

# INDIANA



## INDIANA STATISTICS SUMMARY (2011 - 2024)

5	CLIMATE DISASTER DECLARATIONS
\$65.8 MILLION	FEMA + HUD POST-DISASTER FUNDING
6.8 MILLION PEOPLE	POPULATION TOTAL
\$10	PER CAPITA SPENDING ON CLIMATE DISASTERS
WHITE, WARRICK, WARREN, VANDERBURGH, SULLIVAN, MONROE, LAKE, JEFFERSON, CLARK & BENTON (3 DISASTERS)	COUNTY WITH THE HIGHEST DISASTER OCCURRENCES
0	COUNTIES HAVE HAD FIVE OR MORE DISASTERS
1.3 MILLION PEOPLE	LIVE IN AREAS WITH VERY HIGH SOCIAL VULNERABILITY (SVI > 0.75)
7.8 HOURS	TOTAL OUTAGE DURATION (HOURS PER CUSTOMER PER YEAR)
N/A	ASCE INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT CARD GRADE
54	SUPERFUND SITES
\$5.0 BILLION	CLIMATE INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORTED THROUGH SMALL INSURANCE SURCHARGE
\$5 BILLION	OF CLIMATE INFRASTRUCTURE COULD BE SUPPORTED THROUGH A SMALL INSURANCE SURCHARGE




# DISASTER OCCURRENCES 2011-2024

FEDERALLY DECLARED MAJOR DISASTERS BY COUNTY



79% of counties in Indiana have experienced a recent disaster.

Benton, Clark, Jefferson, Lake, Monroe, Sullivan, Vanderburgh, Warren, Warrick, and White County have had the highest number of disasters in the state: 3 disasters each.



Number of Disaster Events


Major Disaster Declarations (2011-2024)

- 0 occurrences
- 1 occurrence
- 2-3 occurrences
- 4-6 occurrences
- 7-9 occurrences
- 10+ occurrences

MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN  
FEMA DATA COURTESY OF IPARAMETRICS

# FEDERAL ASSISTANCE 2011-2024

POST-DISASTER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND HAZARD MITIGATION FUNDS  
OBLIGATED BY COUNTY FOR CLIMATE DISASTERS



\$58.2M FEMA obligations


\$7.7M HUD CDBG-DR Funds

\$65.8M FEMA + HUD assistance

\$10 per capita cost

Indiana has the second lowest per capita spending on climate disasters in the country.

Clark County has received the most post-disaster FEMA assistance in the state: \$3.5 million.



FEMA Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation



Federal Share Obligated (2011-2024)

- \$0 to \$100K
- \$100K to \$1M
- \$1M to \$10M
- \$10M to \$50M
- \$50M to \$100M
- \$100M to \$500M

MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN  
FEMA DATA COURTESY OF IPARAMETRICS

# SOCIAL VULNERABILITY INDEX 2022



AREAS OF GREATEST SOCIAL VULNERABILITY



MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN  
DATA SOURCE: CDC/ATSDR 2022 SVI

# ENERGY RELIABILITY 2023

COUNTIES AT GREATEST RISK OF POWER OUTAGES



MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN  
SOURCE: U.S. ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION 2023

TOTAL: 5 DISASTERS FEMA PA + HM: \$58.2 M HUD CDBG-DR: \$7.7 M FEMA + HUD ASSISTANCE: \$65.8 M				Total		2011		2012		2014		2018		2023	
						1997: SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, AND		4058: SEVERE STORMS, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, AND TORNADOES		4173: SEVERE WINTER STORM AND SNOWSTORM		4363: SEVERE STORMS AND FLOODING		4704: SEVERE STORMS, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, AND TORNADOES	
GEOID	COUNTY NAME	# OF DISASTERS	FEMA TOTAL	PA Obligations	HM Obligations	PA Obligations	HM Obligations	PA Obligations	HM Obligations	PA Obligations	HM Obligations	PA Obligations	HM Obligations	PA Obligations	HM Obligations
18000	18000: Statewide	5	\$17,447,659.41	\$16,414,720.82	\$1,032,938.59	\$2,714,634.28	\$194,355.00	\$3,131,176.93	\$63,155.68	\$2,155,908.91	\$95,203.18	\$1,685,160.40	\$442,063.00	\$6,727,840.30	\$238,161.73
18003	18003: Allen County	2	\$1,075,019.55	\$700,342.10	\$374,677.45					\$700,342.10	\$374,677.45			\$0.00	\$0.00
18007	18007: Benton County	3	\$79,548.59	\$79,548.59	\$0.00	\$15,081.12	\$0.00					\$38,525.06	\$0.00	\$25,942.41	\$0.00
18009	18009: Blackford County	1	\$34,192.58	\$34,192.58	\$0.00					\$34,192.58	\$0.00				
18011	18011: Boone County	2	\$214,583.85	\$214,583.85	\$0.00					\$158,749.70	\$0.00			\$55,834.15	\$0.00
18013	18013: Brown County	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00									\$0.00	\$0.00
18015	18015: Carroll County	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00							\$0.00	\$0.00		
18019	18019: Clark County	3	\$3,476,559.57	\$3,263,873.07	\$212,686.50	\$1,159,359.04	\$0.00	\$1,450,416.39	\$0.00			\$654,097.64	\$212,686.50		
18021	18021: Clay County	2	\$1,532,236.35	\$483,316.35	\$1,048,920.00	\$442,850.79	\$1,048,920.00			\$40,465.56	\$0.00				
18023	18023: Clinton County	2	\$360,225.95	\$360,225.95	\$0.00					\$33,168.46	\$0.00			\$327,057.49	\$0.00
18025	18025: Crawford County	2	\$98,882.61	\$98,882.61	\$0.00	\$21,595.83	\$0.00					\$77,286.78	\$0.00		
18027	18027: Daviess County	1	\$33,579.55	\$33,579.55	\$0.00	\$33,579.55	\$0.00								
18029	18029: Dearborn County	2	\$970,274.06	\$970,274.06	\$0.00	\$670,101.94	\$0.00					\$300,172.12	\$0.00		
18037	18037: Dubois County	1	\$131,351.86	\$131,351.86	\$0.00	\$131,351.86	\$0.00								
18039	18039: Elkhart County	1	\$789,157.10	\$651,500.78	\$137,656.32							\$651,500.78	\$137,656.32		
18043	18043: Floyd County	2	\$1,157,583.57	\$1,157,583.57	\$0.00	\$873,194.59	\$0.00					\$284,388.98	\$0.00		
18047	18047: Franklin County	2	\$89,969.52	\$89,969.52	\$0.00	\$81,959.86	\$0.00			\$8,009.66	\$0.00				
18049	18049: Fulton County	2	\$173,054.09	\$173,054.09	\$0.00					\$38,109.25	\$0.00	\$134,944.84	\$0.00		
18051	18051: Gibson County	2	\$398,077.04	\$398,077.04	\$0.00	\$152,956.15	\$0.00					\$245,120.89	\$0.00		
18053	18053: Grant County	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00									\$0.00	\$0.00
18055	18055: Greene County	1	\$28,327.56	\$28,327.56	\$0.00									\$28,327.56	\$0.00
18057	18057: Hamilton County	1	\$864,678.18	\$864,678.18	\$0.00					\$864,678.18	\$0.00				
18061	18061: Harrison County	2	\$329,985.73	\$329,985.73	\$0.00	\$296,419.88	\$0.00					\$33,565.85	\$0.00		
18063	18063: Hendricks County	1	\$356,186.17	\$356,186.17	\$0.00					\$356,186.17	\$0.00				
18067	18067: Howard County	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00									\$0.00	\$0.00
18069	18069: Huntington County	1	\$94,705.97	\$94,705.97	\$0.00					\$94,705.97	\$0.00				
18071	18071: Jackson County	1	\$713,127.99	\$713,127.99	\$0.00	\$713,127.99	\$0.00								
18073	18073: Jasper County	2	\$1,967,766.34	\$1,967,766.34	\$0.00					\$55,835.46	\$0.00	\$1,911,930.88	\$0.00		
18077	18077: Jefferson County	3	\$1,622,728.40	\$1,622,728.40	\$0.00	\$572,071.71	\$0.00	\$66,834.20	\$0.00			\$983,822.49	\$0.00		
18079	18079: Jennings County	1	\$76,844.03	\$76,844.03	\$0.00	\$76,844.03	\$0.00								
18081	18081: Johnson County	2	\$2,179,191.80	\$2,147,399.70	\$31,792.10					\$242,192.40	\$0.00			\$1,905,207.30	\$31,792.10
18083	18083: Knox County	1	\$207,006.16	\$207,006.16	\$0.00	\$207,006.16	\$0.00								
18085	18085: Kosciusko County	2	\$185,231.19	\$185,231.19	\$0.00					\$185,231.19	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		
18087	18087: LaGrange County	1	\$66,074.55	\$66,074.55	\$0.00					\$66,074.55	\$0.00				
18089	18089: Lake County	3	\$715,403.26	\$715,403.26	\$0.00					\$715,403.26	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
18091	18091: LaPorte County	1	\$537,514.90	\$537,514.90	\$0.00							\$537,514.90	\$0.00		
18093	18093: Lawrence County	1	\$249,473.45	\$249,473.45	\$0.00	\$249,473.45	\$0.00								
18095	18095: Madison County	1	\$272,784.45	\$272,784.45	\$0.00					\$272,784.45	\$0.00				
18097	18097: Marion County	1	\$1,960,982.26	\$1,960,982.26	\$0.00					\$1,960,982.26	\$0.00				
18099	18099: Marshall County	1	\$603,429.94	\$343,479.94	\$259,950.00							\$343,479.94	\$259,950.00		
18101	18101: Martin County	1	\$117,801.57	\$117,801.57	\$0.00	\$117,801.57	\$0.00								
18105	18105: Monroe County	3	\$197,597.93	\$197,597.93	\$0.00	\$47,643.65	\$0.00			\$88,534.94	\$0.00			\$61,419.34	\$0.00
18107	18107: Montgomery County	1	\$79,033.44	\$79,033.44	\$0.00					\$79,033.44	\$0.00				
18109	18109: Morgan County	2	\$2,961,796.65	\$2,961,796.65	\$0.00					\$564,461.26	\$0.00			\$2,397,335.39	\$0.00
18111	18111: Newton County	2	\$160,275.51	\$160,275.51	\$0.00					\$48,465.50	\$0.00	\$111,810.01	\$0.00		
18113	18113: Noble County	1	\$106,460.78	\$106,460.78	\$0.00					\$106,460.78	\$0.00				
18115	18115: Ohio County	2	\$374,802.20	\$374,802.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00					\$374,802.20	\$0.00		
18117	18117: Orange County	1	\$187,449.59	\$168,729.59	\$18,720.00	\$168,729.59	\$18,720.00								
18119	18119: Owen County	2	\$159,339.08	\$100,381.58	\$58,957.50					\$0.00	\$0.00			\$100,381.58	\$58,957.50
18121	18121: Parke County	2	\$111,162.67	\$111,162.67	\$0.00	\$73,888.21	\$0.00			\$37,274.46	\$0.00				
18123	18123: Perry County	2	\$678,332.60	\$678,332.60	\$0.00	\$323,120.83	\$0.00					\$355,211.77	\$0.00		
18125	18125: Pike County	1	\$116,142.64	\$116,142.64	\$0.00	\$116,142.64	\$0.00								
18127	18127: Porter County	1	\$1,037,588.03	\$1,037,588.03	\$0.00							\$1,037,588.03	\$0.00		
18129	18129: Posey County	1	\$218,027.39	\$218,027.39	\$0.00	\$218,027.39	\$0.00								
18131	18131: Pulaski County	1	\$19,910.79	\$19,910.79	\$0.00							\$19,910.79	\$0.00		
18133	18133: Putnam County	2	\$212,833.47	\$212,833.47	\$0.00	\$141,365.25	\$0.00			\$71,468.22	\$0.00				
18137	18137: Ripley County	2	\$122,867.04	\$122,867.04	\$0.00	\$56,379.15	\$0.00	\$66,487.89	\$0.00						
18141	18141: St. Joseph County	1	\$988,858.87	\$439,327.07	\$549,531.80							\$439,327.07	\$549,531.80		
18143	18143: Scott County	2	\$206,690.31	\$206,690.31	\$0.00	\$192,633.77	\$0.00	\$14,056.54	\$0.00						
18147	18147: Spencer County	2	\$157,628.33	\$157,628.33	\$0.00	\$41,367.45	\$0.00					\$116,260.88	\$0.00		
18149	18149: Starke County	2	\$132,201.41	\$132,201.41	\$0.00	\$35,943.19	\$0.00					\$96,258.22	\$0.00		
18153	18153: Sullivan County	3	\$1,846,682.84	\$1,846,682.84	\$0.00	\$221,914.40	\$0.00			\$58,857.66	\$0.00			\$1,565,910.78	\$0.00
18155	18155: Switzerland County	2	\$1,146,318.02	\$1,146,318.02	\$0.00	\$746,400.66	\$0.00					\$399,917.36	\$0.00		
18159	18159: Tipton County	1	\$300,728.51	\$47,137.58	\$253,590.93					\$47,137.58	\$253,590.93				
18163	18163: Vanderburgh County	3	\$2,211,269.20	\$1,984,711.20	\$226,558.00	\$1,430,299.81	\$226,558.00			\$80,504.30	\$0.00	\$473,907.09	\$0.00		
18165	18165: Vermillion County	2	\$137,559.17	\$137,559.17	\$0.00	\$2,937.29	\$0.00					\$134,621.88	\$0.00		
18167	18167: Vigo County	1	\$169,014.72	\$169,014.72	\$0.00					\$169,014.72	\$0.00				
18169	18169: Wabash County	2	\$105,564.38	\$105,564.38	\$0.00					\$84,807.71	\$0.00	\$20,756.67	\$0.00		
18171	18171: Warren County	3	\$199,163.47	\$199,163.47	\$0.00	\$27,513.76	\$0.00					\$79,147.25	\$0.00	\$92,502.46	\$0.00
18173	18173: Warrick County	3	\$1,099,980.28	\$1,090,842.28	\$9,138.00	\$650,884.89	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,138.00			\$439,957.39	\$0.00		
18175	18175: Washington County	2	\$258,206.71	\$258,206.71	\$0.00	\$90,303.95	\$0.00	\$167,902.76	\$0.00						
18177	18177: Wayne County	1	\$455,766.17	\$455,766.17	\$0.00	\$455,766.17	\$0.00								
18181	18181: White County	3	\$727,927.74	\$582,100.38	\$145,827.36					\$74,073.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$508,026.66	\$145,827.36
18183	18183: Whitley County	1	\$78,702.49	\$78,702.49	\$0.00					\$78,702.49	\$0.00				
Total	Total	5	\$58,177,081.58	\$53,816,137.03	\$4,360,944.55	\$13,570,671.85	\$1,488,553.00	\$4,896,874.71	\$72,293.68	\$9,571,816.89	\$723,471.56	\$11,980,988.16	\$1,601,887.62	\$13,795,785.42	\$474,738.60



# APPENDIX

## MAPPING THE IMPACT

### 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 decision-making 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 better-informed 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 2011-2024. 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 by county from 2011-2024 – providing a snapshot of the magnitude of climate disasters across the country in recent history. This report only identifies federally declared disasters, as there is no entity that collects and publishes state disaster declarations. It should be noted that the declarations shown in this report do not reflect every climate event that has occurred between 2011-2024; the report instead only shows those which have met the cost threshold for a federal disaster declaration. Therefore, the findings overall underestimate the number of occurrences and the suffering that some communities have experienced.

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 OCCURRENCES  
SOURCE: FEMA 2011-2024  
MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN

or explosion, in any part of the United States, which in the determination of the President causes damage of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant major disaster assistance under this Act to supplement the efforts and available resources of States, local governments, and disaster relief organizations in alleviating the damage, loss, hardship, or suffering caused thereby.”

Importantly, extreme heat waves do not fit the criteria for federal disaster declarations despite being the leading cause of deaths among climate hazards. Likewise, sea level rise is not included in this definition despite the threat it poses to numerous communities, including damage to property, loss of land, and displacement.

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 2011-2024 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 ASSISTANCE  
SOURCE: FEMA (HA+PM) 2011-2024  
MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN

The Disaster Declaration tables provided at the end of each chapter show all federal Disaster Declarations declared between 2011-2024 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 2011-2024 after 2024, so the total sum of funds associated with that event are not captured.** All FEMA funds allocated to counties between 2011-2024 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. 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



SOCIAL VULNERABILITY  
SOURCE: CDC/ATSDR 2022  
MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN

level, indicating where the most socially vulnerable populations within each county live. The 15 indicators are grouped into four themes:


- **Socioeconomic Status** (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.

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.



ENERGY RELIABILITY  
SOURCE: US ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION 2023  
MAP MADE BY REBUILD BY DESIGN



**System Average Interruption Duration Index (SAIDI)** is one of the performance metrics used to measure the reliability of an electric utility’s service. This metric measures the total time (in minutes) an average customer experiences a non-momentary power interruption over a one-year (calendar) period.

A Major Event Day (MED) is another metric which occurs when the SAIDI exceeds a specific threshold within a given day and tends to reflect outages on the longer end of the spectrum. The data presented in this report shows a metric of SAIDI combined with MED to highlight and report electric reliability in areas (utility territories) irrespective of the root cause of the interruption. The Energy Reliability Map displays the SAIDI\_W\_MED metric for utility territories and highlights areas that are susceptible to electric system vulnerabilities based on reliability performances. These vulnerabilities serve as an indicator as to where investments and improvements in the distribution grid should be focused.

Electric utilities experience power interruptions due to a variety of issues. Those issues include inclement weather, vegetation management practices, utility practices, maintenance patterns, and capital investment strategy, among others, which all play a part in a utility’s overall reliability performance. The U.S. Energy Information Administration produces an Annual Electric Power Industry Report which utilizes data collected from U.S. electric utilities reflecting their reliability performance against certain industry standards and performance metrics. Utilities have the flexibility to report interruptions according to duration and frequency either with major events, without major events, or both.

The annual SAIDI is the summation of the individual SAIDIs for each non-momentary interruption event over the entire year (2023):

$$SAIDI = \frac{\sum(\text{Duration of Interruption} \times \text{No. of Sustained Customer Interruptions})}{\text{Total No. of Customers Served}}$$

For utilities that report SAIDI metrics using the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) standards, “non-momentary” interruptions are those lasting

longer than five minutes. A Major Event Day (MED) is another metric which occurs when the SAIDI exceeds a specific threshold within a given day and tends to reflect outages on the longer end of the spectrum.

Utilities have certain flexibilities when reporting with these metrics. Including MED in the SAIDI metric (SAIDI\_W\_MED) provides an overall picture of the electric reliability experienced by customers. Excluding MED from the SAIDI metrics (SAIDI\_WO\_MED) tends to separate power interruption events by their durations, which provides an indicator of the source of the power interruption (i.e., distinguishes a Major Event vs. Systematic Operation interruption).

Our methodology utilizes SAIDI\_W\_MED as the primary measurement indicator for the electric reliability experience of the end user (customer). Our SAIDI\_W\_MED metric highlights the reported electric reliability in areas (utility territories, counties, and states) irrespective of the root cause of the interruption. Our metric does not exclude interruptions categorized as MEDs.

This report endeavors to highlight areas across the national electric distribution network (utility territories) that are susceptible to electric system vulnerabilities based on historical reliability of performance. We view vulnerabilities caused by major events (longer duration outages) on par with vulnerabilities caused by systematic failures (shorter duration outages) and believe they should equally drive electric grid investment and improvement decisions. These investments should also incorporate solutions aimed at mitigating systemic vulnerabilities that stem from issues like vegetation management practices, distribution automation improvements to major event vulnerabilities with root causes embedded in grid hardening, distribution generation schemes, and Automated Metering Infrastructure (AMI) upgrades aimed at minimizing customer interruption numbers and durations.

WE  
CANNOT  
WAIT ANY  
LONGER = = =