacts on these chronically vulnerable communities can be disproportionately harmful as compared to impacts on more resilient communities. Even modest hazard impacts on countries with marginal food production and health care capabilities can overwhelm the capacity of the country to cope.

The devastating impacts of natural hazard events can prevent communities from achieving the most basic of human goals, human survival. Flooding, landslides, and cyclones are among some of the natural hazards that have impacted Sri Lanka communities over the past 15 years (Table 1). The selected events shown on Table 1 have killed more than 400 individuals, displaced over one-half million people, destroyed thousands of homes, damaged roads, water supplies, agricultural production, and fostered disease. The events in Table 1 do not show the substantial losses that also result from the accumulation of impacts of smaller events over a long time period. Together sudden on-set hazards like landslides and slowly emerging hazards like global warming interfere with the capability of community members to achieve the essential goals and objectives that embody the vision of what they want the future to be.

Table 1: Selected Hazard Events in Sri Lanka (from UNDRO web page)

| Hazard | Date | Location | Fatalities Missing | Displaced Persons | Impacts |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Floods Monsoon | Jul 1984 | Ratnapura, Kegalle, Gampaka, Colombo | 3 | 14,000 homeless | 1500 houses destroyed |
| Floods Landslides | Jan. 1986 | Floods in eastern area; Landslides in Central provinces | 43 dead 12,897 families affected | 3,030 homes destroyed | |
| Irrigation Dam Burst | Apr. 1986 | Kantalai Reservoir 138 mi. NE of Colombo | 14 dead; 25 missing | 9500 | Housing reconstruction RS 5.4 million (400 new homes; 450 homes repaired) Polluted wells; Disease; Agriculture Dozens of villages flooded |
| Floods and La ndslides | June 1989 | SouthWest; Bulathkohupitiya in Kegalle District worst affected | 300 dead | 300,000 homeless | Homes (Columbo 900; Matara 250) Roads Bridges Culverts Sanitation; water supply; |
| Floods And Landslides | Jan 1990 | Ampara Badulla, Kandy, Kurunegala, Matale, Monaragala, Nuwara, Eliya, Polonnaruwa, Trincomalee | 33 dead | 37,653 400,000 affected | 16,000 homes |

| Hazard | Date | Location | Fatalities Missing | Displaced Persons | Impacts |
|------------------------|--------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Cyclone | Nov. 1992 | Eastern Coast, moving west; Ratnapura; Badulla; Nuwara; Eliya Districts | 3 dead | | housing Heavy rainfall Communications; Railway; Roads |
| Floods Monsoons | Jun 1993 | South; Colombo, Kalutara; Galle; Matara; Ratnapura | 8 | 28,000 families effected | |
| Floods | Dec. 1993 | North Central North Eastern 7 Districts | | 150,000 people effected | Property damage; plantations, farms, infrastructure extensively damaged; irrigation tank overflows |
| Floods – NE Monsoon | Nov. 1994 | Batticaloa Trincomalee | | 95,680 families homeless | Roads, railways badly damaged; major water reservoirs & tanks full |
| Floods | May 1995 | Western, Northwestern Sabragamuwa & southern provinces | 1 | 10,000 families displaced | Road traffic, electrical supply, telecommunications interrupted |
| Floods | Oct. 1995 | Ratnapura; Kegalle | 4 dead (landslides) | 20,000 people affected | Two minor landslides |

Risk control planning focuses on identifying those risk control measures necessary to achieve defined measures of community success. The risks to be addressed by the implementation of risk control measures depend on the significance of the risks to the community, the community's risk tolerance and acceptance of loss, and the availability of resources to control risk. Differences in goals, objectives, and capabilities among communities will result in the identification of different risk control priorities.

The growing need worldwide by developing countries for assistance to cope with (1) chronic vulnerability, (2) impacts related to natural hazards, and (3) impacts related to internal conflicts has resulted in increased competition for internal and external resources. It is imperative that communities identify essential risk control measures necessary to lessen the need for assistance and to more effectively direct and use relief that is received. Risk control planning is a central element in achieving a community's goals and objectives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Acknowldegements | ii |
|--|-----|
| Preface | iii |
| Introductory Note | i٧ |
| Introduction to the Risk Control Planning Workbook | 1 |
| Section One – Establishing Guiding Principles | 7 |
| Section Two – Performance Evaluation | 21 |
| Section Three – Performance Improvement | 51 |
| Section Four – Performance Tracking | 55 |
| References | 56 |

INTRODUCTION TO THE RISK CONTROL PLANNING WORKBOOK

Purpose

The Risk Control Planning Workbook guides policy makers, planners, emergency managers, scientists, and others through the process of identifying risk control measures to improve community sustainability in a world in which potential damage and injury from natural hazard impacts should be considered a certainty. The goal of risk control planning is not to eliminate hazard impacts, but to identify opportunities to reduce risks induced by these impacts in a manner that is consistent with community defined goals, performance objectives, and capabilities. The risk control planning methodology presented in this workbook provides a structured framework for deciding what to do about risk.

Methodology

The methodology is divided into two parts: an administrative process and a planning process. The workbook will focus on the risk control planning process shown on Table 2. However, it is important to note that the following administrative process needs to be applied to each step shown on Table 2:

- 1. Planning what work needs to be done
- 2. Organizing the resources needed to complete that work
- 3. Motivating participants to do the work
- 4. Controlling work schedules and budgets

Different departments, agencies, or ministries will generally be responsible for completing different steps in the risk control planning process. Each organizational unit involved will need an administrative process to manage the planning activities in each step.

The Risk Control Planning Process focuses on the identification of risk control measures to reduce the frequency, severity, or unpredictability of hazard impacts. The Risk Control Planning Process includes five steps (Table 2):

- (Step 1) Establish guiding principles for the risk control program:
- (Step 2) Evaluate the performance of community exposures to likely hazard impacts according to the guiding principles established in Step 1,
- (Step 3) Identify risk control options and formulating risk control policies to improve performance capability according to the guiding principles established in Step 1 and based on the evaluation of the community's capabilities in Step 2:
- (Step 4) Evaluate the effectiveness of implemented risk control measures,
- (Step 5) Communicate risk control information to community stakeholders

Application

The workbook methodology may be applied to any type of organization. However, the effectiveness of selected risk control measures must be evaluated from the perspective of a specific organization, such as a community department, community government, public-private stakeholders task force, or country. Similarly, the effectiveness of risk control measures must be evaluated with respect to the reduction of a specific risk to the implementing organization. The implementation of a risk control measure to reduce a risk to one organization may not address or may even increase the risk to another organization. The workbook adopts the perspective of a local community when discussing the development of guiding principles, identification of risk control goals and objectives, the selection of potential risk control measures, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of implemented risk control measures.

Planning Guides

Table 4 lists planning guides that are included in the workbook to help users complete the risk control planning process for steps one through four.

Workbook Format

The workbook is organized into five sections. Each section covers one step in the Risk Control Planning Process:

- Section One Guiding Principles. The first step for community planners is to establish a context for risk control planning. The Risk Control Status Report defines the community's planning framework by: describing the community, identifying the community's planning goals, reviewing existing policies, programs, and plans for achieving those goals, and by establishing pre- and post-hazard impact performance objectives to guide the evaluation of the community's risk and to guide the selection of risk control measures to reduce that risk to acceptable levels.
- Section Two Performance Evaluation. The second step in the planning process is to evaluate the potential natural hazard impacts on the capability of the community to achieve the community planning goals according to the Guiding Principles defined in Step One. This step defines the community's risk problem.
- **Section Three Performance Improvement**. Identification, evaluation, and implementation of risk control measures to improve the performance capability of the community according to the Guiding Principles define in Step One.
- Section Four Performance Tracking. Development of mechanisms to track the effectiveness of implemented risk control measures. Collection of data on the impacts of natural hazards over time can help identify the need for additional risk control measures or the revision of existing measures.
- **Section Five Risk Communication**. Effective risk management requires the recognition that risk control is everyone's business. People need to understand what risks threatened the community, who and what they impact, how, why specific risk control measures are being implemented, and what their role is in that implementation.

Table 2: Steps in the Risk Control Planning Process

| Part Two – Risk Control Planning Process | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Step One | Step Two | Step Three | Step Four | Step Five | | | |
| Guiding Principles | Performance Evaluation | Performance Improvement | Performance Tracking | Risk Communication | | | |
| Review Mission | Identify critical exposures | Evaluate feasibility of risk control options | Reporting requirements | Training and education | | | |
| Review Policies | Identify potential hazards | Adopt risk control measures | Simulation tests | Internal and external communications | | | |
| Review Programs and Plans | Assess risk | Implement risk control programs | Post-hazard impact reports | | | | |
| | | Participants | • | | | | |
| Senior Executives Community Leaders Stakeholders in the risk control process | Risk Managers Line Managers Researchers Analysts | Risk Control Planning Team Line Managers Engineers Contractors | Risk Managers Line Managers Employees | Risk Managers Line Managers Public Relations Corporate Communications | | | |
| | | Planning Outpu | ts | 1 | | | |
| Community goals Pre-hazard impact performance objectives Post-hazard impact performance objectives | Exposure inventory Exposure ranking Hazard Identification Exposure vulnerability ranking Risk Matrix | Risk control policy Risk control plans | Planning Scenarios Database Formats Loss data base | Newsletters Press Releases Customer inserts | | | |

Table 3: Planning Guides for Implementing the Risk Control Methodology

| Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Guiding | Performance Evaluation | Performance | Performance Tracking |
| Principles (G1) Definition of | (E1) Exposure checklist | Improvement | Tracking (T1) Planning |
| risk area | (E2)Exposure inventory | | Scenario(s) |
| boundaries | (E3) Exposure Indicators(E5) Exposure Ranking | (I2) Impact Checklist | (T2) Data base format issues |
| (G2) Collection of | (LS) Exposure Ranking | Checklist | Tormat issues |
| information to identify | (H1) Hazard Checklist(H2) Hazard Identification | (I3) Effectiveness Checklist | |
| community goals and objectives | (H3) Hazard Indicators(H4) Hazard Ranking | | |
| (G3) Definition of performance | (V1) Assessment Checklist (V2) Vulnerability | | |
| objectives | identification (V3) Vulnerability Indicators (V4) Vulnerability Ranking | | |
| | (R1) Risk Matrix | | |

Definitions

The terms used to define hazard, risk, vulnerability, exposure and other key risk control planning concepts have been used interchangeably for different applications and have been defined differently for similar applications. This blurring of meanings makes it necessary to provide working definitions for key terms and concepts as they will be used in this workbook.

Consequences: the damages, injuries, and losses of life, property, environment, or business described in quantitative terms, such as size of economic impact, percentage of functional loss, etc. Links the probability that a hazard will occur to the vulnerability of the types of values exposed to produce an estimate of the potential loss associated with the impact of a specific hazard.

Exposure: The types of values at risk, including (1) property, (2) personnel, (3) net income (economy), and (4) liability (duty to others). Liability includes legal obligations to comply with worker safety regulations, provide employee benefits, comply with environmental regulations, and other legal requirements. Liability as used in the workbook refers to the organization's duty to others as established by policy, law, custom, community values, or other real or perceived duties owed to the community.

Hazard: A natural, human or economic event that has the potential to cause harm or loss: *falling rock is a hazard in steep, mountain areas.*

Hazard identification: The process of defining and describing potential community hazards. Hazard identification includes defining and describing the hazard's physical characteristics, causative factors, probability and frequency of occurrence, magnitude and severity, and locations likely to be affected.

Mitigation: Actions taken to eliminate, prevent, or strengthen community exposures to the impacts of natural hazard events. The hazard event triggers a test of the effectiveness of implemented mitigation measures to perform as desired.

Peril: the exposure to potential injury, loss, or destruction: they faced the peril of falling rocks, Peril is generally used by insurance companies to describe exposures to hazards covered by the policy.

Preparedness: Actions taken to reduce potential loss by improving the community's emergency response and recovery capabilities. A hazard event triggers the activation of emergency response and recovery plans prepared to rapidly stabilize and control hazard impacts. Mitigation and preparedness actions are complementary approaches to reducing loss. The most rapid and effective response will not undo the immediate losses triggered by the hazard on-set. The focus of preparedness actions is on executing effective rescue, containment, salvage and recovery.

Probability: The chance that an event can be expected to occur. Probabilistic methods follow the "law of large numbers", which requires stability and independence of events over time. A probability forecast requires a large amount of data on past events so that a reliable pattern of occurrence can be established. In addition, the conditions that established that pattern must remain stable. The historic record may not be long enough to establish a reliable pattern of occurrence for many natural hazards. If the mechanisms causing the hazard are well enough understood, then probability can be calculated using analytical means rather than observations of real events. Probabilities can be very helpful in forecasting future events, but the dependence on the stability of the environment, the completeness of the data, the consistency of the data, and the independence of each event needs to be taken into consideration when evaluating the accuracy of results.

Risk: the <u>exposure to the chance</u> of injury or loss; risk may be expressed mathematically as the product of the probability that a loss will occur times the value at risk (exposure). Three interrelated factors combine to describe risk:

- Values at risk of potential hazard impacts (Exposure Inventory)
- Likelihood that a hazard will occur,
- Vulnerability of exposed values to the likelihood of injury, loss, or destruction.

Risk Assessment: The risk assessment defines the risk problem through the identification of potential risks and the analysis of the significance of those risks to the community. Risk identification includes an assessment of community exposures, hazards, and vulnerability. Risk analysis estimates the significance of identified risks on the community's capability to achieve its defined goals and objectives. Gaps in understanding the nature of the hazard and uncertainties in expected hazard impacts lead to less accurate risk assessments.

Risk Evaluation: A process or method for evaluating the feasibility of possible risk control measures. Integrates risk assessment results with risk control planning goals and objectives to identify a range of risk control options.

Stakeholders: Those individuals and organizations that literally have a stake in the outcome of the risk control planning process. They may be directly responsible for some part of the community's risk problem. They may be directly affected by community risks and/or the measures selected to control them. They may have information important to completing the risk control planning process.

Vulnerability: The specific circumstances or hazardous conditions that increase the chance that a loss will occur. In this workbook, "hazard" will designate the event with the potential to cause harm. "Vulnerability" or "hazard factors" will be used to indicate adverse conditions or circumstances that increase the chance that a loss will occur.

SECTION ONE – ESTABLISH GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Overview

Purpose

The first step for community planners is to establish a context for making risk control decisions. What community values are the risk control decisions expected to support? What essential resources are necessary to carry out the fundamental objectives the community has specified for achieving those values? What regulatory, financial, and operational criteria must be met before and after a hazard impact? What tolerance does the community have for uncertainty and potential loss? Answering these questions helps define the guiding principles for the identification and implementation of risk control measures that support the community's vision for existing and future development.

Information collected to establish a context for risk control planning forms the basis of the Risk Control Status Report. This initial report provides a "blue print" for risk control planning by outlining what the community hopes to accomplish, what resources are available, and what is in place to protect those resources.

General Risk Control Planning Information Sources

The community's mission or vision statement provides a starting point for understanding the importance and relative priority of community goals and objectives. These community goals and objectives form the basis for identifying essential community functions and for establishing specific performance objectives for the facilities and operations needed to carry out those functions. Each community will have a different perspective on what the future should look like and what resources will be needed to achieve that vision. Some communities may want to support and expand existing industries. Other communities may want to encourage new types of businesses and industries. Others may want to focus efforts on improving the availability of affordable housing. Risk control planning needs to address the specific interests of the community.

The community may have prepared a Comprehensive Plan or General Plan that states the official long-term policy for future community development, including the consideration of economic, political, social and physical impacts on growth and change. Functional plans describe the personnel, facilities and operations needed to implement each community function identified in documents like the General Plan. Community functions might include transportation, water service, public safety, building safety, etc. The policies and programs adopted by a community to implement the Comprehensive Plan and associated functional plans provide key information for the formation of the guiding principles to be used in risk control planning. These principles guide the selection of appropriate risk control measures that support the implementation of the community vision, the Comprehensive Plan and functional plans. These plans also specify who has the authority to implement plan objectives, what regulations must be addressed, and what coordination with other governmental and non-governmental entities is required. This information helps formulate pre-hazard and post-hazard risk control planning objectives.

Sri Lanka Risk Control Planning Information Sources

Presently all disaster matters are handled by the Central Government of Sri Lanka with the assistance of District and Divisional Secretaries. The Districts and Divisional Secretaries operate under the Central Government to carry out civil administration. The link between the District and Divisional Secretaries and local authorities was not well defined at the time this workbook was prepared (1999. Implementation of a proposed Draft Disaster Counter-Measures Act will strengthen the integration of disaster planning activities between the Central Government and local authorities. This proposed Act defines Central Government activities pertaining to natural and other hazards in Sri Lanka. Enactment of the Act will establish (1) the National Council for Disaster Management (chaired by the Prime Minister) and (2) the National Disaster Management Center. The

National Council will be responsible for directing and formulating policies on which the National Disaster Management Plan and National Emergency Operations Plan for natural disasters will be based (Mattingly, UNDP Consultancy Report, 1998). Enactment of the Disaster Counter-Measures Act will direct the National Disaster Management Center to prepare or coordinate the preparation of plans based on policies and programs of the National Council and with assistance from a Technical Advisory Group.

The Urban Development Authority (UDA) is the chief planning entity for Sri Lanka. UDA responsibilities are set-forth in the following documents:

The UDA Act of 1978 with subsequent amendments UDA declarations and circulars Planning and Building Regulations – Gazette No. 386/2 1986 Town and Country Planning Ordinance of 1949 Central Environmental Authority Law of 1983 Coast Conservation ACT Gazetted Development Plans Draft Development Plans Housing and Town Improvement Ordinance Municipal and Urban Council Ordinances

The UDA operates in most urban areas of Sri Lanka. The primary UDA responsibilities include: (1) providing planning assistance to local authorities to develop plans that integrate the physical (buildings, infrastructure, environment), social, and economic aspects of the community to achieve the welfare, security, and safety of local inhabitants; (2) regulating development, planning and building, and (3) preparing regional plans. In regional planning, the UDA structures the plan and helps define the role of cities in the regional plan. The UDA prepared the Urban Sector Policy Action Plan (USPAP), the Sabarabamuwa Regional Structure Plan, and environmental workbooks for Bandarawela and Hambantota. UDA completed a Divisional land use plan that addresses natural hazard and urban environment problems. UDA also completed a plan for mapping landslide-prone areas.

The National Building Research Organization (NBRO) prepared a manual, called "Site Selection, Development Planning and Construction in the Hilly Regions of Sri Lanka." This manual forms the basis for the development of guidelines to incorporate potential landslides into planning activities.

There are 9 provinces in Sri Lanka. Each province has a Provincial Council with several local government units, including municipal Urban Councils like the Ratnapura Municipal Council and Village level councils like the Pradeshiya Sabha. The Municipal Councils prepare and fund local operations plans and budget for routine community needs.

These organizations have information that local community' will need to incorporate into local riks control planning activities.

Examples of Sri Lanka Institutions Involved in Government Coordination of Sri Lanka Planning Activities Related to Natural Hazards

The Housing Secretary for the Ministry of Housing, Construction, & Public Utilities (M/HC&PU) chairs the Secretarial Committee on Urban Sector Policy that facilitates interministerial coordination and networking among a number of government agencies. These agencies include the Ministry of Health, Highways, & Social Services (the new Disaster Management Centre), the Ministry of Cooperatives, Provincial Councils, and other organizations within the ministry.

Three organizations under the M/HC&PU have been selected to assist in implementing the Ratnapura Demonstration Project initiated by the Asia Disaster Preparedness Center under the Asia Urban Disaster Mitigation Project (AUDMP). These organizations include the Centre for Housing Planning and Building (CHPB), the Urban Development Authority (UDA), and the National Building Research Organization (NBRO). A CHPB project coordinator will be appointed to prepare, plan, coordinate, and control AUDMP project activities, including establishing links with all agencies, organizations, and individuals involved. The CHPB and the Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration provide training on natural disaster management.

Risk Control Planning Activities

Task 1. Define Risk Area Boundaries

The first step in the risk control planning process is to define the boundaries of the risk area(s) within which risk control measures will be implemented (Planning Guide G1). Defining the risk area helps to identify the stakeholders that should be involved in the development of risk control measures. Each of the three factors used in this workbook to describe community risk – exposure, vulnerability, and hazard – vary geographically. Geographic variations in hazard impact zones, in concentrations of exposures, and in degree of vulnerability within a defined risk area enable variations in risk to be identified. The risk area may be the boundaries of a neighborhood, a community, a country, or other type of administrative unit. The risk area may be subdivided into smaller risk sites to evaluate variations in risk within the risk area.

Consistently defined risk areas also help identify and foster implementation of risk control measures that best meet the implementing organization's risk control planning goals and objectives. For example,

- An international risk control program might define risk areas based on the boundaries of countries, of greater metropolitan areas, or the location of essential world industries (like food production resources). Such programs generally address the reduction of risks capable of causing significant global consequences. The exposure inventory to be collected in the defined risk areas will also reflect the goals and objectives of the international program. Humanitarian organizations like the Red Cross and Red Crescent might focus their inventory collection on population demographics and health care resources.
- A national risk control program might define risk areas based on national political divisions, such as states, provinces, districts or use the boundaries of greater metropolitan areas. National programs generally address the reduction of risks capable of causing significant national consequences. Thus, there may be noteworthy local risks that are not addressed in national programs.
- A state or provincial control programs may define risk areas based on subunits like counties, urban areas, or other administrative unit
- A community risk control program might define risk areas based on the boundaries of the community or of the metropolitan area. The risk area might be subdivided into risk sites defined by internal community boundaries, such as zipcodes, neighborhoods, wards, precincts, or other community administrative units. The variations in risk (exposure, hazard, and vulnerability) among the risk sites within the community risk area will help identify locally relevant risk control measures. Community risk sites help identify the type and amount of assistance needed to reduce risks within selected parts of the community.
- A private entity, such as an insurance company or a bank, needs to define risk areas that best identify the risk to the organization from an individual policy holders or property owners. Geographic information systems capable of identifying exposure, vulnerability, and hazard in small geographic units have become increasingly important to organizations needing to assess the impact of each new policy or property purchase on the corporate book of business. These tools also help look at risks aggregated over the risk areas defined by local, national, and international organizations.

Overlapping risk control areas defined by different levels of government may result in a community being responsible for the implementation of risk control measures reflecting the program concerns of local, regional, and national authorities. This overlapping of jurisdiction responsibilities is one of the reasons that effective risk control programs requires participation from each stakeholder group.

Task 2. Collect Information

Use Planning Guide G2 to help identify information needed to prepare the Risk Control Status report. This report describes the community and helps establish a framework for the planning process.

Task 3. Define Risk Control Planning Objectives

Use Planning Guide G3 to guide the development of risk control planning objectives. These objectives need to take into account community needs before and after a hazard event impacts the community. Risk control planning objectives should support the capability of the community to achieve its essential community goals.

Planning Guide G1 Definition of Risk Area Boundaries

Purpose

The purpose of defining the risk area boundary is to establish the geographic region in which risks will be identified and analyzed. The risk area must be consistently defined in order to complete a meaningful risk assessment. Each element of risk – exposure, hazard, and vulnerability – must be identified within a consistently define risk area boundary. Selection of the risk area boundary will depend upon the goals and objectives of the risk control program. The risk area may be subdivided into smaller risk sites to better identify variations of risk within the risk area. Site boundaries should also be clearly defined.

Identify Community Risk Area Boundaries

A community risk control program might use a legal description of the boundaries of the municipal council to define the community risk area. Smaller risk sites within the community might be defined by the boundaries of community administrative units, such as neighborhoods. For example, the Ratnapura Municipal Council (RMC) is divided into 15 municipal wards (Table 4). The geographic boundaries of the RMC can be used to define the risk area. The boundaries of each ward can be used to define community risk sites. The Sri Lanka Urban Multi-Hazard Disaster Mitigation Project prepared a Map Work Book (June 1998) that describes the RMC and provides a map of the municipal wards.

A national risk control program might use the boundaries of larger administrative units to define risk areas. Sri Lanka is divided administratively into 9 provinces and 25 districts. The provincial councils include several local government units, such as municipal councils and village councils. Subdivisions of the provincial council risk area could be defined as risk sites. Thus, the RMC located in the Ratnapura District could be a risk site for a provincial risk area defined by the boundaries of the Sabaragamuwa Province of Sri Lanka. It is the only municipal council in the province. A national program that focuses on urban areas might use municipal council boundaries to define risk sites. Or, a larger administrative boundary such as a province or district might be selected. The definition of the risk sites for a national program should foster the comparison of risks throughout the country and help identify the organizations that will be involved in implementing risk control measures within the risk sites. If implementation will be through local municipal councils, then municipal council boundaries may be appropriate to define national risk sites. If implementation will be through provincial councils, then risk sites coinciding with provincial boundaries may be most convenient.

Table 4: Definition of risk area boundaries

| Identification of the risk area | Risk Sites | Identification of risk sites within the risk area | Stakeholders in the RMC risk control planning process |
|---|---|---|---|
| Example: Risk area boundary is defined as the geographic region that encompasses the Ratnapura Municipal Council (RMC). | The risk area is subdivided into risk sites using the boundaries of the RMC Wards | (1) Hudellana (2) Kospelwailla (3) Weralupe (4) Pompakele (5) Godigamuwa (6) Angammana (7) Tiriwanakettiya (8) Batugedara (9) Warakatota (10) Kadaweediya (11) Kotuwa (12) Pulungupitiya (13) Dewalegawa (14) Muwagama (15) Mudduwa | RMC Local authorities Homeowners Business owners Gem Associations Plantation owners Workers Central Government UDA NBRO CHPB AUDMP |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Planning Guide G2

Collection of information to identify community goals and objectives

Purpose

A community's goals and objectives form the basis for the development of community policies and programs. Community plans and legislation specify how these policies and programs will be implemented in order to achieve those community goals and objectives. Collection of information on existing plans involving the community, therefore, provides a starting point for identifying the goals and objectives that will need to be addressed in the risk control planning process. Community plans also provide a source of information on the type of resources that will be needed to implement policies and programs. These resource lists help define essential community exposures.

Identify Community Planning Information and Information Sources

Table 5 lists information necessary to generally describe the community physically and organizationally. Table 6 provides space to index existing plans that may be used to help identify community planning requirements, goals, objectives, and implementation resources. The information collected in Tables 5 and 6 provides the context for the development of the risk control planning framework. If information is not available, enter NA (not available) into the location column and make a note in the Comments column concerning how that information could be obtained.

Planning Coordination

What external organizations should be involved in the identification and implementation of risk control measures to manage the impact of natural hazards on the community? It is common for the goals and objectives of different communities, community organizations, and the national government to differ, reflecting different priorities, resources, and authorities. Planning coordination to resolve basic differences in priorities and concerns will help identify risk control measures that are consistent with a broad range of objectives and facilitate implementation. The proposed Disaster Counter Measures Act provides a mechanism for coordinating Sri Lanka disaster planning activities.

Table 5: Identification of information that describes the community physically and organizationally.

| Information that describes the risk area | Enter information below | What documents provide this information? | Where are document s located? | Comments |
|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------|
| Risk Area Name | | | | |
| Location | | | | |
| Risk Area Size | | | | |
| Boundaries | | | | |
| Population | | | | |
| Administrative units | | | | |
| Primary businesses | | | | |
| Industries | | | | |
| Community vision or mission statement | | | | |
| Community internal organizational relationships (attach copy of organization chart) | | | | |
| Community external organizational relationships (attach flowchart showing relationships) | | | | |

Table 6: Index of plans developed to implement local, regional, and national policies and programs in the Risk Area. Use to identify community planning goals and objectives

| Plan Name | Plan Developer Plan Purpose | Implementing Organization(s) (Ministry, Agency, Community Dept.) | Required or voluntary | Plan location and contact information |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Community Comprehensive or General Plan | | | | |
| Urban Sector Policy Action Plan | Urban Development Authority | | | |
| Sabarabamuwa Regional Structure Plan | | | | |
| Site Selection, Development Planning & Construction in Hilly Regions of Sri Lanka | NBRO Guidelines to incorporate potential landslides into planning activities | | | |
| National Disaster Management Plan | | | | |
| National Emergency Operations Plan | | | | |
| National Irrigation Plan | | | | |
| Public Health and Safety Plan | | | | |
| Local water supply plan | | | | |
| Local transportation plan | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Planning Guide G3 Definition of Risk Control Planning Objectives

Purpose

Risk control planning objectives help to identify the community's essential exposure inventory, define how that inventory should perform under conditions of risk, and define the characteristics that risk control measures must have to help the community achieve the goals identified in the documents collected using Planning Guide G2. Planning Guide G3 helps identify constraints and priorities that will be imposed on the selection of risk control measures in order to be compatible with overall community needs. Enter additional guidelines as desired.

Pre-Hazard Objectives – Risk Control Planning objectives that should be met whether or not a hazard event has occurred.

The following are examples of common pre-hazard objectives that risk control measures should address. These are objectives that must be met whether or not a hazard impacts the community. These objectives will be used to help identify the facilities and operations necessary to meet community goals during times of normal operations. These objectives will also help identify selection criteria to be used to identify risk control measures. Risk control measures that do not meet pre-hazard impact objectives are unlikely to be successfully implemented. Table 7 provides space to identify pre-hazard community goals and objectives, who is responsible for defining them, and who is responsible for implementing them. Typical pre-hazard risk control planning objectives include:

- Maximize use of existing resources by operating economically, efficiently, and equitably. Benefits gained through the identification and implementation of risk control measures should be appropriate to the costs required. Who pays the costs and who receives the potential benefits should be carefully considered.
- Comply with legal mandates, including worker safety, environmental regulations, contracts etc. Legal requirements may indicate specific risks that must be addressed by the risk control program and identify risk control measures that must be implemented. For example, environmental laws may indicate levels of contamination that can not be exceeded within the risk area and specify how hazardous material must be handled to reduce the risk that levels might be exceeded.
- □ Provide a tolerable working environment by providing risk control measures to support worker safety and enhance worker confidence and productivity.
- □ Address issues related to operational, social, political, or cultural concerns. Identification and implementation of risk control measures must take into account issues that would facilitate or prevent successful implementation.

Table 7. Identification of Pre-Hazard impact planning objectives

| Identify Planning objective | What pre-hazard objectives have been defined by the community? | What organizational unit is responsible for defining these objective? | What stakeholders are involved in carrying out these objective? | Where is information needed to define this objective located? |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Economic – risk control planning budget | | | | |
| Economic – business development | | | | |
| Legal – worker safety requirements | | | | |
| Legal – environmental requirements | | | | |
| Legal – planning and building regulations | | | | |
| Social – community housing | | | | |
| Social – medical | | | | |
| Social – beautification | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Post-Hazard Objectives - Risk Control Planning objectives that should be met after the hazard event has occurred.

Risk control measures should meet the following objectives in the event that a natural hazard impacts the community. Note that human survival is considered the baseline objective for risk control measures. Implementing risk control measures to achieve Community Sustainability or Growth will generally require more resources than to achieve the baseline objective of human survival. Check those post-hazard objectives to be included in your risk control planning process. Enter additional objectives as desired. This checklist may also be used to outline a schedule of planning activities. For example, the initial planning period might focus primarily on issues related to life safety. Table 8 provides space to enter proposed post-hazard objectives.

- Human Survival. The fundamental objective of risk control planning is to protect life. Level 1. Protection of life safety. Minimum performance standards for building construction are generally set to this level. It is important to note that buildings designed to a life safety standard may be a total economic and functional loss following the impact of a natural hazard event.
 - Level 2. Continuity of facilities, operations, and level of operation needed to save lives. A higher performance standard is needed if a building or operation must be capable of operating following a natural hazard event. The highest standard is required for facilities, such as nuclear power plants, that must operate without interruption. Delivery of water to suppress fires versus potable water for drinking purposes may be addressed by setting specific performance objectives for the community's water supply and distribution system following different types and severity of hazard impacts. The evaluation and construction costs to achieve this level are substantially higher than those required to achieve a basic life safety standard.
- Community Sustainability. While human survival is the fundamental goal of risk control planning, survival of the individual is necessary but not sufficient to ensure survival of the community.
 - Restoration of community facilities and operations essential to community survival
 - Protection and reconstruction of property
 - Protection of community revenue sources
 - Restoration of normal operations
- Community Growth and Redevelopment. A devastating natural hazard can also provide opportunities for new growth and redevelopment. Obsolete facilities or equipment may be replaced. Structures designed to inadequate building standards may be strengthened. Addressing these issues in the risk planning process provides an opportunity to prepare recovery and reconstruction plans during a less stressful planning environment.
 - ♦ Seek new income
 - Development opportunities

Table 8. Post-hazard impact risk control planning objectives

| Identify Planning objective | What pre-hazard objectives have been defined by the community? | What organizational unit is responsible for defining these objective? | What stakeholders are involved in carrying out these objective? | Where is information needed to define this objective located? |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Life Safety – housing | | | | |
| Life safety – business and industrial facilities | | | | |
| Life safety- fire suppression system | | | | |
| Life safety – police protection | | | | |
| Life safety – emergency medical system | | | | |
| Life safety – drinking water | | | | |
| Community survival – economic needs | | | | |
| Community survival- social needs | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

SECTION TWO – PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Overview

Purpose

The purpose of the performance evaluation is to define the community's risk problem. The performance evaluation involves the completion of a Risk Assessment to identify and analyze the likelihood and consequences of community risk. The Risk Assessment includes the identification of the three elements of risk: (a) community exposures necessary to carry out essential community functions; (b) hazards likely to impact essential community exposures; and (c) the vulnerability of essential community exposures to potential hazard impacts. The risk analysis applies quantitative and/or qualitative methods to systematically estimate and rank risks according to their probabilities and consequences.

The methodology presented in this workbook stresses the usefulness of an initial qualitative risk control planning process to develop an understanding of risks capable of impeding a community's highest priority goals. This initial risk assessment helps focus attention on key risk problems, assign priorities to the selection and implementation of risk control measures and provides information on risks that require more detailed methods of analysis. Increasingly complex qualitative and quantitative risk assessments should be completed for high priority risks identified in the initial screening process as requiring more complex methods of assessment in order to determine appropriate risk control actions.

Information Sources

Exposure Inventory. Exposures are generally classified by risk managers into four groups: property, net income, legal, and personnel exposures. Tables 9-12 list types of exposures in each of these four groups. Selected exposure indicators for each exposure group are identified. These tables also list information sources for obtaining information needed to assign a value to these exposure indicators. The exposure indicators that can be used to characterize the community's exposure in the Risk Assessment. Focusing on exposure indicators representing community resources necessary to achieve high priority community goals helps narrow the focus of the exposure inventory. The information collected in Step One identifying the community goals and risk control planning objectives helps in the identification of appropriate exposure indicators for the Risk Assessment. Selecting a set of essential exposure indicators limits the cost and time needed to complete the exposure inventory.

Community exposures include those owned by the local government (public sector) and those owned by individuals and corporations (private sector). Information on public sector exposures may be obtained from local government agencies, such as facilities, real estate, finance, and human resources departments. Some general community exposure information may also be available though local or national government agencies, such as population data, information on the community's gross national product, and values of imports and exports.

Private sector exposures may be more difficult to obtain. Data collection methods that extrapolate or estimate private sector exposures from information that is more readily available may be needed. The HAZUS loss estimation program funded by the US Federal Emergency Management Agency and developed by Risk Management Solutions provides a methodology for estimating exposures using nationally available databases that can be adjusted by local communities. In the HAZUS methodology, land use maps are used to identify the type of building occupancies within a risk site defined by the boundaries of a zipcode. Databases linking building occupancies to specific types of buildings and an estimated average size per building provides an estimate of the number and type of buildings in the risk site. Building type tables are prepared for ranges of time to help track changes in building type over time. For example, if adobe construction is

commonly used for building homes, then those areas of the land use map marked single family, residential dwellings can be assumed to primarily consist of adobe homes. If the average home size is also known, then an estimate can be made of the number of homes in that area as well. The HAZUS loss estimation software uses this type of map data linked to building types method to estimate property exposures within areas included by zip code boundaries. The methodology is described in detail in the technical manuals that accompany the software.

Inventories of specific types of exposures may be necessary to collect some types of exposure data. Data collection can be a costly and time consuming activity, which is why it is important to select exposure indicators that are most needed to achieve community goals.

Table 9 - Property Exposures

| Exposure | Exposure Factors | Property Exposure | Information Sources | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Types | • | Indicators | | | | |
| Real Property | Land Buildings Permanent Structures Utilities Transportation | □ City Hall □ Police precincts □ School buildings □ Hospitals and clinics □ Housing units □ Commercial buildings □ Light industry □ Heavy industry □ Agricultural land □ Water system □ Power system □ Transportation system | □ Land use maps □ Housing database □ Tax assessor database □ Property database □ Real estate division □ Building inventories | | | |
| Tangible Personal Property | Furniture, equipment, & supplies Money & Securities Records of money due Machinery Data processing hardware, software, & media Papers, documents Mobile property | □ Fire suppression equipment □ Agricultural machinery □ Value of building contents estimate for each occupancy type □ Bank Statements □ Accounting records □ Insurance records | □ Public records and archives □ Private records and archives □ Inventories | | | |
| Intangible Personal Property | Community goodwill Right to collect fees and taxes Licenses Leases & leasehold interest Patents | □ Gem mining licenses □ Business licenses | □ Accounting records□ Legislation | | | |

Table 10 - Net Income Exposures

| Exposur e Types | | (posure | | | | Exposure | In | dicators | | |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------|----|--|----------|--|----|--|----------|---|
| | | | Со | mmunity | Ce Go | ntral vt | Со | mmercial | | ormation urces |
| Revenues | • | Taxes Fees Budgets | | Permit Fees Service Fees Taxes Earned Central Gov't Allocations | | GDP \$69.7 billion (1996 estimate) Per Capita GDP \$3,760 (1996 estimate) Total Foreign Trade | | Gross Domestic Product by sector: agriculture (23.8%), industry (24.7%), services 51.5% (1994) | | Trade data Economic data Internationa I Monetary Fund World Bank |
| | | | | | | National Revenues \$3 billion | | | | |
| Expenses | • | Salaries & Benefits | | Total Salary and Benefits | | National Expenses \$4.2 billion | | Accounting Records | | Budget allocations Accounting |
| | • | Expens e History | | Operating Expenses | | Budget Targets | | | " | records |
| | | | | Emergency Expense History | | Emergency Expense History | | | | |

Table 11 - Legal Exposures (Duty or Responsibility Owed)

| Exposure Types | Exposure Factors | Exposure Indicators | Information Sources |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Legal | Employees | □ Work force | Human resource database |
| Social | Legislation | Number of residents | |
| | environmental | | □ Legislation |
| Political | worker safety | □ Safety regulations | |
| | Danulation | D. Niverban of aventages | □ Ordinances |
| Cultural | Population | □ Number of employees | □ Policies |
| | exposure | | □ Policies |
| | | □ Land Management | |
| | | Requirements | |

Table 12 – Skilled Worker and Leadership Exposures

| Exposure types | Exposure Factors | Personnel Exposure Indicators | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | | Community | Information Sources |
| Individuals whose loss would be a special hardship to the community | Elected officials | □ Type and number of skilled workers | ☐ Human resources☐ Job database |
| | Skilled Workers | Type and number of government workers | □ Accident data |
| Retirement, Death Disability, Resignation | Business leaders | □ Type and number of business leaders | |

Hazard Information. Information on the impacts of past hazards on the community is often available in local private and public sector archives, newspapers, legends, and in the memories of long-term residents. This type of information can provide useful insights into the types of hazards that have caused loss of life and damage to parts of the community in the past. Since human records and memory are often short in comparison to the repeat times of many natural hazards, care should be given in the evaluation of historical hazard information. Also, some areas of the community may not have reports of past hazard impacts only because no one lived or worked there in the past. Historic data is often helpful in convincing a community that a problem exists.

National and local organizations that study specific hazards – geology, meteorology, environmental – are good sources of information. Private consulting firms may provide information or complete studies under contract for local communities.

Vulnerability Information. Information on the vulnerability of the community's essential exposures to potential hazard impacts may be obtained from a variety of sources. Historic records might provide information on how community exposures performed under past hazardous conditions. Particular locations in the community may have experienced repeated landslides or flooding. Particular types of buildings may have experienced greater or lesser damage during floods, strong winds, or other hazard impacts that may damage a building structurally. This information needs to be evaluated carefully because the vulnerability of exposures may change over time. For example, older buildings may perform more poorly today than they did when first constructed. Newer site preparation techniques may improve the performance of some locations.

Engineering studies on the performance of land and buildings (Real Property Exposures) during different types of hazard impacts provide useful vulnerability information. Research on the vulnerability of different age groups to injury and death provide information on differences in vulnerability among different portions of the population.

Sri Lanka Risk Exposure, Hazard, and Vulnerability Information Sources

The following organizations are sources of exposure, hazard, and vulnerability information to needed to complete a risk assessment for a Sri Lanka community. Many of these organizations have also completed functional plans related to their area of responsibility. Some of these plans have been noted in Step One.

CHPB provides training, information services and carries out research related to housing, construction management and human settlements.

National Disaster Management Centre Central Environment Authority

Department of Meteorology
Department of Irrigation
Land Commissioner's Department
Ministry of Health
Geological Survey Department
Coast Conservation Department
Engineering Faculty, University of Peradeniya
Institute of Fundamental Studies
Telecommunication Regulation Commission

Risk Assessment Methods

The Risk Assessment helps define the community's risk problem by forecasting future hazard impacts on essential community exposures. Past patterns of hazard impacts combined with an understanding of the causes of natural hazards and of the causes of hazard-induced damage are used to estimate future impacts. The Risk Assessment provides a systematic process for identifying, estimating, and ranking community risks.

Data to be used to determine potential patterns of hazard impacts must meet the following requirements:

- data must be complete; for example, when analyzing the frequency and severity of a natural hazard in a community, one must determine the completeness of available data. For example, a low population in the impact area may result in under-reporting of even sizeable events. Similarly, high population may result in detailed reporting of even very small events. When estimating future events from the occurrence of past events, it is important to determine if the data is complete for the sizes of events being considered. The evaluation of incomplete data may distort forecasts of future events and complicate the understanding of past events;
- data must be collected on a consistent basis to enable meaningful comparisons (same type, source, technique, and valuation methods should be used)
- data should be relevant to the risk control objectives defined in Step One; if the risk control objective is to improve the reliability of electrical service following the impact of a natural hazard, then collecting information on dollar losses to the community from the disruption of the electrical system would not provide the necessary information (though such losses may be useful in determining the benefits of implementing a selected risk control measure)
- data should be organized to reveal potential risks; for example organizing data on past hazard impacts according to time of occurrence (chronological order) may obscure important information related to the size of dollar losses or outages times sustained

Quantitative and qualitative Risk Assessment methods may be used depending upon the type and amount and quality of data needed, assessment costs, accuracy, and the application of the results.

Quantitative and qualitative methods may be used to estimate the severity and frequency of:

- natural hazards in the community
- damage and injury related to the impacts of natural hazard events (vulnerability of the community's essential exposures)
- economic or functional losses sustained by the community as a result of natural hazard impacts

Quantitative Methods

Quantitative methods include probabilistic and analytic approaches to understanding the severity and consequences of events. "Probability is the relative frequency with which an event can be expected to occur in the long run in a stable environment (Essentials of

Risk Management)". Probabilistic methods assumes that the event being studied is governed by an unchanging probability distribution over time and meet the "law of large numbers" requirements for stability and independence. For stability, events must have occurred in the past under substantially identical conditions and have resulted from unchanging, basic causal forces and future events can be expected to occur under the same conditions. For independence, past events and future events will be independent of each other. The occurrence, for example, of a flood this year is independent of the occurrence of a flood last year.

Analytical methods require sufficient understanding of the event being studies to make appropriate assumptions and define functions appropriately.

Qualitative Methods

Deterministic methods may be used to identify potential community risks. Selected past hazard events can be used to evaluate the impacts on the community. These "scenario" events help people visualize the potential damage. However, they may be misleading to those who misinterpret them to represent all possibilities. They are most useful to support emergency response planning.

Ranking risks using qualitative values for exposure, hazard, and vulnerability indicators provides an informal method to systematically assess potential risks. To facilitate comparisons of risks in the community, indicator data must be collected within the defined the defined risk area or areas.

Planning Activities

Task 1. Risk Assessment: Risk Identification and Risk Analysis

The planning activities in this step focus on the assessment of potential natural hazard impacts on the vulnerability of the community's exposure inventory. The results are used to help community planners to define the community's risk problem. The Risk Assessment task consists of two primary activities, Risk Identification and Risk Analysis. Risk Identification focuses on an assessment of the community's exposure, potential hazards, and the vulnerability of community exposures to potential hazard impacts. Specific risk indicators should be selected for each of these three elements of risk to provide a consistent basis for the risk assessment.

Risk Analysis uses quantitative or qualitative analytical methods to estimate the relative importance of each selected risk indicator. Risk indicators are ranked based on the consequences to the community's capability to perform essential functions. These relative risks form the basis for the risk control planning process.

In Step Three, a Risk Evaluation process is presented for evaluating the feasibility of risk control measures that will improve the community's performance capability by addressing risks with a significant impact on the community.

Task 2. Risk Identification – Exposure Assessment

The Exposure Assessment Checklist (Planning Guide E1) lists the steps to be taken to assess the community's exposure. Planning Guide E2, Exposure Identification, provides a classification scheme for identifying exposures. Exposure data may be collected by (1) using questionnaire results to define critical community functions (Planning Guide E3), which helps identify the facilities, equipment and personnel needed for implementation of critical functions, (2) reviewing community property inventory records, (3) interviewing and meeting with community employees and community stakeholders, and (4) inspecting community facilities. Planning Guide E4 helps users select exposure indicators to characterize specific community exposures. The exposure indicators help identify the specific type of information that will need to be collected to assess the type of exposure. Planning Guide E5 provides a method to subjectively rank the importance of identified community exposures based on the user defined exposure indicators.

Task 3. Risk Identification – Hazard Assessment

The Hazard Assessment Checklist (Planning Guide H1) lists the steps to be taken to assess the hazards likely to impact the community. Hazard Identification Checklists (Planning Guide H2) provide a classification scheme to help identify the types of hazard events that a community is likely to experience. Hazard data may be collected by (1) reviewing research results from organizations like the Geological Survey that investigate specific types of hazard, (2) using questionnaires to identify past community hazard experience, (3) field inspections, and (4) contracting for hazard specific studies. Planning Guide H3 helps the user select specific hazard indicators to help identify the specific type of information that will need to be collected to assess the types of hazards likely to impact the community. Planning Guide H4 provides a method to subjectively rank the importance of identified community hazard impacts based on user defined hazard indicators.

Task 4. Vulnerability Assessment

The Vulnerability Assessment Checklist (Planning Guide V1) lists the steps to be taken to assess the vulnerability of community exposures. The Vulnerability Identification

Checklist (Planning Guide V2) provides a vulnerability classification scheme to help identify the types of vulnerability's (adverse conditions) that the community's exposure inventory is likely to experience. Vulnerability data may be collected by (1) reviewing past damage and loss histories that report the impacts of comparable hazard impacts on comparable exposures, (2) reviewing research results of empirical or theoretical investigations of potential hazard impacts on comparable exposures, and (3) conducting laboratory studies. Planning Guide V3 helps the user identify specific vulnerability indicators for selected potential hazards. Planning Guide V4 provides a method to subjectively rank the importance of identified vulnerabilities based on user defined vulnerability indicators. These vulnerability characteristics represent adverse conditions that increase the likelihood that a hazard will cause damage or harm. The hazard trigger, such as high rainfall, acts on these vulnerabilities, resulting in damage and loss to the community.

Task 5. Risk Analysis

Combine the results of the exposure, hazard, and vulnerability assessments using the qualitative rankings to rate each of these elements of risk for each risk site within the risk area. Therefore, for Ratnapura, each ward would have the selected exposures, hazards, and vulnerabilities ranked. These rankings would be plotted on the risk matrix. The hazard frequency data would be plotted on the vertical axis and the consequences would be plotted on the horizontal axis. The consequences represent the average exposures for the risk site versus the average vulnerability for those exposures within the risk site. Therefore, a risk site with a number of high priority exposures would have a high average priority (priority of 1 to 3 with 1 being the highest priority). An average vulnerability of those exposures within the risk site would also be averaged. So, vulnerability of the specified exposures to multiple hazards within the risk site would also have a high average priority. This combination of exposure and vulnerability represented the consequences of the hazard impacts on essential community exposures.

Planning Guide E1 - Exposure Assessment Checklist

- The first step in identifying exposures is to identify the risk control program goals and objectives (Step One). The type of exposure information to be collected will include exposure indicators like those listed on Tables 9-12 that are needed to identify the potential risk to the capability of achieving the defined program goals and objectives. For example, if the program goals include the reduction of loss of life caused by the impact of landslides, then exposure indicators might include: community population distribution data, identification of areas of unstable land, equipment designed to provide warnings to potential victims, equipment needed to prevent additional ground failure, etc. If the goals and objectives are defined to reduce the operational risks to a community department, then the resources needed by that department to carry out critical functions needs to be identified. Planning Guide 2 helps identify the resources needed to implement a community function, such as public health and safety. The exposure indicators would again be selected to support the goals and objectives of a risk control program designed to support that function. The type of risk control measures to be selected and the evaluation of their effectiveness can only be done with respect to their ability to help the implementing organization achieve its risk control program goals and A community risk control program may be established by a obiectives. stakeholders groups of public and private sector participants or it may be established by a specific community department.
- Define community exposure indicators to be used in the risk assessment (Planning Guide E3). Refer to Tables 9-12 for examples of exposure indicators. It is important to specify particular exposure indicators to enable exposure data to collected consistently. Also, vulnerability data will be collected for the specific exposures identified in this step.
- Assign qualitative values to exposure indicators to assess their relative level of importance to the community in each risk site within the risk area (Planning guide E4).

Planning Guide E2 - Essential Community Function Profile

Complete the following function profile for the three most important functions in each community department. Essential functions are those considered essential for the implementation of plans and programs developed to carry out community goals and objectives included in the Risk Control Status Report.

| | Name of community function | | | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Name of community department: | | | | | | |
| | Location of function. Identify the name and location of building(s) needed to perform this function. If more than one building, assign a number in order of priority | | | | | | |
| | Area serviced by function (community, ward, district, province, etc.) | | | | | | |
| | Peak demand time period (seasonal peaks related to weather, seasonal peaks related to festivals, holidays, daily peaks related to normal operational schedules, etc.) | | | | | | |
| - | What type of revenue would be lost to the community if this function could not be carried out, such as property taxes, license fees, etc. Provide a general estimate of the value of the revenue exposed to potential loss using L (low), M (medium), H (High). | | | | | | |
| _ _ | Backup capability or contractor available to perform function: yes no Name/Address of backup capability (department or equipment) or name of contractor: | | | | | | |
| - | Liability to community by duration if function unavailable (what legal responsibility does the community have to provide this function): | | | | | | |
| - | Impact on community by duration if function unavailable: | | | | | | |

| Working Paper # | Wo | rkina | Pal | ner# |
|-----------------|----|-------|-----|------|
|-----------------|----|-------|-----|------|

| Does the community have insurance to cover the financial impacts of not being able to perform this function? yes no |
|--|
| Interdependent operations/functions/services that rely on the performance of this function in order to be carried out: |
| |
| Essential personnel, buildings, services, supplies, and equipment needed to perform this function: |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Notes:

Planning guide E3 - Exposure Indicators

For each exposure category selected to provide an understanding of the community's vulnerability to natural hazard impacts, enter the exposure indicators that you will use in your Exposure Assessment. The selection of exposure indicators will depend upon what data is available to you at the time of the assessment and what resources would be needed to collect new data. Exposure Indicators provide a measurable value that can be defined by the user to assess the level of exposure. For each exposure indicator you select, note where you can obtain the exposure indicator information. If the information is not available, how can it be obtained, and how expensive would acquiring it be (low, medium, high).

Table E1 - Property Exposures

Table E2 – Net Income Exposures

Table E3 - Legal Exposures

Table E4 – Personnel Exposures

<u>Planning Guide E4 – Assign relative priorities to each exposure factor</u>

These tables provide a method for qualitatively ranking exposures by assigning an exposure level to each of the exposure indicators identified using Planning Guide E3. The range of values defined will need to be adjusted to fit local conditions and concerns. For example, the values used to rate population exposures were developed after evaluating the information from the Ratnapura Demonstration Project Map Book. Values were selected to compare the relative exposures among the municipal wards. A larger or smaller community may need to adjust these values to better reveal where there are concentrations of people or property. A national organization may need to set levels for consistent application across the country to best show relative values of exposures among different communities. The goal of the workbook is provide an internally consistent, systematic method to evaluate the relative importance of community exposures.

Tables 9-12 identifies types of exposures included in each exposure class and suggests possible exposure indicators that can be used to estimate the value of those exposures. Planning Guide E2 provided a questionnaire to help identify specific exposures important to the implementation of essential community functions. Functions should be selected that contribute to the achievement of the community goals and objectives identified in Step One.

| Defir | Property Exposure Ranking - Land Use (PE-LU) Defined using land use maps as the exposure indicator for real property | | | | | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Priority | Exposure Ranking | Exposure Indicator Description | | | | | |
| 1 | High | Urban Centers | | | | | |
| 2 | Medium | Urban Settlements | | | | | |
| 3 | Low | Agricultural Estates | | | | | |

| Property Exposure Rating – Essential Facilities (PE-CF) | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Higher p | Higher priority for community facilities needed to carry out essential functions | | | | | |
| Function: Public Health & Safety – Emergency Management | | | | | | |
| Priority | Priority Exposure Level Description | | | | | |
| 1 High | | Needed to implement emergency response actions | | | | |

| 2 | Medium | Needed to implement recovery actions |
|---|--------|--|
| 3 | Low | Needed for normalization of community activities |

| Net Income Exposure Rating - Municipal Council (NI-MC) Higher priority for income sources that provide the greatest municipal revenue | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Priority | Exposure Level Description | | | | |
| 1 | High | Range of revenue income considered high | | | |
| 2 | Medium Range of revenue income considered medium | | | | |
| 3 | Low Range of revenue income considered low | | | | |

| Liability Exposure Rating - Population (LE-P) Higher priority for concentrations of people | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Priority | Priority Exposure Level Description (based on RMC population) | | | | | | |
| 1 | High | Population over 4000 | | | | | |
| 2 | Medium | Population density 2000-4000 | | | | | |
| 3 | Low | Population density less than 2000 | | | | | |

| | Skill Exposure Rating - Age (S-A) Higher priority for concentrations of people | | | | | | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Priority | Priority Exposure Level Description | | | | | | |
| 1 | High | More than 75% of skilled workers or leaders over 50 | | | | | |
| 2 | Medium | 50-75% of skilled workers or leaders over 50 | | | | | |
| 3 | Low | Less than 25% of skilled workers or leaders over 50 | | | | | |

Risk Identification - Hazard Assessment

<u>Planning Guide H1 – Hazard Assessment Checklist</u>

- □ Identify potential community hazards (types of hazards) (Planning Guide H2). Sources of information include local newspapers, oral history, and research studies.
- □ Compete a Hazard Information Checklist like the one shown in Planning Guide H3 and H4 to identify types and applications of information to characterize each hazard.
- □ Define hazard indicators to be used to characterize the hazards to be included in the assessment (Planning Guide H4).
- Assign qualitative values to the hazard indicators to determine the relative frequency and severity of each hazard type (Planning Guide H5). Use to rank the hazard in each risk site within the risk area.

Planning Guide H2 - Types of Hazard Events

| Natural | | Economic |
|---------|-------------|----------|
| Hazards | Operational | Hazards |

| ٥ | Avalanche | ۵ | Hazardous | Pollution | | Theft | | Currency |
|---|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|--------|---|
| ۵ | Coastal Erosion | | Materials Spills Construction and | Chemical leakage | | Forgery | _ _ | fluctuations Depression Inflation |
| | Cyclones | | Development Accidents | Industrial | _ | Fraud | | Strikes War |
| | Disease | | Structural Fires | contam. | | Vandalism Sabotogage | | |
| | Drought | | Production Accidents | | | Embezzlement | | |
| | Earthquakes | | Mechanical | | | | | |
| | Erosion | | Failures (HVAC) | | | | | |
| | Flooding | | Air Plane Crashes | | | | | |
| | Lightning | | Traffic Accidents | | | | | |
| | Landslides | | Water Outage | | | | | |
| | Molds | | Communications Outage | | | | | |
| | Subsidence | | Power Outage | | | | | |
| | Tropical Storms | ٥ | Transportation Closures | | | | | |
| ۵ | Volcanic Activity | | Ciocaros | | | | | |
| ۵ | Wildland Fires | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Planning Guide H3 - Hazard Information Checklist

| Type of | Geographic | Geologic Data | Special | Incident |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------|----------|
| Hazard Event: | Data | | Studies | Reports |
| Natural, | Uses: Define | Uses: Identify | | Uses: |

| Human, Economic | spatial distribution of hazard | type, distribution, and relative strength of rock types | Uses: Identify establis detailed hazard characteristics | sh past | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Natural Hazards | | | | | | | |
| FLOODS Riverine: periodic overbank flow of rivers and streams. Flash: quickly rising small streams after heavy rain; Urban: overflow of storm sewer systems usually due to poor drainage following heavy rain Coastal — flooding along coastal areas associated with severe storms, hurricanes, or other events | □ Topographic Maps – trace the land contour at regular intervals; help define variations in elevation Arial Photos (stereographic high-altitude or landsat low altitude) □ Slope Maps divide an area into cells based on the percent slope; □ Precipitation Contour Maps □ Flood-prone area maps □ Flood-hazard maps | □ Bedrock or surficial geology maps- location of recent water deposits (alluvium − sand, gravels) □ Relative characteristics of geologic data − e.g. rock strength | inundation s maps show elevation of flood waters for specified times Loss Dam inundation Dam | rts data | | | | |
| Sources of Flood Information: Type of Information Needed: | | | | | | | | |
| Map Scale: Re | gional C | ity/Country Wide | Site-Specifi | С | | | | |

Planning Guide H4 - Types and Applications of Information

| Type of Hazard | Scale of Hazard Information |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
|----------------|-----------------------------|

| | Regional Mapping 1:64,000- 1:250,000 | Town/District 1:10,000- 1:24,000 | Site-Specific Study |
|------------------|--|---|---|
| | Uses: Formulation of broad policies to guide future development. Regional assessment | Uses: Land use planning (Zoning ordinances, etc.). | Uses: Structural design, economic studies, land-use regulation. |
| Drought | Spatial variation in mean stream flow Global climate change | Precipitation data | Water quality, reservoir levels and contents, groundwater levels |
| Flooding | Regional map of flood prone areas Regional maps of drainage system Climate and precipitation maps | Flood prone area maps showing potential areas of flooding based on location near rivers, streams, lakes, ocean or other water body. Hydrologic and hydraulic studies showing peak stage and peak discharge Topographic maps Airphoto mosaics | Flood hazard maps showing potential extent of inundation based on detailed technical study of flooding in a given locality Land surface elevations and depth relationships |
| Landsliding | Regional map of past landslides Evaluation of soils data and surficial geologic maps Reconnaissance slope maps Terrain analysis | Landslide inventory using time series air photos and field investigations Slope stability map | Site maps based on field investigations and/or laboratory tests of soil samples showing slope categories, depth of overburden, depth of groundwater |
| Sea Erosion | Regional maps showing areas in close proximity to oceans or bays Coastal geomorphology and topography Storm data | Topographic maps Airphoto mosaics Elevation of coastal dunes and bluffs | Tidal elevation studies Current studies |
| Subsidence | Evaluation of soils data and surficial geologic maps. | Mine inventory Geologic studies | Site maps showing active and abandoned tunnels Engineering studies |
| Tropical Cyclone | Historical storm pathways | Wind and precipitation | Local wind and rain data |

Planning Guide H5

Ranking potential hazard impacts. For each risk site estimate the frequency of hazard impacts likely to occur for each hazard. Generally more frequency events will be less severe than unusually events. Risk Sites: Wards of Ratnapura Municipal Council

| Level | | - Hamapai | Na Widilicipal Co | tural Hazards | | |
|-------|---|--|---|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | | Flooding | Landslides | Tropical Storm | Cyclone | Drought |
| 1 | Likely to occur several times in a year | Substantial rain, excessive run off; | | | | |
| 2 | Likely to occur several times in a lifetime | Significant, temporary flooding of low lying areas | | | | |
| 3 | Likely to occur in a lifetime | Inundation of major portion of RMC | Landslides causing fatalities and destruction of property | | | |
| 4 | Possibly will occur in a lifetime | | | | | |
| 5 | Unlikely to occur in a lifetime, but possible | | | | | |

Risk Identification - Vulnerability Assessment

Planning Guide V1 - Vulnerability Assessment Checklist

- □ Use this planning guide (Planning Guide V1) as a checklist for completing the Vulnerability Assessment.
- □ Use Planning Guide V2 to help identify the elements of vulnerability and vulnerability indicators for community exposures identified using Planning Guide E2 and noted on Planning Guide E3.
- □ Assign relative weighting factors to vulnerability indicators.
- □ Use weighted vulnerability indicators to assess the relative vulnerabilities of the exposure inventory located in each risk site within the risk area.

Planning Guide V2

| Real Property Vulnerability - RPV | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Vulnerability Factors Real Property Vulnerability Indicators | | | | | |
| | | Building | Location | Site Conditions | Development |
| Adverse conditions increase the potential for | Building Features Location | □ Age of construction □ Type of | □ Hazard zone □ Population | □ Slope □ Drainage | □ Site Construction, digging, grading |
| exposures to sustain loss Triggers, such | Site Conditions | construction Foundation | Density Proximity of emerg. | □ Vegetation □ Geologic materials | □ Mechanical Failure |
| as rainfall, act on adverse conditions to produce loss | Development Activities on Site | □ Building Code □ Life Safety Systems | Services | | □ Land use |
| | Pe | ersonal Propert | y Vulnerability | - PPV | |
| Vulnerability | Factors | | erty Vulnerability | y Indicators - | Tangible (TPV) |
| | | | Building Characteristics | Back-up Provisions | Location |
| Adverse conditions that increase the potential for damage or loss of life | Installation Building Backup | specific installation requirement s | Emergency systems to protect from damageAlarm systems | Copies of records and documentsDuplicate supplies & equipment | □ Hazard specific location requirements |
| Triggers, such as fire, act on adverse conditions to produce loss | Location | | | □ Manual procedures | |
| | Personnel | Vulnerability – | | | |
| Vulnerability | Factors | F | | rability Indicato | rs |
| Individuals whose loss due to retirement, | Elected officials | □ Age □ Job risk | □ Hui | ation Source man resource record | ds |
| death, disability or resignation would be a | Skilled employees | □ Employment ra | | onomic data | |
| hardship on the community | Business leaders | | | | |

Risk Analysis

<u>Planning Guide R1 – Risk Analysis Checklist</u>

- □ The Risk Analysis Matrix in Planning Guide R1 enables the results of the Exposure Assessment, Hazard Assessment, and Vulnerability Assessment to be plotted to graphically show relative risks. Evaluation of the significance of these risks to the capability of the community to achieve its goals and objectives focuses attention on areas where risk control measures are needed.
- Risks shown on the risk matrix are based on subjectively defined and weighted risk indicators. Meaningful representation of risk requires careful selection of the indicators to be plotted. Risk should be plotted relative to a specific function, area, or hazard. The Risk Matrix can be used to illustrate the spatial distribution of risk from natural hazards for each geographic area in the community. To be meaningful, the same exposure and vulnerability indicators will need to be assessed relative to the frequency and severity of a specific hazard.
- □ When looking at general risks to the community of selected hazards, exposure indicators that best express community vales should be selected. For example, population density, number of housing units, per capita gross domestic product, etc.
- When examining risks of selected hazards on specific community functions, exposure indicators related to elements of the community needed to perform that function should be assessed. For example, the relative risk to the community's capability to carry out emergency response actions requires the assessment of exposure and vulnerability indicators for community elements essential for each functional activity. Risk Matrices may be prepared to show the risk to community property needed to implement response actions (critical facilities) for each of several natural hazards.

RISK MATRIX

| Community Name: |
|--|
| Risk Area Boundary: |
| Name of Hazards: |
| Past Hazard History: |
| EXPOSURE |
| List Exposure Indicators for each type of exposure to be addressed in the risk assessment. Indicators should be consistent with the goals and objectives of the risk control program. For example, property indicators for a public safety program might include hospitals, fire stations, police stations, and schools. The type of measurement used to assign a value to each indicator provides a method for identifying the importance of the exposure. Values that might be selected to measure the level of property exposure could include: number of buildings, building replacement costs, importance to support emergency response actions, etc. Exposure priority levels can then be assigned to ranges of exposure values based upon local conditions and needs. |
| Property Exposure Indicators: hospitals - number |
| Net Income Exposures: tax- income |
| Liability (Responsibility): population- size |
| Personnel Exposures (Skilled Workers/Leaders): doctors-number |

HAZARD

Describe the hazard impacts likely to occur for each potential hazard according to the level of frequency shown on the table below. For example, significant flooding capable of covering the first floor of homes and businesses is likely to occur in the RMC risk area several times in a lifetime (H=F2). To better identify variations within the risk area, describe the hazard impact likely for each risk site within the risk area. Not all risk sites in the RMC risk area would be exposed to potential flooding hazards. Only a few risk sites would be exposed to potential landslide hazards.

| Frequency of Hazard Event in Risk Area: | | | | |
|---|----------------|---|--|--|
| | Very High (F1) | 50 % in 1 year; likely to experience one or more times a year | | |
| | High (F2) | 50% in 10 year; likely to several times in a lifetime | | |
| | Moderate (F3) | 50% in 50 years; likely to experience in a lifetime | | |
| | Low (F4) | 10% in 50 years; possible to experience in a lifetime | | |
| | Very Low (F5) | 50% in 500 years; unlikely to experience in a lifetime, but might | | |

| F | Flood | Risk Sites | Landslide | Risk Sites | Subsidence | Risk Sites |
|-------|---|----------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| VH(1) | Minor flooding | | | | Minor to moderate subsidence | |
| H(2) | Moderate to Major flooding – temporary resettlement | | Minor landsliding no fatalities; repairable property damage | | Major subsidence | |
| M(3) | Catastrophic Flooding – prolonged resettlement | Muwagama Weralupe | Major landsliding – fatalities; property destroyed | Helauda Angammana | | |
| L(4) | | | | | | |
| VL(5) | | | | | | |

VULNERABILITY

List Vulnerability Indicators for each exposure and type of hazard likely to occur. Indicators should relate to the potential for the specific hazard to cause damage or harm to the selected type of exposure.

Property (buildings –type and age of construction, number of stories; land – slope, location, geology)

Flood vulnerability indicators:

Land – (High) proximity to coastline or river systems; in flood plain; (Moderate) in floodway; Low (higher elevations)

Buildings – (High) single story, on-grade construction; (Moderate) two-story, on-grade construction; (Low) two-story, elevated foundation

Net Income (taxes – diversity of revenue sources)

Liability (Responsibility) (population – density, age)
Population – (High) high density, over 65/under 5; fast moving water

Personnel (Skilled Workers/Leaders) (doctors-distance to replacements)

Risk

For each Risk Area and/or Risk Site combine and average the exposure rankings to obtain a value for all exposures of interest. Combine and average the vulnerability ranking for each hazard impact on the exposures in the risk area. Plot the combined exposure/vulnerability ranking for the risk area or risk sites in the risk area on the Risk Matrix opposite the frequency of the hazard selected. Describe the severity of the hazard in the Risk Matrix Cell.

Planning Guide R1

| Frequency | RISK MATRIX | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Very High (1) 50% in 1 year | | | Subsidence in areas of gem mining | | | |
| High (2) 50% in 10 year | | | | | Severe flooding in Weralupe | |
| Moderate (3) 50% in 50 years | | | | Landslides in Heulada area | | |
| Low (4) 10% in 50 years | | | | | | |
| (Eng.Design) | | | | | | |
| Very Low (5) 50% in 500 years | | | | | | |
| | 3E/3V | 2E/3V-3E/2V ight | | E1/V2-E2/V1 ficant | E1/V1 Extreme | |
| | | INCREASIN | IG CONSE | QUENCES | ^ | |

SRI LANKA



LOCATION INFORMATION

| | Building Name Street Address City Ward District |
|--|---|
| | Province |
| | BUILDING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE (1) Risk Reduction (3) Immediate Occupancy |
| (2) Life Safety | (4) Continual Occupancy |
| BUILDING CONTAC | |
| Building Contact Name/Telep | phone number: |
| | Telephone number: |
| Emergency Contact Name/16 | elephone number |
| | HAZARDS |
| General Site Informati | |
| | yes no not available |
| Soil type Percent of site w/soft soil | Depth to competent layer |
| | Moderate 6-15 deg Steep >15 deg. |
| Percent of site with Steep slo | |
| | ne area yes no |
| | asses, flowers) Moderate (shrubs) High (trees) |
| √egetation Hazard: no | |
| | ood fair poor |
| | yes no Comment: |
| Site-Specific Hazards | _ l andslidas |
| • | siteyes no Date(s) |
| Susceptibility: none | |
| | y landslide : yes no |
| toooo poternian, bioonea s | , idinasiids : yee iie |
| Site-Specific Hazards · | - Flooding |
| | te:yesno |
| Flood susceptibility none | |
| Access potentially blocked by | y flooding? yes no |
| Site-Specific Hazards | - Tropical Storm |
| • | e to site: yes no Date(s) |
| Susceptibility none | I M H |
| | storm damage (e.g. fallen trees, flooding)? yes no |
| | |
| Site-Specific Hazards | |
| | n site? yesno Date(s) |
| Mining activity under or near | |
| Comment: | |
| | yesno Comment: |
| access potentially blocked by | y subsidence? yes no |
| | |

SRI LANKA

VULNERABILITY

| Structural System |
|--|
| Structural drawings reviewed yes no not available |
| Designed according to local or national building code standards: yes no |
| Name and year of Building Code |
| Year built Basic Structural Type: |
| Number of stories above grade Number of below grade levels |
| Total height Plan dimensions (foot print) |
| Roof type Roof conditions poor good excellent |
| Foundation type: Foundation elevated no yes feet |
| Foundation conditions: poor good excellent |
| Exterior walls made of woodmasonry concrete steel other |
| Plan irregularity L M H Vertical irregularity L M H |
| Adjacent building hazard: Falling Hazard L M H Other: |
| General condition: good fair poor |
| General condition: good fail pool |
| Architectural System |
| Cladding yesno Cladding Weight: heavy medium light |
| Windows: safety glass yes no Window size: small moderate large |
| Elevator: yes no; |
| Elevator lobby-recall (fire safety system) yes no |
| |
| Mechanical/Electrical Systems |
| Sprinkler system yes no Building fully sprinkled yes no |
| Location(s) of sprinklers |
| Type of sprinkler system(s) wet dry halon other |
| Fire extinguishers yes no; Fire alarm system yes no |
| Fire Alarm System Monitoring yes no |
| Name of fire alarm monitoring company |
| Internal Security system yes no |
| Security Monitoring Company |
| Exterior security system: video cameras yes no |
| Exterior boundary fencing yes no; If yes, full boundary with gates? yes no |
| Security Patrols yes no |
| If yes, name-number of firm |
| Temperature Alarms yes no |
| |
| Furniture/Equipment Vulnerability |
| Critical emergency response equipment on siteyesno Protected yes no |
| Critical operations equipment on site yes no Protected yes no |
| Comments: |
| |
| Electrical System |
| Electrical Company Name/Number: |
| Electrical distribution system underground above ground |
| Emergency back-up system (Generator) yes no; Protected yes no |
| Generator fuel type Days supply of fuel on site |
| Uninterrupted Power System yes no Durationminutes |
| Emergency lighting yes no Where? |
| Exterior lighting: fluorescent incandescent emergency |
| metal halide mercury vapor high pressure sodium |
| Comments: |
| |

SRI LANKA

| Water and Solid Waste System | |
|--|------|
| Water company name/number: | |
| Potable water stored on-site yes no How many gallons: | |
| Solid waste (sewer) company name/number (if different) | |
| Water safety systems: eye wash yes no; | |
| body wash yes no | |
| Comments: | |
| Communications Systems | |
| Local telephone company name/number: | |
| Long distance company name/number: | |
| Type of telephone connections copper wire T1 lines fiber optic call | ole |
| Direct access long distance code: | |
| PBX system yes no | |
| Direct dial lines (ring down phones) yes no location(s) | |
| Pay phone on-site or less than 5 minute walking distance to site yes no | |
| Cell phones yes no Number Type | |
| Pagers yes no Number | |
| Building Paging system yes no Is paging system on emergency power yes | _ no |
| Radios yes no Number of channels Number of radios | |
| Radio frequency (channel) to use during emergency: | |
| Type/manufacturer of radios: | |
| Satellite phone yes no | |
| Comments: | |
| Natural Cas System | |
| Natural Gas System | |
| Natural gas on-site yes no | |
| Name/number of natural gas company | |
| Automatic gas shut-off values yes no | |
| Gas detection system yes no What type of gas? | |
| Gas used for air conditioning only yes no | |
| Other uses: | |
| Comments: | |
| Emergency Preparedness | |
| | |
| Emergency evacuation route posted: yes no Where: | |
| Emergency procedures posted: yes no Where: | |
| Emergency telephone contacts posted: yes no Where: | |
| Emergency supplies kept on-site? yes no Where: | |
| What type of supplies? | |
| | |
| EXPOSURE Page 16 | |
| People | |
| Number of employees on site | |
| 24 hr employees on-site | |
| Hours operational | |
| Days operational | |
| Number children or elderly on site (under 5/over 65) | |
| Total estimated visitors, vendors, customers typically on site at one time | |

SRI LANKA

| Building |
|--|
| Community owned building yes no |
| Building value L M H |
| Check how value estimated: |
| building replacement costsfunctional replacement costs reproduction |
| costs economic value |
| Building leased yes no |
| Leasing Agent – Name/ Number: |
| Leasehold Value to client none LMH |
| Alternate site available for relocation of essential functions? yes no |
| How long would it take to relocate to alternate site? |
| Building Contents |
| Value of contents L M H |
| Functional importance of contents to carry out emergency response: L M H |
| Functional importance of contents to carry out non-emergency community functions: _L _MH Comments: |
| Functions |
| List top three community functions located in this facility: |
| (1) |
| (2) |
| (3) |
| Development |
| Personnel |
| List personnel required to carry out each of the above functions by name and position: |
| (1) Function |
| Name: |
| Position: |
| Contact Information (location, phone number): |
| Contact micrimation (location, prioric number). |
| Others: |
| |
| |
| (2) Function |
| Name: |
| Position: |
| Contact Information (location, phone number): |
| Солистино полистино полист |
| Others: |
| |
| (3) Function |
| Name: |
| Position: |
| Contact Information (location, phone number): |
| Contact information (location, priorie number). |
| Others: |
| |

SECTION THREE - PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Overview

Purpose

Feasibility and selection of Risk Control Options, including an evaluation of their potential effectiveness. The previous section helps define the community's risk problem. The next step is to identify risk control measures that might be effective in reducing the risks identified.

FACILITY RISK PROFILE LANKA

SRI

Planning Guide R1 - Risk Control Evaluation Checklist

| Purpose: Guide the selection of appropriate Risk Control measures to reduce the impact of hazards on an organization's ability to achieve goals and objectives. |
|---|
| Hazard: |
| Exposure or vulnerability to be addressed by the proposed Risk Control Measure: |
| Brief description of the current non-preferred situation (the current level of exposure and vulnerability): |
| Preferred or target situation (what level of exposure or vulnerability do you want the Risk Control measure to achieve?) |
| Proposed Risk Control Technique (check one) to reduce exposure or vulnerability: |

FACILITY RISK PROFILE LANKA

SRI

- Avoidance (eliminate risk to organization by not locating in area of potential hazard impact, not purchasing vulnerable land or buildings, and/or refusing to engage in functions that could potentially be impacted)
- □ Prevention (reduce the frequency of occurrence of the potential hazard impact)
- □ Loss Reduction Mitigation (reduce the severity of hazard impact by improving the survivability of people, property, and functions through actions completed prior to hazard impact)
- □ Loss Reduction Preparedness (reduce the severity of hazard impact by improving the organizations capability to rescue, salvage, and recover through actions completed after hazard on-set)
- □ Segregation of Exposures Separation (increase system capacity and robustness through geographic, physical and operational separation of facilities and functions)
- Segregation of Exposures Duplication (increase system sustainability by providing back-up support for elements that may be nonfunctional after hazard impact)
- □ Contractual Transfer (transfer responsibility for hazard impact to another organization)
- Retain risk by accepting potential impacts and planning to pay for financial losses out of existing operating expenses.

| Proposed Risk Control Measure: | |
|--------------------------------|--|
|--------------------------------|--|

□ Each Risk Control Technique has a number of Risk Control Measures that may be selected for implementation. Table X shows a sample of these measures.

Implementation Feasibility

_ yes ____ no ____ uncertain

| (1) | Is the technical information needed to recommend and adopt the proposed Risk Control measure available? Information needs include understanding the nature of the hazard, how the hazard impacts the organization, and what options are available to reduce that impact. Different levels of information will be needed depending upon the type of measure proposed. yes no uncertain |
|-----|--|
| (2) | Are the financial resources available or can they be obtained to implement this risk control measure? Implementation of some measures will require on-going costs in addition to the amount needed to initially recommend and adopt the measure. Will training need to be provided? Will compliance need to be monitored? Will supplies or equipment need to be replenished over time? yes no uncertain |
| (3) | Is the organization, community, agency or individual that has the authority to implement the proposed risk control measure willing to do so? This is particularly important for voluntary measures, but also applies to those established by law or organizational policy. |

FACILITY RISK PROFILE LANKA

SRI

| (4) Do the staff or individuals responsible for implementing the risk control measur have the knowledge to do so? For example, implementation of a building code (mitigation risk control technique) requires that staff in the community's building |
|---|
| department understand the code requirements and be able to determine if buildin plans conform to those requirements yes no uncertain |
| Implementation Effectiveness |
| Coverage. What percentage of the entire community organization, agency, or individual's home will be addressed by implementation of the proposed risk control measure? For example, implementation of an ordinance restricting development in potential landslide areas may only apply to a small portion of a community where as implementation of a building code may apply to a construction. Similarly, implementation of preparedness measures within a organization could apply to all staff or selected staff units. |
| Potential Impact. Within the area addressed by the propose Risk Control measure, what is the potential impact of a 100% successful implementation of the proposed measure? For example, a community Risk Control measure that requires all new construction in potential landslide areas to include the installation of a drainage system to manage water on site may have little impact if little or no new construction is occurring in the defined hazard area. |
| Implementation Success. Implementation may be blocked by a number of site-specific and issue-specific characteristics of the community organization, agency, or individual responsible for implementing the proposed Riscontrol measure. This is a subjective estimate of the likelihood that the Risk Control measure will be successfully implemented. |

Implementation Cost Assessment

What is the estimated cost (high, medium, low) of adopting the proposed Risk Control measure? Costs include expenditures needed to collect information defining the nature of the hazard, understanding the impacts that the hazard will have on the community, organization, agency, or individual.

SECTION FOUR - PERFORMANCE TRACKING

Overview

Purpose

Establish procedures to monitor the effectiveness of risk control measures. Collection of data on the frequency and severity of natural hazard impacts needs to use a consistent format. If data is gathered using different hazard, exposure, or vulnerability indicators, patterns identified over time will not be meaningful. It will be difficult if not impossible to determine if differences are related to how the data was collected and aggregated versus real differences.

SRI LANKA

REFERENCES

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Guide 1739-95, *Risk Based Corrective Action Applied at Petroleum Release Sites.* "ASTM is in the process of developing a generic RBCA standard that would have application beyond petroleum products. RBCA is a framework or philosophy, a method for approaching a problem.... The objective of RBCA is to reduce risk to public health and environment to an acceptable level." (from www.newjerseyrisk.rog/html/rbca.html)

Earthquake Disaster Risk Index, RADIUS Project, 1998

Florida Department of Community Affairs, 1997, *The Local Mitigation Strategy: A Guidebook for Florida Cities and Counties*, prepared by Florida Department of Community Affairs. Web site: http://www.state.fl.us/comaff/DEM/BRM/LMS/lmscover.htm

Mattingley, Shirley, ADPC consultancy reports.

United States Coast Guard, Dec. 1996, *Risk Based Decision Making Guidelines*, Washington D.C.. "A set of guidelines to facilitate field use of risk based approaches to safety and environmental protection. Utilizing a five-phase process of goal selection, risk assessment, risk management, impact assessment and risk communication, these guidelines outline specific approaches to improving waterway management"

USAID/OAS, 1997, Caribbean Disaster Mitigation Project: Planning to mitigate the Impacts of Natural Hazards in the Caribbean, Unit of Sustainable Development and Environment, General Secretariat, Organization of American States. Wed site; http://www.oas.org/EN/CDMP/

Project Contacts

For further information about this paper or the Sri Lanka Multi-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project, please contact:

1. Mr. N.M.S.I. Arambepola

Project Manager

Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program

Asian Disaster Preparedness Center

P.O. Box 4, Klong Luang,

Pathumthani 12120, THAILAND

Tel: (66-2) 524-5376 Fax: (66-2) 524-5350

Email: <arambepola@ait.ac.th> URL: URL: kttp://www.adpc.ait.ac.th

2. Mrs. Geethi Karunaratne

Project Director, Sri Lanka Urban Multi-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project

Director, Centre for Housing, Planning and Building

No. 333. Sunil Mawatha

Pelawatta, Battaramulla, SRI LANKA

Tel: (94-1) 875628 Fax: (94-1) 875628

3. Mr. R. M. S. Bandara

Assistant Project Manager, Sri Lanka Urban Multi-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project

Acting Head, Landslide Studies and Services Division

National Building Research Organisation

99/1, Jewatte Road

Colombo 5. SRI LANKA

Tel: (94-1) 505149 Fax: (94-1) 502611

Email: <nabro@slt.lk>

4. Mrs. Hesther Basnayake

Director, Environment & Landscape

Urban Development Authority

7th Floor, Sethsiripaya

Battlaramulla, SRI LANKA

Tel: (94-1) 872387/872259 Fax: (94-1) 872386/872260

Email: <enscape@uda.lk>

5. Ms. Linda Noson

Consultant, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center

AMEC

11335 NE 122nd Way, Suite 100

Kirkland, WA 98034, USA

Tel: (1-425) 8204669 Fax: (1-425) 8213914

Email: <lnoson@agraus.com>

The Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program (AUDMP), launched in 1995, is the largest regional program of ADPC. The program, with core funding from the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance of the United States Agency for International Development, will ultimately work in ten or more countries of the region. The program was designed to make cities safer from disasters. The goal of the AUDMP is to reduce the disaster vulnerability of urban populations, infrastructure, critical facilities and shelter in targeted cities in Asia, and to promote replication and adaptation of successful mitigation measures throughout the region. Towards this end, the program develops and supports national demonstration projects, information dissemination and networking activities, and policy seminars and professional training in the target countries of Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam.



The Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC) is a regional resource center dedicated to disaster reduction for safer communities and sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific. Established in 1986 in Bangkok, Thailand, ADPC is recognized as an important focal point for promoting disaster awareness and developing capabilities to foster institutionalized disaster management and mitigation policies.

For more information, please get in touch with us at the following address:

Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC) P.O. Box 4, Klong Luang, Pathumthani 12120, Thailand

Tel.: (66-2) 524-5364, 524-5376 Fax: (66-2) 524-5350, 524-5360 E-mail: adpc@ait.ac.th Website: www.adpc.ait.ac.th