

OKLAHOMA STATIST	ICS SUMMARY (2011 - 2021)
22	CLIMATE DISASTER DECLARATION
2ND HIGHEST	NUMBER OF DISASTERS IN THE CO
CRAIG, DEWEY, ROGER MILLS	COUNTIES WITH THE HIGHEST DIS
41	COUNTIES WITH FIVE OR MORE D
7	SUPERFUND SITES
CLEVELAND, OKLAHOMA, TULSA	HIGHEST COMPOUNDING RISKS
\$849 MILLION	FEMA + HUD POST-DISASTER FUN
3.9 MILLION	POPULATION TOTAL

\$215

\$3.6 BILLION

ER DECLARATIONS

SASTERS IN THE COUNTRY

THE HIGHEST DISASTER OCCURENCES

FIVE OR MORE DISASTERS

ST-DISASTER FUNDING

DTAL

PER CAPITA SPENDING ON CLIMATE DISASTERS


OF CLIMATE INFRASTRUCTURE COULD BE SUPPORTED THROUGH A SMALL INSURANCE SURCHARGE

DISASTER OCCURRENCES 2011-2021

FEDERALLY DECLARED CLIMATE DISASTERS BY COUNTY

FEMA ASSISTANCE 2011-2021 POST-DISASTER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND HAZARD MITIGATION FUNDS **OBLIGATED BY COUNTY FOR CLIMATE DISASTERS**






Cleveland County has received the

most federal post-disaster recovery funds in the state: \$32 million.

Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation

Federal Share Obligated (2011-2021)



Number of Disaster Events


Craig, Dewey, and Roger Mils


disasters.

more than five.

counties have each had 10 recent

Major Disaster Declarations (2011-2021)	
0 occurences	
1 occurrence	
2-3 occurences	
4-6 occurrences	
7-9 occurrences	Source: FEMA 2021
10+ occurrences	Maps courtesy of iParametrics





\$667M FEMA obligations

\$182M HUD CDBG-DR Funds

\$849M FEMA + HUD assistance


\$215 per capita cost

SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX 2011-2021

AREAS OF GREATEST SOCIAL VULNERABILITY


ENERGY RELIABILITY 2011-2021

COUNTIES AT GREATEST RISK OF POWER OUTAGES



Twenty-three counties in Oklahoma have populations with high social vulnerability and low energy reliability.


Aggregated Annual Electric Outage Duration Including major events - SAIDI_W_MED



Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration Maps courtesy of APTIM

Social Vulnerability Index


CDC (2018)	
No Value	
0.0 - 0.2	
0.2 - 0.4	
0.4 - 0.6	
0.6 - 0.8	Source: CDC/ATSDR 2018 Social
0.8 - 1.0	Vulnerability Index Maps courtesy of iParametrics



COMPOUNDING RISKS: A FRAMEWORK FOR FUTURE INVESTMENT

Cleveland, Oklahoma, and Tulsa counties have high risk of climate disasters and other compounding risks.

Oklahoma, Cleveland, Logan, McClain, and Canadian counties have had five or more disasters and have had a high increase in poulation.



Areas with the greatest return on investment due to physical and social risk



U.S. counties were analyzed for social benefits using the following parameters: NOAA Sea Level Rise (Source: Sea Level Rise and Coastal Flooding Impacts (noaa.gov)); Population Density (Source: 2020 Census Demographic Data Map Viewer); Population Change (Source: 2020 Census Demographic Data Map Viewer); Poverty (Source: 2020 Census Demographic Data Map Viewer); Cardiovascular Diseases (Source: US Data | GHDx (healthdata.org)); Neoplasms (Source: US Data | GHDx (healthdata.org)); Diabetes, urogenital, blood, and endocrine diseases (Source: US Data | GHDx (healthdata.org)); FEMA Natural Hazard risk (Source: Map | National Risk Index (fema.gov))t | Map courtesy of APTIM.

County Name	High Population Density	High Percent of Population Change	High Poverty Rate	High Health Risk	Types of High Climate Risk	Sea Level	Total Risk Count
Adair		<u> </u>			6		3
Alfalfa							0
Atoka							0
Beaver					2		2
Beckham					_		0
Blaine							0
Bryan					2		3
Caddo					2		3
Canadian					-		0
Carter					2		2
Cherokee					6		3
Choctaw					3		3
Cimarron					2		3
Cleveland Coal					1		4
Coal					2		3
					2		
Cotton							0
Craig					3		3
Creek					3		2
Custer					1		3
Delaware					5		3
Dewey							0
Ellis							0
Garfield					3		2
Garvin							0
Grady					1		2
Grant							0
Greer							0
Harmon							0
Harper					2		2
Haskell					4		3
Hughes					1		3
Jackson					1		3
Jefferson							0
Johnston							0
Kay					3		3
Kingfisher							0
Kiowa							0
Latimer					1		3
Le Flore					4		3
Lincoln							0
Logan							0
Love							0
Major							0
Marshall							0
Mayes					3		3
McClain							0
McCurtain					1		3
McIntosh					5		3

County Name	High Population Density	High Percent of Population Change	High Poverty Rate	High Health Risk	Types of High Climate Risk	Sea Level	Total Risk Count
Muskogee					6		3
Noble							0
Nowata					1		3
Okfuskee					2		3
Oklahoma					8		4
Okmulgee					2		3
Osage					3		2
Ottawa					7		3
Pawnee							0
Payne							0
Pittsburg					4		3
Pontotoc					2		2
Pottawatomie					3		2
Pushmataha					2		3
Roger Mills							0
Rogers					2		2
Seminole					2		3
Sequoyah					3		3
Stephens					1		2
Texas					2		2
Tillman							0
Tulsa					6		4
Wagoner					2		3
Washington					3		2
Washita							0
Woods							0
Woodward							0



IMAGE RIGHT: WEBBERS FALLS, OKLAHOMA, INUNDATED BY A SWOLLEN ARKANSAS RIVER ON MAY 31, 2019 | STEVE PILTZ, NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE TULSA, OKLAHOMA

OKLAHOMA

TOTAL: 22 DISAS	STERS		2011		2012	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	2020	2021
FEMA PA + HM: S HUD CDBG-DR: S FEMA + HUD AS		1970: SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, AND STRAIGHT- 1985: SEVERE WIN LINE WINDS AND SNOW	NTER STORM 1988: SEVERE STORMS AND	1989: SEVERE STORM: TORNADOES, STRAIGHT- WINDS, AND FLOODIN	T-LINE TORNADOES, STRAIGHT-LINE 4078: FREEDOM AND NOBLE	4109: SEVERE WINTER STORM AND SNOWSTORM TO	1117: SEVERE STORMS, RNADOES, AND FLOODING	4164: SEVERE WINTER STORM	4222: SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, STRAIGHT-LINI WINDS, AND FLOODING	E 4247: SEVERE WINTER STOR AND FLOODING	RMS 4256: SEVERE WINTER ST AND FLOODING	ORMS 4274: SEVERE STORMS AN FLOODING	D 4299: SEVERE WINTER STO	4315: SEVERE STORMS, DRM TORNADOES, AND FLOODING	4324: SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, AND FLOODING	ST	38: SEVERE STORMS, RAIGHT-LINE WINDS, IADOES, AND FLOODING	4453: SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, AND FLOODING	4456: SEVERE STORMS, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, TORNADOES, AND FLOODING 4575: SEVERE WIR	ITER STORM 4587: SEVERE WINTER STORMS
# County Name	# of ClimateDisastersTotal FEMA2011-2021Obligations	PA Obligations HM Obligations PA Obligations H	HM Obligations PA Obligations HM Obligations	s PA Obligations HM Oblig	igations PA Obligations HM Obligations PA Obligations HM Obligations	PA Obligations HM Obligations PA C	bligations HM Obligations	PA Obligations HM Obligation	ns PA Obligations HM Obligation	ns PA Obligations HM Obligati	ations PA Obligations HM Oblig	gations PA Obligations HM Obligati	ions PA Obligations HM Obliga	tions PA Obligations HM Obligations	PA Obligations HM Obligations PA Ob	ligations HM Obligations PA Obl	igations HM Obligations	PA Obligations HM Obligations	PA Obligations HM Obligations PA Obligations H	M Obligations PA Obligations HM Obligations
Statewide Adair County	22 \$382,478,313.98 6 \$2,343,800	3 \$2,237,147.97 \$143,501.87 \$1,135,361.60	\$21,956.66 \$231,032.67 \$81,187.6 \$335,630 \$	68 \$5,150,300.61 \$135 \$0	35,810.81 \$1,392,709.83 \$31,791.00	\$54,416,008.77 \$601,423.50 \$1	i,409,207.74 \$862,373.23	3 \$2,182,195.68 \$27,730	00 \$10,962,663.58 \$1,094,802 \$87,183	.09 \$16,629,632.41 \$214,84 \$0	840.13 \$35,473,020.44 \$40 \$270,591 \$1,	7,246.00 \$190,402.33 \$99,90 286,534	08.25 \$119,245,415.37 \$613,0	98.00 \$80,077,965.00 \$698,629.25 \$183,521 \$0	5 \$1,559,053.36 \$274,633.25 \$4,7		07,888.00 \$482,398.0 \$180,342 \$	4 \$887,520.20 \$160,083.48 0	\$256,752.01 \$0.00 \$13,855,568.71	\$112,704.52 \$593,773.63 \$49,583.17 \$0 \$0 \$0
Alfalfa County Atoka County	9 \$1,368,715 5 \$3,761,059				\$0 \$0	\$13,604 \$0	\$62,520 \$(D	\$897,190	\$84,032 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0			\$0 \$0	\$	1,240,368 \$	0 \$10,517 \$0 \$143,046 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$20,195 \$0 \$24,146 \$0
Beaver County Beckham County	5 \$1,203,956 8 \$2,939,930	3				\$281,025 \$0 \$41,158 \$0			\$229,478 \$291,	418 \$80,487 \$112	12,887 \$27,162 \$	196,851	\$726,497 \$0	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$288,073 \$0		\$158,919 \$37,51 1,672,416 \$	5 0		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Blaine County Bryan County	8 \$588,167 4 \$1,458,984	7		\$87,304	\$0	\$87,201 \$0			\$925,926	\$143,989 \$0 \$355,349	\$0 \$125,850 \$0	\$0	\$21,024	\$0			\$23,528 \$	0 \$156.019 \$0	\$99,272	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$21,690 \$0
Caddo County Canadian County	9 \$1,611,244 8 \$31,719,126	4		\$0 \$422,983 \$1,3	\$0 1 389 044		\$1,332,061 \$(0	\$460,781 \$800,718 \$30,	\$0 \$252,324 000 \$5,004,376 \$25	\$0 \$298,710 25,266 \$135,005	\$0 \$341,836 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$0			\$47,344 \$ 2,634,379 \$	0	\$210,249 \$19,800,936	
Carter County Cherokee County	2 \$1,915,111 7 \$743,130		\$156,339 \$	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					\$1,907,065	\$0	\$64,590	0.2		\$409,701 \$0	02 02 0		\$0 \$112,50	0		\$8,047 \$0
Choctaw County Cimarron County	3 \$1,021,044		φ130,003 φ					\$526,133	\$0 \$0 \$494,910	\$0	ψ0+,050			\$0 \$0			φ0 φ112,30			\$0 \$0
Cleveland County	5 \$32,698,400				\$0 \$0		\$23,725,072 \$954,920		\$1,911,319	\$0								000 7/0	\$6,048,381	\$0 \$58,707 \$0
Coal County Comanche County	6 \$581,818 5 \$6,098,021						\$99,406 \$0		\$198,831 \$4,624,331	\$0	\$123,615 \$10,875	\$0 \$1,008,576	\$0		\$81,372 \$0			\$66,743 \$0	\$349,575	\$11,850 \$0 \$0 \$104,664 \$0
Cotton County Craig County	5 \$3,521,958 10 \$2,197,127	\$89,768		\$201,798	\$0 \$92,642 \$179,818		\$75,138 \$5,864	4	\$2,316,060 \$169,274 \$35,	\$U 914	\$0 \$166,895	\$0 \$264,473 \$0	\$0	\$470,662 \$0	\$941,424 \$0		\$696,792 \$	0 \$12,565 \$0		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Creek County Custer County	5 \$1,420,167 8 \$8,399,754	•			\$0 \$0	\$600,248 \$51,975			\$458,315 \$1,723,441	\$0 \$0 \$169,622 \$47		\$59,699				\$0 \$0 \$	\$871,728 \$ 1,749,367 \$	0	\$50,148	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$4,875 \$0
Delaware County Dewey County	8 \$2,007,481 10 \$7,418,604		\$161,521 \$	\$0 \$81,530	\$0 	\$907,317 \$0			\$175,452 \$160, \$470,349	\$0 \$1,385,203	\$109,306 \$ \$0 \$983,289	148,683 \$0	\$336,013	\$818,635 \$0 \$0 \$1,446,726 \$0) \$20,177 \$0	\$431,330 \$0 \$	\$331,750 \$ 1,448,152 \$	0	\$10,225	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Ellis County Garfield County	6 \$478,626 5 \$2,121,307					\$103,415 \$0 \$79,359 \$0				\$0 \$1,024,206	\$0 \$0		\$278,071	\$0			\$97,140 \$ \$904,727 \$37,50	0	\$0 \$75,515	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Garvin County Grady County	3 \$963,393 8 \$3,638,096			\$68,770	\$0				\$571,782 \$1,851,170	\$0 \$0 \$197,990	\$0 \$33,476 \$	\$391,611 138,925 \$288,157	\$0 \$0				\$228,471 \$	0	\$826,880	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$4,256 \$0
Grant County Greer County	8 \$3,061,263 5 \$184,079				\$521,074 \$0	\$15,986 \$0			\$36,546 \$80,618	\$0 \$24,489 \$0 \$72,750	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$12,598	\$0 \$0					2,400,183 \$ \$18,113 \$	0 0	\$11,686	\$0 \$51,299 \$0 \$0 \$0
Harmon County Harper County	4 \$143,772 3 \$443,045	2							\$124,969	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$308,900 \$2	22,500		\$18,803 \$0	\$111,646 \$	0		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Haskell County	7 \$2,582,879 4 \$2,755,361)	\$636,040 \$	50			\$143,876 \$(\$310,929 \$(\$1,141,941 \$1,960,473	\$0 \$0	\$277,463 \$483,958	\$0		\$383,559 \$0			\$111,646 \$ \$0 \$	0		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Jackson County	6 \$2,657,055 4 \$671,738	5	0.	\$27,179	02				\$1,886,975 \$624,679	\$0 \$0	\$222,445	\$0 \$69,427	\$0				\$412,529 \$	0	\$65,679	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Johnston County	3 \$1,369,344 8 \$6,310,372	•		\$21,113	\$863,529 \$0	\$32,181 \$47,690			\$1,341,203 \$749,110	\$0 \$0	£0 £1	501,496			\$28,142 \$0	c	3,023,465 \$90,00	0.2 0.2 0.2	02	\$0 \$2 001 \$0
Kingfisher County	8 \$1,617,617	7		\$17,212	\$0	\$32,181 \$47,690 \$9,466 \$0			\$54,175	\$0 \$82,975	\$0 \$41,649	\$0				\$	1,280,181 \$	0 \$0 \$0	\$131,958	\$0 \$2,901 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Latimer County	7 \$1,651,231 4 \$301,677	7					\$115,998 \$0	0	\$973,846 \$70,969	\$0 \$0 \$54 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0		\$20,488 \$0			\$583,103 \$		\$19,092	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$114,711 \$0
Le Flore County Lincoln County	8 \$2,274,265 7 \$2,789,212	2	\$244,897 \$	\$0 \$39,682	\$0		\$0 \$483,289 \$472,620 \$844,264	9 \$8,714 4	\$0 \$987,579 \$21, \$0 \$958,					\$86,561 \$0 \$86,870 \$0	\$274,527 \$0		\$214,057 \$ \$405,935 \$	0 0 \$5,658 \$0	\$15,737	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Logan County Love County	8 \$6,393,873 3 \$269,007	7	\$0	\$384,955	\$0				\$412,518 \$3,099, \$227,840	\$0	\$0			\$86,870 \$0		\$	1,126,234 \$	0 \$41,168 \$0	\$989,120	\$0 \$0
McClain County McCurtain County	5 \$4,531,350 4 \$1,392,468	3		\$677,166	\$0		\$286,913 \$296,803	3 \$162,096	\$2,451,865 \$153, \$0 \$573,612	\$0	\$656,760	\$0							\$665,479	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
McIntosh County Major County	5 \$2,594,595 9 \$2,115,922	2	\$1,067,367 \$	\$0 \$9,693	\$0	\$39,606 \$0	\$336,862 \$6	0	\$901,284 \$144,884 \$1,120,		\$286,382 18,000 \$214,085	\$0 \$0	\$126,342 \$13	30,029				\$234,394 \$0	\$17,521	\$2,698 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Marshall County Mayes County	2 \$1,013,390 6 \$1,342,833		\$0						\$985,599 \$27, \$211,874	\$0	\$231,130	\$0		\$40,050 \$56,339))		\$691,659 \$	0		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Murray County Muskogee County	3 \$783,872 7 \$9,542,761		\$354,893 \$	\$0					\$764,508 \$879,462	\$0 \$0	\$376,496	\$0		\$325,505 \$0	\$19,364 \$0 364,238 \$0	\$	5,022,264 \$2,144,90	3		\$0 \$0 \$75,000 \$0
Noble County Nowata County	7 \$341,391 8 \$2,129,916		\$0	\$52,943	\$0 \$48,208 \$0	\$0 \$22,261	\$146,201 \$	0	\$28,308 \$98,429	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0					\$177,247 \$ 1,690,766 \$14,17	0 \$0 \$0	\$113,575	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Okfuskee County Oklahoma County	7 \$4,930,438 5 \$29,747,179						\$600,652 \$1,717,120 \$10,558,814 \$974,00	5	\$909,512 \$1,651,072 \$1,036,	\$0 696 \$3,475,367	\$32,279 \$0	\$0			\$409,587 \$0	\$	1,073,968 \$	0 \$187,322 \$0	\$11,824,422	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$226,803 \$0
Okmulgee County Osage County	9 \$4,538,458 6 \$2,255,928			\$0 \$0	\$0		\$246,628 \$	0	\$1,323,863 \$1,577,	352	\$409,003 \$0	\$0 \$0			\$124,835 \$0		\$575,363 \$ 1,311,166 \$	0 \$0 \$0 \$0 0 \$883,822 \$0		\$3,564 \$0 \$0 \$0
Ottawa County Pawnee County	9 \$3,049,871 4 \$426,370	\$88,997	\$99,624	\$0	\$0		\$12,851 \$39,700	D	\$138,673 \$230,	033	\$74,017 \$	192,000		\$214,083 \$21,303 \$180,915 \$0	3	\$	1,120,662 \$580,95 \$209,053 \$		02	\$4,093 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Payne County Payne County Pittsburg County	3 \$1,605,292 9 \$3,822,044	2	\$166.563	60			\$119.911		\$2.094.445	\$0	\$335.031	\$0		\$411,289 \$0	\$121 752 \$0	\$	1,204,560 \$	0 \$154.024 \$0	\$400,732	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$4.014 \$0
Pontotoc County	3 \$1,215,949								\$2,094,445 \$972,306 \$1,364,583	\$0 \$0				<u>्</u> र्णम,209 ३८	\$121,752 \$0 \$243,643 \$0			0	\$380,994	\$0 \$0
Pottawatomie County Pushmataha County	6 \$2,745,809 8 \$2,499,053	\$0 \$0	φυ 				\$721,926 \$0 \$92,404 \$0	0 \$1,097,815	\$0 \$449,823	\$0	\$643,761	\$0		22.550			\$171,618 \$ \$61,031 \$ \$254,037 \$27.50	0 0 \$154,219 \$0	\$380,994	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Roger Mills County Rogers County	10 \$1,813,760 5 \$3,149,614	\$275,891	\$0			\$277,211 \$0			\$572,017 \$0 \$1,148,		\$0 \$189,813	\$72,503	\$0 \$8	\$300,048 \$0	50 \$0 5		\$254,027 \$37,50 1,424,855 \$		\$0	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Seminole County Sequoyah County	3 \$751,141 6 \$6,832,276	5	\$364,079 \$	50			\$162,778 \$6		\$588,363 \$1,530,092 \$1,		\$727,696	\$0		\$299,274 \$3,261,972	2		\$640,685 \$	0		\$0 \$0 \$6,977 \$0
Stephens County Texas County	6 \$2,618,318 3 \$330,643	3	\$0						\$509,458 \$36,	071		\$1,387,867	\$0 \$253,026	\$0 \$77,616 \$0				\$284,737 \$0		\$76,763 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Tillman County Tulsa County	7 \$2,805,264 4 \$16,246,360	\$998,531	\$19,658						\$1,786,230 \$171,871 \$248,	\$0 063	\$118,763	\$0 \$281,745	\$0	\$69,354 \$855,799	3		\$174,969 \$ 3,355,475 \$206,30	0 \$443,557 \$0 6	\$0	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$321,302 \$0
Wagoner County Washington County	4 \$1,219,372 3 \$175,542		\$0						\$547,608	\$0							\$533,496 \$112,50 \$86,401 \$	0		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Washita County Woods County	9 \$5,744,120 6 \$895,865					\$0 \$15,713 \$327,626 \$0			\$1,158,690	\$0 \$70,707 \$26 \$9,120	26,011 \$2,923,441 \$ \$0 \$0	158,108 \$0	\$33,588	\$19,456 \$90,932 \$0	2 \$70,958 \$0	\$	1,210,105 \$ \$525,532 \$	0	\$0	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Woodward County Total FEMA Allocation	5 \$1,266,247	2 \$4,871,305 \$143,502 \$3,490,382	\$141 239 \$3 925 597 \$81 48	38 \$7 221 516 \$1	1.524.855 \$2.918.163 <u>\$211.609</u> \$0 \$0	\$424,654 \$0	\$55,032,768 \$6,178,33	8 \$3 976 955 \$27 7	30 \$64 718 108 _\$11 272		99.704 \$50.021.535	162,104 \$4,224,095 \$0	\$552,784	\$0 19.177 \$85.922.280 \$4.984.075	5 \$4,547,145 \$274,633	\$0 \$0	\$288,809	0 6 \$3,924,175 \$160,082	\$256,752 \$0 \$56,094,412	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$189,467 \$1,809,922 \$49,593

DISASTER OCCURRENCES 2011-2021

	TOTAL DISASTERS
California	25
Mississippi	22
Oklahoma	22
lowa	21
Tennessee	20
Louisiana	18
Alabama	17
Texas	17
Vermont	17
West Virginia	17
Arkansas	16
Kentucky	16
New Hampshire	16
New York	16
Washington	16
Alaska	15
North Carolina	15
Nebraska	14
Missouri	13
Kansas	13
New Jersey	13
North Dakota	13
South Dakota	13
Montana	12
Oregon	12

	TOTAL DISASTERS
Virginia	11
Florida	11
Georgia	11
Minnesota	11
Connecticut	10
Hawaii	10
Maryland	10
New Mexico	10
Wisconsin	10
Idaho	9
Massachusetts	9
Pennsylvania	9
South Carolina	8
Colorado	7
Utah	7
Maine	6
Michigan	6
Ohio	6
Arizona	6
Delaware	5
Illinois	5
Indiana	4
Rhode Island	4
Wyoming	4
Nevada	3

FEMA AND HUD COST PER CAPITA 2011-2021

	PER CAPITA		PER CAPITA		
Louisiana	\$1,736	New Mexico	\$97		
New York	\$1,348	Arkansas	\$81		
New Jersey	\$815	Massachusetts	\$73		
North Dakota	\$738	Georgia	\$64		
Vermont	\$593	Montana	\$63		
Texas	\$518	Kansas	\$60		
West Virginia	\$481	New Hampshire	\$55		
Alaska	\$401	Rhode Island	\$53		
Florida	\$390	Minnesota	\$49		
Nebraska	\$390	Pennsylvania	\$49		
South Carolina	\$289	Virginia	\$49		
Alabama	\$275	Maryland	\$39		
South Dakota	\$269	Washington	\$36		
North Carolina	\$243	Wyoming	\$32		
Hawaii	\$229	Idaho	\$32		
lowa	\$228	Wisconsin	\$27		
Oklahoma	\$215	Illinois	\$24		
Oregon	\$210	Michigan	\$23		
Missouri	\$162	Ohio	\$19		
Mississippi	\$159	Maine	\$18		
California	\$157	Delaware	\$14		
Connecticut	\$149	Utah	\$11		
Colorado	\$141	Nevada	\$11		
Kentucky	\$105	Indiana	\$7		
Tennessee	\$97	Arizona	\$2		

DATA VISUALIZATION TOOLS

It is evident the U.S. is already paying a steep price for this challenge. Rebuild by Design partnered with APTIM and iParametrics to create the following visual tools to demonstrate how climate events have affected each state. The set of six maps depicts which areas have been hit the hardest by recent climate events, where recovery funds are focused, where those individuals with high social vulnerabilities live, and which areas have the least energy reliability.

The U.S. needs to change the way it is making funding decisions. Where we make priority investments is equally important to what we invest in. Returns on investments (ROI) in the form of social benefits to communities needs to be part of grant evaluations. The U.S. need to utilize new decision-making frameworks that are forward-looking. The final map in the set includes an example of a new decisionmaking framework that takes into account current vulnerabilities and future climate risks. This is one example of how physical and social vulnerability indicators could inform where investments in adaptation infrastructure can yield high returns in social benefits to the most impacted communities. Our team recognizes, however, that there are other decision-making frameworks to explore, and further research is needed to understand which indicators should be included in any state-specific model. Given the ever-present constraints on funding availability, the intent of presenting these maps together is to prompt investments that address multiple known vulnerabilities simultaneously within projects, furthering comprehensive climate adaptation planning.

The following data are designed as a tool to help communities understand their risks to make betterinformed choices with higher returns on investment, though each state should determine their own framework for investment.

There are always many ways to present these data. For the purposes of this report, we chose to analyze the years 2011-2021. The following six maps and two tables are presented in this format with the following considerations and limitations:

GEOGRAPHIC MAP

The map provides topographic and geographic context for each state and its surrounding areas, indicating whether the state encompasses coastal, riverine, lake, alpine, or desert land.




GEOGRAPHIC MAP. SOURCE: ESRI WORLD IMAGERY BASEMAP

DISASTER DECLARATIONS (RED)

This map shows federally declared climate disasters of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant major by county from 2011-2021 – providing a snapshot of disaster assistance under this Act to supplement the magnitude of climate disasters across the country the efforts and available resources of States, local in recent history. This report only identifies federally governments, and disaster relief organizations in declared disasters, as there is no entity that collects alleviating the damage, loss, hardship, or suffering and publishes state disaster declarations. It should caused thereby."1 be noted that the declarations shown in this report do not reflect every climate event that has occurred Importantly, extreme heat waves do not fit the criteria between 2011-2021; the report instead only shows for federal disaster declarations despite being the those which have met the cost threshold for a federal leading cause of deaths among climate hazards. disaster declaration. Therefore, the findings overall Likewise, sea level rise is not included in this definition underestimate the number of occurrences and the despite the threat it poses to numerous communities, suffering that some communities have experienced. including damage to property, loss of land, and displacement.

According to the Stafford Act, as amended in May 2021, a "major disaster" includes "any natural catastrophe (including any hurricane, tornado, storm, high water, winddriven water, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, volcanic eruption, landslide, mudslide, snowstorm, or drought), or, regardless of cause, any fire, flood,




DISASTER DECLARATIONS. SOURCE: FEMA 2021 | MAPS COURTESY OF IPARAMETRICS.

or explosion, in any part of the United States, which in the determination of the President causes damage

It should be noted that while most disaster declarations are due to climate events, there are a few instances of disasters due to other natural hazards, such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. Though these events are not increasing in magnitude or frequency due to climate change, the severity of their impact may be connected. As climate impacts degrade household and critical infrastructure, communities may become more vulnerable to other natural hazards. Retrofitting infrastructure after these events often requires the same measures as floods, tornadoes, fires, etc., so these events were included in the report to demonstrate the need to prioritize multi hazard adaptation approaches.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE (ORANGE)

The map shows the amount of federal dollars allocated to counties through FEMA's Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs between 2011-2021 which allocates funding to individual counties and statewide. The map does not show where "statewide" allocations were spent within the state, but rather only shows county allocations. However, these statewide allocation amounts are included in the Disaster Declaration table at the end of each chapter and included in the "FEMA Total" provided next to the map. The adjacent table adds HUD's Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery funds - which are only available to states after a disaster - to the FEMA Total for an estimate of federal post-disaster spending in each state.




FEDERAL ASSITANCE. SOURCE: FEMA 2021 | MAPS COURTESY OF IPARAMETRICS.

The Disaster Declaration tables provided at the end of each chapter show all federal Disaster Declarations declared between 2011-2021 and the corresponding FEMA obligations associated with those events. However, in some instances, FEMA continues to obligate funds for years following a declaration. Some states have received funds for events that took place between 2011-2021 after 2021, so the total sum of funds associated with that event are not captured. All FEMA funds allocated to counties between 2011-2021 are shown in the federal assistance map; however, they do not show up in the Disaster Declaration table if their corresponding event took place prior to 2011. For example, counties in the State of Illinois are still receiving funds from a 1960s storm. The funds obligated to those counties are included in the map, but that event is not included in the Disaster Declaration table at the end of the chapter.


There are additional sources of federal funding made available to governments or individuals in response to disasters, such as the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) projects, Small Business Administration (SBA) loans, and private insurance payouts, which are not included in this report because they are harder to uniformly track and/or must be paid back. Therefore, our findings underestimate the total support available to states and individuals post-disaster. Since disaster aid is allocated to repair physical damage to property, events such as extreme heat, which largely creates physical damage to persons and not property, rarely qualify for federal disaster recovery aid. Additionally, there is only a shallow understanding of the economic impact of social and health-related costs and environmental degradation after a disaster.

SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX (GREEN)

Social vulnerability refers to the potential negative effects on communities caused by external stresses on human well-being. Such stresses include natural or human-caused disasters or disease outbreaks. The factors that determine social vulnerability are directly tied to social determinants of health or the social, economic, and physical factors - such as race, socioeconomic status, and environmental conditions - that influence health. Socially vulnerable populations fare the worst during a disaster and often take longer to recover.² The Center for Disease Control/Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry Social Vulnerability Index (CDC/ATSDR SVI) uses 15 U.S. census variables to help local officials identify communities that may need support before, during, or after disasters. The map presents the SVI on a census block level, indicating where the most socially vulnerable populations within each county live. The 15 indicators are grouped into four themes: Socioeconomic Status



SOURCE: CDC/ATSDR 2018 SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX MAPS COURTESY OF IPARAMETRICS



SOURCE: US ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION | MAPS COURTESY OF APTIM

(below poverty, unemployed, income, no high school diploma); Household Composition & Disability (aged 65 or older, aged 17 or younger, older than age 5 with a disability, single-parent households); Minority Status & Language (minority, speak English "less than well"); and Housing Type & Transportation (multi-unit structures, mobile homes, crowding, no vehicle, group quarters).
(below poverty, unemployed, income, no high school diploma); Household Composition & Disability (aged 65 or older, aged 17 or younger, older than age 5 with a disability, single-parent households); Minority Status & Language (minority, speak English "less than well"); and Housing Type & Transportation (multi-unit structures, mobile homes, crowding, no vehicle, group quarters).

Social Vulnerability Index data are not being used to make post-disaster assistance funding decisions. HUD only requires Low and Moderate Income for a portion of their funding. FEMA does not consider it in their allocations. To learn more about how vulnerable populations fare during climate events, turn to p. 10.


ENERGY RELIABILITY (BROWN)

Climate events often lead to energy disruptions for hours, days, or weeks. This map shows the annual average interruption time (in minutes) across the different energy utility providers within a state. Regions (or utility territories) in the darkest shade, on average, experience longer energy outages. These data are aggregated by utility territory, not county, meaning more than one provider can serve a county or group of counties. Viewing the Energy Reliability Map next to the SVI Map, one can begin to infer which regions have the most socially vulnerable residents and are served by the least reliable energy providers. Energy reliability is increasingly becoming related to climate disasters and weather events. Inclusion of these maps is to support evaluation of need for concurrent flood and energy resilience projects. To read more about how energy reliability is calculated, see Appendix A.

COMPOUNDING RISKS (PURPLE)

This map overlays multiple physical and social vulnerability indicators to identify areas where new climate infrastructure would have the greatest return on investment.

This map overlays social inputs – population density, increase in population, and health risks – with physical risk inputs – high risk of climate hazards and sea level rise – to get a more detailed picture of the populations who are most vulnerable to climate events to inform future choices of where new climate infrastructure may have the greatest return on investment through the creation of social benefits.



SOURCES: NOAA, FEMA, 2020 US CENSUS, GHDX, US EPA I MAP COURTESY OF APTIM

some demographic information, these maps have added additional criteria, such as population density, population increase, poverty rates, and health risks, to focus on the compounding effects. For instance, if a climate event happens in an area where there is already high social vulnerability, that community is likely to suffer more.

This approach provides an example of how to begin creating new frameworks for allocating funding, moving away from funding based on damage estimates from the previous storm. These assumptions should be ground-checked by each state as data do not always give us the full picture. For instance, in some cases, the areas highlighted for "highest compounding risks" may already have numerous funding sources while others, such as rural communities, may not. In other areas, the location where investments need to be directed may be adjacent to the county with the highest need. For example, an adaptation intervention to protect a downstream riverine community may need to be built upstream in a less vulnerable area to stop flooding at its source.

Analyzed Risks Include:

- + Climate: sea level rise, multiple climate hazards
- + **Social:** population density, population increase, and poverty
- + Health: cardiovascular disease, neoplasms, and other health indicators

ENDNOTES

1 Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, Public Law 93-288, as amended," 42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq., and Related Authorities, 2021. [online], www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fema_stafford_act_2021_vol1.pdf

2 Flanagan, B., Gregory, E., Hallisey, E., Heitgerd, J. & Lewis, B. "A Social Vulnerability Index for Disaster

Management. Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management," 8(1), 2011. https://doi. org/10.2202/1547-7355.1792

COMPOUNDING RISK (TABLE)

Though 10 data sources went into the data for the purple map, the chart shows a simplified view into how the areas of most need were chosen. An array of physical and social challenges were analyzed and then each county was given a score of 0 to 6, with 6 showing areas with the highest potential for returns on investment in the form of social benefits to the county. In order to qualify for a high need of investment, counties needed to have high climate risk. Read more about this approach in Appendix B.

DISASTER OCCURRENCES AND FEMA INVESTMENTS BY COUNTY (TABLE)

The chart provides the raw county-level disaster data used to inform the first two maps. Our team found that sifting through disaster declaration data is often difficult or not available. By making these data public and easily accessible, it is our intent that other organizations, academics, governments, and other decision-makers will continue to make use of and build on this collection.

THANK YOU

FUNDERS

Siegel Family Endowment

with

Rockefeller Brothers Foundation Tiger Global Philanthropic Ventures

CONTRIBUTORS

Research:

Eleni Myrivili Hannah Crane **Georgetown Climate Center** Rosa Lander Sam Horowitz

Graphic Design:

Austin Pena Haerim Park Gabrielle Napolitano Geethanjali MR Vishal Amler Xenia Adjoubei

Editing:

Rose Weiner Matthew Greene

Fall 2022

REBUILD BY DESIGN



institute for public knowledge new york university

AUTHORS

Amy Chester Johanna Lawton

PARTNERS

APTIM:

Bridget Huston Cris Weber Heather Vollmer Jane Brogan Jeff Haney Paul Tschirky Samantha Danchuk Steve Kral Zhifei Dong

iParametrics:

Ariel Seigel Jeff Stevens **Paul Pelletier** Mark Homrich





