



CLIMATE  CENTRAL

# CALIFORNIA, OREGON, WASHINGTON AND THE SURGING SEA

A vulnerability assessment with projections for  
sea level rise and coastal flood risk

Boulder Creek

This page intentionally blank

# CALIFORNIA, OREGON, WASHINGTON AND THE SURGING SEA

## A VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT WITH PROJECTIONS FOR SEA LEVEL RISE AND COASTAL FLOOD RISK

### ABOUT CLIMATE CENTRAL

**Climate Central** surveys and conducts scientific research on climate change and informs the public of key findings. Our scientists publish and our journalists report on climate science, energy, sea level rise, wildfires, drought, and related topics. Climate Central is not an advocacy organization. We do not lobby, and we do not support any specific legislation, policy or bill. Climate Central is a qualified 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization.

**Climate Central** scientists publish peer-reviewed research on climate science; energy; impacts such as sea level rise; climate attribution and more. Our work is not confined to scientific journals. We investigate and synthesize weather and climate data and science to equip local communities and media with the tools they need.

June 2014

Princeton: One Palmer Square, Suite 330 Princeton, NJ 08542  
Phone: +1 609 924-3800  
Toll Free: +1 877 4-CLI-SCI / +1 (877 425-4724)  
[www.climatecentral.org](http://www.climatecentral.org)

---

## REPORT AUTHORS

### BEN STRAUSS, PhD, Lead

Vice President for Climate Impacts and Director of the Program on Sea Level Rise, Climate Central

Dr. Strauss directs Climate Central's Program on Sea Level Rise. He has published multiple scientific papers on sea level rise, testified before the U.S. Senate, and led development of the SurgingSeas.org coastal flood risk tool, leading to front-page coverage in the New York Times and Washington Post, appearances on NBC, ABC, CBS, PBS and NPR national programming. He holds a Ph.D. in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology from Princeton University, an M.S. in Zoology from the University of Washington, and a B.A. in Biology from Yale University.

### CLAUDIA TEBALDI, PhD

Project Scientist, National Center for Atmospheric Research and Science Fellow, Climate Central

Dr. Tebaldi is a climate statistician at the National Center for Atmospheric Research and collaborates with the Climate Science and Impacts groups at Climate Central. Her research interests include the analysis of observations and climate model output in order to characterize observed and projected climatic changes and their uncertainties. She has published papers on detection and attribution of these changes, on extreme value analysis, future projections at regional levels, and impacts of climate change on agriculture and human health and she is currently a lead author for the IPCC Assessment Report, within Working Group 1. She has a Ph.D. in statistics from Duke University.

### SCOTT KULP

Senior Developer and Research Associate, Climate Central

Scott Kulp serves as Senior Developer and Research Associate for Climate Central's Program on Sea Level Rise. Most recently he has worked on the development of Climate Central's Surging Seas 2.0 Analysis System and Risk Finder web toolkit. Previously, at Rutgers, he published several papers on the topic of 3D blood flow simulations as well as worked for the U.S. Department of Defense on several research projects. Scott holds an M.S. and is finishing a Ph.D. in Computer Science at Rutgers University, and holds a B.S. in Computer Science from Ursinus College.

---

## CONTRIBUTORS

### SUSAN CUTTER, PhD

Hazards and Vulnerability Research Institute, University of South Carolina

### CHRIS EMRICH, PhD

Hazards and Vulnerability Research Institute, University of South Carolina

### DANIEL RIZZA

Climate Central

### DANIEL YAWITZ

Climate Central

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To NOAA's Coastal Services Center, which has provided high-accuracy coastal elevation data, consistent courtesy, and leadership with its Sea Level Rise Viewer, an enterprise this research strives to extend.

To officials at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and other agencies, who provided special guidance regarding their extensive public geospatial datasets.

To Climate Central's financial supporters for this project: The Kresge Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation, The Schmidt Family Foundation, and Island Foundation.

And finally to all of our present and past colleagues at Climate Central not listed as authors or contributors, but who have provided support on this project in small ways and large, with particular thanks to Remik Ziemlinski, and also Paul Ferlita, Lindsay Harmon, and Alyson Kenward.

## SUGGESTED CITATION

Strauss, B., C. Tebaldi, S. Kulp, S. Cutter, C. Emrich, D. Rizza, and D. Yawitz (2014). California, Oregon, Washington and the Surging Sea: A vulnerability assessment with projections for sea level rise and coastal flood risk. Climate Central Research Report. pp 1-29.

---

# CONTENTS

Executive Summary	7
Introduction	8
In Brief	8
Research Improvements	8
Surging Seas Risk Finder: A New Online Tool	9
A Timeline of Growing Risks	10
Sea level rise projections	10
Global sea level rise projections	10
Local sea level rise projections	11
Coastal flooding: History and projections	12
Historical analysis to define extreme floods	12
Coastal flood projections	12
Global warming multiplies extreme flood risk	13
People, Property and Infrastructure in Harm's Way	14
Land	14
People, property and infrastructure	15
The most vulnerable	16
Conclusion	18
References	19

---

# CONTENTS

Appendix A: Methods	21
Projecting local sea level rise	21
Projecting coastal flood risk	22
Estimating global warming flood risk multipliers	24
Mapping low coastal areas	25
Assessing social vulnerability	26
Estimating exposure of people, property and infrastructure	28
Appendix B: Glossary and Abbreviations	29

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sea levels are rising at an accelerating rate, and the scientific community is confident that global warming is the most important cause. Higher sea levels translate to more and higher coastal floods. To forecast future risk, this analysis integrates historic flood statistics with local sea level rise projections developed by the U.S. National Research Council. Under mid-range projections, floods exceeding today's historic records are likely to take place throughout California, Oregon and Washington within the next 30 years. In Southern California, such floods would become annual events within the same period; in Northern California and Puget Sound, this would take up to six decades.

Low-range sea level projections lead to an at least 50 percent chance of floods exceeding 3 feet above the high tide line within 50 years, at all sites assessed from San Diego to Seattle. Under high-range projections, there is an at least 50 percent chance of floods above 6 feet at each site by the end of the century, with much higher floods possible but with lower probability.

1,300 square miles of land lie less than 3 feet above the high tide line in California, Oregon and Washington. The total drops to 475 when accounting for potential protections from levees, beach ridges and other features. Some \$42 billion in property value, and 72,000 homes, sit on this smaller area. These figures jump to \$111 billion and 202,000 homes on 825 square miles of land under 6 feet, after accounting for potential protections.

Also accounting for protections, California accounts for half of the total exposed land at each elevation, but more than 85 percent of exposed homes and property value. Washington accounts for about one third of the total land exposure, and one eighth of homes and property. While Oregon is home to almost one fifth of the exposed land at each elevation, its housing and property exposure range from 1 to 3 percent for the total region.

Combined, the three states have 1,047 miles of road below 3 feet, after accounting for potential protections, plus 32 schools, 7 power plants, and 569 EPA-listed sites such as hazardous waste dumps and sewage plants. At 6 feet, these numbers grow to more than 3,125 miles of road, 105 schools, 25 power plants, and 1,938 EPA-listed sites.

This report is being released as a summary of findings coincident with the online launch of a California, Oregon and Washington Surging Seas Risk Finder tool, accessible via <http://sealevel.climatecentral.org>.

The tool includes:

- Interactive local projections of sea level rise and increasing coastal flood risk from 1-10 feet by decade;
- A zooming, zip-searchable map of low-lying areas threatened, plus layers showing social vulnerability, population density and property value;
- Detailed assessments of populations, property, infrastructure and contamination sources exposed, for each implicated county, city, town, zip code, planning district, legislative district and more; and
- State- and county-wide heat maps facilitating high-level vulnerability comparisons.

Detailed knowledge of vulnerability is a critical tool for communities seeking to build resiliency to the climate challenges of today and the future.



---

# 01. INTRODUCTION

## IN BRIEF

In March 2012, Climate Central released its first analysis of sea level rise and coastal flood threats in the United States. We published two [scientific papers](#) in a peer-reviewed journal; a [national report](#); fact sheets for each coastal state; and an interactive online map called [Surging Seas](#). About [800 stories](#) in local to national media covered our findings, and a [U.S. Senate committee](#) invited Climate Central to testify about the research in April 2012 – six months before Hurricane Sandy.

This report represents a major extension to our analysis for California, Oregon and Washington, using the same essential methods as our original work, but incorporating greatly improved and expanded data. The report summarizes major themes and findings taken from a much larger body of results accessible via a new interactive online tool, the [Surging Seas Risk Finder](#), available for a growing set of coastal states throughout the U.S.

## RESEARCH IMPROVEMENTS

Our 2012 analysis used the best available national coverage elevation dataset at the time. This analysis uses far more accurate laser-based (lidar) elevation data. Our 2012 research assessed land, population and housing vulnerable to sea level rise and coastal flooding. This research assesses over 100 additional variables, including socially vulnerable populations, populations by racial and ethnic group, property value, roads, rail, airports, power plants, sewage plants, hazardous waste sites, schools, churches, and hospitals. Our 2012 analysis tabulated exposure at state, county, and city levels. This analysis adds zip codes, congressional districts, planning districts, state and local legislative districts, and more.

For sea level rise projections, this report relies primarily upon localized Pacific Coast projections by the National Research Council (NRC 2012). The full analysis and Risk Finder also include updated scenarios for future emissions of carbon pollution, as developed by the global climate research community. We use updated models of the global warming expected from these emissions, and a selection of global sea level rise models, instead of just one. We then factor in local effects, such as sinking land, to develop local sea level rise projections, employing the same methods as in our original peer-reviewed research.

We also carry forward the same methods we previously used to characterize storm surge risk, and integrate it with projected sea levels, to develop projections of overall local flood risk by decade. However, we have updated analysis inputs to include the full available record of hourly water levels at each water level station through the end of 2012. This means decades more data for most stations than the standard 30-year period used in the original analysis, increasing the robustness of our findings.

---

# 01. INTRODUCTION

## SURGING SEAS RISK FINDER: A NEW ONLINE TOOL

The Surging Seas Risk Finder is searchable by geography, and offers easy navigation and visualization of analysis results from hundreds of thousands of combinations of location, water level, and risk element. The Risk Finder is divided into four components:

- **Map:** Interactive zooming map of sea level and flood risk zones
- **Forecast:** Projections of sea level rise and flood risk
- **Analysis:** Detailed analysis of exposed population, assets and infrastructure by individual location, from zip to state level
- **Comparison:** Comparisons of exposure across the whole state or selected county

---

# 02. A TIMELINE OF GROWING RISKS

Long before sea level rise permanently submerges new land, it will make its presence felt through higher and more frequent coastal floods, because higher seas raise the launch pad for storm surge.

In fact, every coastal flood today is already wider, deeper and more damaging because of the roughly 8 inches (IPCC 2013) of warming-driven global sea level rise that has taken place since 1900. This analysis finds that a moderate sea level rise scenario leads to better than even chances of historically unprecedented coastal flooding within the next 10 to 30 years throughout California, Oregon and Washington's Puget Sound. A fast scenario means near certainty in the same time frame.

This section explores projected sea level rise and how it aggravates coastal flooding.

## SEA LEVEL RISE PROJECTIONS

Using National Research Council (2012) projections, this analysis finds that future local sea level rise increases with latitude along the Pacific Coast -- from San Diego, California, where midcentury projections range from 0.5-1.6 feet, through Neah Bay, Washington, at the tip of the Olympic Peninsula, where they range from 0.1-1.2 feet. By 2100, the ranges are 1.7-4.9 feet for San Diego, and 0.8-3.9 feet for Neah Bay. These figures all use sea level in 2012 as the baseline.

### Global Sea Level Rise Projections

The Earth's average temperature has warmed by more than one degree Fahrenheit over the last century, and scientists overwhelmingly agree that most or all of this warming comes from human influence (IPCC 2013). This influence comes mainly through the burning of fossil fuels and resulting accumulation of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Global sea level rise is one of the scientifically best-established consequences of this warming. Warming shrinks glaciers and ice sheets, adding water to the ocean; and also heats up the ocean, expanding it. Over the past two decades, global sea level has risen roughly twice as fast as it did during the 20th century.

Projecting future sea level is a difficult scientific challenge, not least because it will depend upon how much more carbon humans put into the atmosphere. The National Research Council projected 1.7, 2.7 or 4.6 ft of global sea level rise by 2100, measured against a 2000 baseline. For simplicity, we call these scenarios "slow", "medium" and "fast."

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recently released its Fifth Assessment Report on climate science (IPCC 2013). IPCC's sea level projections range from 0.9-3.2 feet by 2100, but explicitly do not include a potential rapid ice sheet breakdown scenario. The NRC's projections, especially the fast scenario, incorporate greater contributions from ice sheets.

Surging Seas Risk Finder, the interactive web tool accompanying this report, includes projections

---

## 02. A TIMELINE OF GROWING RISKS

based on all three NRC scenarios; scenarios developed by NOAA for the National Climate Assessment; IPCC projections; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers guidelines, semi-empirical projections developed by Vermeer and Rahmstorf (2009); and a no-global-warming scenario for comparison. We will add additional global sea level rise projections over time.

### **Local Sea Level Rise Projections**

Local sea level rise can differ from global sea level rise for many reasons. The ocean is not flat, and shifting currents and sea surface temperatures can alter local sea level trends over years or decades. In addition, the land itself is slowly sinking or (more rarely) rising in many coastal areas, augmenting or diminishing local sea level rise. Later in the century, gravity effects will also play a role: as ice sheets diminish, so will the gravitational force they exert on the oceans, and ocean surface water will make subtle adjustments accordingly.

For its main projections, this analysis uses the National Research Council's local projections, interpolated to each study site. For estimates based on global projections from other studies, this analysis employs the same method as Tebaldi et al (2012) to develop projections for each location studied. In essence, we compare global sea level rise to local sea level rise measured at a water level station over a 50-year period. We use the difference to define a local component of sea level rise, and assume that the local component rate will continue unchanged into the future. This is a reasonable assumption at least for the effects of sinking or rising land, effects important enough to account for most or all of the long-term local component in most places (Tebaldi et al 2012). (See Appendix A or Tebaldi et al (2012) for more detail.)

For this report and as presented by the Surging Seas Risk Finder, we developed projections at NOAA water level stations at San Diego, La Jolla, Los Angeles, Port San Luis, Monterey, San Francisco, and Alameda in California; plus Charleston, South Beach, and Astoria in Oregon; and Toke Point, Seattle and Neah Bay in Washington. Projections across these locations varied with latitude, with the highest rises expected in South California, and the lowest expected in northern Washington. Our "medium" projections ranged from 0.5 ft (Neah Bay) to 0.9 ft (San Diego) by 2050, and from 2.0 ft to 2.9 ft by 2100 for the same locations.

The projections given in this analysis should be taken as indicative of long-term trends, and not as precise projections for specific years. Global and local sea level experience natural ups and downs over years and decades that may temporarily obscure the underlying trend, but which will balance out over time.

---

## 02. A TIMELINE OF GROWING RISKS

### COASTAL FLOODING: HISTORY AND PROJECTIONS

Rising seas raise the launch pad for storm surge, driving coastal floods higher. This study projects future flood risk by superimposing sea level rise projections onto historical patterns of flooding. In other words, we assume that coastal storm statistics remain constant – the same frequency and intensity of coastal storms – while sea levels rise. If storms instead worsen, then this analysis would underestimate flood risk.

#### Historical Analysis to Define Extreme Floods

The first step in this approach is to characterize historical coastal flood risk at each study site – in this case, each water level station assessed in California, Oregon and Washington. We apply standard methods to estimate the precise relationship between a flood’s height and its annual likelihood (the higher the rarer), based on a long historical record of hourly water levels. For example, based on sea level in 2012, we estimate that a flood with a 1% annual chance – what we call an “extreme” flood in this study, and commonly referred to as a “100-year” flood – reaches 2.9 feet above the high tide line at San Francisco. In over 100 years of records, the all-time observed high was 2.8 feet above the same reference (in 1983, during the strongest El Nino of the century).

We apply the same methods as Tebaldi et al (2012) for this analysis (see Appendix A for a briefer summary). However, we update our previous findings by now including water level records through the end of 2012, and back to the earliest year with reliable records at each water level station. This allows us to project future risks of “unprecedented” floods as well as statistically “extreme” ones.

In this report, we give all flood heights and water levels in elevations relative to Mean Higher High Water (MHHW), or what we more simply call today’s “high tide line,” defined based on tide levels during NOAA’s standard 1983-2001 tidal “epoch.” Our purpose is to give a good sense of how high floods might reach above normal local high water lines. Note that different sources use different reference frames; [tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov](http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov) (more specifically [here](#)) provides data for inter-conversions at most stations, for example to and from Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) and standard modern map elevation (North American Vertical Datum 1988, or NAVD88).

#### Coastal Flood Projections

As sea levels rise, they increase the chances of extreme floods by today’s standards. For example, an extreme flood reaching 2.3 feet above the present high tide line at Los Angeles would today require a 1%-annual-chance combination of storm surge and tide. But after just 6 inches of sea level rise, a flood reaching the same absolute elevation would only require a 6 inch lesser combination of storm and tide, coming with a roughly 100% annual chance. The transition from rarity to every-year event is set to be swift.

---

## 02. A TIMELINE OF GROWING RISKS

We assessed when floods would exceed the highest-ever observed flood at each of the study stations (see [http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/est/Top10\\_form\\_ft.pdf](http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/est/Top10_form_ft.pdf) for historic flood listings), and found greater than 50 percent chances over the next 10-30 years, based on the National Research Council's medium sea level rise projections. More dramatically, in California, floods exceeding today's records become at least annual events within 30 years in the south, and 40-60 years in the north. Under the Council's high-range projections, these transitions take place 10-20 years earlier.

We conducted the same essential analysis for standard water levels from 1-10 ft above the high tide line, computing probabilities for each level by decade, for all of the stations analyzed. For example, in California, we found that floods would reach greater than 3 feet above the high tide line every year by 2060 at study sites from San Diego to Los Angeles, and by 2070 from Port San Luis to San Francisco, under the NRC's medium sea level rise scenario. Under the fast scenario, the same floods would become annual events by midcentury across all sites. Historic record floods range from 2.3-2.5 feet for Monterey and south, and 2.8-3.1 feet for the Bay Area.

The Surging Seas Risk Finder presents complete results for all levels and locations.

While sea level rise projections are fairly similar for most of the water level stations studied, the local flood risk profiles vary a little more substantially. In general, flood risk by elevation can vary significantly across short distances, depending upon local geography. Thus the escalating flood risks computed for each station may be taken as indicative of increasing risk in its wider area, but should not be interpreted as providing predictions for nearby areas.

### **Global warming multiplies extreme flood risk**

Since sea level rise multiplies extreme coastal flood risk, and global warming contributes to sea level rise, global warming multiplies flood risk. This effect is independent of any potential warming influence on storm frequency or intensity. We assessed the sea level driven global warming multiplier by comparing flood probabilities with and without the global component of sea level rise (leaving out local components that might come from sinking or rising land).

We found that global warming has already multiplied the likelihood of extreme floods by factors often exceeding 10 at sites in all study states.

Multipliers for cumulative flood probabilities (last row of Figures 1 and B1-7) behave more complexly, because the cumulative risk for an extreme flood becomes substantial when accumulated across many decades, even in the absence of global sea level rise. This puts a cap on multiplier values: for example, a background 50% cumulative risk cannot have a multiplier any greater than 2X.

---

# 03. PEOPLE, PROPERTY AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN HARM'S WAY

1,300 square miles of land lie less than 3 feet above the high tide line in California, Oregon and Washington. The total drops to 475 when accounting for potential protections from levees, beach ridges and other features. Some \$42 billion in property value, and 72,000 homes, sit on this smaller area. These figures jump to \$111 billion and 202,000 homes on 825 square miles of land under 6 feet, after accounting for potential protections.

Also accounting for protections, California accounts for half of the total exposed land at each elevation, but more than 85 percent of exposed homes and property value. Washington accounts for about one third of the total land exposure, and one eighth of homes and property. While Oregon is home to almost one fifth of the exposed land at each elevation, its housing and property exposure range from 1 to 3 percent for the total region.

Combined, the three states have 1,047 miles of road below 3 feet, after accounting for potential protections, plus 32 schools, 7 power plants, and 569 EPA-listed sites such as hazardous waste dumps and sewage plants. At 6 feet, these numbers grow to more than 3,125 miles of road, 105 schools, 25 power plants, and 1,938 EPA-listed sites.

## LAND

California, Oregon and Washington have about 1,300 square miles of land at less than 3 feet MHHW, increasing modestly to almost 1,600 square miles less than 6 ft above the tide line. The counties of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta area in California – San Joaquin, Sacramento, Solano, Contra Costa, and Yolo – account for almost exactly half of these totals.

These values are based on analysis of high-resolution land and tidal elevation data from NOAA, after screening out areas classified as saltwater wetlands by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (see Appendix A for more detailed methodology).

We further analyzed how much low-lying land might be protected by levees, sea walls, or natural features such as ridges: 63% of the total area at 3 feet, and 48% at 6 feet. More than two-thirds of the protected area, at both elevations, is inside the five Delta counties listed above, where land has long been sinking – primarily due to decomposition of peat soils following drainage for agriculture. This subsidence strains the extensive levee system, sections of which have failed over 100 times (Ingebritsen et al 2000). Sea level rise will add to the strain.

We used levee data from FEMA's Midterm Levee Inventory, the most complete levee data publicly available. This analysis assumes levees are always high enough and in good condition; the inventory does not report these data. Much of the levee system is known to be in poor repair; but the inventory does not yet include most levees (American Society for Civil Engineers 2013).

---

## 03. PEOPLE, PROPERTY AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN HARM'S WAY

In general, the connectivity of a specific area to the ocean at a given flood or water level can be difficult to assess. Areas that appear connected may not be connected, due to unmapped levees, seawalls or other protections. Areas that appear protected may not be protected, due to faulty levees, or connections via ditches, culverts or sewer lines. Elevation data error may also influence results.

Despite these complications, because of the relatively large percentage of area that might be protected, this analysis departs from Strauss et al (2012) and focuses on the how much apparently unprotected land falls below different threshold elevations – that is, land hydrologically connected to the ocean at those elevations. Further analysis addresses how much population, property and infrastructure sits on that land.

Our approach does not take into account, and also avoids complications from, future erosion as sea levels rise, and the uneven surfaces of floodwaters driven by individual storms, and influenced by details of local geography.

Overall, the maps and analyses here should not be taken as precise predictions or flood emergency guides. Rather, we present them as risk indicators in a world of rising sea levels and increasing floods.

### PEOPLE, PROPERTY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Once maps of vulnerable land are established, it is relatively straightforward to account for the populations, property and infrastructure exposed within these zones. The Surging Seas Risk Finder presents hundreds of thousands of combinations of analysis results by geography, water level, and variable. Here we present some of the major categories and highlights, with a focus on exposure below 3 and 6 feet.

At 3 feet, there is an at least 50 percent chance of floods within 50 years, even under the National Research Council's slow sea level rise projections, for every water level station in this study, from San Diego to Seattle. (In Oregon and Washington, the chances are much higher.)

At 6 feet, there is an at least 50 percent chance of floods by the end of the century, under the Council's fast sea level rise projections, for every water level station in the study. Therefore 3-to-6 feet can be viewed as a reasonable range where floods are likely this century along the whole Pacific Coast, depending upon sea level rise scenario. Much higher floods are also possible but with lower probability.

We find that in California, Oregon and Washington, some \$42 billion in property value and 72,000 homes sit on land less than 3 feet above the local high tide line, after accounting for potential protections from levees, roads, beach ridges and other features. Almost triple the property and housing sit on land below 6 feet, after accounting for protections: \$111 billion and 202,000 homes. More than 85 percent of each of these totals is in California, and less than 3 percent lies in Oregon.



---

## 03. PEOPLE, PROPERTY AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN HARM'S WAY

Of the \$36.5 billion in property and 145,000 people occupying land less than 3 feet above the high tide line in California, more than 90 percent are within the San Francisco Bay basin or in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. To make this assessment, we totaled exposure among Delta counties, plus among zip codes on the San Francisco Bay side of San Mateo, San Francisco, Sonoma, and Marin counties. More than half of California population and property exposed are in San Mateo County alone. (These figures all take potential protections into account.)

Nonresidential buildings and infrastructure are widely at risk as well. All told, and still after accounting for potential protections, 1,047 miles of road lie on land below 3 feet in the trio of states; 32 schools; 7 power plants; and 569 EPA-listed sites, screened to include mostly hazardous waste sites, facilities with significant hazardous materials, and wastewater generators. At 6 feet, these numbers grow to more than 3,125 miles of road, 105 schools, 25 power plants, and 1,938 EPA-listed sites.

This analysis simplifies most facilities as points with a single latitude and longitude. It also evaluates exposure by evaluating the height of the land that structures sit upon. It takes into account neither the full footprint of a facility; nor the potential elevation of structures or equipment above ground; nor the possibility of unsealed basement areas. We regard such analysis as useful for assessing the general exposure of different facility types across different geographies, and as useful for screening the possible exposure of individual facilities. However, authoritative assessments for individual facilities are best served by on-the-ground measurement.

### THE MOST VULNERABLE

Social vulnerability is a broad term that describes the sensitivity of populations to the impacts of environmental risks and hazards, including coastal flooding. Social vulnerability helps explain why some places can experience hazards differently even without differences in exposure. The Social Vulnerability Index is a tool that synthesizes socioeconomic characteristics of populations – characteristics known to influence a community's ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from hazard events like floods (see e.g. Emrich and Cutter 2011; Finch et al 2010; Cutter et al. 2013).

Accounting for potential protections, our analysis found 18,000 people in the high Social Vulnerability Index class below 3 feet across California (73 percent), Oregon (3 percent) and Washington (24 percent). The total jumps to 119,000 below 6 feet, with 78 percent in California and 19 percent in Washington.

The Social Vulnerability Index compares places based on their relative levels of social vulnerability. For this analysis, vulnerability was assessed at the Census tract level each state, using 27 variables from the 2010 Census and the 2006-10 American Community Surveys (see Appendix A for further methodological details). The online [Submergence Risk Map](#) that accompanies this report includes a feature visualizing social vulnerability levels in areas that are physically vulnerable to coastal flooding and sea level rise.

---

## 03. PEOPLE, PROPERTY AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN HARM'S WAY

The Social Vulnerability Index shows where there is uneven capacity for preparedness and response and where pre and post-event resources might be most effectively used to reduce pre-existing vulnerability and increase resilience post-disaster. The index is also a useful indicator in understanding spatial differences in disaster recovery. It has been used in combination with other disaster data to provide emergency responders with a much clearer understanding of disaster impacts, thus providing decision makers with an objective comparison of damages sustained across the full spectrum of affected communities (see <http://webra.cas.sc.edu/hvri/products/SoVlapplications.aspx>).

---

# 04. CONCLUSION

Long before rising seas redraw local maps, they will result in more coastal floods reaching higher. They are already having this effect.

The research in this report underscores the high concentration and wide range of populations, property, infrastructure, buildings, and potential contamination sources in low-lying coastal areas. In the densest areas, the most socially vulnerable populations are exposed the most. Patterns vary from place to place.

It will not require major storms to cause extensive economic damage and suffering in the future. Knowledge of vulnerabilities can lead to better preparation for the next inevitable flood, and the ones after. Higher floods in the future are certain, but how much damage they inflict is not – and will depend on the measures coastal communities take.

---

# 05. REFERENCES

American Society of Civil Engineers (2013). "2013 Report Card for America's Infrastructure: Levees." <http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/a/documents/Levees.pdf> Accessed October 2013.

Cutter, S. L., C. T. Emrich, D. P. Morath, and C. M. Dunning (2013). "Integrating social vulnerability into federal flood risk management planning", *J. Flood Risk Management* DOI: 10.1111/jfr3.12018.

Emrich, C. T., & Cutter, S. L. (2011). "Social vulnerability to climate-sensitive hazards in the southern United States." *Weather, Climate, and Society*, 3(3), 193-208.

Finch, C., Emrich, C. T., & Cutter, S. L. (2010). "Disaster disparities and differential recovery in New Orleans." *Population and Environment*, 31(4), 179-202.

Grinsted, A., Moore, J. C., & Jevrejeva, S. (2012). "Homogeneous record of Atlantic hurricane surge threat since 1923." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(48), 19601-19605.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Working Group 1 (2013). Summary for Policy Makers.

Moss, R.H., Edmonds, J.A., Hibbard, K.A., Manning, M.R., Rose, S.K., van Vuuren, D.P., Carter, T.R., Emori, S., Kainuma, M., Kram, T., Meehl, G.A., Mitchell, J.F.B., Nakicenovic, N., Riahi, K., Smith, S.J., Stouffer, R.J., Thomson, A.M., Weyant, J.P. and Wilbanks, T.J. (2010). "The next generation of scenarios for climate change research and assessment." *Nature*, 463(7282): 747-756.

National Research Council (1987). Responding to Changes in Sea Level: Engineering Implications. National Academy Press: Washington, D.C. [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=1006](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=1006)

National Research Council (2012). Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon and Washington: Past, Present and Future. National Academy Press: Washington, D.C. [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=13389](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13389)

Neumann, J., Hudgens, D., Herter, J., & Martinich, J. (2010). "The economics of adaptation along developed coastlines." *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 2(1), 89-98

Parris, A., P. Bromirski, V. Burkett, D. Cayan, M. Culver, J. Hall, R. Horton, K. Knuuti, R. Moss, J. Obeysekera, A. Sallenger, and J. Weiss (2012). "Global Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the US National Climate Assessment." *NOAA Tech Memo OAR CPO-1*. 37 pp.

Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact Technical Ad hoc Work Group (2011). "A Unified Sea Level Rise Projection for Southeast Florida." A document prepared for the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact Steering Committee. 27 p.

Strauss, B. H., Ziemplinski, R., Weiss, J. L., & Overpeck, J. T. (2012). "Tidally adjusted estimates of topographic vulnerability to sea level rise and flooding for the contiguous United States." *Environmental Research Letters*, 7(1), 014033.

---

## 05. REFERENCES

Tebaldi, C., Strauss, B. H., & Zervas, C. E. (2012). "Modelling sea level rise impacts on storm surges along US coasts." *Environmental Research Letters*, 7(1), 014032.

USACE (2011). Sea-Level Change Considerations for Civil Works Programs, Department of the Army Engineering Circular 1165-2-212, October 2011, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CECW-CE Washington, D.C. 20314-1000. 32pp. <http://planning.usace.army.mil/toolbox/library/ECs/EC11652212Nov2011.pdf>

Vermeer, M., & Rahmstorf, S. (2009). "Global sea level linked to global temperature." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(51), 21527-21532.

---

## APPENDIX A: METHODS

### PROJECTING LOCAL SEA LEVEL RISE

To project future sea levels at each water level station based on NRC projections, we interpolated each individual component of those projections by latitude. Annual estimates for each component were either conveyed directly in the NRC report or provided by report authors.

To localize global sea level rise projections from sources other than NRC, we followed the same essential methods as Tebaldi et al (2012). In that study, we added “semi-empirical” projections of global sea level rise to separate local sea level change components developed for 55 water level stations around the contiguous U.S. Here we use the example of projections built on top of a semi-empirical model, as in Tebaldi et al.

For the global component in our semi-empirical approach, we used projections from Vermeer and Rahmstorf (2009). Their approach, based on the recent historic relationship between global sea level and global average temperature, has successfully hind-casted sea level rise over the last century and millennium with great fidelity. The relation estimated over the past observed records of sea level rise and global warming can be applied to projections of future temperature change produced by climate models. By this approach, therefore, future global sea level rise is not directly derived from the output of climate models, but is projected on the basis of the future temperature projections of these models. As projections based on historical observed relationships generally do, this approach assumes that the dynamics captured by the past relation will remain the same for the projected future period. If the ongoing increase in global temperatures leads ice sheets to unravel in ways not experienced during the model’s twentieth century calibration period, then this approach may understate the problem.

Use of Vermeer and Rahmstorf’s approach allowed this analysis to take into account a wide range of possible futures, from ones where humanity continues to send great amounts of heat-trapping gasses into the atmosphere, to ones where we sharply reduce these emissions. Through Vermeer and Rahmstorf’s method we were also able to incorporate a range of possible relationships between emissions and global temperature increases (by using a range of climate model parameters and thus exploring the dimension of model uncertainty), and a range of possible relationships between temperature and sea level (by considering the uncertainty in the parameters of the empirical model). Our analysis rolled all of these factors together to produce one set of best estimates, and a range of potential outcomes around them.

For the current Surging Seas Risk Finder, we updated our semi-empirical projections to employ the most recent carbon emissions scenarios (“Representative Concentration Pathways”) and warming models being used by the global scientific community (Moss et al 2010).

In addition to future SLR estimates based on the empirical relation fitted between global temperature projections and SLR (and apart from the NRC-based estimates), we used global SLR models and scenarios that NOAA prepared for the National Climate Assessment (Parris 2012), and from the IPCC (2013) and from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (2011).

---

## APPENDIX A: METHODS

Changes in local sea level come not only from changes in global sea level, but also from local effects such as the slow rising or sinking of coastal land, driven largely by the ancient retreat of massive ice sheets across North America. To determine local effects, we removed global rise from the total observed local sea level increase over a 50-year period (1959-2008) at each of the 55 nationwide stations we analyzed in our original study. The difference between the total observed local component and global rise during the same period (both of them expressed as linear trends of sea level change per year) is what we call the local component, and, in our projections, we assumed that each local component will continue as a constant rate into the future that offsets or adds on to the global component as an additive term. A detailed analysis using multiyear data from high-precision continuous GPS stations showed that vertical land motion can explain most or all of these local components. The forces behind such motion generally stay constant for thousands of years.

Our projections should not be interpreted as precise predictions for specific years, but rather best estimates that indicate overall trends, because of all of the factors that could lead to a range of outcomes (for example, different emissions futures) and because of natural year-to-year and decade-to-decade variability. For this reason, we present projections at the decade scale only.

### PROJECTING COASTAL FLOOD RISK

In Tebaldi et al (2012) and here, to project the probabilities of reaching different high water levels in the future, through combinations of storms, tides and sea level rise, we developed statistics based on patterns of historical extreme water levels, and then superimposed projected sea level rise onto these. For this report, we used local statistics and local sea level projections for each of the California, Oregon and Washington water level stations analyzed.

We used statistical methods specialized for handling extreme values to analyze records of hourly data. We expanded our analysis from the fixed standard 30-year period (1979-2008) used in Tebaldi et al, to use the maximum available high quality data for each water level station through the end of 2012 – starting as early as 1901 (San Francisco, Seattle) or as recently as 1979 (Toke Point, WA).

We estimate the parameters of a Generalized Pareto Distribution at each station, characterizing the probability density of extreme water levels at that location, and on the basis of those parameters we derive what is called a “return level curve” for each water level station. Our return level curves relate water heights (in MHHW) to their annual probability (given sea level in 2012): for example, heights with a 1% chance of being reached in any given year (“100-year” or “century” or “extreme” floods) are higher than heights with a 10% chance (“decade floods”), and so forth. We filtered out the effects of ongoing historic sea level rise at each station by estimating a linear trend over the length of the record and subtracting it out, in order to calculate baseline return level curves influenced only by tides, storms, and seasonal shifts in water level.

---

## APPENDIX A: METHODS

Once we establish a curve for the baseline period (that we can think of as today in most cases), it is easy to modify it for a given time in the future, on the basis of the effects of sea level rise alone. For example, if at that future time sea level has risen by one foot, an event reaching 5 feet of elevation will have at that future time the same probability of occurring as a minor event reaching 4 feet has today. Thus, sea level rise will make rare high water events of today more likely in the future.

These considerations allow us to compute the chance that a particular height  $H$  will be reached in some future year (say, for example the chance that an event reaching 5 feet will happen in 2030). All that is needed is the amount of sea level rise, say  $L$ , between today (the baseline) and that target year, and the return level curve for the baseline: we then take  $H$ , subtract  $L$  and find, on the curve, the probability associated to the event of size  $H-L$ .

Slightly more complex is the computation of the cumulative risk of at least one such event by some future year, i.e., the estimate of the chance that a particular height  $H$  will be reached or exceeded by some future year. The way to think of this is as the complement of (i.e., one minus) the probability that such event will never be reached by that year. As an example, let's say the event  $H$  is currently a "100-year" event. That means that this year it has 0.01 chances of occurring, and therefore 0.99 chances of not occurring. Next year, if nothing changed, the chance of it not occurring would be the same, therefore the probability of  $H$  not occurring this year or next year would be  $0.99 \times 0.99 = 0.98$ ; its complement, that is the chance of  $H$  occurring by next year, would be  $1 - 0.98 = 0.02$ .

The same calculation applies for any number of years until the target year. We simply multiply the chances of the event  $H$  not occurring every year for the entire period, and then take its complement.

Critically, however, sea level rise makes the chance of any event higher—at least on average decade after decade. Therefore we compute changing probabilities over the years, taking into account the effect of sea level rise. To do so, we incorporate local projections of sea level rise decade by decade, not just the total rise projected by the target year.

More specifically, we used the return level curve for each decadal year, e.g. 2040, incorporating sea level rise projected through that year, and applied the same curve for the five preceding and four succeeding years as well. We then used the probability of exceeding  $H$  each year between 2011 and the target year to compute the overall odds of exceeding  $H$  at least once during the period.

To continue with the example of  $H$  as the 100-year event of today one can imagine that for a target year far enough in the future the multiplication will involve values sooner or later (depending on the pace of sea level rise at this station and on the shape of its return level curve) significantly smaller than 0.99, therefore producing a significantly larger value of the complement, by the target year, compared to that computed under the assumption of no sea level rise.

As with our projections of sea level rise, and for similar reasons, we limit our presentation to odds of reaching different flood levels at decade resolution. Any given year, even within a steady long-term trend of sea level rise, may see dips and jumps in the actual value of sea level rise at a given location. Our estimates of sea level rise are appropriate only as long-term average trends, decade after decade.



---

## APPENDIX A: METHODS

Note that the same type of calculation performed for a detailed range of values and years in the future allow us to answer a question mirroring the one above. We can search among our results for which size event will become, say, at least Q% likely by the next 20 years, rather than starting with a given size event and ask what its likelihood of occurring at least once in the next 20 year will be. Similarly we can ask questions about waiting times, looking for the number of years it will take for a given size event to occur with at least an Q% chance.

Our calculations all concern flood levels reaching elevations relative to a stable baseline, the average high tide level during a fixed historic reference period at each station, the so called tidal datum epoch (the current standard epoch is 1983-2001). This way of measuring flood levels is different than pure storm surge, which is calculated as the extra water height above the predicted tidal water level for the very same moment in time. Our focus was not storm surge, but rather how high water actually gets, due to storm surge, plus tide, plus sea level rise.

This analysis assumed that historic storm patterns will not change; in other words, it did not address the possibility that storms might become more or less frequent or severe due to climate change.

This analysis was based on data taken at water level stations. Tides, storm surge, and the resulting statistics vary from place to place, sometimes over short distances, due to factors including land and ocean geometry and storm directions. On the other hand, in our national analysis (Tebaldi et al 2012), results for distantly spaced water level stations within the same region were often similar. Therefore, results from stations may be taken as rough indicators but not precise estimates for their neighborhoods and regions, and the quality and coverage of indication will vary.

### ESTIMATING GLOBAL WARMING FLOOD RISK MULTIPLIERS

To estimate how global warming is shifting the odds of high storm surges, through sea level rise, we calculated the odds of extreme events in a hypothetical world with no past or future global sea level rise due to warming, to compare against our original calculations, which included warming. We did this comparison at each water level station in the study. The approach basically translated to subtracting out the roughly 8 inches of historical global sea level rise measured from 1880-2009, and then also assuming no future global sea level rise, for the no-warming scenario at each station (a scenario viewable in the Surging Seas Risk Finder). The no-warming scenarios still included local sea level rise from factors other than warming, such as sinking or lifting land — the full local component of sea level rise.

We made one further adjustment, which was to add back 10% of the historic global sea level rise (10% of 8 inches), in the event that some of the observed historic rise has come from factors other than warming. Research on the sea level budget assigns the great majority of the 8 inches to warming-caused effects: expansion of the ocean as it has warmed, and the melting and calving of glaciers and ice sheets. Small fractions of global sea rise unaccounted for are widely viewed to come at least in part from additional ice loss. We assume 90% of the 8 inches are due to global warming, and thus deduct this amount for our comparison.

---

## APPENDIX A: METHODS

For comparison of odds with and without warming, we used standard “100-year” or “century” floods as our reference, meaning water station water levels high enough that they have just a 1% chance of occurring in any given year. We calculated the elevations 100-year floods reach when starting on top of baseline 2012 sea level at each station, using the same data and methods as for our overall water level probability projections. Elevations were relative to average local high tide (MHHW) during a fixed past reference period (the 1983-2001 tidal epoch), as with all elevations in related studies.

In comparing the probabilities of flood levels with and without global warming, we cut ratios off at ten, because higher ratios start to lose a sense of meaning. We also do not compute ratios at all when the chance of flooding is very close to zero without global warming. These situations create very large ratios whose exact values are meaningless: tiny changes in near-zero odds (odds without global warming) would lead to enormous changes in the ratio value.

This analysis did not address the possibility that storms might become more or less frequent or severe due to climate change. We also limited ourselves to looking at the total effects of global warming, and did not aim to separate fractions caused by humans versus natural variations. The strong scientific consensus points to people as causing most, if not all, of the average warming observed over the last century, and to being the dominant cause of future warming.

### MAPPING LOW COASTAL AREAS

To develop our maps of at-risk areas, we used high-resolution, high-accuracy laser-based (lidar) elevation data provided by NOAA. These data have a roughly 5 m (16.5 ft) horizontal resolution. In any small fraction of low-lying areas not covered, we used the highest resolution data available from the National Elevation Dataset (NED), a product of the U.S. Geological Survey.

For general discussion of the accuracy of elevation data and what it means for our maps and statistics, see Strauss et al (2012), which used 1/3 arc-second NED data exclusively, as lidar data were not sufficiently available. This discussion concluded that NED quality data are sufficient for the types of analysis conducted here. Nonetheless, the reported vertical accuracy (root mean square error) of lidar data, as used in this analysis, is roughly ten times more accurate than NED.

We began our process by classifying all cells as ocean (ocean, bay, estuary or saltwater wetland) or land (land or freshwater wetland), because ocean or saltwater marsh misclassified as land would lead to overestimates of susceptible total land area. We admitted cells as land according to a conservative consensus of three independent data sets. First, the cells had to be designated as land within the elevation data itself. Second, we included only cells with centers landward of NOAA’s Medium Resolution Digital Vector Shoreline. Finally, we eliminated cells with centers inside areas classified in the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) as estuarine or marine wetland or deepwater. In computing total land area susceptible, we included NWI freshwater wetlands.

Next, we adjusted the elevation of each cell to be in reference to the nearest average high tide line, instead of a standard zero. For example, if a cell’s elevation were five feet, but the local high tide

---

## APPENDIX A: METHODS

reached three feet, then we would compute an elevation of two feet relative to the tide line. Clearly, sea level rise or a storm surge would need to reach only two feet above high tide to threaten this cell with inundation. Sea level and tidal amplitude vary sometimes widely from place to place, and therefore also the average height of high tide. For local high tide elevations, we used values of Mean Higher High Water from VDatum, a NOAA data product and tidal model.

Based on these elevations adjusted relative to MHHW, we identified the set of cells beneath each water level threshold from one to ten feet above local high tide, and drew maps of each area.

Finally, we distinguished areas connected to ocean at a given water level, versus isolated areas, to use in different exposure analyses, and for differential display in our online mapping application. We included levees from the Midterm Levee Inventory in this analysis of connectivity, assuming each levee to be of sufficient height and condition to offer protection at every water level. Additional discussion can be found in the main body of this report (see “Land” in Table of Contents).

### ASSESSING SOCIAL VULNERABILITY

The Social Vulnerability Index for 2006-10 marks a change in the formulation of the SoVI<sup>®</sup> metric from earlier versions (see e.g. Emrich and Cutter 2011). New directions in the theory and practice of vulnerability science emphasize the constraints of family structure, language barriers, vehicle availability, medical disabilities, and healthcare access in the preparation for and response to disasters, thus necessitating the inclusion of such factors in SoVI<sup>®</sup>. Extensive testing of earlier conceptualizations of SoVI<sup>®</sup>, in addition to the introduction of the U.S. Census Bureau’s five-year American Community Survey (ACS) estimates, warrants changes to the SoVI<sup>®</sup> recipe, resulting in a more robust metric. These changes, pioneered with the ACS-based SoVI<sup>®</sup> 2005-09, carry over to SoVI<sup>®</sup> 2006-10, which combines the best data available from both the 2010 U.S. Decennial Census and five-year estimates from the 2006-2010 ACS.

The table below gives a complete list of the 27 variables used in SOVI<sup>®</sup> 2006-10 for Census tract level analysis.

# APPENDIX A: METHODS

Table A1. Variables Used in Social Vulnerability Analysis

VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION
QASIAN	Percent Asian
QBLACK	Percent Black
QHISP	Percent Hispanic
QNATAM	Percent Native American
QAGEDEP†	Percent of Population Under 5 Years or 65 and Over
QFAM†	Percent of Children Living in Married Couple Families
MEDAGE	Median Age
QSSBEN	Percent of Households Receiving Social Security
QPOVTY	Percent Poverty
QRICH200K	Percent of Households Earning Greater Than \$200,000 Annually
PERCAP	Per Capita Income
QESL†	Percent Speaking English as a Second Language with Limited English Proficiency
QFEMALE	Percent Female
QFHH	Percent Female Headed Households
QNRRES	Percent of Population Living in Nursing and Skilled-Nursing Facilities
QED12LES	Percent with Less Than 12th Grade Education
QCVLUN	Percent Civilian Unemployment
PPUNIT	Per Unit
QRENTER	Percent Renters
MDHSEVAL†	Median House Value
MDGRENT†	Median Gross Rent
QMOHO	Percent Mobile Homes
QEXTRCT	Percent Employment in Extractive Industries
QSERV	Percent Employment in Service Industry
QFEMLBR	Percent Female Participation in Labor Force
QNOAUTO†	Percent of Housing Units with No Car
QUNOCCHU	Percent Unoccupied Housing Units

For this analysis, we assessed Social Vulnerability Index scores by Census tract across all of each state. We then assigned tracts high, medium, or low social vulnerability scores, based on whether they fell within the top 20%, middle 60%, or bottom 20%, respectively, of vulnerability for the whole set within each state.

More information on the Social Vulnerability Index is available at <http://webra.cas.sc.edu/hvri/products/sovi.aspx>

---

## APPENDIX A: METHODS

### ESTIMATING EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE, PROPERTY, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

To calculate potential risks at each water level within areas such as zip codes, cities or counties, we used boundaries provided by the 2010 U.S. Census to overlay against our maps of land beneath different water level thresholds. We then computed the amount of land below each threshold in each place. For denominators in percentage calculations, we used our own computations of land area for each place, because our definitions of coastline differed slightly in places from that of the Census.

To tabulate population and housing potentially affected, we used block-level data from the 2010 U.S. Census, and assumed development on dry land only (neither freshwater nor saltwater wetland). For each Census block, we divided the population and number of housing units by the number of dry land cells with centers inside the block. We assigned the resulting per-cell density values back to each cell, creating new datasets for population and housing unit density. To estimate the population or housing at risk for a particular water level, we simply added up population and housing densities of land cells affected under the specification. Our analysis considered the elevation of land upon which housing stands, and made no special provision for elevated or multi-story buildings.

We followed the same approach for property value, computing value density based on Census block group resolution data from Neumann et al (2010). The property value is derived almost exclusively from individual parcel assessed just values, evaluated in 2008, which we adjusted using the Consumer Price Index to 2012 dollars. The data include residential, commercial, industrial, institutional and government property, both taxable and tax-exempt.

For analysis of linear features such as roads and rail, we computed the length of each feature on land below the water level in question, and made totals by feature type (e.g. total roads, federally-owned roads, or mainline rail).

For airports, we used linear runway data, and determined the percentage of runway length on land below each water level. We counted an airport as vulnerable at a given level when this percentage exceeded a threshold of 25%.

For point features, we simply use latitude/longitude coordinates overlaid onto our MHHW elevation map to evaluate whether a building, site or facility falls below a given water level. This approach does not take into account the actual footprint of a structure, nor the possibility that critical features may be elevated above the ground (or stored in an unsealed basement).

The first step in each analysis is to properly filter and de-duplicate records for the feature class or subclass of interest from a source dataset – for example, state-owned roads, commuter rail stations, nuclear power plants, or major hazardous waste sites. We primarily used federal datasets. References for each are accessible via the Surging Seas Risk Finder (within the “Analysis” section, click on a tile to see a details panel with sources listed, linked, and described (via tool tips on a mouse hover)).

---

## APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

**EPA** – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

**Extreme flood** – As used in this report, a coastal flood height with a 1% or lower annual chance, assuming the sea level for 2012.

**High tide line** – see MHHW

**IPCC** – Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

**Lidar** – Light detection and ranging technology. A method of measuring distance that relies on firing laser beams and analyzing their returned, reflected light.

**MHHW** – Mean Higher High Water: a local frame of reference for elevation based on the elevation of the higher of the two high tides each day averaged across a reference period. The reference period used is the current tidal epoch, 1983-2001. This report uses “high tide line” as the equivalent of the height of MHHW.

**MLLW** – Mean Lower Low Water. See MHHW; MLLW is instead a frame of reference based on the elevation of the lower of the two low tides each day.

**NCA** – National Climate Assessment

**NOAA** – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

**NRC** – National Research Council

**Sea level rise, slow** – In this report, the NRC lower-range sea level rise projection

**Sea level rise, medium** – In this report, the NRC main sea level rise projection

**Sea level rise, fast** – In this report, the NRC upper-range sea level rise projection

**SLR** – Sea level rise

**Social vulnerability** - A broad term that describes the sensitivity of populations to the impacts of environmental risks and hazards, including coastal flooding; related to a community’s ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from hazard events.

**Storm tide** – The height of tidal stage plus storm surge

**Tidal epoch** – Period over which tidal levels are defined. See definition for MHHW.

Princeton: One Palmer Square, Suite 330 Princeton, NJ 08542  
Phone: +1 609 924-3800  
Toll Free: +1 877 4-CLI-SCI / +1 (877 425-4724)  
**[www.climatecentral.org](http://www.climatecentral.org)**