

Appendix A: Parameter Changes for Flood-1a Mitigation Policies

| new PE incentive | Local | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| incentives to attract Policy Entrepreneurs | What if incentives were provided for new policy entrepreneurs to become active in the policy process. | fraction of vulnerable property perceived by PE | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| new PE active | Local | | |
|---|--|---|-----|
| incentives to attractive and keep PE involved | What if incentives were given to attract policy entrepreneurs and keep them active in the policy process. | fraction of PE losing interest | .05 |
| | | fraction of vulnerable property perceived by PE | 1 |
| | The time to lose interest increases four times the base run and all of the vulnerable property is perceived as vulnerable. | | |

| commit to knowledge | Local | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| lowering the knowledge commitment threshold | what if incentives were provided to build knowledge without political commitment. | commitment to mitigation effect on vulnerability knowledge | make .5 the lowest value |
| | | | |
| | Allow knowledge to build even without political commitment | | |

| reduce relief stakeholders | Local | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|----|
| Incentives to reduce relief stakeholders | What if there are incentives to reduce the number of stakeholders for relief and protective policies. | fraction of RP losing interest | .5 |
| | | | |
| | Double the fraction of stakeholders losing interests | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| <u>structures fail</u> | Local | time to forget structural failure | 20 |
| remember levee breaks/ structures that fail | what if public information campaigns would increase the memory of levee breaks and play down structural protection. | max fraction vulnerable property protected by structural mitigation | .5 |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|----------------|
| <u>LD zoning</u> | Local | available property effect on land development coalition | max effect =.5 |
| zoning policies to reduce LD stakeholder influence | What if there are incentives and sanctions to restrict land development stakeholder influence on zoning policy decisions. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------|
| <u>less tax pressure</u> | Federal | development effect on new problems | constant at 1 |
| aid to lower property tax pressures | what if resources were provided to control infrastructure costs and local problems. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------|
| <u>regulating recovery</u> | Federal | fraction of damaged properties recovered with public resources | 1 |
| federal funds for recovery creates open space | What if every time recovery uses federal resources, locals are forced to create open space. | federal relief effect on buyout incentives | constant at 1 |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <u>restore environment</u> | Local | switch for natural barrier regulations | 1 |
| structural mit resources to replenish barriers | what if structural mitigation resources are used to replenish natural barriers. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|----------------|
| <u>exist damage memory</u> | Local | existing damage effect on fraction forgetting | never below .5 |
| use existing damage to build memory | what if public information used existing damage to build memory of risk | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|----------------|
| <u>exist memory no forget</u> | Local | existing damage effect on fraction forgetting | never below .5 |
| use damage and do not forget damage | what if public information campaigns used existing damage and provided reminders to keep memory alive | damage forget fraction | .125 |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|----------|
| <u>research floods</u> | Local | commitment to mitigation effect on vulnerability knowledge | always 1 |
| annual research on floods | what if there were annual vulnerability assessments with or without political commitment | time to conduct vulnerability assessment | 1 |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|---|
| <u>low relief agenda</u> | Local | fraction of RP losing interest | 1 |
| restricting protective stakeholder influence | what if incentives prevented PE for relief from staying active in the policy process. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---------|
| <u>less development</u> | Local | PE for LD losing interest t | 1 |
| reduce stakeholders for development | what if incentives reduced the number stakeholders for development | available property effect on land development coalition | max =.5 |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| restrict LD PE | Local | PE for LD losing interest t | 1 |
| lower LD and less effective | what if incentives lowered LD stakeholders and made them less effective in the policy process | PE effect on communicating benefits of development | soft if/then starts at 0 instead of 1 |
| | | | |

| CRS | | Local | | damage forget fraction | | .125 |
|--|---|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|
| mitigation with all four CRS activity categories | What if a community decided to enact and implement policies in all 4 CRS categories | | existing damage effect on fraction forgetting | | never greater than .5 | |
| | | | commitment to mitigation effect on vulnerability knowledge | | never less than .5 | |
| | | | | | | |
| fraction of vulnerable property | fraction of PE losing interest | time to correct structural gap | levee increase multiplier | time to perceive wetland capacity | commitment to mitigation effect on | |
| 1 | .05 | 1 | 4 | 1.25 | never greater than .5 | |

| | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| Base | Local | | |
| Base | No policy parameters are changed. Base conditions apply. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| more levees | Local | levee increase multiplier | 4 |
| perceive the worst case scenario | What if communities responded to events with more structural mitigation projects. What if their worst case scenario was 4 times the last event instead of 2 times the last event. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| media | Local | media effect on reporting damage | 2 |
| media overestimates damage | What if the media overestimated the damages for each event. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------------------------|------|
| <u>memory</u> | Local | damage forget fraction | .125 |
| Keep the memory alive | what if public information campaigns were used to keep the memory of damage alive for more than 4 years. | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|-----|
| <u>PE mit active</u> | Local | fraction of PE losing interest | .05 |
| Policy Entrepreneurs do not find other problems | What if policy entrepreneurs were provided incentives to stay active in the policy process. | | |
| | | | |
