



Fort Sumter National Monument

*Coastal Hazards & Sea-Level Rise Asset Vulnerability Assessment Protocol
May 2016*



Program for the Study of Developed Shorelines
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, NC 28723



Contents

Executive Summary..... 3

 Vulnerability Assessment Products & Deliverables..... 3

Introduction & Project Description..... 4

General Protocol Methodology..... 5

Results Summary & Discussion..... 6

 Exposure Analysis..... 6

 Sensitivity Analysis..... 7

 Threshold Elevation Data Collection at FOSU..... 8

 Vulnerability Calculation..... 8

 Adaptation Strategies..... 10

Unique Factors & Considerations..... 12

Vulnerability Assessment Methodology..... 13

 Additional NPS Climate Change Resources..... 20

This document has been developed by the National Park Service – Park Facilities Management Division Sustainable Operations Branch and Facilities Planning Branch, in partnership with Western Carolina University through a Task Agreement with the Southern Appalachian Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Unit. Contributing authors: Katie Peek (kmcdowell@wcu.edu), Blair Tormey (btormey@wcu.edu), Holli Thompson (hthompson@wcu.edu), Robert Young (ryoung@wcu.edu), Shawn Norton (shawn_norton@nps.gov), Julie McNamee (julie_thomas_mcnamee@nps.gov) and Ryan Scavo (ryan_scavo@nps.gov).

Please cite this report as: Peek, K.; B. Tormey; H. Thompson; R. Young; S. Norton; J. McNamee; R. Scavo. May 2016. Fort Sumter National Monument Coastal Hazards & Sea-Level Rise Asset Vulnerability Assessment Protocol. NPS 392/154056. National Park Service, Washington DC.

Cover Photo: Program for the Study of Developed Shorelines at Western Carolina University.

Executive Summary

The National Park Service (NPS), in partnership with Western Carolina University's (WCU) Program for the Study of Developed Shorelines (PSDS), has developed a **Coastal Hazards and Sea-Level Rise Asset Vulnerability Assessment Protocol**. This protocol is meant to assess the vulnerability of infrastructure to multiple coastal hazards and climate change factors (i.e., erosion, flooding, storm surge, sea-level rise, and historical flooding), over a 35-year planning horizon (2050). Unlike natural resource vulnerability, which combines three metrics (exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity), the newly developed method for assessing infrastructure includes only exposure and sensitivity to coastal hazards and climate change factors in the vulnerability score; adaptation strategies are instead examined in the context of the vulnerability results. The overall goal is to standardize the methodologies and data used, allowing managers to compare the vulnerability of coastal assets across local, regional, and national levels.

A total of 21 structures (buildings, shelters, fortifications, breakwaters, and batteries) and 10 transportation assets (roads, parking lots, and docks) are included in the vulnerability assessment of Fort Sumter National Monument. Almost two-thirds of all FOSU assets analyzed have a high vulnerability. Only 2 assets at FOSU have a low vulnerability to coastal hazards and sea-level rise. The overall high vulnerability of the park is primarily a function of exposure, as all but 3 assets have a high exposure. Sensitivity values at FOSU were much lower; only 5 assets have a high sensitivity.

Combined, the high vulnerability assets at FOSU have a current replacement value of over \$1.1 billion. However, this value includes numerous historical assets, such as Fort Sumter itself, which often have extremely high replacement values. Adaptation strategies were not addressed in-depth for FOSU in 2015, but a future meeting to discuss these issues would be beneficial to the park.

Vulnerability Assessment Products & Deliverables:

- 1) Excel datasheets – All results, including asset-specific scoring, are provided in tabular form. The exposure, sensitivity, and vulnerability scores are reported alongside the Facilities Management Software Systems (FMSS) data for each asset, as well as the scores for each step of the analysis.
- 2) Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Maps and Layers – All GIS data, including the exposure layers, exposure results, and final vulnerability results will be sent to the park as a separate file. The GIS data will also be available to view online at the NPS ArcGIS Online website. Digital data sources can be found in the next section of this document. Contact WCU or NPS for further information.
- 3) Park Specific Vulnerability Results Summary Document – This summary (herein) explains the deliverables, results, and methodology. It briefly summarizes the vulnerability assessment results in the aforementioned datasheets and maps, as well as the methodology, which has been vetted and approved by NPS. This document does not fully describe **all** results from the analysis; see provided datasheets for detailed results.

Introduction & Project Description

The National Park Service (NPS), in partnership with Western Carolina University's (WCU) Program for the Study of Developed Shorelines (PSDS), has developed a **Coastal Hazards and Sea-Level Rise Asset Vulnerability Assessment Protocol**. This protocol establishes a standard methodology and set of best practices for conducting vulnerability assessments in the built environment.

Standardizing the methodologies and data utilized in these assessments allows managers to compare the vulnerability of coastal park assets across local, regional, and national levels. This includes the standardization of data inputs (i.e. widely available, established data) that will allow the application of a consistent methodology among units. Another goal is to create a more complete and effective set of indicators for assessing the sensitivity of assets to coastal hazards. The focus for this protocol is on structures and transportation assets in the NPS asset database (Facilities Management Software System; FMSS), but it could be adapted to other resources.

A proposed standardized approach to assessing climate change vulnerability was described in a multiple agency (NOAA, NPS, USGS, DOD, NWF, and USFS) document titled "Scanning the Conservation Horizon: A Guide to Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment (Glick et al., 2011)." This document defines the vulnerability of natural resources to climate change as: the extent to which a species, habitat, or ecosystem is susceptible to harm from climate change impacts. Vulnerability under this approach is comprised of three equally weighted metrics or components: exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity:

Vulnerability = Exposure + Sensitivity + Adaptive Capacity

- ✓ **Exposure** refers to whether a resource or system is located in an area experiencing direct impacts of climate change, such as temperature and precipitation changes, or indirect impacts, such as sea-level rise.
- ✓ **Sensitivity** refers to how a resource or system fares when exposed to an impact.
- ✓ **Adaptive Capacity** refers to a resource's or system's ability to adjust or cope with existing climate variability or future climate impacts.

While this methodology has been successfully applied to natural systems, some aspects are less appropriate for application in the built environment (i.e., buildings, roads, etc.). For example, structures cannot inherently adapt to climate change or other hazards, while natural resources often can (a salt marsh can adapt to changes in sea level by migrating upland, whereas a building cannot). Therefore, NPS and WCU have modified the methodology and formula for conducting vulnerability assessments of infrastructure within national parks. The new modified formula for the vulnerability of the built environment (buildings, transportation assets, etc.) is as follows:

Vulnerability = Exposure + Sensitivity

For this methodology, adaptive capacity of an asset is evaluated separately and is not included in the vulnerability score. This does not mean that understanding the adaptive capacity of an asset is not important. Identifying the range of effective adaptations for key vulnerable assets is the final and most important step in the overall analysis. Effective adaptations will reduce exposure and/or sensitivity, which is the key to reducing vulnerability.

General Protocol Methodology

The **Coastal Hazards and Sea-Level Rise Asset Vulnerability Assessment Protocol** has four primary steps: 1) Exposure Analysis and Mapping, 2) Sensitivity Analysis, 3) Vulnerability Calculation, and 4) Adaptation Strategies Analysis. A detailed description of the protocol can be found in the final section of this document: Vulnerability Assessment Methodology. Further scoring information can also be found in the Excel results sheets that accompany this report. Below is a general description of the first three steps of the protocol. Adaptation Strategies Analysis is summarized separately in this report.

Exposure Analysis and Mapping: Standard exposure indicators have been established as part of this protocol (Table 1); these indicators represent the primary factors that should be evaluated to determine an asset’s coastal hazard and climate change exposure (to the year 2050). The exposure analysis utilizes data imported into a Geographical Information System (GIS), as exposure is directly dependent on location relative to mapped hazard data. Assets located within an exposure indicator hazard zone (e.g., the storm surge zone) are assigned a higher score than assets located outside the zone. Scores for each indicator are then summed and binned to get a total exposure score. Final exposure scores fall into one of four ranking categories (based on the number of exposure zones): minimal exposure (asset does not lie within any mapped zone), low exposure (1 zone), moderate exposure (2-3 zones), and high exposure (4-5 zones).

Table 1. FOSU specific hazards and data sources for the exposure indicators.

Exposure Indicator	FOSU Specific Hazard	FOSU Data Source
Flooding Potential	1% annual flood ± velocity/waves	FEMA Flood Zones (VE/AE)
Extreme Event Flooding	Storm surge	NPS-specific SLOSH model
Sea-Level Rise Inundation	2050 sea-level rise	NPS-specific SLR modeling
Shoreline Change	Erosion & coastal proximity	Shoreline proximity buffers
Reported Coastal Hazards	Historical flooding	Park questionnaire; storm imagery

Sensitivity Analysis: Sensitivity is a function of the inherent properties or characteristics of an asset. A set of primary indicators has also been determined for asset sensitivity: flood damage potential, storm resistance and condition, historical damage, and protective engineering. The main data source for much of the sensitivity analysis is an asset-specific questionnaire (completed by park staff), which contains detailed questions related to each of the sensitivity indicators. A higher score is given for an unfavorable sensitivity indicator result (e.g., an asset built at grade will get a high score for flood damage potential). The sensitivity scores for each indicator are summed to obtain a total raw score, then binned into three categories: low, moderate, and high sensitivity. Assets with minimal exposure are excluded from the sensitivity analysis, since an asset must be exposed to a hazard in order to be sensitive to it.

Vulnerability Calculation: To calculate a vulnerability score for each asset, the exposure and sensitivity scores are summed, and then binned into four vulnerability ranking categories. The vulnerability ranking categories are as follows: minimal (assets with minimal exposure), low, moderate, and high.

Unique Factors: Each park has a unique set of conditions based on the data available and the geologic setting. At FOSU, the primary unique factors are 1) the use of shoreline proximity buffer only, and 2) the lack of digital FEMA flood data for the Charleston area. A more detailed description of these factors, including how they affected the results for FOSU, are presented later in the report, in the section titled: Unique Factors & Considerations.

Results Summary & Discussion

A total of **21 structures** (buildings, shelters, fortifications, breakwaters, and batteries) and **10 transportation assets** (roads, parking lots, and docks) were included in the vulnerability assessment of FOSU. The term “asset” will be used in this document to represent any structure or transportation infrastructure listed in FMSS, regardless of ownership. Also, the results for this vulnerability assessment represent a time frame of approximately 35 years (2050).

This document provides a general summary of the results for exposure, sensitivity, and vulnerability of structures and transportation assets at FOSU. Specific scores for these factors are reported (alongside FMSS data) for each individual asset in the supplied excel datasheets; final exposure and vulnerability results are also provided as Geographic Information Systems (GIS) maps and layers.

Exposure Analysis:

A notable result of the exposure analysis of FOSU assets is that most (both structures and transportation) have a high exposure (90%) (Table 2). Only one asset has a low exposure, the Fort Moultrie SPAWARS building, which is located on an artificially constructed hill over 8.8 meters in elevation (above NAVD88). Another structure, the Fort Moultrie HECF building, was built on a similarly elevated location (8 meters above NAVD88) and has a moderate exposure (Figure 1). One transportation asset, a parking lot in the Fort Moultrie area, has a moderate exposure (Figure 1). This parking lot is adjacent to the higher elevation SPAWARS building.

The overall high exposure scores for FOSU are primarily due to the widespread nature of the FEMA VE flood zone. Typically, location in the VE zone warrants an automatic high exposure ranking due to the high likelihood of flooding. For example, all of the Liberty Square and Fort Sumter area assets are within the VE zone, yielding each an automatic high score for exposure (regardless of other indicator scores). Only the sound side of the Fort Moultrie area had land outside of the VE zone (within the AE zone instead).

However, three assets in the Fort Moultrie area (SPAWARS building, SPAWARS parking lot, and HECF building), were given more favorable exposure scores in spite of their location in the VE zone since they were situated on artificial hills well above sea level and base flood elevation (elevation measurements ranged from 5.8 – 8.8 meters above NAVD88).

Table 2. FOSU Exposure Results Summary. Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

ASSETS	HIGH EXPOSURE		MODERATE EXPOSURE		LOW EXPOSURE		TOTAL #
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
STRUCTURES	19	90%	1	5%	1	5%	21
TRANSPORTATION	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
ALL FOSU ASSETS	28	90%	2	6%	1	3%	31



Figure 1. A) Exposure results of the Fort Moultrie area of FOSU. B/C) Two lower exposure structures at Fort Moultrie (due to higher elevations).

Sensitivity Analysis:

The sensitivity results for all FOSU assets (structures and transportation) show the majority (52%) have a moderate sensitivity (Table 3). When separated into structures and transportation, the sensitivity scores for FOSU assets are slightly different. Most of the transportation assets (90%) have moderate sensitivity, with only 10% low sensitivity, and none with high sensitivity. For structures, there is a more even distribution for sensitivity, with the lowest percentage having high sensitivity (24%).

Table 3. FOSU Sensitivity Results Summary. Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

ASSETS	HIGH SENSITIVITY		MODERATE SENSITIVITY		LOW SENSITIVITY		TOTAL # ANALYZED
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
STRUCTURES	5	24%	7	33%	9	43%	21
TRANSPORTATION	0	0%	9	90%	1	10%	10
ALL FOSU ASSETS	5	16%	16	52%	10	32%	31

The five structures with high sensitivity at FOSU were reported to have been significantly damaged in the past, lack protective engineering, and are not elevated. Because FOSU has several highly exposed historical assets, most assets have some form of protective engineering, which lowers sensitivity.

The assets with low sensitivity have been largely spared by past storms, are resistant to storm damage, in good condition, and protected by some type of engineering. In fact, many of the low sensitivity structures at FOSU are inherently resistant to storm damage simply due to their original construction and intended design to resist damage during warfare. No transportation assets have a high sensitivity, primarily due to favorable scores for condition and minimal damage from past storms.

Threshold Elevation Data Collection at FOSU

Threshold elevation data collected by the NPS Resource Information Services Division (RISD) were also included in the sensitivity analysis. Ideally, elevation of an asset would be compared to the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Base Flood Elevation (BFE), and the precise threshold elevations acquired by RISD make this comparison possible. This aided in the determination of more reliable elevation indicators for assets at FOSU.

The precise threshold elevation verifies the first metric (flood damage potential) within the sensitivity analysis. This elevation was compared to local BFE for each asset to determine if the asset’s primary threshold was above or below BFE. In general, if an asset is above BFE and also elevated by design, it received a favorable score for the flood damage potential sensitivity metric. More specific methodology for verifying and using these data can be found in the methods section of this document.

Four assets have threshold elevations above local BFE: the Visitors Education Center at Liberty Square, the HECF and SPAWARS Buildings at Fort Moultrie, the SPAWARS parking area at Fort Moultrie, and Fort Sumter Proper Museum.

Vulnerability Calculation:

The majority of FOSU assets are either high or moderate vulnerability (Table 4). Nearly two-thirds (65%) of assets at FOSU are highly vulnerable, while 29% have moderate vulnerability, and only 6% have low vulnerability. The relatively high vulnerability is largely driven by the high exposure of FOSU assets (Table 2), with any variation in vulnerability results largely due to different degrees of sensitivity.

Table 4. FOSU Vulnerability Results Summary. Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

ASSETS	HIGH VULNERABILITY		MODERATE VULNERABILITY		LOW VULNERABILITY		TOTAL #
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
STRUCTURES	12	57%	7	33%	2	10%	21
TRANSPORTATION	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	10
ALL FOSU ASSETS	20	65%	9	29%	2	6%	31

Among the different park areas, the assets located in the vicinity of the Sullivan’s Island Lighthouse (Lifesaving Area) are all highly vulnerable (Figure 2). At Fort Sumter, only those assets within the fort itself (Battery Huger and Fort Sumter Proper Museum) have moderate vulnerability; the rest of the assets at Fort Sumter all have high vulnerability. Similarly, all assets at Liberty Square are highly vulnerable, with the exception of the Visitors Center, which has moderate vulnerability due to favorable sensitivity scores (elevated building, resistant construction, etc.). The greatest variation in vulnerability scores are in the Fort Moultrie area where the sensitivity of certain structures is lower (in spite of high exposure) due to a combination of elevation, building construction/condition, and minimal historical flooding.

High priority assets (API > 70) that are also highly vulnerable include: Fort Sumter Proper, Fort Sumter Waterfront, Fort Moultrie Proper, and the Fort Moultrie Visitors Center Parking Lot. In addition, more than half of the high vulnerability FOSU assets have replacement values (CRV) over \$1 million each.



Figure 2. Mapped vulnerability results for FOSU assets.

Overall, almost two-thirds of all FOSU assets have high vulnerability using this methodology (Table 4, Figure 2). However, there are several important caveats to the vulnerability assessment and results:

- 1) This methodology is meant to assess the vulnerability of a park to coastal hazards and climate change factors combined (i.e., erosion, flooding, storm surge, sea-level rise, and historical flooding; see indicator list in methodology section). Therefore, a park or section of park that has maximum exposure to one or more of these factors (i.e., surge, FEMA VE zone) will inherently have a higher overall exposure, and thus, vulnerability.
- 2) A major goal of this methodology is to create a standard protocol for vulnerability assessments, regardless of the data utilized. As higher quality data become available for the metrics of vulnerability (exposure and sensitivity), the final rankings for these assets may change. In these cases, the same protocol will be used, incorporating the more precise data, and increasing the reliability of the vulnerability results (for example, see FEMA Flooding Data in the section called Unique Factors & Considerations).
- 3) Vehicle access to the Fort Moultrie, Liberty Square, and Sullivan's Island Lighthouse areas depends on several transportation corridors that are not owned by NPS (e.g., Ben Sawyer Boulevard and Bridge, roads in the downtown Charleston area). Some low or moderate vulnerability assets could be safe from flooding (and sea-level rise), but rendered completely inaccessible by road. Other coastal parks have similar issues that relate to ownership or jurisdiction of the transportation leading to NPS-owned assets and resources, necessitating coordination (i.e., additional collaborative vulnerability studies) with regional stakeholders, landowners, and partners.

Adaptation Strategies:

The vulnerability assessment at FOSU was completed in multiple phases throughout 2015. An adaptation workshop, designed to discuss actions that may be taken to reduce park vulnerability, has yet to be held with FOSU management. Preliminary findings and thoughts on adaptation at the park are discussed below. It is hoped that a more in-depth meeting can be scheduled in the future.

The biggest challenge facing FOSU infrastructure is the fact that all park assets are highly exposed to coastal hazards and sea-level rise. This exposure leads to a relatively high overall vulnerability for most park assets. FOSU has units within Charleston Harbor, along the inlet shoreline of Sullivan's Island, on the Sullivan's Island oceanfront, and dock facilities on The Cove.

As a result, the park has to contend with storm impacts, long-term coastal erosion (although some areas of the Sullivan's Island oceanfront are accreting), as well as degradation of infrastructure and protective engineering due to boat wake and changes in bathymetry caused by frequent channel dredging.

This is especially true for the fort itself, which is situated on an island in the middle of Charleston Harbor. A breakwater comprised of rock boulders surrounds the fort (Figure 3), and is the fort's only protection from the waters of the harbor. Continued rising sea level, erosion, and degradation of the breakwater will raise the vulnerability of the fort in the coming decades. This is likely to be exacerbated by plans to further deepen Charleston Harbor, which could lead to increased ship traffic, boat wake, and erosion.

Adaptation options are commonly more limited for historical assets, particularly those related to fortifications. It is extremely difficult and prohibitively expensive to relocate or elevate large masonry structures such as fortifications and batteries. While the NPS generally discourages the use of coastal

engineering structures to protect park assets in exposed areas, the historical nature of the assets at FOSU may be an exception. In many cases, the only sensible option will be to protect the historically important structures with coastal engineering as long as feasible.

However, for non-historic structures (e.g. visitor centers), relocation and elevation strategies may be possible. Vulnerability of a particular asset could be lowered through relocation, which reduces exposure, and/or elevating, which would reduce the asset's sensitivity.

Due in part to the large number of historic structures, the majority of adaptation strategies to reduce vulnerability at FOSU involve engineering solutions. For example, structures like the breakwaters at Fort Sumter (Figure 3) and Fort Moultrie reduce the likelihood that the asset will experience coastal hazards (exposure), or sustain damage from those hazards (sensitivity). Redesigning assets to be more storm-resistant, as was done with the docks at forts Sumter and Moultrie after Hurricane Hugo, can also lower the sensitivity.

With certain transportation assets, downgrading the degree of engineering (e.g. replacing pavement with crushed stone/shell) can reduce the sensitivity. Finally, sometimes the best solution may be to decommission and/or remove highly vulnerable assets, particularly if they no longer fulfill the park mission, or have become problematic to maintain.

FOSU staff should identify all assets that would be candidates for relocation, elevation, or decommissioning.




Figure 3. Stone breakwater on the southeast side of Fort Sumter.

Unique Factors & Considerations

Erosion & Coastal Proximity:

For shorelines without erosion rate data (ocean, estuarine, or developed areas) a simple **coastal proximity buffer** is applied. The coastal proximity buffer distance applied is 35 meters, which can accommodate an erosion rate up to 1m/year, and can account for the fact that infrastructure close to the shoreline is highly likely to experience a range of coastal hazards within the 35 year (2050) timeframe for this analysis. Proximity buffers were used for portions of the shoreline at FOSU, in places where erosion data was unavailable.

FEMA Flooding Data:

As of April 2016, there was no digital data available for the Charleston area in FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (<http://fema.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html> Figure 4A). Therefore, the only FEMA flood hazard data available was from the FEMA Flood Map Service Center (<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/>) which provides simple PDF maps (Figure 4B). Because of this, the FEMA zones are somewhat outdated; any updates to these maps could change the overall vulnerability (by way of exposure) of assets at FOSU.




Figure 4. FEMA data availability for the FOSU region. A) Extent of digital FEMA data in the Charleston area (shaded red). Much of the coastal area of this part of SC (including the FOSU region) is lacking digital data. B) Non-digital flood hazard maps available for FOSU.

Vulnerability Assessment Methodology

The **Coastal Hazards and Sea-Level Rise Asset Vulnerability Assessment Protocol** has four primary steps:

- 1) Exposure Analysis and Mapping
- 2) Sensitivity Analysis
- 3) Vulnerability Calculation
- 4) Adaptation Strategies Analysis

Step 1: Exposure Analysis & Mapping

The first step in the protocol is to analyze the exposure of NPS assets to coastal hazards and climate change. Standard exposure indicators have been determined by WCU; these indicators represent the primary factors or hazards that should be evaluated to determine an asset’s exposure (to the year 2050). The five general exposure indicators are: flooding potential, extreme event flooding, sea-level rise inundation, shoreline change, and reported coastal hazards. The goal of this methodology is to standardize the data sources for exposure analysis, using widely available and regularly updated sources (when possible). Table 5 summarizes these indicators, as well as common data sources for each.

Table 5. Exposure Indicators for Asset Coastal Hazards and Sea-Level Rise Vulnerability

Exposure Indicator	Common Data Sources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flooding Potential 1% annual flood chance ± velocity/waves	FEMA Flood Zones (VE or AE); LiDAR DEM or other elevation model
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extreme Event Flooding storm surge, tsunami, extreme high water	NPS-specific SLOSH model; tsunami models; tide gage recorded extreme high water data
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sea-Level Rise Inundation 2050 projection	NPS-specific SLR modeling; LiDAR DEM or elevation other model
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Change erosion, coastal proximity, cliff retreat	State or USGS erosion rate buffers; cliff retreat rate buffers; shoreline proximity buffers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reported Coastal Hazards historic flooding, visible slope instability	Park surveys/questionnaire results; storm imagery & reconnaissance

The exposure analysis utilizes data imported into Geographical Information Systems (GIS) format, as exposure is directly dependent on location and mapped hazard data (whether the area experiences the hazard). Digital hazard data are gathered for each of the exposure indicators, such as the online georeferenced FEMA flood map layers. The only dataset that does not come from a widely available, well established source is the reported coastal hazards layer, which is derived from storm imagery, reconnaissance, and direct communication with park personnel. Each exposure data layer thus represents an exposure indicator hazard zone for a particular park. Assets that are located within a particular zone are assigned a higher score than assets located outside of the hazard zone.

The following sections describe the specific methods, scoring, and common data sources of each exposure indicator.

Flooding Potential:

The flooding potential indicator describes hazards related to the 1% annual flood chance, including waves and water velocity. For most parks, data for this exposure indicator comes from FEMA’s [digital flood maps](#). Two primary FEMA flood zones are utilized: the VE and AE zones (and sometimes

the A, AO, or AH). According to FEMA, the VE zones are areas subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event, with additional hazards due to storm-induced velocity wave action, and the AE zones are areas subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event (determined by detailed methods). For a further description of the FEMA flood zones, including the other A zones, see FEMA's [website](#).

If an asset is within the AE (or other A) zone, it receives an unfavorable score (4) for the flooding indicator. Any asset within the VE zone (the highest hazard zone) receives an unfavorable score for the flooding indicator, and is also assigned an automatic high score for exposure overall. Assets in neither flood zone receive a favorable score (1) for this indicator. Within some parks the FEMA data is incomplete; in these cases, other elevation data sources (such as LiDAR DEMs) are used to supplement the FEMA data.

Extreme Event Flooding:

The extreme event flooding indicator captures flooding from major storms, tsunamis, and other extreme high water events. **Storm surge** is the primary extreme event flooding that occurs within parks along the east and gulf coast of the U.S. The data source for storm surge is a NOAA surge inundation model: Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH; see [NOAA](#) for more information).

The SLOSH model uses a composite of several thousand model runs with differing storm conditions each time to predict surge. There are two products of this: the Maximum Envelope of Water (MEOW), which is a set of worst case scenarios for certain characteristics like storm category, speed, trajectory, and tide level; and the Maximum of the Maximum Envelope of Water (MOM), which is the worst of all potential scenarios modeled. The surge data included in the exposure analysis (the SLOSH MOM for a category 3 storm) represents the maximum potential surge conditions. SLOSH storm surge data for this protocol was supplied by the NPS Climate Change Response Program (CCRP).

For parks that are not subject to tropical storms and surge (primarily west coast parks), an alternative extreme event flooding hazard is evaluated, commonly either modeled **extreme high water** events or modeled **tsunami** hazard zones. Data for extreme high water events were provided by CCRP; these data map historic patterns of extreme high water events based on tide gage information. The source of the tsunami hazard data is variable, but commonly comes from state agencies or universities.

If an asset falls within the mapped category 3 storm surge zone, extreme high water zone, or the tsunami hazard zone, it receives an unfavorable score (4) for the extreme event flooding indicator. If it lies outside of these zones, it receives a favorable score (1) for this indicator.

Sea-Level Rise:

The sea-level rise indicator describes the potential rise in water within parks by the year 2050. The data source for this exposure indicator is a NPS-specific sea-level rise inundation model provided by the NPS CCRP. The estimated inundation extent was achieved by utilizing a modified bathtub approach as developed by NOAA, and attempts to account for local and regional tidal variability and hydrological connectivity. Polygon extents consist of 4 model-run scenarios using sea-level change maps produced by Colorado Center for Astrodynamic Research at the University of Colorado in Boulder. The maps are based on Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP), which are four

greenhouse gas concentration trajectories. Two RCPs were modeled, a moderate RCP, 4.5 and the most extreme RCP, 8.5. Each RCP was projected to the years 2050 (condition used for this protocol) and 2100. One caveat of these data is that the model does not incorporate local land level change (subsidence or uplift). For many parks this is not a problem, as this change is relatively small compared to the amount of predicted water level rise. However, the sea-level rise data in parks with high rates of subsidence (parks in southern Louisiana) or uplift (many Alaska parks) will require adjustment.

If an asset falls within the mapped 2050 SLR zone, it receives an unfavorable score (4) for the sea-level rise indicator. If it lies outside of the mapped SLR zone, it receives a favorable score (1).

Shoreline Change:

For most parks, particularly those along the U.S. East and Gulf coasts, shoreline **erosion** buffers are created using known erosion rate data. These data are commonly acquired from the [U.S. Geological Survey, Coastal and Marine Geology Program](#) or from state coastal management programs. Short-term erosion rates (usually data ranging from the 1970s to 2004) are utilized to make buffer zones for a 35-year time frame. Rates are binned into the following categories before buffering: 1m/year, 2m/year, 4m/year, 6m/year, 8m/year, etc. (continuing increments of 2 meters).

Many national parks along the west coast of the U.S. contain steep cliff shorelines. In some cases, these shorelines are retreating significantly due to cliff erosion; this is particularly true of areas comprised of unconsolidated materials (sands and gravels) or loosely consolidated bedrock (commonly sedimentary rock). In these cases, cliff retreat data will be utilized in place of erosion rate data (when available). Like erosion rates, the cliff retreat rates are utilized to make **cliff retreat** buffer zones for a 35-year time frame (2050). Below 1 meter, retreat rates are binned into detailed increments, with categories of: 0.25m/year, 0.5m/year, 0.75m/year, and 1m/year, and the same categories as shoreline erosion for rates above 1 meter: 1m/year, 2m/year, 4m/year, 6m/year, 8m/year, etc. (increments of 2 meters).

For shorelines without erosion or cliff retreat rate data (ocean, estuarine, or developed areas), a simple **coastal proximity** buffer is applied. The coastal proximity buffer distance used is 35 meters, which can accommodate an erosion rate up to 1m/year, and can account for the fact that infrastructure close to the shoreline is highly likely to experience a range of coastal hazards within the 35 year (2050) timeframe of this analysis.

If an asset falls within the erosion, cliff retreat, or coastal proximity buffer zone, it receives an unfavorable score (4) for this indicator. If it lies outside of these zones, it receives a favorable score (1).

Reported Coastal Hazards:

All of the other exposure indicators represent the *potential* area that could be affected by coastal hazards; the zones do not represent data from actual past events. Therefore, it is essential to have one indicator that includes actual reported coastal hazards. Understanding what has happened in the past in an area is essential to predicting what may happen in the future.

Historical flooding information for each park is commonly obtained from a questionnaire that is completed by park staff. Historical flooding information is also derived from storm imagery,

reconnaissance visits, and direct communication with park personnel. For this indicator, the following question is posed to park personnel as part of the questionnaire:

Have any of the following assets (or lands around the asset) been FLOODED in previous storm events? * This question is referring to the lands or area around an asset. Even if the asset was not built during a particular storm, we would like to know if that location has been flooded in the past.

For high elevation parks with cliff retreat and no flooding hazards, a similar question is asked for this indicator, and is related to **visible slope instability**. For cliff retreat, it is important to know if the landscape around an asset is currently showing signs that further retreat and erosion is imminent.

After scores are given for each exposure indicator (either 1 or 4), they are summed and binned to get a total exposure score for each asset. Final binned exposure scores fall into one of four ranking categories (based on the number of exposure zones): minimal exposure (asset does not lie within any mapped hazard zone), low exposure (1 zone only), moderate exposure (2-3 zones), and high exposure (4-5 zones). Specific scoring ranges can be found within the Excel results sheets. Any assets that obtain an exposure ranking of minimal are not further analyzed for sensitivity. Finally, all asset types (transportation and structures) are analyzed for exposure using the same general methodology.

Step 2: Sensitivity Analysis

The second step in the protocol is to analyze the sensitivity of NPS assets to coastal hazards and climate change. Similar to exposure, a set of indicators was determined for asset sensitivity. Unlike exposure, however, sensitivity is evaluated independent of location (only exposure is location-dependent). Sensitivity refers to how that asset would fare when exposed to the hazard, which is a function of the inherent properties or characteristics of the asset. While the sensitivity indicators for structures and transportation assets are generally the same (Table 6), how sensitivity is addressed during design and construction is very different.

Because digital sensitivity data are not generally available, the primary data source for much of the sensitivity analysis is an asset-specific questionnaire. This questionnaire contains detailed questions related to the various sensitivity indicators (e.g., is the structure elevated above base flood elevation). It is distributed to appropriate personnel within each unit— typically individuals that possess long institutional memory and familiarity with park facilities. Where appropriate, sensitivity data is also obtained from FMSS, the National Bridge Inventory, aerial imagery, and site visits.

Bridges are considered transportation assets, but have additional factors that must be considered when analyzing sensitivity to coastal hazards and climate change. Table 6 summarizes the four general sensitivity indicators (for all assets), as well as the four additional bridge indicators. The following section describes each sensitivity indicator in detail, including data sources, methodology, and scoring.

Table 6. Sensitivity Indicators for Asset Coastal Hazards and Sea-Level Rise Vulnerability

Sensitivity Indicator	Data Sources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Damage Potential (Elevated)	Asset questionnaire; direct measurements of threshold elevation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Storm Resistance & Condition	Asset questionnaire; FMSS database
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historical Damage	Asset questionnaire; discussion with park staff
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protective Engineering	Asset questionnaire; field & aerial imagery analysis; WCU Engineering Inventory
Additional Bridge Indicators	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bridge Clearance	National Bridge Inventory (item 39)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scour Rating	National Bridge Inventory (item 113)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bridge Condition	National Bridge Inventory (item 59 & 60)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bridge Age	National Bridge Inventory (item 27); FMSS database

Flood Damage Potential:

The flood damage potential indicator represents how likely an asset is to be inundated if the surrounding land area is flooded. For structures, this usually means whether or not the building is constructed on elevated stilts or pilings. Alternatively fill be added to the surrounding land to artificially elevate the asset above local ground height. This information is commonly obtained through the park questionnaire or visual inspection during site visits. For this indicator, the following question is posed to park personnel as part of the questionnaire:

Are any of the following assets elevated at least 5 feet above local ground level (including critical utilities)? Examples include: 1) assets on stilts or pilings, or 2) assets built on artificial fill material above local ground level. NOTE: If elevated, but not quite 5 feet, indicate in comments.

When available, threshold elevation data collected by the NPS Resource Information Services Division (RISD) are included in the sensitivity analysis. These data, which have been collected at only a handful of parks thus far, are acquired with sub-centimeter Global Positioning System (GPS) equipment in order to record accurate threshold and asset elevations. In parks that do not have these data, the questionnaire (in combination with field work) is the primary data source used to determine whether an asset is elevated. The questionnaire generally inquires whether an asset is elevated above ground level – in the case of structures, at least 5 feet. Ideally, elevation of an asset would be compared to FEMA’s Base Flood Elevation (BFE), and the precise threshold elevations acquired by RISD make this comparison possible. This can aid in the determination of highly reliable elevation indicators for structures within parks. It should be noted however, that elevation is one of several indicators used to calculate the sensitivity of an asset, and availability of precise elevation data, while preferable, is not critical in gauging overall sensitivity and vulnerability.

The precise threshold elevation verifies the first metric (flood damage potential) within the sensitivity analysis. This elevation is compared to local BFE for each asset to determine if the asset’s primary threshold was above or below BFE. If an asset is elevated above BFE, it will receive a favorable score for the flood damage potential sensitivity metric (only if it is within a FEMA flood zone).

If an asset is reported to be elevated on stilts, built on elevated fill, or has a threshold above FEMA BFE, it receives a favorable score (1) for the flooding potential indicator. If it is not elevated (built at grade), it receives an unfavorable score (4) for the indicator.

Storm Resistance & Condition:

This sensitivity indicator represents how well an asset will resist damage from coastal hazards based on two factors: 1) overall storm resistance and 2) condition. Assets built to storm-resistant standards, with quality construction, or in good condition are less likely to be damaged by coastal hazards. For this indicator, the following two questions are posed to park personnel:

Are any of the following assets built to resist flood/wave storm damage? Examples include: 1) assets built to specific storm-resistant standards/engineering codes, or 2) assets particularly or inherently resistant to other forms of damage or deterioration (e.g., fortifications).

Are any of the assets listed below particularly vulnerable to flood/wave damage due to condition? In other words, is the asset in poor condition due to deterioration, lack of maintenance, etc.? DO NOT consider the location of the asset (even if it is near the water or commonly flooded), only consider the physical condition of the asset itself. The condition should be considered independent of the asset's location.

This sensitivity indicator is scored as a combination of storm resistance and condition. If an asset is reported to be storm resistant, it receives a favorable score (1) for half of the total score for this indicator (and vice versa). If the asset is reported to be in poor condition, it receives an unfavorable score (4) for half of the total score for this indicator (and vice versa).

Historical Damage:

The historical damage indicator represents if an asset has been damaged by coastal hazards in the past, as assets that have been previously damaged are more likely be damaged in the future. This is similar to the reported coastal hazards exposure indicator, but instead of focusing on the site or area around an asset, this indicator is focused on damage to the asset itself. For this indicator, the following question is posed to park personnel as part of the questionnaire:

Have any of the following assets been significantly DAMAGED in previous storm/flooding events (water/wave damage only)? * This question is focused on the actual damage from an event (the prior flooding question is about the LAND near the asset being inundated).

If an asset is reported to have been damaged in the past, it receives an unfavorable score (4) for this indicator. If it has not been damaged in the past it receives a favorable score (1) for the indicator.

Protective Engineering:

This indicator represents if an asset is protected by engineering including hard structures (e.g., seawalls, bulkheads) or landscape modifications (e.g., significant drainage alteration, major restored landscape). This indicator assumes that assets protected with engineering are less likely to be damaged by coastal hazards. Data sources include the questionnaire, the [NPS coastal engineering inventory](#), and site visits. The following question is posed to park personnel as part of the questionnaire:

Are any of the following assets currently being protected by an engineered structure (e.g., seawall, bulkhead) or other major engineering (e.g. drainage, major landscape modification, major restored landscape)? Explain if needed.

If an asset is reported to be protected by engineering, it receives a favorable score (1) for this indicator; if the asset is not protected by engineering, it receives an unfavorable score (4) for the indicator.

Bridge Indicators: Clearance, Scour Rating, Condition, and Age:

For bridges within the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) database (public bridges over 20 feet in length), additional indicators are considered; the data for these indicators comes directly from the NBI database. The bridge sensitivity additional indicators include: clearance, scour rating, condition, and age. Table 7 below describes each indicator, including the description, rationale, and scoring.

Table 7. Additional Bridge Indicators

Indicator	Description & Rationale	Scoring (NBI score = sensitivity score)
Clearance	Bridges with higher clearance above the water surface are less likely to be damaged by coastal hazards.	<i>Amount of clearance in feet:</i> > 15 = 1; 9-15 = 2; 1-8 = 3; 0 = 4
Scour Rating	Bridges with scour issues are more likely to be damaged by coastal hazards.	<i>Rating:</i> n/a = 1; low & stable (5-8) = 2; stable (4) = 3; critical = 4
Condition	Bridges in poor condition are more likely to be damaged by coastal hazards.	<i>Condition Rating:</i> n/a = 1; 0-3 = 2; 4-6 = 3, 7-9 = 4
Age	Bridges closer to their lifespan are more likely to be damaged by coastal hazards.	<i>Age (in years):</i> 0-25 = 1; 26-50 = 2; 51-75 = 3; > 75 = 4

To calculate a sensitivity score, each asset is first given a score for all applicable indicators. These scores are summed to obtain a total raw score for sensitivity, then binned into three categories reflective of the number of unfavorable indicators: low sensitivity, moderate sensitivity, and high sensitivity. Specific scoring ranges can be found within the Excel results sheets.

Step 3: Vulnerability Calculation

To obtain a vulnerability score for each asset, the exposure and sensitivity scores are summed, and then binned into four vulnerability ranking categories. The ranking categories are as follows: minimal vulnerability (assets with minimal exposure and not included in the sensitivity analysis), low vulnerability, moderate vulnerability, and high vulnerability. Specific scoring ranges for vulnerability can be found within the Excel results sheets. A subset of the assets from the completed vulnerability analysis will be chosen by the park for development of adaptation strategies (step 4).

Step 4: Adaptation Strategies Analysis

After the vulnerability analysis is complete, adaptation strategies can be analyzed for key assets within each park. FMSS data such as Asset Priority Index (API) and Optimizer Band (OB) can help select the assets to analyze for adaptation strategies. Assets analyzed will likely include those with high vulnerability and high priority and/or high criticality (API/OB), as well as high vulnerability assets with low priority and/or criticality. This adaptation analysis begins with discussions with the park, or by way of a questionnaire. This portion of the analysis focuses on the options available to the park to reduce the overall vulnerability of key assets. An outline of potential adaptation strategies to reduce coastal hazards and climate change vulnerability has been compiled by WCU for both structures and transportation assets (Table 8).

Table 8. Adaptation Strategies to Reduce Vulnerability of Assets to Coastal Hazards and Sea-Level Rise

Adaptation Action	Effect on Vulnerability and Rationale
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elevate	Reduces the sensitivity of the asset; elevating a structure (and critical utilities) or transportation asset (i.e., a road) reduces the risk of flood damage.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Relocate	Reduces the exposure of the asset; relocating the asset to a lower risk area reduces the likelihood that it will experience impacts from coastal hazards/SLR.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protect/Engineer	Reduces the exposure and/or sensitivity of the asset; protecting the asset with an engineered structure or landscape modifications (i.e., drainage) can reduce the likelihood that the asset will experience, or obtain damage from, coastal hazards/SLR.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decommission & Remove	Eliminates the vulnerable asset.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Storm-Resistant Redesign	Reduces the sensitivity of the asset; redesigning the asset to be more storm resistant can reduce the likelihood of damage from coastal hazards/SLR.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engineering Downgrade (transportation assets only)	Reduces the sensitivity of the asset; downgrading the amount of engineering (i.e., replacing paved parking lot with shell material lot) can reduce the cost of rebuilding after damage and gives more flexibility for replacement.

This protocol is designed solely to assess the vulnerability of physical infrastructure. However, there are other adaptation actions for vulnerable assets that would not reduce the vulnerability of the physical asset, but instead its function. For example, a park might consider moving the critical contents within a building to a higher floor to reduce potential flood damage. Similarly, parks may decide to shift an asset’s function to a less vulnerable asset. These adaptation actions do not change the vulnerability of the original asset (i.e., exposure and sensitivity remain the same); instead these actions change the criticality of the asset, potentially making it less of a concern to the park.

Additional NPS Climate Change Resources

Additional efforts are being made by NPS to address climate change in the coastal zone, as well as other critical environments. A number of these studies aim to improve the understanding of overall trends in climate change stressors, while others have focused on recording the specific effects of those stressors on natural and cultural resources within parks. Using this research and the latest climate science, the NPS is guiding adaptation efforts at units nationwide. Below are some of the climate change related resources at NPS:

- General Climate Change at NPS: <http://www.nps.gov/subjects/climatechange/index.htm>
- Climate Change Adaptation for Cultural Resources: <http://www.nps.gov/subjects/climatechange/adaptationforculturalresources.htm>
- Coastal Adaptation: <http://www.nps.gov/subjects/climatechange/coastaladaptation.htm>
- NPS Climate Change Adaptation Plan: http://www.nps.gov/orgs/ccrp/upload/NPS_CCActionPlan.pdf