

Is the Bavarian flood protection policy useful to decrease flood damage? Dr. Klaus Wagner



Evaluation concepts = policy/scientific paradigm

Vulnerability approach Security approach Risk approach The state should guarantee a uniform security State funds should be allocated in an optimal way to Resilience of society should be increased to level for all citizens. reduce the risk level of the state or a special region. reduce the losses due to natural disasters. Focus on the hazard · Focus mainly on the hazard Focus on society + Enforced by law, e.g. German constitutional law + Leading paradigm in flood hazard research Avoidance of Safe Development Paradox Ineffective money allocation because areas with + Effective money allocation Needs long-standing commitment of local high damage potential are not better protected stakeholders Structural measures lead to an increase in damage than those with low damage potential potential which leads to bigger natural disasters (Safe Development Paradox; Levee Effect)

Major trends in Bavarian flood protection policy

Increasing responsibility of the state for hazard protection

Law Type of river Responsibility for Length maintenance and upgrade expenses GBW Public rivers Ca. 2300 km District 1852 BayWG Public rivers State Ca. 2300 km 1907 Private rivers with District Ca. 410 km high flooding danger BayWG 1st order rivers Ca. 4800 km State 1959 2nd order rivers District Ca. 4200 km

Increasing safety standards

• 100-year flood standard obligatory for all big rivers and alpine torrents

Priority for structural mitigation measures

E.g. Program 2020 (enacted after the Pentecost 1999 flood disaster)
annual costs: for structural measures €115 million for flood zone mapping €2,7 million; for improvement of the warning system €1,7 million

Initial actions inspired by the risk approach

- No structural measures for agricultural land.
- Higher security level at the Isar River due to construction and upgrades of the Sylvenstein dam (2005: inflow >200-year flood; outflow <100-year flood)

Example: Flood zone declaration

	Program central objectives				Program subsidiary objectives				Program administration		
Legal basis	Flood	Reten -tion area	Ecology	Damage potential	Return interval of discharge	Area					
	dis- charge					Dis- charge area	Reten- tion area	High Priority near existing development	Funding	Organization	Declaration process
GBW 1852					?					Flood Zone Mapping - Water Authority; Declaration - District Office.	No declaration
BayWG 1907; VwV 1908					>50 years				Normal		Stakeholder consultation with site inspection
WHG 1957					?				the		
BayWG 1959 VwV 1969					>100 years				responsible agencies		Stakeholder consultation; until 1994 county council resolution also necessary
WHG 1996					?						
BayWG 1994 VwV 1999					?				Specially funded		Process since 1999 unclear; since 2003 stakeholder consul- tation with a formal hearing
WHG 2005					>100 year				projects		Stakeholder hearing

BayWG = Bayerisches Wassergesetz = Bavarian Water Law; GBW = Gesetz über die Benützung der Gewässer = Law On the Use of Water Bodies ; VwV = Verwaltungsvorschrift = Administrative Regulation; WHG = Wasserhaushaltsgesetz = German Federal Water Act



• Flood zone declaration changes from an exclusive water management issue to an instrument for spatial planning and environmental protection.

- Implementation of the program was delayed. Until 2006 only 40% of the bigger rivers flood zones had been declared.
- The delay in implementation was caused by a lack of finance until 1997 (start of the Bavarian flood zone mapping program), since then regular changes to the legal basis have caused conflicts with local people and uncertainty for the responsible agencies.

Conclusion

Current policy mainly follows the security approach. New projects, especially for Bavarian towns, try to implement higher security levels for high risk zones. There is no ranking of projects according to cost-benefit analyses. Although the negative effects of technical protection measures are recognized in literature, the Bavarian flood protection policy still emphasizes structural measures. In presentations and publications the Bavarian policy is described as favoring non-structural measures, however funding is still dominated by structural measures.

Contact information:

Chair of Forest and Environmental Policy, University of Technology Munich, Dr. Klaus Wagner, Am Hochanger 13, 85356 Freising, Germany. Phone: +49/8161/71-4751, e-mail: wagner@forst.tu-muenchen.de