

3.5

Hydrological risk: landslides

Nicola Casagli, Fausto Guzzetti, Michel Jaboyedoff, Farrokh Nadim, David Petley

3.5.1 Introduction

The term landslide encompasses a wide variety of phenomena, from the simple fall of rock blocks from vertical rock faces, through to topples and landslides that are dominated either by a sliding motion or by flows of soil and/or rock. Landslides are strongly correlated with other types of natural hazards, such as floods, droughts, wildfires, earthquakes, tsunamis and volcanoes, and are often involved in cascading events of multihazard disasters.

Climate change, the increased susceptibility of surface soil to instability, anthropogenic activities, growing urbanisation, uncontrolled land use and the increased vulnerability of populations and infrastructure contribute to the growing landslide risk. In the Thematic Strategy for Soil Protection (European Commission, 2006), landslides are considered one of the main threats to European soils. In

this framework, landslide disaster risk reduction should be properly undertaken in order to reduce the impact of landslides on humans, structures and infrastructures. In areas with high demographic density, protection works often cannot be built owing to economic or environmental constraints, and is it not always possible to evacuate people because of societal reasons. Forecasting the occurrence of landslides and the risk associated with them, and defining appropriate EWSs, are, therefore, essential needs.

The societal and economic impact of landslide risk is difficult to assess and it is underestimated, since a relevant part of related damage is attributed to other natural hazards, in multihazard chains (e.g. seismically induced failures, rainfall induced debris flows, lahars and rock avalanches associated with volcanism).

An established worldwide scientific landslide community has flourished in the last decades, thanks to several international organisations, such as the

International Consortium on Landslides and the Landslide Joint Technical Committee, which periodically organise the World Landslide Forums and the International Landslide Symposia, respectively. Regular landslide sessions are also organised at the General Assembly of the European Geoscience Union each year.

The term 'landslide' describes a variety of processes that result in the downward and outward movement of slope-forming materials, including rock, soil, artificial fill or a combination of these.

In this subchapter, the main causes and triggers of landslides and their socioeconomic impact at European

level are described, before some general concepts and methodologies on landslide zoning (inventory, susceptibility and hazard maps) and EWSs based on the analysis of landslide monitoring data and rainfall data are introduced.

3.5.2 Landslide causes and triggers

The most recent landslide classification is found in Hungr et al. (2014). It discerns five main types of movement: falls, topples, slides, spreads and flows. Many landslides consist of a variety of movement types occurring in sequence. For example, large landslides in high mountainous areas often start as rock falls involving freefalling rock that detaches from a cliff, which upon impact at the cliff toe may spontaneously transition into a very high-energy rock avalanche (Hutchinson, 1988). The properties of the flow change further as the landslide entrains or deposits debris and water.

Landslides vary greatly in size. At the largest scale, a single landslide can involve up to some cubic kilometres of rock and soils. At the other end of the scale, a small boulder has the potential to cause loss of life, if it strikes an individual, or to cause mass fatalities if, for example, it causes a train to derail. In general, the potential to cause loss scales with size of the landslide, largely because of the scaling of the kinetic energy and the affected area.

A key causal factor for landslides is the topographic setting of the potential site. In general, the propensity to

failure usually increases as the slope angle increases, from essentially zero on a flat surface to a significantly higher level when slopes are steep. However, the relationship with geological factors is highly non-linear, and below a key gradient, any given slope is likely to be stable under most conditions. Slopes naturally evolve into a stable state under any given set of environmental conditions, primarily through landsliding processes. External factors disrupt the slope equilibrium to induce instability; thus, for example, a migrating river channel or an unusual flood may erode the toe of a slope, increasing the slope gradient and the likelihood of failure. The slope will then naturally evolve back to its stable gradient through time, perhaps by means of another landslide that removes the excess material.

A second set of causal factors relates to the type of material involved in the potential instability and its geotechnical properties, such as internal friction and cohesion. In hard rock masses, stability is usually defined not by the intact strength of the material but by the joints, fractures and faults. The strength of these discontinuities may be dramatically lower than the intact rock strength, especially where they are lined with a weaker material. Where such a discontinuity has an orientation that promotes failure, the resistance of the slope to landsliding can be dramatically reduced. Therefore, in many cases, analysis of susceptibility depends on an understanding of the role played by these discontinuities. Furthermore, the strength of slope materials degrades through the processes of weathering, which may physically and chemically

alter the constituent minerals or may break an intact mass into smaller, weaker pieces. Therefore, the susceptibility of a slope to failure may increase with time.

Earth materials interact closely with hydrology and hydrogeology. Water is probably the most important factor that promotes slope instability. In many cases, water influences the strength parameters of geological materials, generally reducing strength when materials become saturated. Pore water pressure changes the effective stress state of a slope, typically reducing resistance to shear forces, and promoting instability. The lack of understanding of hydrological conditions is a frequent cause of failure in managed slopes; the 1966 Aberfan disaster in South Wales for example (Bishop et al., 1969), in which more than 140 people were killed by a landslide from a mine waste tip, was primarily the result of the construction of the tip on a spring and watercourse, which promoted conditions of full saturation after periods of heavy rainfall. However, water can also have more complex relationships with instability. For example, in some materials partially saturated conditions can provide additional strength through the generation of suction forces, while in others saturated conditions can promote soil liquefaction after failure, turning a slow landslide into a highly mobile and highly destructive flow.

Land use can also be a key factor in landslide causation. Some types of vegetation can improve stability by providing additional strength to the soil via root systems, and by regulating the infiltration of water and drawing

down pore water pressures through transpiration. In general, forested slopes are more stable than those left bare, and there is a large body of evidence to support the argument that there is increased mudflow activity after fires have removed vegetation (Cannon and Gartner, 2005; Shakesby and Doerr, 2006) and increased landsliding after careless logging (Jakob, 2000). In general, the removal of vegetation promotes instability. Growing new vegetation is a difficult (but effective where successful) way to restore stability. Deforestation highlights the action of humans as the final key factor. As people modify the landscape, the likelihood of landsliding changes. In many cases, humans promote instability by cutting slopes to steeper angles, removing vegetation, changing hydrology and increasing weathering rates.

Landslide occurrence is related to causal factors, which create a propensity for a slope to fail, and triggers, namely the specific external event that induces landslide occurrence at a particular time.

In most cases, the timing of failure is associated with a trigger event. This is not always true, however; there is increasing evidence that slopes can fail through progressive mechanisms that involve the weakening of slope through time until stability is compromised, but such events are rare,

although they can be destructive. However, most landslides are associated with a clearly defined trigger. Heavy rainfall is a key factor in generating landslides, primarily through the generation of pore water pressures and thus a reduction in the effective normal stress. For example, the annual global landslide cycle is dominated by the effects of rainfall associated with the South Asian and East Asian monsoons (Petley, 2010). The impact of the South Asian monsoon on the southern edge of the Himalayas, allied with the topography and materials of the region, makes this the global hotspot for landslide occurrence. However, the same correlation holds true everywhere.

The second key factor, and possibly the most important in terms of loss of life, is the impact of seismic events. Large earthquakes in mountain chains can trigger extraordinary numbers of landslides. Recent events include the 2005 Kashmir (Pakistan) earthquake and the 2008 Sichuan (China) earthquake, both of which killed more than 20 000 people in landslides. The Sichuan earthquake alone triggered more than 100 000 landslides. At present, the nature of the interaction between seismic waves and slopes is poorly understood, and forecasting the impacts of a future earthquake in terms of landslides is fraught with difficulty. However, the high levels of loss suggest that this will be a key area of research in the future.

Humans can also be a key trigger of landslides. The construction of hydroelectric stations can be significant. The Three Gorges Dam in China, the world's largest hydroelectric project, is expected to lead to the ultimate

relocation of 1.4 million people owing to the construction of a 650-km long reservoir and the increased landslide risk; similar problems can be also found in Europe but to a lesser extent. The Vajont rock slide (Italy) resulted in the deaths of more than 2 000 people in 1963, when rock fell into the reservoir impounded by the highest arch dam in the world at the time. Humans trigger landslides through slope cutting (especially for road construction), deforestation, irrigation, undercutting and changes in hydrology and blasting, among many other activities. Mining activities have a particularly large impact. In more developed countries, mining is therefore strictly regulated; sadly, in less affluent countries, regulation lags considerably, and losses are much higher.

Finally, in active volcanic areas, landslides can be a major problem. Some of the highest levels of loss have occurred as a result of the high-mobility volcanic landslide known as a lahar, and volcanic flank collapses, which can be tsunamigenic, may be the largest terrestrial landslides possible. Some of the deadliest landslide events on record have occurred in volcanic areas. Active volcanism promotes instability (the 1980 Mount St Helens eruption started with a landslide that depressurised the volcano), and dome collapse is common. Volcanic deposits regularly mobilise into high-energy flows, and hydrothermal activity can cause material strength degradation over large areas. Major debris avalanches, partially submarine, were triggered by the 2002 eruption of Stromboli volcano (Italy) and they caused tsunamis, in a typical multihazard domino effect (Tinti et al., 2006).

3.5.3 The socio-economic impact of landslides in Europe and climate change


The fast-paced changes in society, climate change and the human impact on the environment have a major impact on the frequency and spatial distribution of landslides. Annual

climate data in Europe for the last two centuries demonstrate a shifting pattern in frequency and intensity of extreme weather events (IPCC, 2012, 2013). Along with the changes in climate and weather patterns, demography, land use and other factors driving the landslide risk are changing rapidly (UN, 2015). Indeed, projections through the 21st century for Europe indicate that societal changes may lead to a larger increase in the impacts from landslides and other natural haz-

ards than climate change. Therefore, the changes in the socioeconomic impact of landslides should be considered at two different timescales. The influence of climate change on the spatial and temporal characteristics of landslide risk will be noticeable by the end of the century. At a shorter timescale of one to two decades, the rapid changes in anthropogenic factors such as urbanisation and land use change drive the dynamic risk pattern that we face today.

FIGURE 3.26

Estimate of changes in the exposure of Europe's population to landslides in the 21st century
Source: SafeLand (2013)



Regional climate model (RCM) simulations from the EU FP6 project ENSEMBLES (Van der Linden and Mitchell, 2009) predicted a consistent large-scale pattern of heavy precipitation changes in Europe. The simulations generally showed an increase in heavy precipitation over northern and central Europe in winter, although some inconsistencies were found among the predictions from different models in mountainous regions and at the foothills of the mountains. In summer, most models agree on an increase in heavy precipitation over Scandinavia and reduced precipitation in southern Europe. The largest inconsistencies were found in the transition zone across central Europe, which separates areas with positive trends in the north and areas with negative trends in the south. Considering both the expected changes in patterns of extreme precipitation events and changes in other factors driving the landslide risk, the EU FP7 project SafeLand assessed the expected changes in climate-driven landslide activity (magnitude, frequency) in Europe in the next 100 years.

It must be emphasized that any prognosis of the changes in the socio-economic impact of landslides due to climatic change involves a high level of uncertainty.

The SafeLand study estimated that landslide hazard threatens about 4 % of European citizens today. In addi-

tion to the people directly threatened in their homes, 8 000-20 000 km of roads and railways are exposed to high landslide hazard, causing additional direct threats to life and economic assets as well as problems for emergency response and recovery operations (Jaedicke et al., 2013). The SafeLand prognosis was that about 0.7% of the total European population will experience an increase in landslide risk by the end of the century, although in some parts of Europe the risk will be reduced. The spatial pattern of the expected change in the European population exposed to landslide risk is depicted in Figure 3.26. The main changes in landslide risk at the European scale shown in the figure are due to the changes in population pattern caused by migration and urbanisation.

The SafeLand project also made a detailed study of the changes in landslide risk pattern at local scale for selected sites in Europe for the period 1951-2050. For these studies, the climate simulations were downscaled to simulate localised heavy precipitation events in regions where rain-induced landslides occur on a regular basis. The downscaled climate models predicted an increase in landslide hazard at all sites. These results differed from the predictions provided by larger scale climate models at some locations. These differences might be explained by the refinement in the climate model used, which, for example, considered the influence of local topography on precipitation. This demonstrated that large-scale models are useful to evaluate the relative spatial variations of landslide activity, while local scale models are necessary for urban planners and local authorities to estimate the future risks

associated with landslides and other hydro-meteorological hazards in their communities or regions of interest.

In addition, the large uncertainties in population and traffic evolution scenarios, land use changes and political decisions regarding urban development require that the key parameters driving landslide risk are accurately monitored and that the prognosis of landslide risk is continuously updated as new information becomes available and more accurate and refined climate change models are developed.

3.5.4 Landslide zoning: inventory, susceptibility and hazard maps

The mapping of landslides underpins disaster risk reduction strategies, integrating socio-economic impacts, and therefore the challenge is to analyse their causes and triggers in our changing environments. Owing to the extraordinary breadth of the spectrum of landslide phenomena, no single method exists to identify and map landslides and to ascertain landslide susceptibility and hazard.

In addition to predicting ‘where’ a slope failure will occur, landslide hazard forecasts ‘when’ or ‘how frequently’ it will occur, and ‘how large’ it will be (Guzzetti et al., 2005).

The simplest form of landslide mapping is a landslide inventory map, which shows the location and, where known, the date of occurrence and the types of landslide that have left

discernible traces in an area (Guzzetti et al., 2012). Landslide inventory maps can be prepared by different techniques, depending on their scope and the extent of the study area. Small-scale inventories ($\leq 1:200\,000$) are compiled mostly from data obtained from the literature, through inquiries to public organisations and private consultants, by searching chronicles, journals, technical and scientific reports, or by interviewing landslide experts. Medium-scale landslide inventories (1:25 000 to 1:200 000) are most commonly prepared through the systematic interpretation of aerial photographs at scales ranging from 1:60 000 to 1:10 000, and by integrating local field checks with historical information. Large-scale inventories ($> 1:25\,000$) are prepared, usually for limited areas, using both the interpretation of aerial photographs at scales greater than 1:20 000, very high-resolution satellite images or digital terrain models, and extensive field investigations.

An archive inventory shows information on landslides obtained from the literature or from other archive sources. Geomorphological inventories can be further classified as historical, event, seasonal or multitemporal inventories. A geomorphological historical inventory shows the cumulative effects of many landslide events over a period of tens, hundreds or thousands of years. In a historical inventory, the age of the landslides is not distinguished, or is given in relative terms (i.e. recent, old or very old). An event inventory shows landslides caused by a single trigger, such as an earthquake, rainfall event or snowmelt event, and the date of the landslide corresponds to the date (or period) of

the triggering event. Examining multiple sets of aerial or satellite images of different dates, multitemporal and seasonal inventories can be prepared. A seasonal inventory shows landslides triggered by single or multiple events during a single season, or a few seasons, whereas multitemporal inventories show landslides triggered by multiple events over longer periods (years to decades).

Landslide susceptibility is the probability of spatial occurrence of slope failures, given a set of geo-environmental conditions. Landslide hazard is the probability that a landslide of a given magnitude will occur in a given period and in a given area.

Conventional methods to prepare landslide inventory maps rely primarily on the visual interpretation of stereoscopic aerial photography, aided by field surveys. New and emerging techniques, based on satellite, airborne and terrestrial remote sensing technologies, promise to facilitate the production of landslide maps, reducing the time and resources required for their compilation and systematic update. These can be grouped in three main categories, including the analysis of surface morphology, chiefly exploiting very-high-resolution digital elevation models captured for example by LiDAR (light detection and ranging) sensors, the automatic

or semi-automatic interpretation and analysis of satellite images, including panchromatic, multispectral and synthetic aperture radar (SAR) images, and the use of new tools to facilitate field mapping.

Qualitative and quantitative methods for assigning landslide susceptibility can be classified into five groups (Guzzetti et al., 1999):

1. geomorphological mapping, based on the ability of an expert investigator to evaluate and map the actual and potential slope instability conditions;
2. analysis of landslide inventories, which attempts to predict the future landslide spatial occurrence from the known distribution of past and present landslides (typically, this is obtained by preparing landslide density maps);
3. heuristic or index-based approaches, in which investigators rank and weight the known instability factors based on their assumed or expected importance in causing landslides;
4. process-based methods that rely on simplified physically based landslide modelling schemes to analyse the stability/instability conditions using simple limit equilibrium models, such as the ‘infinite slope stability’ model, or more complex approaches;
5. statistically based modelling contingent on the analysis of the functional relationships between known or inferred instability factors and the past and present distribution of landslides. Regardless of the method used, it is important that the susceptibility zonations are validated using independent landslide information,

and that the level of uncertainty associated with the zonation is given (Rossi et al., 2010).

Landslide hazard is more difficult to obtain than landslide susceptibility, since it requires the assessment of the temporal frequency of landslides and the magnitude of the expected failures (Guzzetti et al., 2005). The temporal frequency (or the recurrence) of landslides, or of landslide-triggering events, can be established from archive inventories and from multitemporal landslide maps covering sufficiently long periods. Furthermore, where a landslide record is available, an appropriate modelling framework needs to be adopted (Witt et al., 2010). Alternatively, for meteorologically triggered landslides, one can infer the frequency of landslide events from the frequency of the triggering factors, for example the frequency (or the return period) of intense or prolonged rainfall periods. The uncertainty inherent in the prediction of triggers that may result in landslides adds to uncertainty inherent in the prediction of occurrence of landslides.

To determine the magnitude of an expected landslide, investigators most commonly revert to determining the statistics of landslide size (area or volume). Accurate information on landslide area can be obtained from high-quality geomorphological inventories. Determining the volume of a sufficiently large number of landslides is more problematic, and usually investigators rely on empirical relationships linking landslide volume to landslide areas (Guzzetti et al., 2009; Larsen et al., 2010; Catani et al., 2016). Finally, when determining landslide

hazard as the joint probability of landslide size (a proxy for magnitude), the expected temporal occurrence of landslides (frequency) and the expected spatial occurrence (landslide susceptibility), great care must be taken to establish if, or to what extent, the three probabilities are independent. In many areas, given the available information and the local settings, this may be difficult to prove (Guzzetti et al., 2005). We expect that the quantitative assessment of landslide hazard will remain a major scientific challenge in the next decade.

Such identification of areas susceptible to landslide hazard is essential for the landslide risk assessment and possible implementation of effective disaster risk reduction strategies. These strategies (Dai et al., 2002) include land-use planning, development control, the application of building codes with different engineering solutions, acceptance, and monitoring and early warning systems. Land planning control reduces expected elements at risk. Engineering solution is the most direct and costly strategy for reducing either the probability of landsliding or the probability of spatial impact of a landslide. One approach is correction of the underlying unstable slope to control initiation of landslides (such as stabilisation of slope, drainage, retaining walls or planting), and the other is controlling of the landslide movement (such as barriers/walls to reduce or redirect the movement when a landslide does occur). The acceptance strategy defines acceptable risk criteria (Fell, 1994; Fell and Hartford, 1997); and the monitoring and warning system strategy reduces expected elements at risk by evacuation in advance of failure.

3.5.5 Landslide monitoring and early warning

These systems require a fine assessment of the socioeconomic impact of landslides, which must be based on accurate landslide mapping, as well as an understanding of their causes. EWSs for landslides are based on the reliable continual monitoring of relevant indicators (e.g. displacements, rainfall, groundwater level) that are assumed to be precursors to triggering landslides or reactivations. When values for these indicators exceed predefined thresholds, alarms are transmitted directly to a chain of people in charge of deciding the level of warning and/or emergency that must be transmitted to the relevant stakeholders, following a predefined process (Figure 3.27). In some cases, warnings can also be automatically transmitted. Usually, one to five alert levels are used (Blikra, 2008; Intrieri et al., 2013): the highest level may lead to emergency warnings to the population, evacuations or the use of sirens and loudspeaker messages in several languages to force people to move to a safer place, as in the case of tsunamis induced by landslides.

An EWS needs to be set up with specific requirements. First, the potential impacts must be defined based on a risk analysis informed by hazard mapping, including the impact of global changes (Corominas et al., 2014). In addition, the causes and triggers of disasters must be thoroughly analysed and the development of local coping capacities must be included (Dash

and Gladwin, 2007).

The number of EWSs dedicated to landslides has greatly increased since the beginning of the 21st century because of the progress made in electronics, communication and computer programs for monitoring and imaging. In addition, the innovations in satellite technologies and ground remote sensing have greatly improved the capacity of remote imaging measurements versus in situ point measurements (Tofani et al., 2013). Implementing an EWS depends on the context, namely (1) the type of landslide (Hungri et al., 2014), (2) the disaster scenarios considered, (3) the degree of awareness of the stakeholders, including populations, and (4) the allocated resources (e.g. budgetary, human).


Landslide types determine, first, if the appropriate EWS must be site specific or regional (Intrieri et al., 2013), and also if it is dedicated to identifying triggering conditions and/or to detecting an ongoing event (Sättele et al., 2016). For example, monitoring systems of debris-flow or shallow landslide EWSs are usually based on thresholds of rainfall amount over a period of time. These thresholds are based on rainfall intensity-duration, cumulated event rainfall-duration (Guzzetti et al., 2008), or antecedent precipitation (including snow depth) measures and soil moisture (Baum and Godt, 2010; Jakob et al., 2012). An extended monitoring of those indicators usually makes it possible, therefore, to set regional alarms. Landslide types also constrain the maximum lead time or time of reaction after the alarm trans-

mission (Sättele et al., 2016). In some specific cases, debris-flow catchments are equipped with monitoring systems such as ultrasonic and seismic sensors that detect the debris-flow movements (Marchi et al., 2002) and automatically send a warning message to shorten the reaction time as much as possible.

For site-specific systems, displacements measured by different sensors and pore water pressure and/or precipitation are usually used (Michoud et al., 2013). Various sensors can be set to monitor displacements, including extensometers (cable or laser) and crackmeters that measure the distances between two points, and total stations that are also used to provide distances and 3D positions using targets positioned on site. Moreover, GPSs

FIGURE 3.27

(A) Illustration of the components of a modern EWS that does not show the energy sources and the two or three levels of redundancy. (B) Flow chart of the activities of the implementation and operation of an EWS (modified from Intrieri et al., 2012). The blue box in (b) indicates the action linked to the monitoring system. Source: courtesy of authors



are nowadays widely used, which can give the real 3D position of a point (Gili et al., 2000). All the above techniques usually provide data only at specific point locations; thus, several of them must often be set up in a network to monitor areal deformations. Inclometers give deformations at depth along boreholes, providing essential data on the changes in depth of landslide behaviour (Blikra, 2008). For the last few years, ground-based interferometric radar (GB-InSAR) has been used for the most critical landslides (Casagli et al., 2010; Blikra, 2012; Rouyet et al., 2016). It provides a map of the distance changes, from the GB-InSAR to the landslide surface, at a millimetre scale and with a time resolution of a few minutes. Satellite InSAR images are also used to monitor long-term displacement trends, with results being strongly dependent on the type of treatment. In optimal cases, the time resolution is about 6 days, with millimetre precision and metre spatial resolution (Berger et al., 2012). Finally, as landslides react to water infiltration, many instruments are dedicated to monitor water: rain gauges, piezometers, thermometers, barometers, moisture content sensors and other meteorological data. Pore water pressure changes monitored with piezometers usually have a good correlation with slope movements (Michoud et al., 2013).

Behind the implementation of the monitoring part of EWSs is the understanding of the landslide mechanisms, that is, the identification of the main parameters controlling the movements of the landslide (Intrieri et al., 2012 and 2013). For this purpose, the design of a landslide conceptual model (LCM) is fundamental,

since it will guide the type and the location of the sensors to install, and it is required to forecast landslide failure scenarios. The updating of an LCM must be continual during the whole life of an EWS. In addition, landslide failures may trigger other hazardous events in a cascade effect, such as tsunamis or dam breaks, that have to be considered in the EWS. The reasons why an EWS is implemented are either the identification of an unacceptable risk level or an increase in, or abnormal, landslide activity. Although the LCM implementation process provides reasons to fix appropriate sensors that will monitor the most significant failure initiation indicators, there are usually many practical constraints, such as topography, access, visibility and available resources.

Landslide monitoring and EWSs are tools to forecast the potential occurrence of disasters, thus contributing to the implementation of effective disaster risk-reduction strategies.

Ideally, the first data from a monitoring system are used to calibrate and fix alarm thresholds usually based on displacement velocities or accelerations, or pore water pressure or precipitations (Cloutier et al., 2015). This approach can be supported by failure forecast models, such as the Fukuzono method, or by more complex models (Crosta and Agliardi, 2003; Federico et al., 2012). The alarm thresholds

will be used to trigger chains of actions that will involve different levels of people depending on the alert level, from technicians and experts to officers and politicians who will be involved in the assessment of the abnormal situations and who will have to make decisions (Froese and Moreno, 2014). This starts from the initial check of the situation and the coherence of the movement detection of the sensors (to avoid false alarm), and it can end with an evacuation decision. It requires that the monitoring system is reliable and is therefore redundant in terms of sensors, communication and the stakeholders involved. Pre-defined crisis units must follow decision trees to propagate or stop the warning at each level. This also necessitates the requirement to verify constantly that the observed landslide behaviour is still following the expected course, which also implies that the threshold and alarm levels can be reassessed by the crisis units.

The most important actions that can be prompted by EWS high-alert levels are evacuations and a rapid set-up of protection measures. They imply that all stakeholders, including the relevant population, must be prepared through education and training to implement the appropriate response.

In addition, the methods used to emit and communicate the emergency situation must be adapted to the local population culture. It must be stressed that all stages of implementation or operation must include feedback to the other stages. Frequent feedback and updates are a key point. They must also include the reappraisal of the indirect effects (cascade). A final problem relates to communication to

the general population, which, to be effective, needs trust and training and must be an efficient means by which to communicate and emit warnings and actions within the noise of our ‘connected world’. It appears that only 38 % of the EWSs have more than one communication vector to inform the population (Michoud et al., 2013).

3.5.6 Conclusions and key messages

Partnership

Understanding landslide risk requires a multihazard approach, based on networking and partnership between different scientific disciplines, with transdisciplinary research that aims to identify those socioeconomic and institutional elements that require attention in landslide DRM.

Knowledge

Knowledge of landslide risk is a multidisciplinary task that requires an understanding of processes and mechanisms, spatial and time prediction, vulnerability assessment, monitoring and modelling of the effects related to environmental and climate change.

Innovation

The effectiveness of landslide risk mitigation measures critically depends on scientific innovation and technological development for rapid mapping, monitoring and early warning.

REFERENCES CHAPTER 3 - SECTION II

3.4 Hydrological risk: floods

- Alfieri, L., Feyen, L., Salamon, P., Thielen, J., Bianchi, A., Dottori, F., Burek, P. (2016) Modelling the socioeconomic impact of river floods in Europe. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 16, 1401–1411.
- Alfieri, L., Burek, P., Dutra, E., Krzeminski, B., Muraro, D., Thielen, J., Pappenberger, F., 2013. GloFAS — global ensemble streamflow forecasting and flood early warning. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 17, 1161–1175.
- Alfieri, L., Burek, P., Feyen, L., Forzieri, G., 2015. Global warming increases the frequency of river floods in Europe. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 19, 2247–2260.
- Alfieri, L., Salamon, P., Pappenberger, F., Wetterhall, F., Thielen, J. (2012) Operational early warning systems for water-related hazards in Europe. *Environmental Science and Policy* 21, 35–49.
- Alfieri, L., Velasco, D., Thielen, J., (2011). Flash flood detection through a multi-stage probabilistic warning system for heavy precipitation events. *Advances in Geosciences* 29, 69–75.
- Alvarez-Garretón, C., Ryu, D., Western, A., W., Su, C.-H., Crow, W. T., Robertson, D. E., Leahy, C. 2015. Improving operational flood ensemble prediction by the assimilation of satellite soil moisture: comparison between lumped and semi-distributed schemes. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 19, 1659–1676.
- Apel, H., Aronica G.T., Kreibich H., Thielen, H.A., 2008. Flood risk analyses—How detailed do we need to be?. *Natural Hazards* 49 (1), 79–98.
- Arnal, L., Ramos, M.H., Coughlan, E., Cloke, H.L., Stephens, E., Wetterhall, F., Andel, S.J., F. Pappenberger undefined, 2016. Willingness-to-pay for a probabilistic flood forecast: a risk-based decision-making game. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 20, 3109–3128.
- Ballard, S.P., Li, Z., Simonin, D. and Caron, J.F., 2016. Performance of 4D-Var NWP-based nowcasting of precipitation at the Met Office for summer 2012. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 142, 472–487.
- Berenguer M., Corral C., Sánchez Diezma, R., Sempere Torres, D., 2005. Hydrological validation of a radar-based nowcasting technique. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 6, 532–549.
- Blöschl, G., Zehe, E., 2005. On hydrological predictability. *Hydrological Processes* 19, 3923–3929.
- Boudou, M., Danière B., Lang M., 2016. Assessing changes in urban flood vulnerability through mapping land use from historical information. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 20, 161–173.
- Brauer, C.C., Teuling, A.J., Overeem, A., Velde, Y., Hazenberg P., Warmerdam, P.M.M., Uijlenhoet, R., 2011. Anatomy of extraordinary rainfall and flash flood in a Dutch lowland catchment. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 15, 1991–2005.
- Bubeck, P., Botzen, W.J.W., Aerts, H J.C.J., 2012. A Review of Risk Perceptions and Other Factors that Influence Flood. *Mitigation Behavior. Risk Analysis* 32, 1481–1495.
- CCC, 2017. Adaptation sub committee of the Committee on Climate Change, UK. www.theccc.org.uk
- Chen, A.S., Leandro, J., Djordjevic, S., 2016. Modelling sewer discharge via displacement of manhole covers during flood events using 1D/2D SIPSON/P-DWave dual drainage simulations. *Urban Water Journal* 13(8), 830–840.
- Cloke, H.L., Pappenberger, F., 2009. Ensemble flood forecasting: a review. *Journal of Hydrology* 375, 3–4.
- Cloke, H.L., Wetterhall F., He Y., Freer J.E., Pappenberger, F. undefined, 2013. Modelling climate impact on floods with ensemble climate projections. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 139 (671 part B), pp. 282–297.
- Cole, S.J., Moore, R.J., Aldridge, T.A., Gunawan, O., Balmforth, H., Hunter, N., Mooney, J., Lee, D., Fenwick, K., Price, D., Demeritt, D., 2016. Natural Hazards Partnership Surface Water Flooding Hazard Impact Model: Phase 2 Final Report.
- Collenteur, R.A., Moel H., Jongman, B., Di Baldassarre, G., 2015. The failed-levee effect : Do societies learn from flood disasters ? *Natural Hazards* 76 (1), 373–388.
- Collier, C.G., 2007. Flash flood forecasting: What are the limits of predictability?. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 133, 3–23.
- Copernicus Emergency Management Service—Mapping, 2017. <http://emergency.copernicus.eu/mapping>, [accessed 24 April, 2017].
- Coughlan de Perez, E., van den Hurk, B., van Aalst, M. K., Amuron, I., Bamanya, D., Hauser, T., Jongma, B., Lopez, A., Mason, S., Mendler de Suarez, J., Pappenberger, F., Rueth, A., Stephens, E., Suarez, P., Wagemaker, J., Zsoter, E., 2016. Action-based flood forecasting for triggering humanitarian action. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 20, 3549–3560.
- Crochemore, L., Ramos, M., Pappenberger, F., Andel, S., Wood, A., 2016. An experiment on risk-based decision-making in water management using monthly probabilistic forecasts. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 97 (4), 541–551.
- Dale, M., Wicks, J., Mylne, K. Pappenberger, F., Laeger, S., Taylor, S., 2014. Probabilistic flood forecasting and decision-making: An innovative risk-based approach. *Natural Hazards* 70(1), 159–172.
- Dartmouth Flood Observatory. <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~floods/>, [accessed 24 April, 2017].
- Daupras, F., Antoine, J. M., Becerra, S., Peltier, A., 2015. Analysis of the robustness of the French flood warning system: a study based on the 2009 flood of the Garonne River. *Natural Hazards* 75(1), 215–241.
- de Moel, H., Jongman, B., Kreibich, H., Merz, B., Penning Rowsell, E., Ward, P., 2015. Flood risk assessments at difference spatial scapes. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 20(6) 865–890.
- Demeritt, D., Nobert, S., Cloke, H.L., Pappenberger, F., 2013. The European Flood Alert System and the communication, perception, and use of ensemble predictions for operational flood risk management. *Hydrological Processes* 27(1), 147–157.
- Di Baldassarre, G., Viglione, A., Carr, G., Kuil, L., Yan, K., Brandimarte, L., Blöschl, G., 2015. Debates—Perspectives on socio-hydrology: Capturing feedbacks between physical and social processes. *Water Resources Research* 51, 4770–4781.
- Dittrich, R., Wreford, A., Butler, A., Moran, D., 2016. The impact of flood action groups on the uptake of flood management measures. *Climatic Change* 138(3), 471–489.

- Dottori, F., Salamon, P., Bianchi, A., Alfieri, L., Hirpa, F.A., Feyen, L., 2016. Development and evaluation of a framework for global flood hazard mapping. *Advances in Water Resources* 94, 87-102.
- EEA, 2017. Climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in Europe — Synergies for the knowledge base and policies, forthcoming
- EFAS, 2016. European Flood Awareness System (EFAS). European Commission Joint Research Centre. <https://www.efas.eu/>, [accessed 16 April, 2017].
- Emerton, R.E., Stephens, E. M., Pappenberger, F., Pagano, T. C., Weerts, A.H., Wood, A.W., Salamon, P., Brown, J. D., Hjerdt, N., Donnelly, C., Baugh, C., Cloke, H.L., 2016. Continental and global scale flood forecasting systems. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water* 3 (3), 391-418.
- Environment Agency, 2015. Public dialogues on flood risk communication. Final Report — SC120010/R1. Environment Agency, Bristol, UK.
- European Commission, 2007. Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 288/27, 6.11.2007, 27–34.
- FFC, n.d. Flood forecasting centre. <http://www.ffc-environment-agency.metoffice.gov.uk/>, [accessed 16 April, 2017].
- Garcia Pintado, J., Mason, D., Dance, S. L., Cloke, H., Neal, J. C., Freer, J., Bates, P. D., 2015. Satellite-supported flood forecasting in river networks: a real case study. *Journal of Hydrology* 523, 706-724.
- Garde Hansen, J., McEwen, L., Holmes, A., Jones, O. 2016. Sustainable flood memory: Remembering as resilience. *Memory Studies*, 1-22.
- Gaume, E., Bain, V., Bernardara, P., Newinger, O., Barbuc, M., Bateman, A., Blaskovicová, L., Blöschl, g., Borga, M., Dumitrescu, A., Daliakopoulos, I., Garcia, J., Irimescu, A., Kohnova, S., Koutroulis, A., Marchi, L., Matreata, S., Medina, V., Preciso, E., Sempere Torres, D., Stancalie, G., Szolgay, J., Tsanis, I., Velasco, D., Viglione, A., 2009. A compilation of data on European flash floods, *Journal of Hydrology* 367(1-2), 70-78.
- Gersonius, B., Ashley, R., Pathirana, A., Zevenbergen, C., 2013. Climate change uncertainty: building flexibility into water and flood risk infrastructure. *Climatic Change* 116(2), 411-423.
- GloFAS, 2017. Emergency Management Service - Global Flood Awareness System. European Commission Copernicus. www.global-floods.eu, [accessed 16 April, 2017].
- Hall, J., Arheimer, B., Borga, M., Brazdil, R., Claps, P., Kiss, A., Kjeldsen, T.R., Kriauciuniene, J., Kundzewicz, Z.W., Lang, M., Llasat, M.C., Macdonald, N., McIntyre, N., Mediero, L., Merz, B., Merz, R., Molnar, P., Montanari, A., Neuhold, C., Parajka, J., Perdigao, R.A.P., Plavcova, L., Rogger, M., Salinas, J.L., Sauquet, E., Schaer, C., Szolgay, J., Viglione, A., Bloeschl, G., 2014. Understanding flood regime changes in Europe: a state-of-the-art assessment. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 18(7), 2735-2772.
- Hirabayashi, Y., Mahendran, R., Koirala, S., Konoshima, L., Yamazaki, D., Watanabe, S., Kim, H., Kanae, S., 2013. Global flood risk under climate change. *Nature Climate Change* 3, 816-821.
- HM Government (2016). National Flood Resilience Review. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/551137/national-flood-resilience-review.pdf [accessed 06 April, 2016].
- Huntingford, C., Marsh, T., Scaife, A.A., Kendon E.J., Hannaford, J., Kay, A.L., Lockwood M., Prudhomme, C., Reynard, N.S., Parry, S., Lowe, J.A., Screen, J.A., Ward, H.C., Roberts, M., Stott, P.A., Bell, V.A., Bailey, M., Jenkins A., Legg, T., Otto, F.E.L., Massey, N., Schaller, N., Slingo, J., Allen, M.R., 2014. Potential influences on the United Kingdom's floods of winter 2013/14. *Nature Climate Change* 4, 769-777.
- Hydrologic Ensemble Prediction Experiment, n.d. www.hepex.org, [accessed 24 April, 2017].
- Javelle, P., Demargne, J., Defrance, D., Pansu, J. and Arnaud, P., 2014. Evaluating flash-flood warnings at ungauged locations using post-event surveys: a case study with the ALGA warning system. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 59 (7), 1390-1402.
- Kendon, E. J., Ban, N., Roberts, N.M., Fowler, H.J., Roberts, M.J., Chan, S.C., Evans, J.P., Fosser, G., Wilkinson, J.M., 2016 Do convection-permitting regional climate models improve projections of future precipitation change?. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*.
- Klinger, C., Landeg, O., Murray, V., 2014. Power Outages, Extreme Events and Health: a Systematic Review of the Literature from 2011-2012. *PLOS Currents*, 6.
- Kumar, P., 2011. Typology of hydrologic predictability. *Water Resources Research* 47(4), W00H05.
- Landeg, O., Lawson, J., 2014. Effective flood resilience in health providers: Flooding at a major NHS Blood and Transplant Facility. in *Chemical Hazards & Poisons Report*, Public Health England, Sep, Iss.24.
- Lavers, D. A., Allan, R. P., Wood, E. F., Villarini, G., Brayshaw, D. J., Wade, A. J., 2011. Winter floods in Britain are connected to atmospheric rivers. *Geophysical Research Letters* 38, L23803.
- Le Coz, J., Patalano, A., Collins, D., Guillén, N.F., García, C. M., Smart, G.M., Bind, J., Chiaverini, A., Le Boursicaud, R., Dramais, G., Braud, I., 2016. Crowdsourced data for flood hydrology: Feedback from recent citizen science projects in Argentina, France and New Zealand. *Journal of Hydrology* 541, B, pp. 766-777.
- Liechti, K., Zappa, M., Fundel, F., Germann, U., 2013. Probabilistic evaluation of ensemble discharge nowcasts in two nested Alpine basins prone to flash floods. *Hydrological Processes* 27, 5-17.
- Liguori, S., Rico Ramirez, M.A., Schellart, A.N.A., Saul A. J., 2012. Using probabilistic radar rainfall nowcasts and NWP forecasts for flow prediction in urban catchments. *Atmospheric Research* 103, 80-95.
- Macdonald, D., Dixon, A., Newell, A., Hallaways, A., 2012. Groundwater flooding within an urbanised flood plain. *Journal of Flood Risk Management* 5(1): 68-80.
- Marchi, L., Borga, M., Preciso, E., Sangati, M., Gaume, E., Bain, V., Delrieu, G., Bonnifait, L., Pogačnik, N., 2009. Comprehensive post-event survey of a flash flood in Western Slovenia: observation strategy and lessons learned. *Hydrological Processes* 23, 3761-3770.
- McCarthy, S., Tunstall, S., Parker, D., Faulkner, H., Howe, J., 2007. Risk communication in emergency response to a simulated extreme flood. *Environmental Hazards* 7 (3), 179-192.
- Merz, B., Kreibich, H., Schwarze, R., Thieken, A., 2010. Assessment of economic flood damage. *Natural Hazards Earth System Sciences* 10, 1697-1724.

- Michaels, S., 2015. Probabilistic forecasting and the reshaping of flood risk management. *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* 7 (1), 41-51.
- Muchan, K., Lewis, M., Hannaford, J. Parry, S., 2015. The winter storms of 2013/2014 in the UK: hydrological responses and impacts. *Weather* 70, 55-61.
- Pagano, T.C., Pappenberger, F., Wood, A.W., Ramos, M.H., Persson, A., Anderson, B., 2016. Automation and human expertise in operational river forecasting. *WIREs Water* 3 (5), 692-705.
- Pagano, T.C., Wood, A.W., Ramos, M.H., Cloke, H.L., Pappenberger, F., Clark, M. P., Cranston, M., Kavetski, D., Mathevet, T., Sorooshian, S., Verkade, J.S., 2014. Challenges of Operational River Forecasting. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 15, 1692-1707.
- Palla, A., Colli, M., Candela, A., Aronica, G.T. Lanza, L.G., 2016. Pluvial flooding in urban areas: the role of surface drainage efficiency. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*.
- Pappenberger, F., Beven, K. J., 2006. Ignorance is bliss: Or seven reasons not to use uncertainty analysis. *Water Resources Research* 42, W05302.
- Pappenberger, F., Cloke, H. L., Parker, D. J., Wetterhall, F., Richardson, D.S., Thielen, J., 2015. The monetary benefit of early flood warnings in Europe. *Environmental Science and Policy* 51, 278-291.
- Pappenberger, F., Dutra, E., Wetterhall, F., Cloke H.L., (2012) Deriving global flood hazard maps of fluvial floods through a physical model cascade. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 16 (11), 4143-4156.
- Pappenberger, F., Stephens, E., Thielen, J., Salamon, P., Demeritt, D., van Andel, S. J., Wetterhall, F., Alfieri, L., 2013. Visualizing probabilistic flood forecast information: expert preferences and perceptions of best practice in uncertainty communication. *Hydrological Processes* 27, 132-146.
- Peña, J.C., Schulte, L., Badoux, A., Barriendos, M., Barrera Escoda, A., 2015) Influence of solar forcing, climate variability and modes of low-frequency atmospheric variability on summer floods in Switzerland. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 19, 3807-3827.
- Perks, M.T., Russell, A.J., Large, A.R.G., (2016). Technical Note: Advances in flash flood monitoring using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 20, 4005-4015.
- Ramos, M.H., Mathevet, T., Thielen, J., Pappenberger, F., 2010. Communicating uncertainty in hydro-meteorological forecasts: mission impossible?. *Meteorological Applications* 17(2), 223-235.
- Ramos, M.H., van Andel, S.J., Pappenberger, F., 2013. Do probabilistic forecasts lead to better decisions?. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 9 (17), 2219-2232.
- Revilla Romero, B., Hirpa, F.A., Thielen del Pozo, J., Salamon, P., Brakenridge, R., Pappenberger, F., De Groeve T., 2015. On the Use of Global Flood Forecasts and Satellite-Derived Inundation Maps for Flood Monitoring in Data-Sparse Regions. *Remote Sensing* 7 (11), 15702-15728.
- Rodríguez Rincón, J.P., Pedrozo Acuña, A., Breña Naranjo, J.A., 2015. Propagation of hydro-meteorological uncertainty in a model cascade framework to inundation prediction. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 19, 2981-2998.
- Romanowicz, R., Beven, K.J., 2003. Bayesian estimation of flood inundation probabilities as conditioned on event inundation maps. *Water Resources Research* 39 (3), 1073.
- Rufat, S., Tate, E., Burton, C.G., Maroof, A.S., 2015. Social vulnerability to floods: Review of case studies and implications for measurement. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 14 (4), 470-486
- Sampson, C.C., Fewtrell, T.J., O'Loughlin, F., Pappenberger, F., Bates, P.B., Freer, J. E., Cloke, H.L., 2014. The impact of uncertain precipitation data on insurance loss estimates using a flood catastrophe model. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 18, 2305-2324.
- Schröter, K., Kunz, M., Elmer, F., Mühr, B., Merz, B., 2015. What made the June 2013 flood in Germany an exceptional event? A hydro-meteorological evaluation. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 19, 309-327.
- Scussolini, P., Aerts, J.C.J.H., Jongman, B., Bouwer, L.M., Winsemius, H.C., de Moel, H., Ward, P.J., 2016. FLOPROS: an evolving global database of flood protection standards. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 16, 1049-1061.
- Slater, L.J., Singer, M.B., Kirchner, J.W., 2015. Hydrologic versus geomorphic drivers of trends in flood hazard, *Geophysical Research Letters* 42, 370376.
- Stephens, E., Cloke, H., 2014. Improving flood forecasts for better flood preparedness in the UK (and beyond). *Geographical Journal* 180 (4), pp. 310-316.
- Stephens, E., Day, J.J., Pappenberger, F., Cloke, H., 2015. Precipitation and floodiness. *Geophysical Research Letters* 42 (23), 10316-10323.
- Thielen, A. H., Kreibich, H., Muller, M. Merz, B., 2007. Coping with floods: preparedness, response and recovery of flood-affected residents in Germany in 2002. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 52(5), 1016-1037.
- Thielen del Pozo, J., Salamon, P., Burek, P., Pappenberger, F., Eklund, C., Sprokkereef, E., Hazlinger, M., Padilla Garcia, M., Garcia Sanchez, R., 2017. Handbook of hydrometeorological forecasting. Forthcoming.
- Thielen del Pozo, J., Thiernig, V., Pappenberger, F., Revilla-Romero, B., Salamon, P., De Groeve, T., Hirpa, F., 2015. The benefit of continental flood early warning systems to reduce the impact of flood disasters: An assessment for Europe and an outlook for Africa. JRC Science for Policy Report. EUR 27533 EN.
- Thiemiig, V., Bisselink, B., Pappenberger, F., Thielen, J., 2015. A pan-African medium-range ensemble flood forecast system. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 19, 3365-3385.
- UNISDR, 2015. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Versini, P.A., Berenguer, M., Corral, C., Sempere Torres, D., 2014. An operational flood warning system for poorly gauged basins: demonstration in the Guadalhorce basin (Spain). *Natural Hazards* 71(3), 1355-1378.
- Vigicruces, 2017. Service central d'hydrométéorologie et d'appui à la prévision des inondations (Schapi). <https://www.vigicruces.gouv.fr/>, [accessed 16 April, 2017] (in French).
- Vormoor, K., Lawrence, D., Heistermann, M., and Bronstert, A., 2015. Climate change impacts on the seasonality and generation processes of floods — projections and uncertainties for catchments with mixed snowmelt/rainfall regimes. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 19, 913-931.

- Walker, D., Forsythe, N., Parkin, G., Gowing J., (2016). Filling the observational void: scientific value and quantitative validation of hydrometeorological data from a community-based monitoring programme. *Journal of Hydrology* 538, 713–725.
- Ward, P.J., Jongman, B., Weiland, F.S., Bouwman, A., van Beek, R., Bierkens, M.F.P., Ligtoet, W., Winsemius, H.C., 2013. Assessing flood risk at the global scale: model setup, results, and sensitivity. *Environmental Research Letters* 8, 044019.
- Watson, D., Adams, M., 2010. Design for Flooding: Architecture, Landscape and Urban Design for Resilience to Climate Change. John Wiley & Sons.
- Winsemius, H.C., Van Beek, L.P.H., Jongman, B., Ward, P.J., Bouwman, A., 2013. A framework for global river flood risk assessments. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 17(5), 1871–1892.
- Younis, J., Ramos, M. H., Thielen, J., 2008. EFAS forecasts for the March–April 2006 flood in the Czech part of the Elbe River Basin — a case study. *Atmospheric Science Letters*, 9 (2), 88–94.
- Zsótér, E., Pappenberger, F., Smith, P., Emerton, R.E., Dutra, E., Wetterhall, F., Richardson, D., Bogner, K., Balsamo, G., 2016. Building a Multimodel Flood Prediction System with the TIGGE Archive. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*.

3.5 Hydrological risk: landslides

- Jakob, M., 2000. The impacts of logging on landslide activity at Clayoquot Sound, British Columbia. *CATENA* 38 (4), 279–300.
- Van der Linden, P., Mitchell, J.F.B., (Eds.), 2009: ENSEMBLES: Climate Change and its Impacts: Summary of research and results from the ENSEMBLES project. 160pp.
- Cannon, S. H., Gartner, J. E., 2005. Wildfire-related debris flow from a hazards perspective. In: *Debris-flow Hazards and Related Phenomena*. Springer Praxis Books. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 363–385.
- Shakesby, R., Doerr, S., 2006. Wildfire as a hydrological and geomorphological agent. *Earth-Science Reviews* 74 (3–4), 269–307.
- European Commission, 2006. Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the protection of soil and amending Directive 2004/35/EC. COM/2006/0232 final - COD 2006/0086.
- Baum, R.L., Godt, J.W., 2010. Early warning of rainfall-induced shallow landslides and debris flows in the USA. *Landslides* 7, 259–272.
- Berger, M., Moreno, J., Johannessen, J.A., Levelt, P.F., Hanssen, R.F., 2012. ESA's sentinel missions in support of Earth system science. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 120, 84–90.
- Bishop, A.W., Hutchinson, J. N., Penman, A.D.M., Evans, H.E., 1969. Geotechnical investigation into the causes and circumstances of the disaster of 21 October 1966. In: *A selection of technical reports submitted to the Aberfan Tribunal*. HMSO, London, UK, pp. 1–80.
- Blikra, L. H., 2008. The Åknes rockslide: Monitoring, threshold values and early-warning. In: *Landslides and Engineering Slopes: From the Past to the Future*. Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on Landslides and Engineering Slopes, Xi'an, China.
- Blikra, L.H., 2012. The Åknes rockslide, Norway. In: Clague, J. J., Stead, D. (eds), *Landslides: types, mechanisms and modeling*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 323–335.
- Casagli, N., Catani, F., Del Ventisette, C., Luzi, G., 2010. Monitoring, prediction, and early warning using ground-based radar interferometry. *Landslides* 7, 291–301.
- Catani, F., Tofani, V., Lagomarsino, D., 2016. Spatial patterns of landslide dimension: A tool for magnitude mapping. *Geomorphology* 273, 361–373.
- Cloutier, C., Agliardi, F., Crosta, G.B., Frattini, P., Froese, C., Jaboyedoff, M., Locat, J., Michoud, C., Marui, H., 2015. The First International Workshop on Warning criteria for Active Slides: technical issues, problems and solutions for managing early warning systems. *Landslides* 12, 205–212.
- Corominas, J., Van Westen, C., Frattini, P., Cascini, L., Malet, J.-P., Fotopoulou, S., Catani, F., Van Den Eeckhaut, M., Mavrouli, O., Agliardi, F., Pitalakis, K., Winter, M.G., Pastor, M., Ferlisi, S., Tofani, V., Hervás, J., Smith, J.T., 2014. Recommendations for the quantitative analysis of landslide risk. *Bulletin of Engineering Geology and the Environment* 73 (2), 209–263.
- Crosta, G.B., Agliardi, F., 2003. Failure forecast for large rock slides by surface displacement measurements. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* 40, 176–191.
- Dai, F.C., Lee, C.F., Ngai, Y.Y., 2002. Landslide risk assessment and management: an overview. *Engineering Geology* 64 (1), 65–87.
- Dash, N., Gladwin, H., 2007. Evacuation Decision Making and Behavioral Responses: Individual and Household. *Natural Hazards Review* 8, 69–77.
- Federico, A., Popescu, M., Elia, G., Fidelibus, C., Internò, G., Murianni, A., 2012. Prediction of time to slope failure: a general framework. *Environmental Earth Sciences* 66 (1), 245–256.
- Fell, R., 1994. Landslide risk assessment and acceptable risk. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* 31, 261 – 272.
- Fell, R., Hartford, D., 1997. Landslide risk management. In: Cruden, D., Fell, R. (Eds.), *Landslide Risk Assessment*. Balkema, Rotterdam, pp. 51 – 109.
- Froese, C., Moreno, F., 2014. Structure and components for the emergency response and warning system on Turtle Mountain. *Natural Hazards* 70, 1689–1712.
- Gili, J., Corominas, J., Riu, J., 2000. Using global positioning system techniques in landslide monitoring. *Engineering Geology* 55, 167–192.
- Guzzetti, F., Ardizzone, F., Cardinali, M., Galli, M., Rossi, M., Valigi, D., 2009. Landslide volumes and landslide mobilization rates in Umbria, central Italy. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 279 (3), 222–229.
- Guzzetti, F., Carrara, A., Cardinali, M., Reichenbach, P., 1999. Landslide hazard evaluation: a review of current techniques and their application in a multi-scale study. *Central Italy*. *Geomorphology* 31, 181–216.
- Guzzetti, F., Peruccacci, S., Rossi, M., Stark, C.P., 2008. The rainfall intensity–duration control of shallow landslides and debris flows: an update. *Landslides* 5, 3–17.
- Guzzetti, F., Mondini, A.C., Cardinali, M., Fiorucci, F., Santangelo, M., Chang, K.-T., 2012. Landslide inventory maps: New tools for an old problem. *Earth-Science Reviews* 112 (1–2), 42–66.
- Guzzetti, F., Reichenbach, P., Cardinali, M., Galli, M., Ardizzone, F., 2005. Probabilistic landslide hazard assessment at the basin scale. *Geomorphology* 72 (1), 272–299.

- Hungri, O., Leroueil, S., Picarelli, L., 2014. The Varnes classification of landslide types — an update. *Landslides* 11 (2), 167–194
- Hutchinson, J.N., 1988. General Report: Morphological and geotechnical parameters of landslides in relation to geology and hydrogeology. In: *Proceedings 5th International Symposium on Landslides*, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Intrieri, E., Gigli, G., Casagli, N., Nadim, F., 2013. Landslide Early Warning System: toolbox and general concepts. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 13, 85–90.
- Intrieri, E., Gigli, G., Mugnai, F., Fanti, R., Casagli, N., 2012. Design and implementation of a landslide early warning system. *Engineering Geology* 147–148, 124–136.
- IPCC, 2012. Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V. Barros, T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, D.J. Dokken, K.L. Ebi, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, G.K. Plattner, S.K. Allen, M. Tignor, P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA.
- Jaedicke, C., van den Eeckhaut, M., Nadim, F., Hervás, J., Kalsnes, B., Vangelsten B.V., Smith, J.T., Tofani, V., Ciurean, R., Winter, M.G., Sverdrup-Thygesen, K., Syre, E., Smebye, H., 2013. Identification of landslide hazard and risk hotspots in Europe. *Bulletin of Engineering Geology and the Environment* 73 (2), 325–339.
- Jakob, M., Owen, T., Simpson, T., 2012. A regional real-time debris-flow warning system for the District of North Vancouver, Canada. *Landslides* 9, 165–178.
- Larsen, I.J., Montgomery, D.R., Korup, O., 2010. Landslide erosion controlled by hill-slope material. *Nature Geoscience* 3, 247–251.
- Marchi, L., Arattano, M., Deganutti, A.M., 2002. Ten years of debris flows monitoring in the Moscardo Torrent (Italian Alps). *Geomorphology* 46, 1–17.
- Michoud, C., Bazin, S., Blikra, L.H., Derron, M.H., Jaboyedoff, M., 2013. Experiences from site-specific landslide early warning systems. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 13, 2659–2673.
- Petley, D.N., 2010. Document On the impact of climate change and population growth on the occurrence of fatal landslides in South, East and SE Asia. *Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology and Hydrogeology* 43(4), 487–496.
- Rossi, M., Guzzetti, F., Reichenbach, P., Mondini, A.C., Peruccacci, S., 2010. Optimal landslide susceptibility zonation based on multiple forecasts. *Geomorphology* 114(3), 129–142.
- Rouyet, L., Kristensen, L., Derron, M.H., Michoud, C., Blikra, L.H., Jaboyedoff, M., Lauknes, T.R., 2016. Evidence of rock slope breathing using Ground-Based InSAR. *Geomorphology*.
- Sättele, M., Bründl, M., Straub, D., 2016. Quantifying the effectiveness of early warning systems for natural hazards. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 16, 149–166.
- IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, B. Bex, P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Tofani, V., Segoni, S., Agostini, A., Catani, F., Casagli, N., 2013. Technical NB: Use of remote sensing for landslide studies in Europe. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 13, 299–309.
- Tinti, S., Pagnoni, G., Zaniboni, F., 2006. The landslides and tsunamis of the 30th of December 2002 in Stromboli analysed through numerical simulations. *Bulletin of Volcanology* 68 (5), 462–479.
- Nations, United, 2015. World population prospects. The 2015 revision. Dept. Economics and Social Affairs. undefined undefined, undefined.
- Witt, A., Malamud, B.D., Rossi, M., Guzzetti, F., Peruccacci, S., 2010. Temporal correlations and clustering of landslides. *Earth Surface Process and Landforms* 35 (10), 1138–1156.

3.6 Hydrological risk: wave action, storm surges and coastal flooding

- Arkhipkin, V.S., Gippius, F.N., Koltermann, K.P., Surkova, G.V., 2014. Wind waves in the Black Sea. Results of a hindcast study. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 14 (11), 2883–2897.
- Arns, A., Wahl, T., Dangendorf, S., Jensen, J., 2015. The impact of sea level rise on storm surge water levels in the northern part of the German Bight. *Coastal Engineering* 96, 118–131.
- Bacon, S., Carter, D.J.T., 1991. Wave climate changes in the North Atlantic and North Sea. *International Journal of Climatology* 11, 545–558.
- Bates, P.D., Horritt, M.S., Fewtrell, T.J., 2010. A simple inertial formulation of the shallow water equations for efficient two-dimensional flood inundation modelling. *Journal of Hydrology* 387, 33–45.
- Bengal and the Arabian Sea, Tropical Cyclone Programme, Report No TCP21.
- Bindoff, N.L., J. Willebrand, V. Artale, A. Cazenave, J. Gregory, S. Gulev, K. Hanawa, C. Le Quéré, S. Levitus, Y. Nojiri, C.K. Shum, L.D. Talley and A. Unnikrishnan, 2007. Observations: Oceanic Climate Change and Sea Level. In: Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor, Miller, H.L., (Eds.). *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA, pp. 385–432.
- Breilh, J.F., Chaumillon, E., Bertin, X., Gravelle, M., 2013. Assessment of static flood modeling techniques: application to contrasting marshes flooded during Xynthia (western France). *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 13, 1595–1612.
- Casas Prat, M., Sierra, J.P., 2013. Projected future wave climate in the NW Mediterranean Sea. *Journal of Geophysical Research Oceans* 118 (7), 3548–3568.
- Cavaleri, L., Fox-Kemper, B., Hemer, M., 2012. Wind Waves in the Coupled Climate System. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 93, 1651–1661.
- CEFAS, n.d. WaveNet, Cefas' strategic wave monitoring network for the United Kingdom. www.cefas.co.uk/cefas-data-hub/wavenet/, [accessed 07 April, 2016].
- Charles, E.D., Idier, D., Delecluse, P., Deque, M., Le Cozannet, G., 2012. Climate change impact on waves in the Bay of Biscay. France. *Ocean Dynamics* 62, 831–848.

- Church, J.A., Gregory, J.M., White, N.J., Platten, S.M., J.X. Mitrovica, 2011. Understanding and projecting sea level change. *Oceanography* 24 (2), 130–143.
- Church, J.A., P.U. Clark, A. Cazenave, J.M. Gregory, S. Jevrejeva, A. Levermann, M.A. Merrifield, G.A. Milne, R.S. Nerem, P.D. Nunn, A.J. Payne, W.T. Pfeffer, D. Stammer, A.S. Unnikrishnan, 2013. Sea Level Change. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA, pp. 1137–1216.
- Church, J.A., White, N., 2011. Sea-Level Rise from the Late 19th to the Early 21st Century. *Surveys in Geophysics* 32 (4-5), 585–602.
- Conte, D., Lionello, P., 2013. Characteristics of large positive and negative surges in the Mediterranean Sea and their attenuation in future climate scenarios. *Global and Planetary Change* 111, 159–173.
- Cooper, J.A.G., Pile, J., 2014. The adaptation-resistance spectrum: A classification of contemporary adaptation approaches to climate-related coastal change. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 94, 90–98.
- De Vries, H., Breton, M., de Mulder, T., Krestenitis, Y., Ozer, J., Proctor, R., Ruddick, K., Salomon, J. C., Voorrips, A., 1995. A comparison of 2-D storm surge models applied to three shallow European seas. *Environmental Software* 10(1), 23–42.
- Debernard, J.B., Røed, L.P., 2008. Future wind, wave and storm surge climate in the Northern Seas: a revisit. *Tellus A* 60, 427–438.
- Disaster Management Bureau of the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, 2010. National Plan for Disaster Management 2010–2015. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.
- Dodet, G., Bertin, X., Taborda, R., 2010. Wave climate variability in the North-East Atlantic Ocean over the last six decades. *Ocean Modelling* 31 (3-4), 120–131.
- Dottori, F., Martina, M.L.V., Figueiredo, R., 2016. A methodology for flood susceptibility and vulnerability analysis in complex flood scenarios. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, n/a-n/a.
- Dupuis, H., Michel, D., Sottolichio, A., 2006. Wave climate evolution in the Bay of Biscay over two decades. *Journal of Marine Systems* 63 (3-4), 105–114.
- ECMWF, n.d. Browse reanalysis datasets. <http://www.ecmwf.int/en/research/climate-reanalysis/browse-reanalysis-datasets>, [accessed 17 April, 2017].
- Environment Agency, 2009. Flooding in England: A National Assessment of Flood Risk. Environment Agency report. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/292928/geho0609bqds-e-e.pdf [accessed 07 April, 2016].
- Ferreira, Ó., Garcia, T., Matias, A., Taborda, R., Dias, J.A., 2006. An integrated method for the determination of set-back lines for coastal erosion hazards on sandy shores. *Continental Shelf Research* 26, 1030–1044.
- Gallien, T.W., 2016. Validated coastal flood modeling at Imperial Beach, California: Comparing total water level, empirical and numerical overtopping methodologies. *Coastal Engineering* 111, 95–104.
- Gaslikova, L., Grabemann, I., Groll, N., 2013. Changes in North Sea storm surge conditions for four transient future climate realizations. *Natural Hazards* 66, 1501–1518.
- Gommenginger, C., Thibaut, P., Fenoglio-Marc, L., Quartly, G., Deng, X. Gómez Enri, J. Challenor, P., Gao, Y., 2010. Retracking altimeter waveforms near the coasts — A review of retracking methods and some applications to coastal waveforms. In: Vignudelli, S., Kostianoy, A., Cipollini, P., Benveniste, J. (eds), *Coastal Altimetry*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Gouldby B., Sayers P., Mulet Marti J., Hassan M., Benwell D., 2008. A methodology for regional-scale flood risk assessment. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Water Management* 161, (3), 169–182.
- Gräwe, U., Burchard, H., 2012. Storm surges in the Western Baltic Sea: the present and a possible future. *Climate Dynamics* 39, 165–183.
- Grinsted, A., Moore, A.J., Jevrejeva, S., 2010. Reconstructing sea level from paleo and projected temperatures 200 to 2100 AD. *Climate Dynamics* 34(4), 461–472.
- Groll N., Grabemann I., Hünicke B., Meese ,M., 2017. Baltic Sea wave conditions under climate change scenarios. *Boreal Environment Research* 22, 1–12.
- Groll, N., Grabemann, I., Gaslikova, L., 2014. North Sea wave conditions. An analysis of four transient future climate realizations. *Ocean Dynamics* 64 (1), 1–12.
- Haigh, I.D., Wadey, M.P., Gallo, S.L., Loehr, H., Nicholls, R.J., Horsburgh, K., Brown, J.M., Bradshaw, E., 2015. A user-friendly database of coastal flooding in the United Kingdom 1915–2014. *Scientific Data* 2, 150021.
- Haigh, I.D., Wadey, M.P., Wahl, T., Ozsoy, O., Nicholls, R.J., Brown, J.M., Horsburgh, K., Gouldby, B., 2016. Spatial footprint and temporal clustering analysis of extreme sea level and storm surge events around the coastline of the UK. *Scientific Data* 3, 160107.
- Hallegatte, S., Green, C., Nicholls, R. J., Corfee Morlot, J., 2013. Future flood losses in major coastal cities. *Nature Climate Change*, 3, 802–806.
- Hawkes, P.J., Atkins, R., Brampton, A.H., Fortune, D., Garbett, R., Gouldby, B.P., 2001. WAVENET: Nearshore Wave Recording Network for England and Wales: Feasibility Study. HR Wallingford Report TR 122.
- Hemer, M.A., Wang, X.L., Weisse, R., Swail, V.R., 2012. Advancing wind-waves climate science: The COWCLIP project. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 93, 791–796.
- Hinkel, J., Lincke, D., Vafeidis, A.T., Perrette, M., Nicholls, R.J., Tol, R.S.J., Marzeion, B., Fettweis, X., Ionescu, C., Levermann, A., 2014. Coastal flood damage and adaptation costs under 21st century sea-level rise. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, 3292–3297.
- Hinkel, J., Nicholls, R., Vafeidis, A., Tol, R.J., Avagianou, T., 2010. Assessing risk of and adaptation to sea-level rise in the European Union: an application of DIVA. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 15, 703–719.
- Horsburgh, K., Ball, T., Donovan, B., Westbrook, G., 2010. Coastal flooding in MCCIP Annual Report Card 2010–11. MCCIP Science Review. Available from: www.mccip.org.uk/arc.
- Howard, T., Lowe, J., Horsburgh, K., 2010. Interpreting Century-Scale Changes in Southern North Sea Storm Surge Climate Derived from Coupled Model Simulations. *Journal of Climate* 23, 6234–6247.

- Hünicke, B., Zorita, E., Soomere, T., Madsen, K.S.; Johansson, M., Suursaar, Ü., 2015. Recent Change-Sea Level and Wind Waves. In: The BACC II Author Team (eds.), Second Assessment of Climate Change for the Baltic Sea Basin. Springer, Berlin, pp. 155-185.
- Huthnance, J., Weisse, R., Wahl, T., Thomas, H., Pietrzak, J., Souza, A.J., Van Heteren, S., Schmelzer, N., van Beusekom, J., Colijn, F., Haigh, I., Hjøllø, S., Holfort, J., Kent, E.C., Kühn, W., Loewe, P., Lorkowski, I., Mork, K.A., Pätsch, J., Quante, M., Salt, L., Siddorn, J., Smyth, T., Sterl, A., Woodworth, P. (2016). Recent change - North Sea. In: Quante, M. and Colijn, F. (Ed.), North Sea region climate change assessment. Springer, Switzerland, pp. 85-136.
- Idier, D., Paris, F., Cozannet, G.L., Boulahya, F., Dumas, F., 2017. Sea-level rise impacts on the tides of the European Shelf. *Continental Shelf Research* 137, 56-71.
- IPCC, 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V. Barros, T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, D.J. Dokken, K.L. Ebi, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, G.K. Plattner, S.K. Allen, M. Tignor, P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA.
- IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Jevrejeva, S., Grinsted, A., Moore, J., 2014. Upper limit for sea level projections by 2100. *Environmental Research Letters* 9, 104008.
- Jevrejeva, S., Moore, J.C., Grinsted, A., 2010. How will sea level respond to changes in natural and anthropogenic forcings by 2100?. *Geophysical Research Letters* 37, 07703.
- Jordà, G., Gomis, D., Álvarez-Fanjul, E., Somot, S., 2012. Atmospheric contribution to Mediterranean and nearby Atlantic sea level variability under different climate change scenarios. *Global and Planetary Change* 80-81, 198-214.
- Katsman, C.A., Sterl, A., Beersma, J.J., Brink, H.W., Church, J.A., Hazeleger, W., Kopp, R.E., Kroon, D., Kwadijk, J., Lammersen, R., Lowe, J., Oppenheimer, M., Plag, H.P., Ridley, J., Storch, H., Vaughan, D.G., Vellinga, P., Vermeersen, L.L.A., Wal, R.S.W., Weisse, R., 2011. Exploring high-end scenarios for local sea level rise to develop flood protection strategies for a low-lying delta — the Netherlands as an example. *Climate Dynamics* 109 (3-4), 617-645.
- Kopp, R.E., Simons, F.J., Mitrovica, J.X., Maloof, A.C., Oppenheimer, M., 2009. Probabilistic assessment of sea level during the last interglacial stage. *Nature* 462, 863-867.
- Lesser, G.R., Roelvink, J.A., van Kester, J.A.T.M., Stelling, G.S., 2004. Development and validation of a three-dimensional morphological model. *Coastal Engineering* 51, 883-915.
- Lionello, P., Cogo, S., Galati, M.B., Sanna, A., 2008. The Mediterranean surface wave climate inferred from future scenario simulations. *Global and Planetary Change* 63, 152-162.
- Lionello, P., Galati, M.B., Elvini, E., 2010. Extreme storm surge and wind wave climate scenario simulations at the Venetian littoral. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth Parts* 40, 86-92.
- Lionello, P., Sanna, A., 2005. Mediterranean wave climate variability and its links with NAO and Indian Monsoon. *Climate Dynamics* 25 (6), 611-623.
- Lowe, J.A., Gregory, J.M., Flather, R.A., 2001. Changes in the occurrence of storm surges around the United Kingdom under a future climate scenario using a dynamic storm surge model driven by the Hadley Centre climate models. *Climate Dynamics* 18, 179-188.
- Lowe, J.A., Howard, T., Pardaens, A., Tinker, J., Holt, J., Wakelin, S., Milne, G., Leake, J., Wolf, J., Horsburgh, K., Reeder, T., Jenkins, G., Ridley, J., Dye, S., Bradley, S., 2009. UK Climate Projections science report: Marine and coastal projections. Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, UK.
- Lowe, J.A., Howard, T.P., Pardaens, A., Tinker, J., Holt, J., Wakelin, S., Milne, G., Leake, J., Wolf, J., Horsburgh, K., Reeder, T., Jenkins, G., Ridley, J., Dye, S., Bradley, S., 2009. UK Climate Projections science report: Marine and coastal projections. Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, UK.
- Lowe, J.A., Woodworth, P.L., Knutson, T., McDonald, R.E., McInnes, K.L., Woth, K., Von Storch, H., Wolf, J., Swail, V., Bernier, N., Gulev, S., Horsburgh, K.J., Unnikrishnan, A.S., Hunter, J.R. & Weisse, R. (2010) Past and future changes in extreme sea levels and waves. In: Church, J.A., Woodworth, P. L., Aarup, T., Wilson, W. S. (eds), *Understanding Sea Level Rise and Variability*. Wiley-Blackwell, London, pp. 326-361.
- Lowe, J.A., Woodworth, P.L., Knutson, T., McDonald, R.E., McInnes, K.L., Woth, K., von Storch, H., Wolf, J., Swail, V., Bernier, N.B., Gulev, S., Horsburgh, K.J., Unnikrishnan, A.S., Hunter, J.R., Weisse, R., 2010. Past and Future Changes in Extreme Sea Levels and Waves, *Understanding Sea-Level Rise and Variability*. Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 326-375.
- M. Tignor, H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Marcos, M., Chust, G., Jorda, G., Caballero, A., 2012. Effect of sea level extremes on the western Basque coast during the 21st century. *Climate Research* 51, 237-248.
- Marcos, M., Jordà, G., Gomis, D., Pérez, B., 2011. Changes in storm surges in southern Europe from a regional model under climate change scenarios. *Global and Planetary Change* 77, 116-128.
- Matthews, T., Murphy, C., Wilby, R. L., Harrigan, S., 2014. Stormiest winter on record for Ireland and UK. *Nature Climate Change* 4, 738-740.
- Mawdsley, R.J., Haigh, I.D., Wells, N.C., 2015. Global secular changes in different tidal high water, low water and range levels. *Earth's Future* 3, 66-81.
- McCall, R.T., Van Thiel de Vries, J.S.M., Plant, N.G., Van Dongeren, A.R., Roelvink, J.A., Thompson, D.M., Reniers, A.J.H.M., 2010. Two-dimensional time dependent hurricane overwash and erosion modeling at Santa Rosa Island. *Coastal Engineering* 57, 668-683.
- Meier, H.E.M., 2006. Baltic Sea climate in the late twenty-first century: a dynamical downscaling approach using two global models and two emission scenarios. *Climate Dynamics* 27, 39-68.

- Meier, H.E.M., Broman, B., Kjellström, E., 2004. Simulated sea level in past and future climates of the Baltic Sea. *Climate Research* 27, 59-75.
- Menendez, M., Woodworth, P.L., 2010. Changes in extreme high water levels based on a quasi-global tide-gauge dataset. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 115, C10011.
- Mitrovica, J.X., Tamiseia, M.E., Davis, J.L. and Milne, G.A., 2001. Recent mass balance of polar ice sheets inferred from patterns of global sea-level change. *Nature* 409, 1026- 1029.
- Nicholls, R.J., French, J., Burningham, H., Van Maanen, B., Payo, A., Sutherland, J., Walkden, M., Thornhill, G., Brown, J., Luxford, F., Simm, J., Reeve, D.E., Hall, J. W., Souza, A., Stansby, P.K., Amoudry, L.O., Rogers, B.D., Ellis, M., Whitehouse, R., Horrillo-Caraballo, J.M., Karunarathna, H.U., Pan, S., Plater, A., Dix, J., Barnes, J., Heron, E., 2015. Improving Decadal Coastal Geomorphic Predictions: An Overview of the ICOASST Project. In: *Proceedings of the Coastal Sediments, San Diego, USA*.
- Pelling, H.E., Mattias Green, J.A., 2014. Impact of flood defences and sea-level rise on the European Shelf tidal regime. *Continental Shelf Research* 85, 96-105.
- Perez, J., Menendez, M., Camus, P., Mendez, F.J., Losada, I.J., 2015. Statistical multi-model climate projections of surface ocean waves in Europe. *Ocean Modelling* 96, 161-170.
- Perini, L., Calabrese, L., Salerno, G., Ciavola, P., Armaroli, C., 2016. Evaluation of coastal vulnerability to flooding: comparison of two different methodologies adopted by the Emilia-Romagna region (Italy). *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 16, 181-194.
- Pfeffer, W.T., Harper, J.T., O'Neel, S., 2008. Kinematic constraints on glacier contributions to 21st century sea level rise. *Science* 321, 1340-1343.
- Pickering, M.D., Wells, N.C., Horsburgh, K.J., Green, J.A.M., 2012. The impact of future sea-level rise on the European Shelf tides. *Continental Shelf Research* 35, 1-15.
- Prandle, D., Wolf, J., 1978. The interaction of surge and tide in the North Sea and River Thames. *Geophysical Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society* 55, 203-216.
- PSMSL, 2017. Permanent Service for Mean Sea Level. <http://www.psmsl.org/>, [accessed 17 April, 2017].
- Pugh, D., Woodworth, P., 2014. *Sea-Level Science: Understanding Tides, Surges, Tsunamis and Mean Sea-Level Changes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Purvis, M.J., Bates, P.D., Hayes, C.M., 2008. A probabilistic methodology to estimate future coastal flood risk due to sea level rise. *Coastal Engineering* 55, 1062-1073.
- Rahmstorf, S., 2007. A semi-empirical approach to projecting future sea-level rise. *Science* 315 (5810), 368-370.
- Ramirez, J.A., Lichter, M., Coulthard, T.J., Skinner, C., 2016. Hyper-resolution mapping of regional storm surge and tide flooding: comparison of static and dynamic models. *Natural Hazards* 82, 571-590.
- Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, Roelvink, D., Reniers, A., Dongeren, A.v., Vries, J.v.T.d., McCall, R., Lescinski, J., 2009. Modelling storm impacts on beaches, dunes and barrier islands. *Coastal Engineering* 56, 1133-1152.
- Rossiter, J.R., 1961. Interaction between tide and surge in the Thames. *Geophysical Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society* 6, 29-53.
- Seenath, A., Wilson, M., Miller, K., 2016. Hydrodynamic versus GIS modelling for coastal flood vulnerability assessment: Which is better for guiding coastal management? *Ocean & Coastal Management* 120, 99-109.
- Sekovski, I., Armaroli, C., Calabrese, L., Mancini, F., Stecchi, F., Perini, L., 2015. Coupling scenarios of urban growth and flood hazards along the Emilia-Romagna coast (Italy). *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 15, 2331-2346.
- Smith, D.E., Hunt, N., Firth, C.R., Jordan, J.T., Fretwell, P.T., Harman, M., Murdy, J., Orford, J.D., Burnside, N.G., 2012. Patterns of Holocene relative sea level change in the North of Britain and Ireland. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 54 (26), 58-76.
- Smith, R.A.E., Bates, P.D., Hayes, C., 2012. Evaluation of a coastal flood inundation model using hard and soft data. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 30, 35-46.
- Sterl, A., van den Brink, H., de Vries, H., Haarsma, R., van Meijgaard, E., 2009. An ensemble study of extreme storm surge related water levels in the North Sea in a changing climate. *Ocean Science* 5, 369-378.
- Thorne, C.R., Evans, E.P., Penning-Roswell, E.C., 2007. *Future Flooding and Coastal Erosion risks*. Thomas Telford Ltd, London, UK.
- Toffoli, A., Lefèvre, J.M., Bitner-Gregersen, E., Monbaliu, J., 2005. Towards the identification of warning criteria: Analysis of a ship accident database. *Applied Ocean Research* 27 (6), 281-291.
- Vermeer, M., Rahmstorf, S., 2009. Global sea level linked to global temperature. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (51), 21527-21532.
- Vousdoukas, M.I., Ferreira, O., Almeida, L.P., Pacheco, A., 2012a. Toward reliable storm-hazard forecasts: XBeach calibration and its potential application in an operational early-warning system. *Ocean Dynamics* 62, 1001-1015.
- Vousdoukas, M.I., Mentaschi, L., Voukouvalas, E., Verlaan, M., Feyen, L., 2017. Extreme sea levels on the rise along Europe's coasts. *Earth's Future* submitted after minor revision.
- Vousdoukas, M.I., Voukouvalas, E., Annunziato, A., Giardino, A., Feyen, L., 2016a. Projections of extreme storm surge levels along Europe. *Climate Dynamics* 47, 3171-3190.
- Vousdoukas, M.I., Voukouvalas, E., Mentaschi, L., Dottori, F., Giardino, A., Bouziotas, D., Bianchi, A., Salamon, P., Feyen, L., 2016b. Developments in large-scale coastal flood hazard mapping. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science* 16, 1841-1853.
- Vousdoukas, M.I., Wziatek, D., Almeida, L.P., 2012b. Coastal vulnerability assessment based on video wave run-up observations at a mesotidal, steep-sloped beach. *Ocean Dynamics* 62, 123-137.
- Wahl, T., Chambers, D.P., 2016. Climate controls multidecadal variability in U. S. extreme sea level records. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* 121, 1274-1290.
- Wang, X.L., Zwiers, F.W., Swail, V.R., Feng, Y., 2009. Trends and variability of storminess in the Northeast Atlantic region, 1874-2007. *Climate Dynamics* 33, 1179-1195.
- Weisse, R., Storch, H., Callies, U., Chrastansky, A., Feser, F., Grabemann, I., Günther, H., Pluess, A., Stoye, T., Tellkamp, J., Winterfeldt, J., Woth, K., 2009. Regional meteorological-marine reanalysis and climate change projections: results for northern Europe and

- potential for coastal and offshore applications. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 90 (6), 849–860.
- Williams, J., Horsburgh, K.J., Williams, J.A., Proctor, R.N.F., 2016. Tide and skew surge independence: New insights for flood risk. *Geophysical Research Letters* 43, 6410–6417.
- WMO (World Meteorological Organization (WMO), 2010. Tropical Cyclone Operational Plan for the Bay of
- Wolf, J., 2009. Coastal Flooding — Impacts of coupled wave-surge-tide models. *Natural Hazards* 49 (2), 241–260.
- Wolf, J., 2016. Measurement and analysis of waves in estuarine and coastal waters. In: Uncles, R.J., Mitchell, S.B. (eds), *Estuarine and coastal hydrography and sediment transport*. Estuarine and Coastal Science Association. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Wolf, J., Brown, J. M., Howarth, M.J., 2011. The wave climate of Liverpool Bay — observations and modelling. *Ocean Dynamics* 61, 639–655.
- Wolf, J., Lowe, J., Howard, T., 2015. Climate Downscaling: Local Mean Sea-Level, Surge and Wave Modelling. In: Nicholls, R. J., Dawson, R.J., Day, S. A. (eds), *Broad Scale Coastal Simulation: New Techniques to Understand and Manage Shorelines in the Third Millennium*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Wolf, J., Woolf, D. K., 2006. Waves and climate change in the north-east Atlantic. *Geophysical Research Letters* 33 (6), L06604.
- Wong, P.P., Losada, I.J., Gattuso, J.P., Hinkel, J., Khattabi, A., McInnes, K.L., Saito, Y., Sallenger, A., 2014. Coastal systems and low-lying areas. In: Field, C.B., Barros, V.R., Dokken, D.J., Mach, K.J., Mastandrea, M.D., Bilir, T.E., Chatterjee, M., Elbi, K.L., Estrada, Y.O., Genova, R.C., Girma, B., Kissel, E.S., Levy, A.N, MacCracken, S., Mastandrea, P.R., White, L.L. (eds), *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, USA, pp. 361–409.
- Woodworth, P.L., 2010. A survey of recent changes in the main components of the ocean tide. *Continental Shelf Research* 30, 1680–1691.
- Woodworth, P.L., Blackman, D.L., 2004. Evidence for systematic changes in extreme high waters since the mid-1970s. *Journal of Climate* 17(6):1190–1197.
- Woodworth, P.L., Gehrels, W.R., Nerem, R.S., 2011. Nineteenth and twentieth century changes in sea level. *Oceanography* 24 (2), 80–93.
- Woodworth, P.L., Teferle, N., Bingley, R., Shennan, I., Williams, S.D.P., 2009. Trends in UK mean sea level revisited. *Geophysical Journal International* 176, 19–30.
- Woolf, D., Wolf, J., 2013. Impacts of climate change on storms and waves. *MCCIP Science Review* undefined, 20–26.
- Woolf, D.K., Challenor, P.G., Cotton, P.D., 2002. The variability and predictability of North Atlantic wave climate. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 107 (10), 3145.
- Woolf, D.K., Cotton, P.D., Challenor, P.G., 2003. Measurements of the offshore wave climate around the British Isles by satellite altimeter. *Philosophical Transactions: Mathematical, Physical & Engineering Sciences* 361 (1802), 27–31.
- Woollings, T., 2010. Dynamical influences on European climate: an uncertain future. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 368, 3733–3756.
- Woth, K., Weisse, R., Von Storch, H., 2006. Climate change and North Sea storm surge extremes: an ensemble study of storm surge extremes expected in a changed climate projected by four different regional climate models. *Ocean Dynamics* 56, 3–15.
- Zacharioudaki, A., Pan, S., Simmonds, D., Magar, V.Reeve, D.E., undefined, 2011. Future wave climate over the west-European shelf seas. *Ocean Dynamics* 61 (6), 807–827.