Hurricane Sandy and Increasing Storm Risk in New York Harbor, 1844-2013: A Perspective from NOAA Historical Data

> David Jay and Stefan Talke Portland State University Philip Orton Stevens Institute of technology



Roadmap –

- Brief review of Hurricane Sandy
- What can NOAA historical data tell us about the risk of such storms?
- Using NOAA data to understand how a storm surge behaves in New York Harbor, and how this has changed

Hurricane Sandy – A Brief Review

For additional details, see:

Service Assessment Hurricane/Post Tropical Cyclone Sandy, October 22-29, 2012

NOAA National Weather Service

Storm Track –

> Wikipedia; background image NOAA





An enormous storm; the rare "left turn" was caused by high SLP over Greenland



Sea level Pressure

National Hurricane Center

Wind Speeds



Inundation-





Inundation (ft) above ground level (AGL), from NOS gauges:

The greatest inundation was on the r.h side of the storm, aided by strong winds from the northeast

- Raritan Bay is funnel shaped, facing into the wind
- But what happened in the East River Tidal Strait? (I'll get to that!)

Learning from Historical NOAA Data –

Superstorm Sandy: The worst storm surge in NYH since....?

Hurricanes in 1788, 1821, & 1893 predate modern data but are important to risk



Lack of data is a general problem in analyzing rare, extreme events... What to do? Recovering historical data is an important tool.

Summarized from:

S.A. Talke, P. Orton, and D.A. Jay, [2014], Increasing storm tides in New York Harbor, 1844-2013, Submitted to *Geophysical Research Letters*, and other papers in preparation





<u>Approach 1</u>: Numerical simulation + Generalized Pareto Distribution to assess storm surge and return period

- Storm-surge: ~ 500 year Sandy return period
- Storm tide: surge + astronomical tide:
 ~1000 years return

<u>Approach 2</u>: Analyze available annual extremes: 1570 year return storm tide (Sweet et al., 2013)

Previous Analyses of NYH storm-tide risk



<u>Approach 3</u>: Proxy-based historical reconstruction.

→ Suggests 3 historical storm-tides since 1788 approached the level of hurricane Sandy.

Question: Is New York more vulnerable to extreme events than modeling suggests? Or are historical estimates in error?

Our Approach –

<u>Use historic NOAA tide data</u> from 1844-2012 to provide:

> Insights into the *probability of extreme* storm surge in NYH

> Clues about the long-term
changes and their causes

> Add 1821 as another large event

<u>Use contemporary tide data and</u> <u>models</u> to understand mechanisms

For the future, are there possible *mitigation strategies* at the local level?



<u>Above</u>: Tide Data has been measured nearly continuously in New York area since 1844.

These data are in the National Archives

	~	M		M		$\left(\right)$					nor yes and a set	and the second second		
0	18	885						*	1					and the second s
							U.	S. COAST	T AND GEOD	ETIC SURV	FV			
	Statio	m, San	dy to	took	TABU	LATI	ON C	F TI	DESE	IOUR	LY OF			(11)
	Obser	ver, Jos.	Iw. C	orbett	J. Tu	bulaters 1.7	N Colott a	8 Mart +	R. Moldehad	885, A	nay	- Automatic	TIda san a	
Н. Д	L. Feet.	1 2 Feet. Feet.	Fort, Fort	3 4	5	6	1. Collero, ~	7	8	Readin	ogs are reduce	ed to staff .	Time used is	0
0 0	Dat	<u>a Recc</u>	overy	v and [Digitiza	ation	Fort. Fort. 8.02	<u>A</u> t	halysis	Met	hods	Feet. Feet.	e 13	
1 0	4.47	6.22	5.97	6.67	7.62	7.97	8.27	8.17	7 7.42	677	4.37	3.27	3.12	eet. Feet. 4.0
2 00 30	3.62	5.02	4.87	5.57	6.67	7.42	8.07	1. 8.T3i	dal analy	/sis to	separat	te störr	n súrge	3.3
3 0 30	3.12	Pictures	solga		In arch	6.42	7.37	fre	om astro	nomic	al tide	5.22	3.97	3.5
4 00	3.57	4.12	3.77	3.87	4.52	5.42	6.52	7.52	7.82	0 22	2047	6.47	5.37	4.4
5 00 30	4.62	Student	ts digit	tize the o	data02	4.62	5.92	6.49	7 7.12	7.07	8.07	7.47	6.57	5.7.
6 00 30	3.92	5.52	4.47	3.97	3.87	4.22	5.27	2. Ext	reme va	lue sta	atistical	analys	is on?	7.0
7 00 30	7.02	6.52	5.62	4.87	4.12	4.27	4.87	5.12	-Annual	extren	nes (18)	344-20	128.47	8.3.
8 00 30	7.87	Quality	Assur	ance, in	cluding:	4.87	4.82	4.69	Hurrica	newSto	rm Tide	as (184)	4- 2012)	9.2.
9 00 30	8.27	(a) Re	duĩnđa	ncv .62	5.82	5.42	5.27	457	Ludrica	novisto	rm chr		-7.42	9.1:
10 00 30	8.02.	(b) Dif	ferenc	ing to ic	lentify a	nikés	6.07	5.17	- HUM-1Ca	2.97		se (190	0- 2012)	8.12
1 00 30	7.17	(7 82 (c) Hai	7.62	c analysi	7.12	6.67	6.97	5.87	517	3.0/	3.62	4.02	4.82	6.5
100N 30	5.97		7.72	- 7.57	732	7671	762	682	he GPD	and G	EV prol	bability	curves	\$5.2:
3 00 30	5.17	(d)2Ne	weygri	k i mes	archives	5, 185 L· 7.47	797	7 50	re fit to	data t	o estim	ate ret	urñ92	4.12
4 00 30	4.67	preser	nt5.07	5.92	6.37	7.37	8.07	7 02	periods	6.07	4.87	3.72	2.92	3.42
5.00 30	4.57	4.12.	4.32	5.12	5.67	6.67	7.72	7.72	1.11	7.12	6.32	5.17	3.77	3.67
00 4 30	4.82	4.02	3.87	4.47	5.12	5.92	712	7.92	8,92	7.97	7.42	6.72	5.47	4.97
00 30	5.77	4.67	3.92	4.37	4.67	5.42	6.52	689	8.37	8.42	8.27	7.92	7.07	6.62
00 30	7.07	5.67	4.62	4.72 .	4.42	5.02	5.97	6.14	1.97	8.37	8.47	8.62	8.32	8.27
00 8 30	.22	6.77	5.82	5.42	4.77	5.07	542	5.50	15.97	7.72	8.37	8.92	9.27	9.82
011	1 0 0	and the second s			and a second sec	1 1 1		0.01.	- 17	1.9.19	4119	0 50	A	- C -



Results



AMST: The annual extreme storm tide (highest measured water level annual mean sea level) Before 1950, only 1 event exceeded 1.9m; after 1950, seven have.



Note: The 1893 hurricane was only 1.6m; not even largest event of the year



Results



Left: The annual storm-tide is increasing, based on a 36 yr. running median.

In particular, the upper quartile threshold—the 75% level— has increased by ~20cm.

Significant natural variability. North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO)?



Yes: The detrended difference between upper and lower quartile is *anti-correlated* with a 36 yr median NAO index. $R^2 = 0.92$, pvalue < 0.1

Hence, there is an increased 'spread' in statistics during negative NAO years

2.2 5 yr 5 yr 2.2 - 10 yr 10 yr 2.0 2 1.8 Manhattan Seawall 1.8 Ε 1.6 1.6 1.4 1.4 (a) AMST: 37 yr GEV analysis (b) AMST 1.2 1.2 + MSL change 1950 1850 1850 1900 2000 1900 1950 2000

If 45 cm relative sealevel rise is included, we find that the combined change is 75 cm

The 10 yr storm-tide now exceeds the Battery sea-wall.

Above: Generalized extreme value (GEV) analysis finds a nearly 30 cm increase in the 10 yr storm-tide level since mid-1800s

What is the Sandy Level return period?





What is the Sandy Level return period?

If the AMST from 1844-2013 are used, the estimate is > 5000 years.

Can this possibly be correct, considering the 1821 hurricane was reported to be nearly as high as Sandy?

To obtain an adequate *extreme* risk assessment, we next include the 1821 Hurricane

"THE GAZETTE AND GENERAL ADVERTISER" - September 7, 1821 <u>Singular fact</u> - In <u>one hear</u> during the tornado of Monday evening, the water was forced into the East River 13 feet and 4 inches above low water mark. On the sudden shifting of the wind, the water went off in half the time that it came in. The regularity of the times had no effect upon the water, which yielded entirely to the force of the wind.

Contemporary account from 1821: "water was forced into the East River **13 feet and 4 inches** above **low water mark**"

From contemporary practices in England, there was a staff gauge and probably primitive tide predictions were published by an entrepreneur

Reprinted from Gofsayef, 1957

The Soundings are expressed in feet & show October 23. ^d & 24. th 1835. The dotted surfaces Corrected Establishment of Sandy Hoo Rise of Highest Tide observed above the particular	the depth of water reduced to the lowest spring tides observed represent the bottom at the respective depths of 6,12,18, & 21 feet. k	the second
Height of mean Low Water above the plane Height of mean High Water above the plane	Hassler map, 1844: Tides were measured i	n NYC in the
Mean rise and fall of Tides	1820s and 1830s relative to spring low wat	ter mark.
Mean rise and fall of Neap Tides		1 states

The'low water mark' was probably an **extreme low water datum.** Hence the storm surge probably reached ~**3.5m** (larger than Sandy). The storm tide was probably ~**3m**, 0.5m less than the Scileppi & Donnelly estimate but similar to Gofsayef, 1957 (2.7-3m).

The 1821 Hurricane model using Steven's Institute ECOM (Modern bathymetry/topography)





The 1821 Hurricane model → Storm tide = 3+/-0.2m (red line)



Next Step: Separate tropical storms from Extra tropical storms



http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:1893_Atlantic_hurricane_season_map.png

Storm tracks for all hurricanes from 1851present are listed on Wikipedia

Strategy: compile list of storm tracks near NY, look for signal in water level



Storm Surge Return Period Estimate (GPD analysis), with 1821





Remaining Question: Is there a local component to the long term trend – or is it all climate change/variability?



Shift in tide properties may account for some of the change

With our data, we can changes in harbor dynamics – looks like friction has changed.

NYC = The Battery



Wouldn't it be nice if more historical tide measurements existed ?

They do!

There are records of US tides back to the 1830s in US National archives

More than 500 station-years of unprocessed data still exist in the National Archives

Data as marigrams or hourly and high/low tabulations



See Talke & Jay, 2013 Journal of Coastal Research

Conclusions from Historical Analyses –

- Old data exist to ground-truth proxy estimates of surge risk
- . When more data are used, storm surge risk in New York appears to be higher than found in other estimates. Non-stationary nature of risk makes it difficult to determine the present and future risk
- S. Storm tide amplitudes have shifted independent of sea-level rise.

any h gu

- Tides show evidence of secular shifts. Hence, some of the increased storm risk is likely due to changes in harbor dynamics
- . More work is justified to distinguish the local anthropogenic influence from larger scale (NAO-relate) aspects

30 T.m.

A Quick Look at the NYH Response to Surge –

In the time and frequency domains

Sandy Atmospheric Forcing in NY Area –



- Wind direction switches from NE to SE just before lowest SLP
- E to W wind speed peaks shortly thereafter
- Both pressure and wind will drive a storm surge

Water Level Response (time domain) –

- Surge enters NYH from two directions:
 - Long Island Sound (LIS) via
 East River tidal strait, and
 - Lower New York Bay and NY
 Bight
- Look at time histories from both directions



Water Levels and Winds –

- Less surge at The Battery that at Kings Pt
- The East River is key to flooding in Manhattan:
 - Currents in the East River are hydraulic – water runs downhill
 - Currents in East River were weak for ~12 hrs
 - Wind reversal may have prevented worse flooding in Lower Manhattan
 - But it also prolonged the surge there



NYH is much more connected to LIS than it was before blasting of rocks at Hell Gate, starting 1851

This may be connected to the local part of the increasing surge risk

A Frequency Domain view of the Surge –

CWT scaleograms show:

Long Island Sound is resonant at semidiurnal frequencies (D2).

Atlantic City matches SLP forcing (more or less)

NYH is more diurnal (D1) and "rings" at overtide frequencies well after the surge subsides



NY Bight and NJ

Long Island Sound

D8

D4

D2

D1

2d

4d

D8

D4

D2

D1

2d

4d

D8

D4

D2

D1

2d

4d

307

 We use a continuous wavelet transform (CWT) to analyze time-variable frequency content. This is especially useful for events

Insights from the Frequency Domain –

Compare surge at The Battery to forcing (wind & SLP) using CWT (like trying to match fingerprints)

- > There is not a close match of the surge with either the N-S wind or SLP
 - Frequencies don't match
 - Surge at The Battery outlasts the forcing
- > N-S wind does have some high-frequency energy, because of the sharp reversal during the peak of the storm
- >Conclusion: internal dynamics are important and non-linear



Conclusions –

- NY Harbor is topographically complex and responds in a complicated way to surges
- Water comes into NY Bay from both the NY Bight and Long Island Sound:
 - LIS is resonant at ~12.4 hrs, the frequency of the M_2 tide
 - NY Harbor responds at lower and higher frequencies
- The East River was critical to inundation in Manhattan during Sandy
 - Not clear if this is always true
- The East River has been heavily altered, and this alteration may (or may not) be significant in the increasing storm tide risk found in the 1844-2013 data



Heavy rainfall was <u>not</u> a NYH problem

Below: An approximately linear relationship is found between NAO index and upper quartile threshold (UQT). Storm risk is *largest* for *negative NAO*





Preliminary Storm Tide Return Period Estimate (GPD analysis)



A bootstrapping technique is used to 'infill' unknown data between 1821 and 1843

Results converge above a threshold of about 1.4m

These results show the importance of including all known events in a statistical analysis.



Preliminary Storm Tide Return Period Estimate (GPD analysis)



A bootstrapping technique is used to 'infill' unknown data between 1821 and 1843

Storm Tide Return (Sandy level):

~300 years (range 200-400yrs depending on cutoff)

These results show the importance of including all known events in a statistical analysis.



Remaining Question: Why is there a long term trend?



With our data, we can begin to investigate local changes.

The M2 tide and the M4 overtide (frictionally produced) have shifted over time in NYC.

This is evidence of local perturbations in the estuary and shallow coastal region





Maybe; However, more coincident historical data needs to be found/considered to establish statistical significance



Schematic of a convergent estuary



Observation: Tides in an estuary are a balance between convergence (amplifies height) and friction (reduces height) (Friedrichs & Aubrey, 1994):

$$0 = -g\frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial x} - F.$$

$$F = \frac{8}{3\pi} \frac{c_d U}{\overline{h}} u = r u$$

Hence: Reducing Friction and increasing channel depth tend to increase tidal amplitudes

Conclusion: Modern tidal characteristics, storm surge, and storm-tide interaction have changed since 1800s due to altered bathymetry.

NYC Evacuation Zones (Example) –



Detail of extensive evacuation zones in NYC and New Jersey National Hurricane Center

GEV Analysis



A GEV analysis on 37 year blocks of sequentially incremented data is performed. Risk is nonstationary

The dilemma of modeling the tail of the AMST— GEV Analysis

