

Dealing with Disruption:

Operationalizing Resilience in the Water Sector

Building Disaster Resilience

February 26, 2020 | 2:00 PM - 3:30 PM ET









Eileen White

Director of Wastewater East Bay Municipal Utility District Oakland, CA

Chair, NACWA Climate & Resiliency Committee





ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN WATER AGENCIES





National Association of Clean Water Agencies Resilience Webinar Series: Building Disaster Resilience

February 26, 2020





EILEEN M. WHITE, PE DIRECTOR OF WASTEWATER EILEEN.WHITE@EBMUD.COM

U.S. Weather & Climate Disasters in 2019



International Weather & Climate Disasters in 2019



2019 Was Second-Hottest Year Ever



How is 2020 Looking So Far?



Webinar Speakers

1 Curt Baranowski and Steve Fries, EPA

2 Lindsey Hallock, Cape Fear Public Utility Authority

3 Travis Block, City of Faribault

4 Peggy Nguyen, LA Sanitation & Environment

Let's kick off the webinar!



EILEEN M. WHITE, PE DIRECTOR OF WASTEWATER EILEEN.WHITE@EBMUD.COM

Curt Baranowski

Environmental Scientist Creating Resilient Water Utilities U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC









- Provides drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater utilities with the practical tools, training, and technical assistance needed to increase resilience to extreme weather events.
- Through a comprehensive planning process, CRWU assists water sector utilities by promoting a clear understanding of potential longterm adaptation options.

Resilience Building Process



Resilient Strategies Guide

- Web-based tool, based on previous Adaptation Strategies Guide publication, for reviewing resilient strategies being used by water utilities
- Guided process to review and select priorities, vulnerable assets, and relevant strategies
- Final report documents selected strategies to explore during adaptation planning



Resilient Strategies Guide - Outputs



Resilient Strategies Guide - Update



C

- Adding new step, Funding Sources, that draws information from EPA's Water Finance Clearinghouse
- Funding sources are filtered to those most relevant to the utility location (state/territory) and selected strategies

Climate Resilience Evaluation and Awareness Tool (CREAT)

- Web-based tool for assessing risk of potential extreme weather impacts
- Module-based process with clearly defined goals and reports
- Multiple scenarios provided to help capture uncertainty
- Assessment of current resilience will help inform adaptation planning
- Results help utilities compare risk reduction and implementation costs



CREAT Assessment Process



CREAT Outputs: Final Report



Case Study and Information Exchange

Stories from 44 utilities/communities (so far) addressing these climate-related concerns



Adaptation Case Study and Information Exchange

Case Study: Water and Wastewater Utilities Planning for Resilience

WASHINGTON COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT (WCWCD) WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

Background

The Washington County Water Conservancy District (WCWCD) provides drinking water services to 175,000 customers in the southwest region of Utah. WCWCD's current water supply comes from a combination of surface and ground water sources in the Virgin River watershed, which relies heavily on snowmelt from nearby mountains. The majority of the district's water is sold wholesale to its local municipal partners. The district also operates small retail culinary water, secondary irrigation water, and wastewater systems.

The not-for-profit agency has been operating for over 50 years and is responsible for conserving, developing, managing, and stabilizing water supplies for the county. Since its start, WCWCD has significantly expanded its infrastructure, services, and capabilities in an ongoing effort to serve the county's growing population. The district predicts water conservation will play an increasingly critical role in water resource planning and management to meet future demand and adapt to climate impacts.

Challenges

WCWCD identified sole water source reliance, water supply/quality management, meeting projected water demands with limited local supplies, and natural disasters as leading concerns for the county. They are particularly concerned that potential flood events could affect their water quality and that drought events may reduce the amount of snow pack in the region. Recently, WCWCD has been seeing decreased river flow due to less precipitation and more frequent warm spells during the winter. If a predicted hotter and drier future were to occur, WCWCD would expect severe business impacts to the utility due to service disruption.

Planning Process

To evaluate the resilience of their water system to extreme drought, WCWCD used the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) <u>CREAT</u>. CREAT assists water utilities in identifying future extreme weather and other environmental threats, assessing risks from these threats, and evaluating and comparing measures to adapt to these threats. The assessment brought together individuals from WCWCD, state agencies, and EPA to think critically about potential vulnerabilities, priority assets, and strategies for strengthening infrastructure and operational resilience.

Resilience Strategies and Priorities

Based on experiences from prior threats to their water supply, WCWCD has already taken measures to protect their water supply from drought and to improve their overall resilience. For example, they offer landscape water audits to help residents better understand their water use and provide rebates to users who upgrade their rigation equipment (e.g., use smart timers). Using the results of the CREAT assessment, the county was able to evaluate the performance and costs of different potential adaptation measures that if implemented could further strengthen the physical and operational resilience of the Case Study: Water and Wastewater Utilities Planning for Resilience

hen the

CITY OF BLAIR, NEBRASKA

Background

≎EPA

The city of Blair, Nebraska provides drinking water and wastewater services to residential, industrial and commercial customers. The city of Blair owns and operates the entire municipal water system, including a 20 million gallons per day (MGD) water treatment plant that draws from the Missouri River. Drinking water demand for residential, commercial and industrial customers is described in Table 1. The city of Blair has an interconnection with Omaha through a rural system that can provide up to 1 MGD in case of an emergency.

Table 1. City of Blair Drinking Water Demand

OMER	WATER DEMAND
lential	Average: 1 MGD; Peak demand: 4 MGD City of Blair: population 8,000 Additional small rural systems outside the city: population of 2,000 – 4,000
trial – Il biocampus	10-15 MGD; higher demand in summer months
strial – na Public r Plant D) nuclear r plant	0.4 MGD OPPD switches over to the city of Blair's water source in warmer months w temperature in their usual source water is too high and could cause the nuc plant to violate their National Pollution Discharge Elimination System therm discharge criteria

Additional commercial and

Card

Pow

(OPF

industrial 2 MGD customers



CRWU Data Services and Maps



Storm Surge Inundation Map

Storm Surge Inundation Map	Creating Resilient V	Water Utilities & 💝 EPA _	
Introduction Hurricane Frequency Storm Surge Flooding FEMA Flood Zor	nes Details	ber b	
Hurricane Tracks This story map illustrates historical hurricane and potential areas of coastal flooding and in combining the Introduction Hurricane Frequent	ion Map	Creating Resilient Water Utili	ties & 🛠 EPA
 National Hurricane Center's (NHC's) hur National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adn Lake, and Overland Surge from Hurrica and Federal Emergency Management Agency 500-year flood zones. The map on the right displays the tracks of hu 1900-2015. Each of these storm systems react the storm center was within 50 nautical miles strength, measured by hurricane category, is from yellow (Category 1) to red (Category 5); these hurricanes are shown as dotted lines. T storm track data, visit NOAA's <u>Historical Hurri</u> Use the zoom and search to review the tracks location of interest. Click on a storm segment see the name, year and maximum strength. selected, use the left and right arrows to scrop passed your selected location. Follow this story through the tabs, each with potential for hurricane landfall and coastal fic assessment of flood risk and planning for mit the event of a storm. Follow this story through the tabs, each with potential for hurricane landfall and coastal fic assessment of flood risk and planning for mit the event of a storm. This product displays a seamless nati scenarios developed by the NHC (Nat Surge Unit. This map merges the Max product from 27 of the operational SI Category 1-5 SLOSH MOMs was merginational grid was then resampled, into EM (Digital Elevation Model, i.e. top Surge hazard above ground for each la when NHC forecasts storm surge of 2 ground. SLOSH products do not inclui NC/VA border or in Hawaii. 	he SLOSH (Sea, Lake, and Overland SH is a numerical model used by ompute storm surge. Storm surge is regenerated by a storm, over and les. Flooding from storm surge he track, intensity, size, and forward acteristics of the coastline where it lepth for each hurricane storm ory 2 Category 3 Category 5 and US Virgin Islands Hawaii or links above to review potential cional map of storm surge hazard tional Hurricane Center) Storm ximum of Maximums (MOM) LOSH grids. Each grid for the ged into one national grid. The terpolated, and processed with a hography) to compute the storm hurricane category. This means 20 ft that means 20 ft above use Category 5 storms north of the	ne Californa Californa Chesspeake Bay Dimpton Nerfolk Viscon	 LEGEND Category 4 Storm Surge Inundation Inundation Height Up to 3 feet above ground Greater than 3 feet above ground Greater than 6 feet above ground Greater than 9 feet above ground Leveed Area - Consult Local Officials For Flood Risk

CRWU Water Utility Resilience Support Projects: Outreach and Training





- Email: <u>crwuhelp@epa.gov</u>
- Curt Baranowski: <u>Baranowski.curt@epa.gov</u>
- Steve Fries: <u>fries.steve@epa.gov</u>
- CRWU website: <u>www.epa.gov/crwu</u>



Lindsey Hallock

Director of Public and Environmental Policy Cape Fear Public Utility Authority Wilmington, NC









Resiliency in the Water Sector

February 26, 2020

Lindsey Hallock Director of Public and Environmental Policy Cape Fear Public Utility Authority

CFPUA: Who Are We?

July 2008:

- Cape Fear Public Utility Authority opened its doors with a mission of infrastructure improvement.
- Located in Southeastern North Carolina, with the Atlantic Ocean to our east and the Cape Fear River to our west.

Today:

- Operate three drinking water systems- two groundwater systems and one surface water system on the Cape Fear River.
- Operate two wastewater plants.
- Serve approximately 200,000 people throughout City of Wilmington and New Hanover County, NC.
- Rely on rate revenue for majority of our funding—do not receive tax dollars.



Environmental Hazards We Face

- Sea-Level Rise and Flooding
 - Recent report found sea level rise of 0.9 inches per decade at Wilmington
- Drought
 - Implemented emergency water conservation plan in May of this year after we saw record-breaking rain the year before
- Increasing Temperatures
 - More instances of heat illness for employees working in the field are possible
- Hurricanes
 - Affected by three in the past four years





Hurricane Florence: How Did We Do?

- Maintained water and sewer service to customers throughout event
 - Only one home lost water service
- Pre-planning by Communications Unit resulted in no loss of network, voice, or business communications
- Areas of Improvement:
 - SSOs
 - Energy procurement during extended rain events
 - Raw water redundancy
 - Targeted customer notifications



Partnering With EPA

EPA assisted Cape Fear Public Utility Authority (CFPUA) with a vulnerability and climate risk assessment using the VSAT and CREAT tools.

This process helped CFPUA to:

- Understand their vulnerabilities to natural hazards and climate change impacts
- Calculate the costs and benefits of a variety of adaptation strategies
- Satisfy AWIA risk assessment certification requirement



Using the Tools: Our Experience

- Resilient Strategies Guide (RSG)
 - Sample of CFPUA employees surveyed on risks, vulnerable assets and resolutions:
 - Used Survey Monkey
 - 34 total responses received
 - Questions based on EPA Resilient Strategies Guide
- Vulnerability Self Assessment Tool (VSAT) and CREAT
 - Flood and drought scenarios
 - Acute vs. Chronic Threats
 - Cost-Benefit Analysis of Adaptation Strategies
 - Environmental Projection Data



Resiliency Initiatives In the Works

- CFPUA Energy Team designed to find efficiencies and reduce dependence on fuel
- Incorporating resiliency efforts and climate change data into our CIP
- Conducting elevation study on pump stations in areas vulnerable to flooding



THANK YOU

Lindsey Hallock Director of Public and Environmental Policy Cape Fear Public Utility Authority Lindsey.Hallock@cfpua.org 910-332-6625

Travis Block Public Utilities Director City of Faribault Faribault, MN











FLOOD MITIGATION AND BANK STABILIZATION MEASURES

FACILITY OVERVIEW

- UTILITY BACKGROUND
 - AVERAGE FLOW: 4 MGD
 - 50-60% FLOW IS INDUSTRIAL
 - POPULATION SERVED: 23,352
 - CONCERNED WITH FLOODING
 - PREVIOUS PERIODS OF OVERFLOW/BYPASS
 - INFILTRATION & INFLOW
 - 2010 FLOOD IMPACTS
 - FACILITY LOCATED ON THE RIVER AND EXPERIENCED 6.17 INCHES OF RAIN IN FOUR DAYS. 8.56 INCHES FELL IN THE SAME TIME PERIOD UPSTREAM.
 - PLANT TAKEN OFF-LINE; SIPHON ON INTERCEPTORS ACROSS RIVER KNOCKED OFF-LINE FOR OVER ONE MONTH
 - STRUCTURE RELOCATED AWAY FROM THE RIVER


CANNON RIVER MAJOR WATERSHED











FLOOD MITIGATION MEASURES

- CONSTRUCTION OF APPROXIMATELY 1,715 FEET OF FLOOD BARRIER
- 995 FEET OF FLOODWALL AND 720 FEET OF LEVEE ALONG THE WEST SIDE OF THE WRF.
- THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN EASTERN FLOODWALL TIEBACK AND ROAD CLOSURE SYSTEM.
- THE CONSTRUCTION OF 1,900 FEET OF STREAMBANK STABILIZATION ALONG THE EAST BANK OF THE STRAIGHT RIVER.
- MAKE IMPROVEMENTS (ELEVATING TO ALLOW ACCESS UNDER FLOODING CONDITIONS) TO A KEY SANITARY SEWER STRUCTURE THAT COLLECTS WASTEWATER FROM THE NORTHERN AND INDUSTRIAL PARK SERVICE AREAS OF THE COMMUNITY.





0 ~

- The sharp and advector many part equals regardles, when anticated by an equals plot average out part from the DWCs Debins of Fabrics. Carly shart of the Sector Sec al that is from of









PROJECT FUNDING

- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE OF \$3.8M
- PROPOSED FUNDING SPLIT OF 50/50 STATE & LOCAL
- AN APPLICATION WAS SUBMITTED TO THE MN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FLOOD
 DAMAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM
- A CAPITAL BONDING PROJECT APPLICATION WAS SUBMITTED TO THE MN MANAGEMENT &
 BUDGET OFFICE
- PROJECT IS CURRENTLY ON THE DNR'S ELIGIBLE LIST AND PENDING FUNDING FROM THE STATE
 LEGISLATURE

QUESTIONS ?

TRAVIS BLOCK, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

CITY OF FARIBAULT, MINNESOTA

TBLOCK@CI.FARIBAULT.MN.US

507.333.0365



Peggy Nguyen

Environmental Supervisor Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Department of Public Works Regulatory Affairs Division LA Sanitation and Environment Los Angeles, CA











"Planning for climate change is not necessarily about being green. It really is about managing risk." - Lara Whitely Binder, Climate Impacts Group



Artwork by Russell Farrell (modified by staff)

CLIMATE CHANGE RISK ASSESSMENT AND ADAPTATION MEASURES FOR LA SANITATION AND ENVIRONMENT

City of Los Angeles Sanitation (LASAN) Facilities and Infrastructure

> Presented in the AMWA/NACWA Building Resilience in the Water Sector Webinar February 26, 2020



CITY OF LOS ANGELES REGULATORY AFFAIRS DIVISION Hassan Rad, Division Manager



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Planning for Climate Resiliency
- 2. Climate Resiliency Assessments
- 3. Recommendations/ Cost Estimates
- 4. Next Steps



Source: Climate.NASA.gov



(http://nas-sites.org/americasclimatechoices//)



PLANNING FOR CLIMATE RESILIENCY

We must prepare Los Angeles for future earthquakes and increasing climate disruptions facing our city, including bigger wildfires, longer and hotter heat waves, and rising sea levels. Whether in the form of distributed water solutions to help increase local water supplies and fight fires post-earthquake, or the integration of grid-tied solar powered backup systems to keep fire stations running, it is immediately necessary to have proactive solutions to prepare the City.



TRANSFORMING LOS ANGELES ENVIRONMENT I ECONOMY I EQUITY



PLANNING FOR CLIMATE RESILIENCY

LASAN Strategic Plan Goal No. 8

- Complete a Climate Change Adaptation Plan
- Identify Projects for LASAN's 10-Yr CIP for 2016-17

Initial Risk Screening



Climate Resilience Evaluation and Awareness Tool (CREAT)

LASAN Climate Change Resiliency Assessment and Recommendations

Climate Change Adaptation and Resiliency Plan / CIP Projects Mayor's Sustainability pLAn

- Integrate natural disaster resiliency strategy with climate action and adaptation plans by 2017
- Prepare for future earthquakes and increasing climate disruptions



PHASE 1 SOLID RESOURCES ASSESSMENTS





PHASE 1 AND 2 CLEAN WATER RESOURCES ASSESSMENTS





LASAN REGULATORY AFFAIRS DIVISION



PHASE 1 PROJECT CHRONOLOGY





PHASE 2 PROJECT CHRONOLOGY





PHASE 3 IMPLEMENTATION





CLIMATE IMPACTS TO LOS ANGELES REGION

No. of Hot Days	6-22 days/year by 2060 Health, Safety, Power Outage, Transmission Problems
Flooding	 More extreme precipitation events, river flows, flooding, depths Increase in spatial extent and depth of coastal storm surges
Landslide/ Liquefaction/Wildfire	 More extreme variations in weather patterns (intense precipitation and temperatures, more hot days)
Tsunami	 Submarine earthquakes and landslides, coastal inundation risks Amplified with coastal storms and sea level rise
Sea Level Rise	 CoSMoS 3.0 (2016) 0.5 meters mid-century, 1.5 meters in 2100



REPRESENTATIVE CLIMATE INFORMATION

LOCATION	CLIMATE VARIABLE	HISTORICAL VALUE (OBSERVED)	PROJECTED VALUE FOR 2060 (OBSERVED + CHANGES)
	Average Annual Temperature	62.9°F	66.0°F
Santa Monica Bay	Total Annual Precipitation	18.5 inches	22.4 inches
	100-Year Storm Event	5.4 inches in 24 hours	7.0 inches in 24 hours
	Hot days (over 95°F)	6 days (1981-2000) ³	22 days
	Sea-Level Rise	2 mm/year ⁴	>0.5 meters (1.64 feet)
	Average Annual Temperature	63.2°F	66.1°F
Los Angeles Harbor	Total Annual Precipitation	13.7 inches	15.2 inches
	100-Year Storm Event	7.3 inches in 24 hours	9.5 inches in 24 hours
	Hot days (over 95°F)	6 days (1981-2000) ³	22 days ³
	Sea-Level Rise	2 mm/year ⁴	>0.5 meters (1.64 feet)

3 Dr. Alex Hall, UCLA Study on Climate Change in the Los Angeles Region: Temperature Results, Business As Usual Scenario

4 Historical global sea-level rise observations, used by CoSMoS 1.0

5 Projected sea-level rise data from – SLR from CoSMoS 1.0 for the year 2050, CoSMoS 3.0 model calculations used at 100-year storm plus 0.5m sea-level rise scenario



RISK ANALYSIS



Terminal Island Water Reclamation Plant



WASTEWATER PUMPING PLANT #666 FRIES



Hazards

- 500-yr Flood Zone (Elev 12.25)
- Tsunami (Elev. ~20)
- ∕− 0.5-1.5m CoSMoS (Elev 11.64 − 14.92)

Damage Threshold Elevations

- Door Elev 11.17
- Generator Pad Elev 11.89



*Elevations shown are in NAVD88 and 1' include freeboard

VENICE BEACH LOW-FLOW DIVERSION PUMPING PLANT NO. 647



Climate change risks

- Located in the 500-year flood zone
 and tsunami zone
- Coastal flooding, additional risk with sea-level rise
- Liquefaction*



Figure 1. Hazard Zones for Kinney Circle Pumping Plant No. 647

* Minimized by flat terrain and development

Adaptation options

- Waterproof hatches
- Raise vents to elevations above future design flood elevation
- Use watertight enclosures on electrical, instrumentation and controls and MCCs
- Resize green infrastructure and other drainage enhancements for design storms
- Capture and re-use stormwater for irrigation or other non-potable uses

For planning purposes the estimated cost of the recommended adaptations is \$610,000. The estimated damage replacement costs of the facility is \$3,750,000.



HAWAIIAN & B PUMPING PLANT NO. 677

Climate change risks

- Located in the 500-year flood zone
 and tsunami zone
- Coastal flooding from tsunami
- Liquefaction*



Figure 1. Hazard Zones for Hawaiian & "B" Pumping Plant No. 677

* Minimized by flat terrain and development

Adaptation options

- Install watertight connections and protect the motor control center
- Waterproof instrumentation and controls



- Waterproof hatches and raise vents
- Install submarine doors to control room
- Raise generator pad
- Install bollards to protect above- ground structures from tsunami wave debris

For planning purposes, the estimated cost of the recommended adaptations is \$870,000. The replace-in-kind cost estimate is \$4,071,600.



CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES (SOLID RESOURCES FACILITIES ONLY)

Facility/Operation	Estimated Replacement	Estimated Resilience
	¢1 100 000	timprovement cost
CLARIS	\$1,100,000	ъO
Harbor Collection Yard	\$6,300,000	\$230,000
Harbor Mulching Facility	\$8,500,000	\$0
Gaffey Street Landfill	\$530,000	\$0
Toyon Canyon Landfill	\$500,000	\$220,000
Griffith Park Composting Facility	\$2,200,000	\$220,000
East Valley Yard	\$108,900,000	\$1,540,000
Lopez Canyon Landfill	\$29,500,000	\$0
Alternative Fueling Systems	n/a	\$7,040,000
Totals	\$157,530,000	\$9,250,000



CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES (CLEAN WATER AND WATERSHED PROGRAMS)

Water Reclamation Plants \$300,000,000 \$33,212,900 Wastewater Pumping Plants \$92,474,800 \$12,946,000 Stormwater Pumping Plants \$23,166,000 \$1,860,000 Low-Flow Diversions \$3,250,000 \$380,000 Low-Flow Diversion/Stormwater \$12,174,000 \$1,570,000 Total Estimates \$431,064,800 \$49,968,900	Assets	Estimated Replacement Costs	Estimated Resilience Improvement Costs
Wastewater Pumping Plants \$92,474,800 \$12,946,000 Stormwater Pumping Plants \$23,166,000 \$1,860,000 Low-Flow Diversions \$3,250,000 \$380,000 Low-Flow Diversion/Stormwater \$12,174,000 \$1,570,000 Total Estimates \$431,064,800 \$49,968,900	Water Reclamation Plants	\$300,000,000	\$33,212,900
Stormwater Pumping Plants \$23,166,000 \$1,860,000 Low-Flow Diversions \$3,250,000 \$380,000 Low-Flow Diversion/Stormwater \$12,174,000 \$1,570,000 Total Estimates \$431,064,800 \$49,968,900	Wastewater Pumping Plants	\$92,474,800	\$12,946,000
Low-Flow Diversions \$3,250,000 \$380,000 Low-Flow Diversion/Stormwater \$12,174,000 \$1,570,000 Total Estimates \$431,064,800 \$49,968,900	Stormwater Pumping Plants	\$23,166,000	\$1,860,000
Low-Flow Diversion/ <u>Stormwater</u> \$12,174,000 \$1,570,000 Total Estimates \$431,064,800 \$49,968,900	Low-Flow Diversions	\$3,250,000	\$380,000
Total Estimates \$431,064,800 \$49,968,900	Low-Flow Diversion/ <u>Stormwater</u>	\$12,174,000	\$1,570,000
	Total Estimates	\$431,064,800	\$49,968,900



DETERMINING THE RISK LEVEL AND PRIORITIZING PROJECTS

Level	Utility Business Impacts	Utility Equipment Damage	Source/Receiving Water Impacts	Environmental Impacts
Very High	Long-term or significant loss of revenue or operating income	Complete loss of asset	Long-term compromise of source water quality or quantity	Significant environmental damage – may incur regulatory action
High	Seasonal or episodic compromise of revenue or operating income	Significant damage to equipment	Seasonal or episodic compromise of source water quality or quantity	Persistent environmental damage – may incur regulatory action
Medium	Minor and short- term reductions in expected revenue	Minor damage to equipment	Temporary impact on source water quality or quantity	Short-term environmental damage, compliance can be quickly restored
Low	Minimal potential for loss of revenue or operating income	Minimal damage to equipment	No more than minimal changes to water quality	No impact or environmental damage

Source: EPA Climate Resilience Evaluation and Awareness Tool Version 3.0 Methodology Guide



NEXT STEPS









- Update project approval processes to include climate change and environmental justice considerations
- Raise awareness
- Improve collaboration among project managers, operations staff and environmental review and compliance staff
- Reduce negative impacts to schedule and budget

Institutionalization - Process Improvements



៳៷៲៳៰៳៳

- Updating Project Approval Process to Consider Climate Risk and Environmental Justice Risk Impacts
- Updating Design Standards
- Conduct Funding Research
- Conduct Outreach
- Prepare Training Modules
- Train Project Managers and Asset Owners



Climate Risk Management During Pre-Design







nvinonment

New types of standards and procedural mechanisms provide opportunities for increased climate resiliency.

- Performance-based standards;
- Standards for professional practice;
- Standards of care;
- Different procurement approaches for various types of climate-safe infrastructure projects; and
- ASCE's Manual of Practice (MOP) that recommends an adaptive design approach.


Voluntary Climate Resilience Standards

- <u>The US Green Building Council's Building Resilience</u>—Los Angeles Project (BRLA)
- <u>The Insurance Council of Australia's Building Resilience Rating Tool (BRRT)</u>
- <u>The Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure's Envision Rating System</u>
- <u>The Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety's FORTIFIED Standards</u>
- <u>The US Green Building Council's LEED program</u>
- <u>The US Green Building Council's Performance Excellence in Electricity Renewal (PEER) program</u>
- <u>The RELi Resilience Collaborative's RELi Resiliency Action List & Credit Catalog</u>
- Arup's The Resilience Based Earthquake Design Initiative (REDi)
- <u>Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES)</u>
- Enterprise Community Partners' Enterprise Green Communities Certification
- <u>Alliance for National and Community Resilience (ANCR)</u> (and its resilience benchmarking system, currently under development
- The Department of Homeland Security's Interagency Concept for Community Resilience (ICCR)
- The National Institute of Building Sciences' Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC)
- <u>The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Community Resilience Assessment</u> <u>Methodology (CRAM)</u>
- <u>Cal Green Tiers 1 and 2</u>

Deciding How to Time and Plan Investments With Scenario Planning



Temperature Increases in Different Scenarios



Scenario Planning with Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs)





Regulatory Affairs Division

Retrieved from: https://architecture2030.org/ipcc_analysis/ Source: CSIWG (2018), *Paying It Forward* 42





Adaptation Pathways: Not a Step Change but a Change in Many Steps

Source: CSIWG (2018), Paying It Forward



LASAN CONTACTS

Hassan Rad Regulatory Affairs Division Manager Hassan.Rad@LACity.org

Peggy Nguyen Environmental Supervisor Peggy.Nguyen@LACity.org



REFERENCE INFORMATION

Reference Information



FREEBOARD

Freeboard is a **factor of safety** usually **expressed in feet above a flood level** for purposes of floodplain management.

"Freeboard" tends to compensate for the many unknown factors that could contribute to flood heights greater than the height calculated for a selected size flood and floodway conditions, such as wave action, bridge openings, and the hydrological effect of urbanization of the watershed.

Freeboard is not required by National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) standards, but communities are encouraged to adopt at least a one-foot freeboard to account for the **one-foot rise built into the concept of designating a floodway and the encroachment requirements** where floodways have not been designated. Freeboard results in significantly lower flood insurance rates due to lower flood risk.

Source: FEMA (https://www.fema.gov/freeboard)

DESIGN FLOOD ELEVATION (DFE) CALCULATION METHODOLOGY



The ASCE-recommended design flood elevation (DFE) in Standard 24-14 is calculated using the base flood elevation (BFE) plus a freeboard of 1 foot for inland areas or 2 feet for coastal areas. The BFE is the 100-year flood elevation as shown on a FEMA FIRM.

In the risk assessment, the DFE was compared to actual threshold elevations at facilities for determining risks and needed improvements. DFEs can be summarized as follows:

- Short Term Risk DFEs were identified by comparing the threshold elevations to the BFE plus the relevant freeboard (inland vs. coastal) as the DFE as follows:
 100-year Flood DFE = BFE + Freeboard
- **Medium-Term Risk DFEs** used the BFE plus freeboard plus 1.64 feet (0.5 meter) of sea level rise (SLR) for mid-century conditions as follows:

0.5 meter SLR DFE = BFE + Freeboard + 0.5 meter

• Long-Term Risk DFEs used either the 500-year (0.2 percent chance of annual occurrence) flood elevation plus freeboard, the BFE plus freeboard plus 4.92 feet (1.5 meters) of SLR, or a tsunami depth of 20 feet as follows:

500-year Flood DFE = BFE*1.25 + Freeboard

- 1.5 meter SLR DFE = BFE + Freeboard + 1.5 meters
- **Tsunami DFE = 20 foot estimated tsunami wave height**



COASTAL STORM MODELING SYSTEM (CoSMoS)

- A dynamic modeling approach that has been developed by the United States Geological Survey in order to allow more detailed predictions of coastal flooding due to both future sea level rise and storms integrated with long-term coastal evolution (i.e., beach changes and cliff/bluff retreat) over large geographic areas (100s of kilometers).
- CoSMoS models all the relevant physics of a coastal storm (e.g.,tides, waves, and storm surge), which are then scaled down to local flood projections for use in community-level coastal planning and decision-making.
- Rather than relying on historic storm records, CoSMoS uses wind and pressure from global climate models to project coastal storms under changing climatic conditions during the 21st century.
- Projections of multiple storm scenarios (daily conditions, annual storm, 20-year- and 100-yearreturn intervals) are provided under a suite of sea-level rise scenarios ranging from 0 to 2 meters (0 to 6.6 feet), along with an extreme 5-meter (16-foot) scenario. This allows users to manage and meet their own planning horizons and specify degrees of risk tolerance.

Source: USGS, https://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/coastal_processes/cosmos/index.html



CoSMoS VERSIONS

Version 1.0 Southern California

Version 2.0 Northern California (outer coast)

Version 3.0 Southern California

Model enhancements for southern California include:

- Improved system methodology from CoSMoS 1.0 for more accurate flood projections in high-interest embayments and estuaries
- Long-term coastal evolution projections for sandy beaches and cliffs produced from a collection of state-of-the-art models and historical data
- Downscaled winds from Global Climate Model (GCM) data for locally-generated seas
 and surge
- Discharge from rivers for event response and long-term sediment supply
- An improved baseline elevation DEM that incorporates recent LIDAR survey

Source: USGS, https://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/coastal_processes/cosmos/socal3.0/index.html

Questions & Discussion







Additional Resources

- Funding programs for resilience and adaption <u>List</u> <u>compiled by EPA</u>
- "Federal financial resources for disaster mitigation and resilience in the U.S. water sector" – <u>article</u> in Utilities Policy







Dealing with Disruption: Operationalizing Resilience in the Water Sector

Part 4: June 3, 2020 | 2:00 PM - 3:30 PM ET

Learn more by visiting **nacwa.org/19rw**





