

Project Name and Number:

**Raging River Views Park Flood Acquisition Project (HVMP-2003-01)**

Project Budget:

**\$360,000**

Project Description:

**Acquisition and demolition of 14 flood-prone structures**

Associated Goal and Objective(s):

**Goal: Minimize losses to existing and future structures within hazard areas**

**Objective: Reduce potential damages to the manufactured home park in the floodplain**

Indicator of Success (e.g., losses avoided):

**Losses avoided by acquisition and demolition of flood-prone structures**



Town of Hazardville Composite Loss Map developed previously during risk assessment (see FEMA 386-2).

Was the action implemented?  YES  NO

**IF NO**

**Why not?**

Was there political support for the action?

**YES NO**

Were enough funds available?

Were workloads equitably or realistically distributed?

Was new information discovered about the risks or community that made implementation difficult or no longer sensible?

Was the estimated time of implementation reasonable?

Were sufficient resources (for example staff and technical assistance) available?

**IF YES**

What were the results of the implemented action?

**Of the 14 proposed properties, 10 were acquired. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.19, based on project benefits of \$789,000 and costs of \$360,274. Benefits are based on the net present value of the avoided damages over the project life. Furthermore, about 40 people are no longer in the path of a potential flood, making emergency rescue operations in that area less likely and evacuation easier.**

	YES	NO
Were the outcomes as expected? If No, please explain:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The project originally set out to acquire 14 properties. Four of the 14 owners did not want to participate in the buyout program.</b>		
Did the results achieve the goal and objective(s)? Explain how:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Despite four properties still in harm's way, the objective has been largely met. See additional comments.</b>		
Was the action cost-effective? Explain how or how not:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>The FEMA Limited Data module was used to perform the benefit-cost analysis. Data for the analysis was collected from historical flood data and used as benchmarks in the before mitigation section of the analysis. The damages after mitigation section was left blank, due to the properties being permanently acquired, and the economic risk removed completely. The analysis resulted in a benefit-cost ratio of 2.19, with benefits totaling \$789,000 for 10 properties.</b>		
What were the losses avoided after having completed the project?		
<b>Total avoided losses are \$789,000 over the lifetime of the project (estimated at 100 years).</b>		
If it was a structural project, how did it change the hazard profile?		
<b>N/A</b>		
Additional comments or other outcomes:		
<b>The Planning Department has agreed to work with the remaining four homeowners in evaluating other flood-proofing options.</b>		

Date: **October 12, 2005**

Prepared by: **Hazardville Department of Economic Development  
Hazardville Department of Planning**