

Climate Change Adaptation: Uncertainty Associated with Sequential Finite Period Decisions under Nonstationarity

James Doss-Gollin^{1,2}, Upmanu Lall^{1,2}, and David Farnham^{1,2}

¹Columbia Water Center, Columbia University

²Department of Earth and Environmental Engineering, Columbia University

February 13, 2018

Abstract

Hydroclimatic systems exhibit organized low-frequency and regime-like variability at multiple time scales, causing the risk associated with climate extremes such as floods and droughts to vary at multiple timescales. Despite broad recognition of this nonstationarity, there has been little theoretical development of ideas for the design and operation of infrastructure considering the regime structure of such changes and their potential predictability. This theory is well-suited to analysis of flood adaptation strategies with fixed project operation period M , but not for analysis of sequential decision strategies. In this paper we illustrate some basic considerations of uncertainty and risk analysis associated with the sequential decisions that may need to be made for climate risk adaptation in a nonstationary adaptation. We simulate synthetic data and fit the resulting simulations in a Bayesian context using stationary and non-stationary models to show that **RESULT**. This is a first conceptual step to the development of a full sequential decision analysis approach under nonstationarity.

1 Introduction

Hydroclimatic systems vary on many timescales, including regime-like variability and secular variability (Hodgkins et al., 2017; Hurst, 1951; Matalas, 2012; Merz et al., 2014; Milly et al., 2008; Sveinsson et al., 2005). This multi-scale variability greatly complicates the estimation of future flood sequences, leading to “low confidence in projections of changes in fluvial floods” (IPCC, 2012). Yet the same memory and low-frequency variability that complicate projecting flood sequences far into the future may also impart some predictability at short timescales (Jain and Lall, 2001). The existence of this information gap suggests that approaches for adapting to hydroclimate risks, such as floods, which have short project operation periods, may be preferential in some cases to large and permanent projects with long project operations.

Classical methods for design of infrastructure first specify a return period T (i.e. 100 years), and then design a project that protects against this T -year event. Much of the flood frequency analysis (FFA) literature has tended to focus on the details of flood frequency estimation and on trend detection associated with climate change and land use cover (Kidson and Richards, 2016; Merz et al., 2014; Merz and Blöschl, 2008). The mathematical problem of interest then becomes estimation of the probability distribution $f(p_T)$, where p_T is binary event that the threshold Q_T is exceeded:

$$p_T(t) \equiv \mathbb{P}[Q(t) \geq Q_T] \quad \text{for } t = [t_0 + 1, \dots, t_0 + M]$$

and where t_0 is the first year forecast and M is the project operation period. Although in a stationary setting an unbiased estimator of $P[Q(t) \geq Q_T]$ converges asymptotically to $1 - \frac{1}{T}$, the asymmetric uncertainty distribution of the estimate has also prompted the consideration of the potential for over- or under-design for floods if the conditional mean of the estimated distribution of Q_T is used for design (Stedinger, 1997)¹.

Alternatively, risk-based design methods (RBDM; see Rosner et al., 2014) recognize that the appropriate level of design may itself be a decision variable. Lall (1987) considered the uncertainty in the frequency with which floods may exceed the design level for different values of p (equivalent to different values of T), and also for different sample sizes for estimation N and different project operation periods M . The duration M may reflect the physical life of a proposed infrastructure element, or its economic life. In the context of financial instruments which may be used for risk mitigation, M specifies the length of the contract and Q_T the threshold at which a payout is triggered. In such a setting, the mathematical problem is to estimate the future distribution of $Q(t)$ rather than just the future distribution of the binary outcome p_T .

Under classical assumptions of stationarity, all estimates are assumed independent of time. Yet even under stationarity, Jain and Lall (2001) showed that low-frequency variability can lead to a high probability of surprise, particularly when the length of the record used for estimation N is short. This finding is particularly important to keep in mind given that low-frequency change has been found to be large as compared to detected trends in the observed record (Hodgkins et al., 2017).

Of course, the hydroclimate systems are not stationary, due to climate, river modification, and land use change (Merz et al., 2014; Milly et al., 2008). However, predicting future hydrologic behavior in a particular location is inherently difficult given limited data and complex, highly nonlinear physics. Physical scaling arguments for an intensified hydrologic cycle under climate change (see Muller et al., 2011; O’Gorman, 2015) do not in general hold over land (Byrne and O’Gorman, 2015; Shaw et al., 2016). Attempts to use a “model chain” approach encompassing: (i) emission scenario; (ii) general circulation model (GCM); (iii) downscaling; (iv) hydrological catchment model; and (v) flood frequency analysis, typically with bias correction applied at several steps, can lead to results which are difficult to interpret in a probabilistic context (Dankers and Feyen, 2009; Dittes et al., 2017; Merz et al., 2014; Ott et al., 2013). In particular, the downscaling and bias correction methods typically applied assume stationary relationships (e.g. between GCM rainfall and observed rainfall) which have no physical basis, particularly in a changing climate. Recent work has also sought to shorten the above model chain by modeling $Q(X(t))$, where X is a set of climate state variables from a GCM run, and where the relationship between X and Q can more reasonably be assumed stationary (Delgado et al., 2014; Hall et al., 2014; Silva et al., 2016). Alternatively, purely statistical approaches have extended classical flood frequency analysis by incorporating a time trend in the parameters of statistical distributions (Obeysekera and Salas, 2014; Serinaldi and Kilsby, 2015; Strupczewski et al., 2001; Vogel et al., 2011). In this case, however, the analyst can choose not only the distribution but also the time parameterization, if any, for each parameter, leading to many researcher degrees of freedom (“forking paths” or “multiple comparisons”; Gelman and Loken, 2013) and exacerbating the problems caused by lack of theory for model choice even under nonstationarity (Kidson and Richards, 2016).

The wide variety of methods, each with its own advantages and disadvantages, for estimating the future distribution of flooding $p(Q(t))$ illustrates the theoretical need for approaches to incorporate uncertain estimates of future floods into a decision framework. As we have argued,

¹Vogel198x citation

however, low-frequency variability or system memory may lead to less uncertain probabilistic forecasts at short times than long times. There is thus *a critical theoretical need for decision frameworks which can compare projects of different operation period* using an arbitrary choice of model of future flood behavior. Sequential decision models (see Howard, 1960; Russell, 2003) allow decision-makers to optimize not only what action to take, but also when to take it. Sequential decision models have been used in the hydrological literature for sea wall optimization (Lickley et al., 2014)².

Understanding the full uncertainty associated with thresholds of interest is relevant to many other climate adaptation problems, including infrastructure design for flood management, because we are faced with the task of estimating the infrastructure’s probability of failure p_T for the next M years, as well as the uncertainty and bias in this estimate. However, to properly analyse it we need detailed information on complex cost and loss structures; we thus focus on the illustrative example of financial instruemnts for clarity.

In the following sections we illustrate some very basic considerations of uncertainty and risk analysis associated with the sequential decisions that may need to be made for climate risk adaptation in a nonstationary environment. This is a first conceptual step to the development of a full sequential decision analysis approach under nonstationarity. We proceed as follows . . .

2 Methods

We use a highly idealized model to generate sequences of annual-maximum floods using a known generating mechanism, then fit these sequences in a Bayesian framework to three flood models (stationary, nonstationary, and hidden markov model) to evalaluate their performance under different scenarios (defined by observational record length N and project planning period M) and criteria.

2.1 Synthetic Flood Sequence Generation

In large river basins, extreme river flooding typically requires the large-scale transport and convergence of moisture,³ which often requires specific climate mechanisms. For example, major river floods in the Ohio River Basin (USA) in the 20th century exhibit remarkably consistent large-scale circulation features in the weeks preceding the flood peak (Nakamura et al., 2012; Robertson et al., 2015). This is consistent with findings that have linked flood risk around the world with well-known climate mechanisms such as El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Emerton et al., 2017; Ward et al., 2014). To capture this influence, some recent studies have incorporated a climate index or set of climate indices X as predictor variables for streamflow (Delgado et al., 2014; Griffis and Stedinger, 2007; Silva et al., 2016; Sun et al., 2014)⁴. For a more comprehensive review, we refer the reader to Hall et al. (2014).⁵

ENSO (see Sarachik and Cane, 2010, for a comprehensive review) varies in a quasi-oscillatory manner with variability on the order of 4 year to 6 year modulated by low-frequency behavior. Though the time scales are specific to ENSO, this pattern of quasi-oscillatory behavior modulated by low-frequency behavior is typical of many other climate phenomena. A 100 000 year integration of the Cane-Zebiak model (Zebiak and Cane, 1987) was used to produce a monthly

²need some citations for sequential decisions

³Is this worth adding in

⁴Farnham et al

⁵Farnham et al

NINO3.4 index⁶ with stationary forcing. To create an annual time series, we average the May-July months to create a time series $X(t)$ where t is taken in annual steps $1, \dots, 100\,000$.

Though statistical models relating climate indices and streamflow maxima typically require strong assumptions (i.e. a stationary relationship between predictor and predictand; see Farnham et al.), this framework is the starting point of our synthetic flood generation approach.

$$\log Q(t) | \mu(t), \sigma(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(t), \sigma(t)). \quad (1)$$

The parameters of the distribution vary in time according to the sampled NINO3 index denoted $X(t)$ as well as time itself, representing secular trends:

$$\mu(t) = \mu_0 + \beta X(t) + \gamma(t - t_0) \quad (2)$$

and a constant coefficient of variation

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} \alpha\mu(t) & \text{if } \alpha\mu(t) \geq 0.01 \\ 0.01 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

We partition $\mu(t)$ into a dynamical component, driven by the variability of the climate predictor $X(t)$, and a trend component, represented by a linear increase in time. This trend component may represent changes in land use, global temperature change, or river modification (see Merz et al., 2014). Though this is a highly simplified model neglecting many important mechanisms, it enables us to generate many synthetic sequences of $[M + N]$ years which exhibit chaotic but organized quasi-periodic behavior (regime behavior or low-frequency variability) plus a trend term, thereby capturing many essential features of hydrological variability. Because the computational cost is small, it is easy to generate sets of sequences.

In section 3 we show sequences of streamflow generated by this model for some choices of parameters and discuss the processes which they can reasonably represent.

2.2 Distributional Model

Because we do not, in general, know the true distribution of annual-maximum floods, we compare a stationary and non-stationary parameterizations of the generalized extreme value (GEV) statistical distribution (eq. 4) for estimating the distribution of $Q(t)$ for the future M -year period.

$$f(x | \mu, \sigma, \xi) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \begin{cases} [1 + \xi \frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}]^{(-1/\xi)-1} \exp \left[- (1 + \xi \frac{x-\mu}{\sigma})^{-1/\xi} \right], & \xi \neq 0 \\ \exp \left[- \frac{x-\mu}{\sigma} \right] \exp \left[- \exp \left(- \frac{x-\mu}{\sigma} \right) \right], & \xi = 0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Where μ is the location parameter, σ is the shape parameter, and ξ is the scale parameter of the GEV distribution. For each simulation, the first N years ($t = [t_0 - N + 1, \dots, t_0]$) are treated as observations. Then, once the appropriate time parameterization is selected (table 1), the parameters are fit in a Bayesian framework to fully represent the posterior uncertainty. Computation is carried out in the `python` environment, with simulation using the `numpy` package (van der Walt et al., 2011) and fitting using the No-U-Turn Sampler (NUTS) (Hoffman and Gelman, 2014) as implemented in the `stan` probabilistic programming language (Carpenter et al., 2016). Weak (uninformative) priors are chosen based on recommendations from Martins and Stedinger (2000); the exact parameterizations are described in following sections which describe specific experiments.

⁶We greatly acknowledge the contribution of Nandini Ramesh

2.3 Hidden Markov Model

A Hidden Markov Model (HMM) is a statistical Markov model in which the system being modeled is assumed to be a Markov process with unobserved (i.e. hidden) states (Rabiner and Juang, 1986). The (unobserved) states evolve following a first-order Markov process, and the observed variable (i.e. streamflow) depends only on the observed state. As such, HMMs are a structured prediction method which extend general mixture models to sequences of data, where position in the sequence is relevant. Because this structure allows the hidden state to represent hydroclimatological “regimes” (Merz et al., 2014; Michelangeli et al., 1995; Reinhold and Pierrehumbert, 1982), HMMs have been used extensively to model hydrological variables such as streamflow (Bracken et al., 2016). HMMs have also been used to model the evolution of climate states such as ENSO.⁷

To supplement the distributional models described in section 2.2, we also fit observed streamflow sequences using a HMM as implemented in the python `pomegranate` package (Schreiber, 2016). The model is fit to the N observed years of data using the Baum-Welch algorithm, assuming that the data follow a log-normal distribution conditional only on the state. To choose the number of hidden states, a log probability score is used. Future floods are estimated by simulating future states from the resulting matrix and then drawing floods log-normally using the estimated parameters.

2.4 Flood Estimation and Uncertainty

Finally, we consider a contract in which an insurer agrees to pay the entire coverage cost C every time that the trigger threshold Q_T is exceeded. Although Q_T is in general a decision variable, we treat it as fixed. Then, using the posterior distribution of the parameters of the chosen statistical model (from table 1) we estimate the probability that $Q(t) \geq Q_T$ for $t \in \mathbf{t}$, which is equivalent to $p_T(t)$.

For a particular year, the fair price for the insurance premium is $\mathbb{E}(p_T)C$. However, there is typically also a risk premium associated with the policy that prices the uncertainty in this estimate (since the trigger Q_T is specified in the contract and thus not uncertain). This risk premium is proportional to the variance of p_T , or more generally to its uncertainty distribution. The insurance premium for a particular year is thus

$$Z(t) = C[\mathbb{E}(p_T(t)) + R\mathbb{V}(p_T(t))] \quad (5)$$

where $R \geq 0$ is a coefficient describing the cost of the uncertainty in the estimate of $p_T(t)$.

In this paper we consider the price of a contract of M years to be simply the summed price of the contract for each individual year. We assume that the discount rate is equal to inflation (i.e.

⁷Julian’s work

Model Name	Description	Relevant Section
stationary	$Q \sim \text{GEV}(\mu, \sigma, \xi)$	section 2.2
location trend	$Q \sim \text{GEV}(\mu_0 + \beta_\mu(t - t_0), \sigma, \xi)$	section 2.2
HMM	log-normal Hidden Markov Model	section 2.3

Table 1: Summary of models used for fitting

the inflation-adjusted discount rate is zero) for simplicity. A more comprehensive pricing mechanism for the financial instrument could incorporate more or different information about the uncertainty in the estimate, and should consider the price of the M years as a portfolio (i.e. should consider correlation between the different years). Such an approach, however, is not necessary for this conceptual study.

3 Are Generated Sequences Realistic?

In this section we discuss the sequences of streamflow that are generated and look at their ACF, PACF, distribution, wavelet spectrum, etc. and compare to some that have been identified in the literature.

4 Stationary, Static Risk

Consider static risk and a stationary process, and particularly implications of $\{M, N\}$. Much of this is already laid out in Lall (1987).

5 Stationary, Static Risk

Consider static risk and a non-stationary process. Estimate using drift or nonstationary models using full N of the most recent N (i.e. what Vogel is proposing). Illustrate via simulation for different signal to noise ratio of nonstationary terms and $\{M, N\}$.

6 Dynamic Risk

Consider dynamic risk, i.e. updating and sequential decisions, a nonstationary generative process, and M and N considerations.

7 Discussion

Hopefully something to discuss?

8 Summary

Some interesting conclusions

References

- Bracken, C., B. Rajagopalan, and C. Woodhouse (2016). “A Bayesian Hierarchical Nonhomogeneous Hidden Markov Model for Multisite Streamflow Reconstructions”. en. *Water Resources Research* 52.10. DOI: 10.1002/2016WR018887.
- Byrne, Michael P. and Paul A. O’Gorman (2015). “The Response of Precipitation Minus Evapotranspiration to Climate Warming: Why the “Wet-Get-Wetter, Dry-Get-Drier” Scaling Does Not Hold over Land”. *Journal of Climate* 28.20. DOI: 10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0369.1.
- Carpenter, Bob et al. (2016). “Stan: A Probabilistic Programming Language”. *Journal Of Statistical Software*.
- Dankers, Rutger and Luc Feyen (2009). “Flood Hazard in Europe in an Ensemble of Regional Climate Scenarios”. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 114.D16.
- Delgado, J. M., B. Merz, and H. Apel (2014). “Projecting Flood Hazard under Climate Change: An Alternative Approach to Model Chains”. English. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science* 14.6. DOI: 10.5194/nhess-14-1579-2014.
- Dittes, B. et al. (2017). “Climate Uncertainty in Flood Protection Planning”. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.* 2017. DOI: 10.5194/hess-2017-576.
- Emerton, R et al. (2017). “Complex Picture for Likelihood of ENSO-Driven Flood Hazard”. *Nature Communications* 8.
- Gelman, Andrew and Eric Loken (2013). “The Garden of Forking Paths: Why Multiple Comparisons Can Be a Problem, Even When There Is No “Fishing Expedition” or “p-Hacking” and the Research Hypothesis Was Posited Ahead of Time”. *Department of Statistics, Columbia University*.
- Griffis, V W and Jerry R Stedinger (2007). “Incorporating Climate Change and Variability into Bulletin 17B LP3 Model — World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2007”. *World Environmental and Water \ldots*.
- Hall, J. et al. (2014). “Understanding Flood Regime Changes in Europe: A State-of-the-Art Assessment”. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 18.7. DOI: 10.5194/hess-18-2735-2014.
- Hodgkins, Glenn A et al. (2017). “Climate-Driven Variability in the Occurrence of Major Floods across North America and Europe”. *Journal of Hydrology*.
- Hoffman, M D and A Gelman (2014). “The No-U-Turn Sampler: Adaptively Setting Path Lengths in Hamiltonian Monte Carlo.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*.
- Howard, Ronald A. (1960). *Dynamic Programming and Markov Processes*. Dynamic programming and Markov processes. Oxford, England: John Wiley.
- Hurst, H E (1951). “Long-Term Storage Capacity of Reservoirs”. *Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers* 116.
- IPCC (2012). *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation*.
- Jain, Shaleen and Upmanu Lall (2001). “Floods in a Changing Climate: Does the Past Represent the Future?” *Water Resources Research* 37.12. DOI: 10.1029/2001WR000495.
- Kidson, R and K S Richards (2016). “Flood Frequency Analysis: Assumptions and Alternatives”. *Progress in Physical Geography* 29.3.
- Lall, Upmanu (1987). “Project Risk Considering Sampling Uncertainties and a Finite Project Operation Period”. en. *Application of Frequency and Risk in Water Resources*. Ed. by Vijay P. Singh. Springer Netherlands. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-009-3955-4_23.
- Lickley, Megan J, Ning Lin, and Henry D Jacoby (2014). “Analysis of Coastal Protection under Rising Flood Risk”. *Climate Risk Management* 6.

- Martins, Eduardo S. and Jerry R. Stedinger (2000). "Generalized Maximum-Likelihood Generalized Extreme-Value Quantile Estimators for Hydrologic Data". en. *Water Resources Research* 36.3. DOI: 10.1029/1999WR900330.
- Matalas, Nicholas C (2012). "Comment on the Announced Death of Stationarity". *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*.
- Merz, B. et al. (2014). "Floods and Climate: Emerging Perspectives for Flood Risk Assessment and Management". *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science* 14.7. DOI: 10.5194/nhess-14-1921-2014.
- Merz, Ralf and Günter Blöschl (2008). "Flood Frequency Hydrology: 2. Combining Data Evidence". *Water Resources Research* 44.8.
- Michelangeli, Paul-Antoine, Robert Vautard, and Bernard Legras (1995). "Weather Regimes: Recurrence and Quasi Stationarity". *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 52.8. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0469(1995)052<1237:WRRQSQ>2.0.CO;2.
- Milly, P C D et al. (2008). "Stationarity Is Dead: Whither Water Management?" *Science* 319.5863. DOI: 10.1126/science.1151915.
- Muller, Caroline J, Paul A O’Gorman, and Larissa E Back (2011). "Intensification of Precipitation Extremes with Warming in a Cloud-Resolving Model". *Journal of Climate* 24.11. DOI: 10.1175/2011JCLI3876.1.
- Nakamura, Jennifer et al. (2012). "Dynamical Structure of Extreme Floods in the U.S. Midwest and the UK". *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 14.2. DOI: 10.1175/JHM-D-12-059.1.
- Obeyssekera, Jayantha and Jose D. Salas (2014). "Quantifying the Uncertainty of Design Floods under Nonstationary Conditions". *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* 19.7. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0000931.
- O’Gorman, Paul A (2015). "Precipitation Extremes Under Climate Change." *Current climate change reports* 1.2. DOI: 10.1007/s40641-015-0009-3.
- Ott, Irena et al. (2013). "High-Resolution Climate Change Impact Analysis on Medium-Sized River Catchments in Germany: An Ensemble Assessment". *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 14.4.
- Rabiner, L. and B. Juang (1986). "An Introduction to Hidden Markov Models". *IEEE ASSP Magazine* 3.1. DOI: 10.1109/MASSP.1986.1165342.
- Reinhold, Brian B. and Raymond T. Pierrehumbert (1982). "Dynamics of Weather Regimes: Quasi-Stationary Waves and Blocking". *Monthly Weather Review* 110.9. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0493(1982)110<1105:DOWRQS>2.0.CO;2.
- Robertson, Andrew W et al. (2015). "Weather and Climatic Drivers of Extreme Flooding Events over the Midwest of the United States". *Extreme Events*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rosner, Ana, Richard M. Vogel, and Paul H. Kirshen (2014). "A Risk-Based Approach to Flood Management Decisions in a Nonstationary World". en. *Water Resources Research* 50.3. DOI: 10.1002/2013WR014561.
- Russell, Stuart J. (2003). *Artificial Intelligence : A Modern Approach*. Ed. by Peter Norvig. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Prentice Hall,
- Sarachik, Edward S. and Mark A. Cane (2010). *The El Niño-Southern Oscillation Phenomenon*: Cambridge University Press.
- Schreiber, Jacob (2016). "Pomegranate". *GitHub repository*.
- Serinaldi, Francesco and Chris G. Kilsby (2015). "Stationarity Is Undead: Uncertainty Dominates the Distribution of Extremes". *Advances in Water Resources* 77. DOI: 10.1016/j.advwatres.2014.12.013.
- Shaw, T. A. et al. (2016). "Storm Track Processes and the Opposing Influences of Climate Change". en. *Nature Geoscience* 9.9. DOI: 10.1038/ngeo2783.

- Silva, Artur Tiago, Mauro Naghettini, and Maria Manuela Portela (2016). “On Some Aspects of Peaks-over-Threshold Modeling of Floods under Nonstationarity Using Climate Covariates”. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* 30.1.
- Stedinger, Jerry R. (1997). “Expected Probability and Annual Damage Estimators”. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 123.2. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(1997)123:2(125).
- Strupczewski, W G, V P Singh, and W Feluch (2001). “Non-Stationary Approach to at-Site Flood Frequency Modelling I. Maximum Likelihood Estimation”. *Journal of Hydrology* 248.1-4.
- Sun, Xun et al. (2014). “A General Regional Frequency Analysis Framework for Quantifying Local-Scale Climate Effects: A Case Study of ENSO Effects on Southeast Queensland Rainfall”. *Journal of Hydrology* 512.
- Sveinsson, O G, Jose D Salas, and D C Boes (2005). “Prediction of Extreme Events in Hydrologic Processes That Exhibit Abrupt Shifting Patterns — Journal of Hydrologic Engineering — Vol 10, No 4”. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*.
- van der Walt, Stéfan, S Chris Colbert, and Gaël Varoquaux (2011). “The NumPy Array: A Structure for Efficient Numerical Computation”. *Computing in Science & Engineering* 13.2.
- Vogel, Richard M, Chad Yaindl, and Meghan Walter (2011). “Nonstationarity: Flood Magnification and Recurrence Reduction Factors in the United States”. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 47.3.
- Ward, P. J. et al. (2014). “Strong Influence of El Nino Southern Oscillation on Flood Risk around the World”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111.44. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1409822111.
- Zebiak, Stephen E. and Mark A. Cane (1987). “A Model El Niño–Southern Oscillation”. *Monthly Weather Review* 115.10. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0493(1987)115<2262:AMENO>2.0.CO;2.