

Which Scenario Should We Design For? Insights from House Elevation for the Multiple PDF Problem

James Doss-Gollin^{*1} Klaus Keller^{2,3,4}

^{*}jdossgollin@rice.edu ¹Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Rice University

²Department of Geosciences, the Pennsylvania State University

³Earth and Environmental Systems Institute, the Pennsylvania State University

⁴Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College

HOUSE ELEVATION

Households elevate their homes to manage flood risks, but regulations and guidance are silent on key questions [1, 2].

Q1 How to adapt guidance to building characteristics or household preferences?

Q2 How does nonstationary hazard change guidance?

Q3 Which model of nonstationary hazard should be used?



(a) Selinsgrove, PA

(b) Houston, TX



(c) Plaquemines Parish, LA

(d) Dare County, NC

Figure 1: (a) JDG, (b) Google Maps, (c) Mitch Epstein / New York Times (d) Rob Nichols.

CASE STUDY: NORFOLK, VA

We model a *hypothetical* house in Norfolk, VA, where sea level rise drives nonstationary future flood hazard, following the approach of [1].




Figure 2: Time series of annual maximum of storm surge (after subtracting mean sea level) at Sewells Point, VA (NAVD datum).




Figure 3: Neglecting hydrodynamics, we add sea level rise (a; see ref. [3]) to a Bayesian GEV model of storm surge (b) to get flood hazard. The convolution of hazard and fragility (c; see ref. [1]) yields an assessment of damages and tradeoffs (fig. 6).

ONE SIZE DOESN'T FIT ALL!

- Tailoring guidance to specific building characteristics can improve outcomes
- Elevating to “base flood elevation (BFE) plus a foot” is not always optimal [1, 2]
- Both over- and under-building can be costly [4, 5]




Figure 4: Tradeoffs between construction cost and expected NPV lifetime costs for houses initially situated (L) 2.5 ft and (R) 0.5 ft below the BFE under representative concentration pathway (RCP) 6.0 with fast BRICK [6] dynamics. Note y-axes are not equal.

THE MULTIPLE PDF PROBLEM

Uncertainties from multiple model structures (*e.g.*, ice sheet dynamics) and/or scenarios (*e.g.*, emissions pathways) create multiple estimates of time-varying hazard, *i.e.* the **Multiple PDF Problem**.




Figure 5: Sea level rise projections use the BRICK model [6]. We consider eight time-dependent PDFs of sea level rise: four RCP scenarios \times two parameterizations of ice sheet processes.

Considering other models [3, 7, 8] would compound this problem. **Which PDF should long-lasting infrastructure like housing be designed for?**

REFERENCES

- Zarekarizi, M. et al. *Nature Communications*. 2. Xian, S. et al. *Journal of Hydrology*.
- Ruckert, K. L. et al. *Scientific Reports*. 4. Ansar, A. et al. *Big Is Fragile: An Attempt at Theorizing Scale*. (2019).
- Doss-Gollin, J. et al. *Earth's Future*. 6. Wong, T. E. et al. *Geoscientific Model Development*. 7. Kopp, R. E. et al. *Earth's Future*. 8. DeConto, R. M. et al. *Nature*. 9. Gelman, A. et al. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*. 10. Sharma, S. et al. *A Safety Factor Approach to Designing Urban Infrastructure for Dynamic Conditions*. (2021).
- Wong, T. E. *Advances in Statistical Climatology, Meteorology and Oceanography*. 12. Yao, Y. et al. *Bayesian Analysis*. 13. Gelman, A. et al. *Bayesian Workflow*. (2020).
- Quinn, J. D. et al. *Earth's Future*.

IT MATTERS WHICH PDF YOU CHOOSE!

Any optimal strategy or Pareto frontier is conditional upon an (explicit or implicit) model of future outcomes (see ref. [9] for a more philosophical discussion).




Figure 6: Tradeoffs between (L) construction cost and expected lifetime costs or (R) construction cost and the uncertainty of future lifetime costs depend on the model selected.

Weights assigned to PDFs or simulations, **including implicit uniform weights**, should be communicated transparently to facilitate critique and improvement

SYNTHEZIZING PDFS FOR DECISION RELEVANCE

If there are only a few PDFs, then qualitative comparisons (*e.g.*, fig. 6) may be sufficient. With *many* PDFs (*e.g.*, fig. 5, refs. [3, 10]), further synthesis is needed.

We consider the *common case* of assessing decisions using simulations (SOWs) from each of K PDFs. A system model f quantifies the outcomes u of taking decision x under SOW s . Examining all SOWs created by a given model yields *scenario-conditional optimization* (fig. 6). To synthesize across PDFs, a weighting approach based on Bayesian Model Averaging [11, 12] is used.




Figure 7: Sketch of the “Prior Model Averaging” framework.

DIFFERENT BELIEFS EMPHASIZES DIFFERENT POSSIBILITIES

The prior model averaging approach (fig. 7) assigns a weight to each PDF based on their

- The prior can't be “right” [9, 13] or “scenario neutral” [14]
- let's at least **make assumptions transparent!**




Figure 8: If we weight all scenarios equally, then our projection of MSL in 2100 follows the sampling distribution; this may or may not reflect available information.




Figure 9: Weights assigned to each PDF (from fig. 5) under each prior considered. Horizontal line shows the weight given to each under an implicit uniform assumption.

LOOKING AHEAD

This didactic example illustrates a need for better synthesis and communication of deep uncertainties for decision making. **LET'S COLLABORATE ON:**

- More complex models to capture more relevant metrics
- Better priors over nonstationary hazard
- Interacting, sequential decisions
- Inclusive assessment of ethical questions around scenario weighting




Figure 10: House elevation is just one of many design problems where nonstationary hazards, subject to scenario and model structure uncertainties, drive outcomes. (a) JDG (b) D. Howard / Wikipedia.