

US Army Corps of Engineers 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Probabilistic Flood Hazard Assessment Research Workshop Rockville, MD

#### Data, Models, Methods and Uncertainty Quantification in Probabilistic Storm Surge Models

- Presenter: Victor M. Gonzalez PE (USACE ERDC-CHL)
- PI: Norberto C. Nadal-Caraballo, PhD (USACE ERDC-CHL)
- Efrain Ramos-Santiago, Madison O. Campbell
- 20 February 2020





DISCOVER | DEVELOP | DELIVER

# Outline

- Introduction
- Probabilistic storm surge modeling
- Uncertainty
- Data Sources
- Methods and Models
  - SRR
  - Marginal Distributions
  - Generating synthetic storm set
  - Error and integration
  - Epistemic uncertainty



### Introduction

- Project part of U.S. NRC's Probabilistic Flood Hazard Assessment (PFHA) research plan.
- Support risk-informed licensing and oversight activities.
- Develop hazard curves with uncertainty represented through confidence limit curves.
- Approach informed by USNRC guidance on probabilistic seismic hazard assessment (PSHA)
  - Evaluation of data, models, and methods used in probabilistic storm surge models.
  - Epistemic uncertainty is quantified and propagated through logic trees.
- Consider AEPs that go beyond traditional state-of-practice in nonnuclear facilities (e.g., 10<sup>-4</sup> to 10<sup>-6</sup>).



# Probabilistic storm surge hazard modeling

- Based on the joint probability analysis of tropical cyclone (TC) forcing and responses.
- Basic elements:
  - SRR: Frequency of occurrence at location.
  - Development of Synthetic TCs and their probabilities.
  - Hydrodynamic Modeling: wind and pressure fields, circulation modeling (water levels), wave modeling.
  - Integration of response and uncertainty.

Hydrodynamic Modeling Synthetic Storm Storm Recurrence Hazard Curve Distribution Fitting set with computed Rate Integration probability mass of TC Parameters **TC Parameters** Function of location Central pressure, Cp Incorporate Examples: (x\_), Translational speed, Ts Uncertainty Bavesian Quadrature Storms/year/km Heading direction, Hd (error terms) (BQ) Radius of maximum winds. Response Surface (RS) Rmax

US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# Uncertainty

#### **JPM** Integral

 $\lambda_{r(\hat{x})>r} = \lambda \int P[r(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon > r | \hat{x}, \varepsilon] f_{\hat{x}}(\hat{x}) f_{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon) d\hat{x} d\varepsilon$ 

 $\approx \sum_{i}^{n} \lambda_{i} P[r(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon > r | \hat{x}, \varepsilon]$ 

#### where:

$$\begin{split} \lambda_{r(\hat{x})>r} &= \text{AEP of TC response } r \text{ due to} \\ \text{forcing vector } \hat{x} \\ \hat{x} &= f(x_o, \theta, \Delta p, R_{max}, V_t) \\ \lambda &= \text{SRR (storms/yr/km)} \\ \hat{\lambda}_i &= \text{probability mass (storms/yr) or } \lambda p_i, \\ \text{with } p_i &= \text{product of discrete probability and} \\ \text{TC track spacing (km)} \\ P[r(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon > r | \hat{x}, \varepsilon] \text{ conditional} \\ \text{probability that storm } i \text{ with parameters } \hat{x}_i \\ \text{generates a response larger than } r \\ \varepsilon &= \text{unbiased error or aleatory uncertainty} \\ \text{of } r \end{split}$$

#### CHL COASTAL & HYDRAULICS LABORATORY

#### Uncertainty:

- Aleatory natural randomness of a process, not reducible.
- Epistemic lack of knowledge about validity of models and data for the representation of real system.

#### PSHA based approach:

- Epistemic uncertainty based on the selection and application of alternative data, methods, and models.
- Capture the center, body, and range of technically densible interpretations.

# **Data Sources**

- NOAA HURDAT2
- Extended Best Track Dataset EBTRK (Demuth et al. 2006)

UNCLASSIFIED

- GCM downscaling data
- Stochastic Track models
- Statistical models: e.g. R<sub>max</sub> and Holland B
- Advance Tropical Cyclone Forecasting (ATCF) Data
- CHS Data (historical data reconstruction using metamodeling techniques)



10

6

5

4 3

2

Water Level (m, above MSL)

### **Epistemic Uncertainty in SRR Models**

#### Models for Calculating SRR.

- Uniform kernel function (UKF) or capture zone.
- Gaussian kernel function (GKF).
- Epanechnikov kernel function (EKF).
- **SRR** uncertainty contribution ( $\Delta p \ge$ 28 hPa):
  - Sampling uncertainty 65%
  - Selected period of record 19%
  - Gaussian kernel size 15%
  - Observational data 1%





#### Differences less than 0.61 m

 $w(d_i)$ 

EK

#### **Engineer Research and Development Center** US Army Corps of Engineers •

UK

#### **Defining Joint Probability of Storm Parameters**

#### • Effect of selection of $\Delta p$ distribution on hazard curve.



LTWD & DTWD curve considers the discretization of TCs into high and low intensity.

The effect is to lower the hazard curve.

Choice of Δp distribution showed limited impact

US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# **Defining Joint Probability of Storm Parameters**

#### • Effect of selection of $R_{max}$ distribution on hazard curve



Data sources and distributions:

- **EBTRK**:
  - Gumbel
  - Lognormal
  - Normal
  - Weibull
- Vickery and Wadhera (2008) statistical model:
  - Lognormal

More spread in the family of curves than for central pressure.

# **Defining Joint Probability of Storm Parameters**

#### • Effect of selection of $V_t$ distribution on hazard curve



Data sources and distributions:

- HURDAT2 derived
  - Gumbel
  - Lognormal
  - Normal
  - Weibull

Smallest spread in the family of curves.

Grouping reflects the difference between considering all distributions and separating by intensity.

US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# **Generation of Synthetic Storm Sets**

# Three methods for computing synthetic storm probability masses:

- Hybrid optimal sampling approach (applied to JPM-Reference):
  - **Discretization technique:** 
    - **•** Bayesian Quadrature: *R<sub>max</sub> and V<sub>f</sub>*
    - **•** Uniform Discretization:  $\Delta p$  and heading (θ)
  - Assignment of probability weights: Bayesian quadrature
  - Monte Carlo Sampling
    - 1,000,000 yrs
    - Empirical distribution, implicit probability weights in sampling Meta Gaussian Distribution
      - TC parameter dependencies -> Gaussian Copula
      - Relative probability weights of each synthetic TC:
      - estimated dividing its multivariate probability by the sum of the multivariate probabilities of all the synthetic storms

Coastal Reference Location	Number of TCs Sampled
Virginia Beach, VA	364,228
The Battery, NY	211,997
Newport, RI	267,505
Boston, MA	205,668



US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# **MGD** Parameter

#### MGD allows explicit consideration of parameter correlations.

Sensitivity analysis for  $\Delta p$  and  $R_{max}$  correlation



Comparison generalized correlation estimate vs correlation from data.



US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# **Generation of Synthetic Storm Sets**



The Battery, NY							
Synthetic Storm	Percent Change (%) JPM-reference						
Generation Method	1X10 <sup>-2</sup>	0.2X10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.2X10 <sup>-3</sup> 1X10 <sup>-3</sup>		1X10 <sup>-6</sup>		
JPM-OS Hybrid	-18.0	-16.7	-13.0	-3.1	-0.3		
MCS	-6.3	-8.4	-8.3	-5.3	1.1		
MGD	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.7	1.7		
MGD, Corr.=0	-8.7	-8.2	-6.9	-3.3	-0.7		
JPM-Reference	-	-	-	-	-		

MGD was based on the same storms used for JPM-Reference. The method for both are consistent, being the only difference the assignment of probability weights. Small difference between the two results.

US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# Sources of Error

- Hydrodynamic modelingMeteorological modeling errors
- Track error
- Holland B
- Tide (Gulf coast)

Uncertainty	North Atlantic Coast Comp. Study (2015)	Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay Wave and Water Level Modeling Study (2015)	South Atlantic Coast Study: Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands (ongoing)*	Flood Insurance Study: Coastal Counties, Texas (2011)	FEMA Region II Storm Surge Project (2014)	Mississippi Coastal Analysis Project (2008)
Hydrodynamic Modeling	0.48 m	0.91 m (combined with meteorological modeling)	0.20 m (constant) 0.30 (proportional)	0.56 to 0.76	0.39	0.23 m
Meteorological Modeling	0.38 m	-	0.14 (proportional) 0.09 (constant)	0.07 to 0.30	0.54	0.36 m
Strom Track Variation	0.25 m	0.09 m	N/A	0.20 x wave setup	N/A	N/A
Holland B	0.15 x storm surge elevation	0.17 x surge elevation	N/A	0.15 x surge elevation	N/A	0,15 x surge elevation
Astronomical Tide	variable	0.20 m	0.11 m	N/A	N/A	0.20 m

 $\sigma_{\varepsilon} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\varepsilon 1}^2 + \sigma_{\varepsilon 2}^2 + \dots + \sigma_{\varepsilon i}^2}$ 

# Holland B. Estimated, highly correlated to other parameters, specially $R_{max}$



\*Average values over 15,000 virtual gages

US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# Spatially-varying modeling error

Modeling error: has a direct effect on hazard curve shape and confidence limits.

- Global uncertainty: 1.42 ft.
- Spatially varying uncertainty:





US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# Characterization of Uncertainty in JPM integral

#### Methods:

- Zero uncertainty,  $\sigma = 0$
- Constant uncertainty,  $\sigma = 0.61$  m
- Proportional uncertainty, σ = 0.2\*WL
- Constrained uncertainty, σ=min(σ\_constant, σ\_proportional)
- Mean of constant and proportional,  $\sigma$ =mean ( $\sigma$ \_constant,  $\sigma$ \_proportional)

 $WL_n = \mu + \sigma(Z^*)$ 





Storm surge (m)						Percentage difference					
CRL	JPM-OS	AEP					AEP				
	Uncertain	1E-02	1E-03	1E-04	1E-05	1E-06	1E-02	1E-03	1E-04	1E-05	1E-06
	Combined	1.9	3.0	4.2	4.9	5.5	-	-	-	-	-
	Constant	2.3	3.2	4.2	4.9	5.5	17	7	1	0	0
6488	Mean	2.1	3.1	4.2	5.0	5.7	7	3	1	2	4
	Proportion	1.9	3.0	4.2	5.2	5.9	0	0	1	5	8
	Zero	1.8	2.8	3.5	3.7	3.9	-6	-7	-16	-25	-29
	Combined	3.0	4.7	6.2	6.9	7.5	-	-	-	-	-
7672	Constant	3.1	4.7	6.2	6.9	7.5	4	0	0	0	0
	Mean	3.1	4.7	6.4	7.5	8.3	1	0	4	7	10
	Proportion	3.0	4.7	6.7	8.0	9.0	0	1	8	15	20
	Zero	2.9	4.2	5.3	5.5	5.8	-4	-11	-14	-20	-23

US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# **Epistemic Uncertainty – Simplified Logic Tree Example**

The variations in data, model, and methods closely align with previous study approaches.



17

US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# Family of Hazard Curves – The Battery, NY

Family of hazard curves representing alternate data, model and methods.

Number of curves: 1,261.

About 1.2 m spread at 100 years and 1.5 at 1,000 years.

Uncertainty (84% CL-Mean) less than 0.40 m for the graphed AEPs.





US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

# Family of Hazard Curves – Additional Locations

The uncertainty computed as the difference between the 84% confidence limit and the mean for the curves tops out at about 0.45 m for Chesapeake Bay. **Curves cluster based** on intensity grouping. Branches added based on method to characterize uncertainty would increase uncertainty.



US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

### Reports

Gonzalez V.M., N.C. Nadal-Caraballo, J.A. Melby, and M.A. Cialone. 2019. *Quantification of Uncertainty in Probabilistic Storm Surge Models: Literature Review*. ERDC/CHL SR-19-1.

Nadal-Caraballo, N.C., V.M. Gonzalez, and L. Chouinard. 2019. *Quantification of Uncertainties in Probabilistic Storm Surge Models: Storm Recurrence Rate Models for Tropical Cyclones*, ERDC-CHL TR-19-4. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.

Nadal-Caraballo, N.C., V.M. Gonzalez, E. Ramos-Santiago, and M.O. Campbell. *Data, Models, and Methods for Defining Joint Probability of Storm Parameters and Generating Synthetic Storm Simulation Sets.* ERDC/CHL TR-20-X (In Review)





US Army Corps of Engineers • Engineer Research and Development Center

2

#### References

- Chouinard, L., C. Liu, and C. Cooper. 1997. Model for Severity of Hurricanes in Gulf of Mexico. Journal of Waterway, Port, Coastal, and Ocean Engineering 123 (3): 120–129.
- Demuth, J., M. DeMaria, and J.A. Knaff, 2006: Improvement of advanced microwave sounder unit tropical cyclone intensity and size estimation algorithms. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 45: 1573-1581.
- Nadal-Caraballo, N.C., J.A. Melby, V.M. Gonzalez, and A.T. Cox. 2015. North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study – Coastal Storm Hazards from Virginia to Maine. ERDC/CHL TR-15-5. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- Vickery, P.J., and D. Wadhera. 2008. Statistical Models of Holland Pressure Profile Parameter and Radius to Maximum Winds of Hurricanes from Flight-Level Pressure and H\*Wind Data. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology* 47(10): 2497-2517.



### **Contact Information**

U.S. Army Engineer R&D Center Coastal and Hydraulics Laboratory Norberto C. Nadal-Caraballo, Ph.D. Phone: (601) 634-2008 Email: <u>Norberto.C.Nadal-Caraballo@usace.army.mil</u>

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Joseph F. Kanney, Ph.D. Phone: (301) 980-8039 Email: Joseph.Kanney@nrc.gov

