Adapting to Climate Change in

Coastal Monmouth County

Environmental Planning Studio

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

May 2, 2012

Presentation Outline

- Introduction
- Best Practices
- Mitigation and Planning Regulations
- Case Study Overview
- Case Studies: Sea Bright, Highlands, Middletown
- Comparison of Case Studies
- Mitigation SWOT
- Conclusions

Municipal Case Study Historical Overview

- Dynamic, ever changing coast due to influences from currents and storms.
- 1890s- storms repeatedly destroyed wooden bulkheads and battered many of the cottages in Sea Bright.
- Christmas Storm and Jan. 1914 Storm- caused massive destruction.

Municipal Case Historical Overview

- 1944- Great Atlantic Storm
- 1947- Sea wall built
- 1962 The Great Ash Wednesday Northeaster
- 1992 Northeaster
 - Impetus for beach replenishment- first round 1995
- 2001- second round of beach replenishment
- 2009- Tropical Storm Ida causes massive erosion
- 2011- Hurricane Irene

Responses to Notable Storm Events

Storm Event	Local Defensive Responses	Federal Law Enactment	State Law Enactment
1890's	First rock "wall" attempted at Sea Bright cottages rebuilt		
1913-14	Railroad retreated inland by a block; cottages abandoned,		1914 Waterfront Development Act
1944	Sea Bright Sea Wall built on former rail right of way		
1962—Noreaster	Houses built higher on stilts	1968 NFIA – NFIP and FEMA Established 1972 CZMA followed by multiple updates, most notably 1990 Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973	1970 NJ Wetlands Act 1973 CAFRA
1992Noreaster	Middletown Master Plan Adopted 2004	1994 Reform Act (NFIRA) of 1 2004 Flood Insurance Reform Act (FIRA) 2005 CZMA updated	1993 CAFRA update

NFIP Payouts 1978-Feb. 2012

U.S. \$ Billions Per State

18,000,000,000 000,000,000 4,000,000,000 2,000,000,000 Texas Florida New York Pennsylvania Mass 5 Ы Louisiana Mississippi New Jersey Maryland 5 2 3 6 1 4 7

U.S. \$ Millions Per Municipality



Sea-Level Rise

•Sea-level rise caused by Global Climate Change creates a displacement of the shoreline at all coastal margins, including those on the barrier islands, the baysides, and the mainland.

•In 2007, the IPCC estimated the projected median sea-level rise to be on the order of 0.6 to 1.2 meters in the next 100 years.

•The historic rates of median sea-level rise along the New Jersey coast range from 3-4 mm/yr.

•Projected rates of median sea-level rise in New Jersey are expected to increase to 6mm/yr.

Source: (Psuty and Silveira, 2007)



Predicted range of sea-level rise in IPCC report (Bindoff, et al., 2007).

	Historic SLR (mm/yr)
Mathe	Battery, NY	2.7
- Allon &	Sandy Hook, NJ	4.1
	Atlantic City, NJ	3.9
C VIII V	Philadelphia, PA	2.6
HI Share	Lewes, DE	3.1
and the second s	Annapolis, MD	3.6
M. Ste	Washington, DC	3.2
C 12	Hampton Roads,V	A 4.3
	Portsmouth, VA	3.7
4 5 3	Wilmington, NC	1.9
the second s		

Rates of sea-level rise derived from tidal records. (Psuty and Silveira, 2007)

Storm Surges and Sea-Level Rise

Storm Return	Pro	obability	of Occurre	ence	Base Flood	Base Flood	
I CHOM	1 year	7 years	ears 15 years 30 year		Lievation	(30-yrs SLR)	
10-Yr Storm	10.0%	52.2%	79.4%	95.8%	7.0 ft	7.6 ft	
50-Yr Storm	2.0%	13.2%	26.1%	45.5%	9.6 ft	10.2 ft	
100-Yr Storm	1.0%	6.8%	14.0%	26.0%	10.9 ft	11.5 ft	
500-Yr Storm	0.2%	1.4%	3.0%	5.8%	13.4 ft	14.0 ft	

As sea-level rises, the effects of storms produce greater inundations and are able to reach farther inland. Smaller storms, which were of little concern before, now reach levels and locations which were attained rarely in the past. (Psuty and Silveira, 2007)

Modeling Flooding



"Hazus is a nationally applicable standardized methodology that contains models for estimating potential losses from earthquakes, floods, and hurricanes."

Hazus-MH uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology to estimate physical, economic, and social impacts of disasters.

•**Physical damage** to residential and commercial buildings, schools, critical facilities, and infrastructure;

•Economic loss, including lost jobs, business interruptions, repair and reconstruction costs; and

•Social impacts, including estimates of shelter requirements, displaced households, and population exposed to scenario floods, earthquakes, and hurricanes.







HAZUS uses hydrology models, Elevation data, FEMA FIRM Maps, 2000 Census data, and economic data to estimate losses based on predefined damage functions.



Hazus Methods

Refining the Flood Model

- The extent of flooding is modeled using FEMA's standardized Hazus methods and refined with LiDAR-based Digital Elevation Models.
- FEMA funded Light Detection And Ranging (LiDAR) data acquisition.
 - Collected from Dec. 2006 to Feb.
 2007
 - 0.6ft vertical accuracy
 - 1 meter horizontal resolution



Photo Source: http://lidar.cr.usgs.gov/eaarl/



LiDAR-based DEM Hillshade



Fiscal Impact Analysis

Fiscal Impact Analysis estimates the net financial affect of storm events on municipalities' budgets

Involves evaluation of tax revenues and expenditures associated with storm events



Net: Revenues and expenditures are calculated to determine the net impact of a storm on a municipality's budget

Fiscal Impact Analysis

- Three components of a fiscal impact analysis:
- 1. Municipal
- 2. County
- 3. Schools

*Note: Only the municipal component of a fiscal impact analysis is analyzed in this presentation

Fiscal Impact Analysis Assumptions



Reasons for Choosing Case Study Municipalities

Economically Diverse:

		Population	Median Income	Poverty Rate
_	Highlands	5,005	\$78,869	12.3%
<	Middletown	66,522	\$96,190	3%
	Sea Bright	1,412	\$74,236	4.8%

Source: US Census 2010

- Unique Characteristics:

Middletown—large land area, subject to bayshore and riverine flooding;

Highlands—bisected by steep slope into bayshore floodplain and plateau;

Sea Bright—low lying commercial district on coastal barrier island and is protected by seawall.

Municipal Case Studies



Case Study: Highlands

- Highlands consists of a low lying floodplain and a plateau that sits high above the shore
- Unfortunately, the town's central business district (CBD) is located along Bay Avenue in the low-lying floodplain. This area is very flood-prone and even 10year floods inundate this area quite easily
- 2004 Master Plan acknowledges the problem but appears to offer little in the way of solutions

Current Conditions



Highlands Borough, NJ



Digital Elevation Models with a horizontal accuracy of 1 meter and a vertical accuracy of 0.6 ft.

Source: NJDEP, FEMA, & Bing Maps Hybrid









	2011 Budget	Rebuild	Retreat	Smaller Subsidy
10 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$10,721,412	\$10,412,460	\$11,048,432
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,937,757	\$8,018,716
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$2,621,736	-\$2,474,703	-\$3,029,716
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.127	1.118	1.189
50 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$11,541,115	\$11,177,924	\$12,278,524
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,919,766	\$8,009,721
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$3,441,439	-\$3,258,159	-\$4,268,804
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.238	1.229	1.361
100 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,107,980	\$11,485,413	\$13,135,963
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,810,021	\$7,954,848
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,008,304	-\$3,675,392	-\$5,181,115
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.316	1.299	1.494
500 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,789,486	\$7,582,679	\$12,105,907
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$6,469,763	\$7,284,719
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,689,811	-\$1,112,916	-\$4,821,188
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.409	0.990	1.541

	2011 Budget	Rebuild	Retreat	Smaller Subsidy
10 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$10,721,412	\$10,412,460	\$11,048,432
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,937,757	\$8,018,716
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$2,621,736	-\$2,474,703	-\$3,029,716
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.127	1.118	1.189
50 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$11,541,115	\$11,177,924	\$12,278,524
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,919,766	\$8,009,721
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$3,441,439	-\$3,258,159	-\$4,268,804
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.238	1.229	1.361
100 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,107,980	\$11,485,413	\$13,135,963
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,810,021	\$7,954,848
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,008,304	-\$3,675,392	-\$5,181,115
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.316	1.299	1.494
500 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,789,486	\$7,582,679	\$12,105,907
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$6,469,763	\$7,284,719
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,689,811	-\$1,112,916	-\$4,821,188
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.409	0.990	1.541

	2011 Budget	Rebuild	Retreat	Smaller Subsidy
10 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$10,721,412	\$10,412,460	\$11,048,432
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,937,757	\$8,018,716
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$2,621,736	-\$2,474,703	-\$3,029,716
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.127	1.118	1.189
50 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$11,541,115	\$11,177,924	\$12,278,524
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,919,766	\$8,009,721
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$3,441,439	-\$3,258,159	-\$4,268,804
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.238	1.229	1.361
100 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,107,980	\$11,485,413	\$13,135,963
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,810,021	\$7,954,848
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,008,304	-\$3,675,392	-\$5,181,115
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.316	1.299	1.494
500 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,789,486	\$7,582,679	\$12,105,907
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$6,469,763	\$7,284,719
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,689,811	-\$1,112,916	-\$4,821,188
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.409	0.990	1.541

	2011 Budget	Rebuild	Retreat	Smaller Subsidy
10 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$10,721,412	\$10,412,460	\$11,048,432
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,937,757	\$8,018,716
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$2,621,736	-\$2,474,703	-\$3,029,716
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.127	1.118	1.189
50 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$11,541,115	\$11,177,924	\$12,278,524
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,919,766	\$8,009,721
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$3,441,439	-\$3,258,159	-\$4,268,804
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.238	1.229	1.361
100 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,107,980	\$11,485,413	\$13,135,963
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$7,810,021	\$7,954,848
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,008,304	-\$3,675,392	-\$5,181,115
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.316	1.299	1.494
500 Year Storm				
Expenditures	\$8,099,675	\$12,789,486	\$7,582,679	\$12,105,907
Revenues	\$8,099,675	\$8,099,675	\$6,469,763	\$7 <u>,28</u> 4,719
Net Revenue	\$0	-\$4,689,811	-\$1,112,916	-\$4,821,188
Equalized Tax Rate	0.757	1.409	0.990	1.541

Highlands 2011: Population Loss Due to Storms



Highlands Net Revenues in the Event



Highlands Expenditures in the Event of Storms







Case Study: Middletown

1944 Riverine flooding, North Shrewsbury River

During the night of the 1944 hurricane, from her house on the northern bank of The North Shrewsbury River, June Methot saw that the river was 30' above the normal high tide line. "Not until morning did we discover that a sturdy 100—foot dock, 50 to 60 feet of solid concrete bulkhead and one-third of our riverbank had vanished." –Methot, June. Up & Down the River. Navesink, NJ: Whip Publishers, 1980.

1992 Coastal Flooding

"In Middletown, the hardest hit sections were Leonardo, Belford and Port Monmouth. In Port Monmouth, the township's new fishing pier, built with Green Acres funds and opened in August, suffered severe damage.

The Old Spy House, the first house built in New Jersey, suffered no visible damage, but an observation deck located over the dunes behind the old structure was pulled up during the storm and pushed into the neighboring fishing pier. Middletown Mayør Rosemarie Peters said the dunes that had protected the township's beach were destroyed and the beach itself suffered severe erosion.

"There's a lot of work to be done," Peters said. "We just had power returned to most of the township today."

2010 Hurricane Earl

Current Conditions

Middletown Township, NJ



Middletown Township, NJ



Digital Elevation Models with a horizontal accuracy of 1 meter and a vertical accuracy of 0.6 ft.

Source: NJDEP, FEMA, & Bing Maps Hybrid

Middletown Township, NJ



Digital Elevation Models with a horizontal accuracy of 1 meter and a vertical accuracy of 0.6 ft. Source: NJDEP, FEMA, & Bing Maps Hybrid

Middletown Township, NJ



Digital Elevation Models with a horizontal accuracy of 1 meter and a vertical accuracy of 0.6 ft.

Source: NJDEP, FEMA, & Bing Maps Hybrid

Middletown Township, NJ



Digital Elevation Models with a horizontal accuracy of 1 meter and a vertical accuracy of 0.6 ft. Source: NJDEP, FEN

Source: NJDEP, FEMA, & Bing Maps Hybrid

Middletown Township, NJ



Middletown Fiscal Analysis



Case Study: Sea Bright

- Barrier spit bounded by the Shrewsbury River to the west and the Atlantic Ocean to the east.
- The downtown commercial area is located in the lowest lying part of the borough and is prone to severe riverine flooding during spring tide high tide events.
- Borough has severe erosion issues.
- 1947- construction of seawall.
- 1995-1st phase of beach nourishment project.
- 2001- 2nd phase of beach renourishment.
- 2012- 3rd phase of beach renourishment.

Current Conditions













Sea Bright Fiscal Analysis

Sea Bright's Tax Rate in Storm Events: Scenarios 0.800 0.700 0.600 0.500 Rebuild 0.400 Retreat Smaller Subsidy 0.300 0.200 0.100 0.000 10 Year 50 Year 100 Year 500 Year Base

Case Study Comparisons



100 Year Storm - Percent Change of Tax Rate





500 Year Storm - Percent Change of Tax Rate





Hazus Analysis

Expected Substantianly Damaged Structures From Flooding

Storm Return	Highland	s Borough	Sea Brigh	t Borough	Middletown Township		
Period	Period Residential Commerci		Residential	Commercial	Residential	Commercial	
10-yr	90	0	0	0	84	0	
50-yr	100	0	1	0	1,455	0	
100-yr	161	0	21	1	1,974	0	
500-yr	903	1	324	10	4,186	12	

Expected Loss of Use to Essential Facilities

Storm	Highlands Borough					Sea Bright Borough				Middletown Township			
Return	Fire		Police		Fire		Police		Fire		Police		
Period	Stations	Hospitals	Stations	Schools	Stations	Hospitals	Stations	Schools	Stations	Hospitals	Stations	Schools	
10-yr	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	
50-yr	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	
100-yr	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	
500-yr	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	

Adaptation and Mitigation Best Practices

Municipal Level Modification

- Incentives to promote infill development in low floodrisk areas
- Locating new development and critical facilities outside flood-prone areas
- Reduction of impermeable surfaces
- Park/open space in floodplains
- Creation of sand dunes
- Modernize storm water drains and systems

Mitigation Strategies and Best Practices

Property Level Modifications

- Property elevation requirements
- Reduction of Impermeable Surfaces
- Setback restrictions for vulnerable properties facing waterfronts
- Green building techniques
 - Adds strength and longevity to buildings

Mitigation Strategies and Best Practices

Retreat

- No new development or redevelopment within determined flood-prone areas
- Buyout of flood-prone properties
 - Possible adaptive reuse for recreation or natural preservation/buffer areas

Mitigation Strategy Ranking

Methods

- Weighting Criteria (high, med, low)
- Point of View Society at large, as opposed to local
- Folding property level strategies into actions
- Screening of low ranking strategies in order to show top performers

• Criteria

- Incrementalism
- Cost
- Fairness/Equity
- Impact on Shore (and State) Economy
- Impact on Environment
- Impact on Flood Mitigation

Mitigation

Top Choices (multiple slides if necessary)

- Retreat or Stand your ground?
 - Property Level Modifications
 - Market/Management Responses
 - Municipal/Government Level Modifications



The three strategies that have been adopted by municipalities tend to be: •More costly (to society at large),

- •More environmentally damaging; and
- •Less effective at flood Control.

Conclusions of Analysis

• Physical threat

- Fiscal
 - Retreat after storm impacts
 - Implementation: Moratorium and rezoning
 - Oncoming small subsidy world
 - Debris removal fund
 - Retreat

Federal incentives diminish effects of storms that would otherwise trigger these responses

Recommendations

Government Officials: Plan

- Curtail federal incentives
- Implement policies of gradual retreat
- Prepare for more severe storms to be the new norm

Planning Professionals:

- Encourage development away from coastal areas
- Encourage natural mitigation techniques
 - Encourage the use of permeable ground cover and stormwater management strategies

American Littoral Society:

- Generate tools and information to aid coastal municipalities
- Encourage government officials to adopt the policies we have laid
- Aid municipalities in adapting to coastal climate change.

Acknowledgements

Gabrielle Barnett - Former Sea Bright Renter Scot Bell - Sea Bright Property Owner Dr. Cathy Folio - North Middletown Property Owner and Resident Jason A. Greenspan, PP, ACIP - Director of Planning and Community Development, Township of Middletown William J. Keeler - Councilman, Borough Sea Bright David Listokin, PhD - Professor, Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers University, and Co-Director, Center for Urban Policy Research of Rutgers University Dina Long - Mayor, Borough of Sea Bright Margaret Murnane - Deputy Coordinator, Monmouth County Sheriff's Office, Office of Emergency Management Norb Psuty - Professor, Coastal geomorphology, shoreline erosion, coastal zone management Stephanie Rinaldi - Port Monmouth, Middletown, Property Owner and Resident Charles Rogers - Office of Emergency Management ("OEM") - Middletown, NJ Judd Schechtman - Doctoral Candidate, Rutgers University Thomas A. Thomas, PP - Former Planning Consultant to Highlands, Middletown and Sea Bright Sea Bright Public Library Staff

Eastern Branch of the Monmouth County Library Staff

*A special thank you to Dr. Clinton Andrews for his guidance and support.

Zhuosi (Joyce) Lu Tim Dillingham Clinton Andrews Christine Bell Albert Macaulay Michael D'Orazio Marcus Ferreira Katherine Nosker Kyle Davis Brian Gibbons Michael Yaffe