

MILITARY EXPERT PANEL REPORT

SEA LEVEL RISE AND THE U.S. MILITARY'S MISSION

2ND EDITION

February 2018



Military Expert Panel Members

General Ronald Keys, United States Air Force (Ret)
Lieutenant General John Castellaw, United States Marine Corps (Ret)
Vice Admiral Robert Parker, United States Coast Guard (Ret)
Rear Admiral Ann C. Phillips, United States Navy (Ret)
Rear Admiral Jonathan White, United States Navy (Ret)
Brigadier General Gerald Galloway, United States Army (Ret)

Military Expert Panel Chair

Heather Messera

Edited by

Francesco Femia

THE CENTER FOR
CLIMATE AND
SECURITY

Military Expert Panel Report
SEA LEVEL RISE AND THE U.S. MILITARY'S MISSION

2ND EDITION

February 2018

Cover Photo:

*AERIAL PHOTO OF NAVAL AIR STATION KEY WEST, TRUMBO POINT ANNEX, FLORIDA.
APRIL 2016.*

US NAVY/MASS COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST 3RD CLASS CODY R. BABIN

CONTENTS

- I Note from the Military Expert Panel 4**
- II Executive Summary 5**
- III Findings and List of Recommendations 6**
- IV Introduction: Military Infrastructure in a Changing Security Landscape 7**
 - Figure 1: Coastal Installation Assets
- V Review of the Risk Landscape 10**
 - Highlight: Nuisance Flooding: Far More Than Just a “Nuisance”
- VI Combined Risk Outlook Based on Recent Studies 16**
- VII Discussion: Sea Level Rise and Military Readiness, Operations, and Strategy 17**
 - Table 1: Climate Change, Readiness, Operations and Strategy
 - Readiness and Operations 19**
 - Figure 2: Contrasting Installation Sea Level Rise Vulnerability
 - Strategy 22**
 - Highlight: Strategic Implications - The U.S. Asia-Pacific Rebalance
- VIII Case Studies 26**
 - Highlight: Arctic Infrastructure
 - Highlight: Protecting the “Jewels in Our Crown of Capability”
- IX Conclusion and Recommendations 49**

The Center for Climate and Security thanks its many colleagues that informed this study. We would especially like to thank John Conger, John Marburger, and Joan VanDervort for their expert review, and Scoville Fellow Christian Stirling Haig for his valuable contributions to our analysis.

I NOTE FROM THE MILITARY EXPERT PANEL

As military professionals who have spent our adult lives serving the United States, we are concerned about the impact that the effects of climate change, especially sea level rise, have on the ability of our military infrastructure to sustain our nation's operating forces and fulfill our nation's strategic objectives. It is clear we must do more to address these risks, and do it soon. As Secretary of Defense James Mattis made clear to Congress during his confirmation process, "the effects of a changing climate"—rising sea levels included—"impact our security situation."

There are a growing number of studies that explore the current and potential physical impacts of sea level rise on U.S. military installations, and these studies show that the risks are increasing at a faster rate than previously expected.¹ However, important follow on questions remain only partially answered: How will a changing climate impact our military basing, training, readiness and ability to conduct military operations? What are the broader implications for our military's ability to fulfill its missions especially with anticipated increases in the operational tempo? This report begins to answer those questions and offers a path forward to policy-makers for addressing those risks.

As a Department of Defense (DoD) report released in January 2018 states, "changes in climate can potentially shape the environment in which we operate and the missions that we are required to do."² The very geostrategic landscape in which the U.S. military operates is going to be different from what it is today, and that presents extraordinary challenges. As the aforementioned report also states: "if extreme weather makes our critical facilities unusable or necessitates costly or manpower-intensive work-arounds, that is an unacceptable impact."³ At the center of this adjustment are coastal military installations, their infrastructure, and the adjacent supporting communities that form the backbone of this global military force. Adjusting to this rapidly changing theater will be absolutely critical for the U.S. military to maintain its ability to fulfill its mission, and for the United States to adequately pursue its national security interests.

This report looks out in time to assess current and projected effects of sea level rise happening simultaneously across a broad range of military infrastructure domestically and globally, and the resulting effects on the services' ability to train, mobilize, operate and fulfill strategic objectives. The continued strength of the U.S. depends, in large part, on having a clear-eyed assessment of risks and threats to the nation, and addressing them well before they manifest themselves. This report is an attempt to present a clearer understanding of sea level rise risks, what these risks mean for our nation's armed forces, what they mean for national security, and how we can construct processes which respond with foresight to whatever our future holds. In doing so, we hope to modestly contribute to the effectiveness of our nation's military and to help ensure a strong and resilient United States.

Signed,

General Ronald Keys, United States Air Force (Ret),
Lieutenant General John Castellaw, United States Marine Corps (Ret),
Vice Admiral Robert Parker, United States Coast Guard (Ret),
Rear Admiral Ann C. Phillips, United States Navy (Ret),
Rear Admiral Jonathan White, United States Navy (Ret),
Brigadier General Gerald Galloway, United States Army (Ret)

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States military is the most capable globally-deployed military force in the history of the nation state. American forces are present in almost every country, ready to advance U.S. interests, whether that be on a combat or humanitarian mission. To accomplish this, the U.S. military depends on essential services and infrastructure, both built and natural, to support a trained and ready force.

This capability, however, rests on an assumption of climate stability - including the stability of the 95,471 miles of coastline along which 1,774 U.S. military sites reside across the globe.⁴ In the 21st century, the stability of that climate, and the stability of those coastlines from which the military launches its operations, is set to experience dramatic change. For example, major transportation, command and control, intelligence, and deployment hubs may face erratic outages, or operational disruptions, due to sea level rise and storm surge. In that context, the ability of U.S. military forces to fulfill mission requirements will likely be hindered by greater costs, delays, and insufficient assets at critical junctures. As these risks to coastal military infrastructure evolve over this century, they may become strategic vulnerabilities that could affect our ability to deter our enemies, defend our interests, and support our friends. In other words, engagement “at a time and a place of our choosing” may not be our choice in the future.

As a recent Department of Defense (DoD) report states, “changes in climate can potentially shape the environment in which we operate and the missions that we are required to do.”⁵ The very geostrategic landscape in which the U.S. military operates is going to be different from what it is today.⁶ At the center of this adjustment are coastal military installations - their infrastructure and the adjacent supporting communities - that form the backbone of this global military force. Adjusting to this rapidly changing theater will be absolutely critical for the U.S. military to maintain its ability to fulfill its mission, and for the United States to adequately pursue its national security interests.

This 2nd edition of the Military Expert Panel Report: Sea Level Rise and the U.S. Military’s Mission includes new information released by the DoD since 2016, the inclusion of additional analysis on the vulnerability of energy and transportation infrastructure around military infrastructure, and new maps showing projections for sea level rise and storm surge where that military infrastructure resides. The report is not an exhaustive assessment of all the climate risks and vulnerabilities that military installations face – not least as other significant risks such as drought and wildfire are not a part of this analysis. However, the report does attempt to synthesize research done by the DoD, Congress and independent researchers, explores a range of case studies, analyzes what those findings mean for military readiness, operations and strategy, and lays out areas that deserve more attention.

III FINDINGS AND LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This report finds that over the course of the remainder of the 21st century, the U.S. military's domestic and international coastal military installations face significant risks from climate-driven changes in the environment, namely sea level rise and its interaction with an increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. This report also finds that these risks, if not sufficiently mitigated, may have wide-ranging effects on the military's ability to effectively fulfill its mission. This includes effects on military readiness, operations, and strategy. This report also concludes that policies and plans for addressing these risks will need to reach beyond infrastructure resilience. The effects of a changing climate present operational and strategic risks, and these broader implications require more analysis, planning, and prevention. The complex relationship between sea level rise, storm surge and global readiness and responsiveness must be explored across the services, and from the strategic down to the operational level. Secretary of Defense, James Mattis has stated that the effects of a changing climate "impact our security situation," and that "we are prepared to address the effects of a changing climate on our threat assessments, resources, and readiness."⁷

Given that the conclusions of this report are shared by Department of Defense (DoD) leadership, the report authors recommend that policy-makers support comprehensive and preventive measures, in the near term, to address these risks. In this context, we offer eight specific recommendations for the near-term aimed at addressing sea level rise risks to the U.S. military's mission.

1. **Continuously identify and build capacity to address infrastructural, operational and strategic risks.**
2. **Integrate climate impact scenarios and projections into regular planning cycles.**
3. **Make climate-related decisions that incorporate the entire spectrum of risk projections.**
4. **Model catastrophic scenarios and incorporate into planning and war gaming exercises.**
5. **Work with international counterparts at key coastal bases abroad.**
6. **Track trends in climate impacts as uncertainty levels are reduced.**
7. **Maintain close collaboration with adjacent civilian communities.**
8. **Continue to invest in improvements in climate data and analysis.**

See page **49-51** for the full recommendations.

IV INTRODUCTION: MILITARY INFRASTRUCTURE IN A CHANGING SECURITY LANDSCAPE

U.S. military forces are present in almost every nation across the globe, and operate from “nearly 562,000 facilities on 4,800 sites worldwide and covering 24.9 million acres.”⁸ The DoD’s ability to deploy quickly and effectively depends on a well-functioning infrastructure of military installations, testing sites, and training grounds that are secure from threats. Climate change introduces an added risk factor, particularly for those installations and sites along the coast worldwide.⁹ In 2008 the National Intelligence Council found that over 30 military sites in the continental United States were already facing elevated risks because of sea level rise.¹⁰ That number has grown in the years since. A recent report noted that over 200 military installations participating in a vulnerability assessment have already been effected by storm surge, and the U.S. military has taken notice.^{11 12}

By the end of the 21st century, the climate, sea levels, and the shape of many of the coastlines from which the military builds, trains and launches its operations, will likely be significantly different. Already, on the global scale, “sea level has risen by about 8 inches since the late 1880s.”¹³ By 2100, projections show an average global mean rise of up to 6.6 feet (2 meters) should marine-based sectors of the Antarctic ice sheet collapse.^{14 15} Given that around 10 percent of U.S. military installations and training grounds are located along low-lying and exposed coastlines, the long-term effects in terms of flooding will be significant.¹⁶ However, the effects of sea level rise go well beyond slow-onset effects. As noted by The Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP), the DoD’s environmental research program, potential risks to installations include:

- Loss or damage to mission essential infrastructure including coastal development; energy and water infrastructure;
- Loss or degradation of mission capabilities;
- Loss of training and testing lands, including beaches and barrier islands;
- Loss of transportation means, facilities, and/or corridors;
- Loss of habitat and associated natural resources;
- Increased risk of storm damage and coastal erosion; and,
- Increased potential for loss of life.¹⁷

Beyond the significant financial damage that can result from such flooding (including the costs of closures), an increase in the frequency and intensity of flooding, and increased erosion, can render portions of installations generally inoperable for significant periods of time. In key Areas of Responsibility for the U.S. military, such as the Asia-Pacific region, a combination of sea level rise and an increase in the severity and intensity of tropical storms could pose enormous problems. U.S. military installations in the region face challenges. First, they are especially exposed to severe weather events such as cyclones. Second, in the wake of these storms, these installations not only have to quickly recover their own capabilities, but they may

also have to function as a main hub for the humanitarian and disaster relief efforts that follow.¹⁸ As the U.S. implements its long term regional strategies, it will need to strongly consider how climate change will complicate strategic objectives – including its growing humanitarian assistance/ disaster relief role. Climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where U.S. troops are operating today. This is not a distant problem, but a current one. As Secretary Mattis has stated, “it is appropriate for the Combatant Commands to incorporate drivers of instability that impact the security environment in their areas into planning.”¹⁹

Evidence suggests that climate change may make cyclones and other tropical storms more intense.²⁰ As these storms interact with a rising sea level, the risks of multiple weather-related disasters impacting U.S. military installations simultaneously, at home and abroad, rise. Couple that with the need to defend U.S. interests in key, contested geostrategic environments, such as the South China Sea, and the military’s mission may be complicated even further.

The physical landscape in which the U.S. military operates is no longer a fixed variable. In fact, of the 292 military sites within 2 kilometers of the coastline, 45% have reported that they were effected by flooding in recent years.²¹ Since the U.S. military’s numerous coastal military installations lie in a rapidly changing landscape, it will have to adapt, and adapt quickly. At the center of this adjustment lies a fundamental need to build a resilient military infrastructure. Time is an important factor. As noted in the 2016 SERDP report on managing uncertainty for coastal risk management, “[u]ncertainty is not a reason for inaction, because taking no action is a decision in itself.”²² SERDP’s 2013 report on climate impacts and coastal military installations also noted that the decisions, or lack of decisions, that are being made today will drive how vulnerable the military’s “assets and capabilities” will be, in the face of climatic risks, for “many decades to come.”²³

Floodwaters from storm surge caused by hurricane Isabel fills a corridor at the U.S. Naval Academy. September 2003.
US NAVY





Aerial photo of Naval Air Station Key West's Trumbo Point Annex, Florida. April 2016.

US NAVY / MASS
COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST
3RD CLASS CODY R. BABIN

This report looks beyond the direct physical impacts of sea level rise on military infrastructure to provide insight into how those physical effects may affect military readiness, operations, and strategy. We asked the question: What might these changes mean for U.S. national security writ large? If it is to meet the goals of protecting the American people, U.S. allies, and national interests, the defense community does not have the luxury of waiting until events transpire to prepare for, respond to, and mitigate these risks. With a number of new efforts complete or underway, the security community now has sufficient understanding of the risks of climate change and sea level rise to justify comprehensive action – especially for coastal bases and the surrounding communities that are already feeling the effects (and incurring the damage). This report provides details from recent analyses, observations on the lessons they convey, and recommendations for U.S. policy makers on how to interpret and act in line with the new findings they present.²⁴

FIGURE 1: Coastal Installation Assets

From Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 'Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications', U.S. DoD, 2013:

Coastal military installations include many different assets that are vulnerable to climate changes. These assets include:

- Training/testing lands
- Protective shoreline buffers, barrier islands, and coastal wetlands
- Navigation channels
- Piers and docks
- Roads
- Bridges
- Parking areas
- Office and residential buildings
- Warehouses
- Communication data centers
- Sewage and oily waste treatment facilities
- Fuel tanks and distribution lines
- Water treatment and supply systems (plants, pumps, pipelines, wells)
- HVAC systems (buildings, equipment, distribution pipelines)
- Power infrastructure (substations, generators, distribution)

V REVIEW OF THE RISK LANDSCAPE

Scientists have long projected that climate change will contribute to sea level rise, storm surges, flooding, and other challenges for coastal areas. Indeed it is already doing so.²⁵ As these projections have expanded in volume and sharpened in detail, they have indicated increasing challenges for coastal military installations. This has led to an increase in the DoD's attention to sea level rise risks, and a number of global and site-specific studies by both the U.S. government and independent researchers. Over the past decade, an elevated appreciation for the scale of risk in the 21st century as well as the urgency for action, given the necessity of long planning horizons for complex coastal infrastructure, has developed within DoD leadership. As Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment, Lucian Niemeyer stated in response to a December 2017 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report on the topic, “[t]he Department, will continue to be prepared to conduct operations today and in the future, and will be prepared to address the effects of a changing climate on our threat assessments, resources, and readiness. I am committed to making our installations more resilient in support of our mission, our warfighters, and our communities.”²⁶ GAO also included climate change in the agency's 2017 “High Risk” list, reporting that it is an area with high vulnerabilities and significant financial risk to the U.S. Government.²⁷

History of Department of Defense (DoD) attention to climate change risks

The U.S. DoD has recognized the security implications of a changing climate as far back as 2003.²⁸ Recognition of the risk, and action to address it, has grown with each passing year – culminating in a “DoD Directive on Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience” in 2016, that provided policy guidance and assigns responsibilities on managing the risks associated with climate change.²⁹ ³⁰ It directed DoD components to assess the effects of climate change on the department's mission and to take into account those effects when developing plans and implementing them. It also concluded that climate change will continue to be a constant consideration in how DoD goes about its missions, acquisition programs, readiness plans, and construction projects. As noted in the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR):

“Climate change will affect DoD in two broad ways: First, climate change will shape the operating environment, roles and missions that we undertake. Second, DoD will need to adjust to the impacts of climate change on our facilities and military capabilities.”³¹

The first category includes consideration of climate change as a strategic risk, given the possibility that it will act as an “accelerant of instability or conflict, placing a burden to respond on civilian institutions and militaries around the world.”³² The second category includes consideration of the “30 U.S. military installations that [are] already facing elevated levels of risk from rising sea levels,” along with a much larger group of military sites that will face elevated risks throughout the 21st century.³³ As with its treatment of other security risks, DoD has based its assessment of climate change risks on the best available science.

Previous assessments of climate change risks to coastal military infrastructure

The DoD has already experienced the effects of climate change on its bases and training areas.³⁴ From sea level rise, to melting permafrost and increasingly severe storm events, some coastal installations have already begun to respond to impacts on their infrastructure.³⁵ As a result of the concrete budgetary and readiness impact of these events, DoD has expanded its capacity to analyze and address these challenges, and has leveraged work completed by other federal agencies to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the situation. Much of DoD's capacity for analysis has been built in its Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP). Other offices within the military services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense play important roles as well. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for example, has monitored sea level rise for decades and contributes actively to DoD's analysis of the effects of climate change.

The 2010 QDR noted the intelligence community assessment that at least 30 U.S. defense installations were already seeing increasing risks due to sea level rise, and tasked the SERDP to lead new assessments of DoD installations to determine how they may be affected by climate change. SERDP analysts have paid particular attention to coastal infrastructure, given that, according to GAO, “[a]bout 10 percent of DoD coastal installations and facilities are located at or near sea level and are already vulnerable to flooding and inundation. Rising sea levels and more intense heavy downpours will make these conditions worse.”³⁶ Early work in response to the QDR's tasking involved developing tools and methods that would enable the department to do consistent analysis. As this work has continued, defense experts have worked to advance their models and reduce uncertainties in their coastal assessments.³⁷

Much of the work to meet this task has been done in coordination with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and other agencies, some of which have facilities co-located or nearby to vulnerable defense sites. NASA, for example, has installations co-located with defense installations in Florida, Mississippi, Virginia, and elsewhere.

In addition to the DoD's own work, a number of other efforts have expanded the body of information available to congressional and executive branch decision makers and planners in the past few years. This work clarifies the likely scale of damage, level of risk, and likelihood of specific types of challenges that DoD should expect. Though climate effects have already manifested at defense installations today, these reports show even greater risks in the decades ahead – including many that can be expected by 2050-2070, well within the expected lifetime of current investments in facilities and infrastructure.

A 2014 GAO report provides specifics on the effects of climatic and environmental changes on training, readiness, and operations at several U.S. defense installations. Among the examples, the authors reported “the combination of thawing permafrost, decreasing sea ice, and rising sea level on the Alaskan coast have led to an increase in coastal erosion at several Air Force radar early warning and communication installations. According to installation officials, this erosion has damaged roads, utility infrastructure, seawalls, and runways.”³⁸

New Tools for Analysis and Planning

In April 2016, the DoD released a report titled “Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for DoD Coastal Sites Worldwide.”³⁹ Led by SERDP, the report was developed by experts from the U.S. Navy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), NOAA, United States Geological Survey (USGS), several universities and companies, and other public institutions.


The 2016 SERDP report is one of the most expansive publicly-released efforts to date. It details the methodology used to develop a range of scenarios that can serve as starting points for vulnerability assessments, planning, and decision-making for coastal risk management. Researchers used five different sea-level rise projections, adjusted for site-specific considerations, to develop sea-level and extreme water level scenarios for 2035, 2065 and 2100. The report accompanies a database of scenarios covering 1,774 DoD sites around the world, which integrate the complex interplay among land subsidence, sea level rise, ice melt, and other factors affecting coastal installations. These unique geographic, geological, and environmental factors indicate that defense sites will not be uniformly affected, and underscore the importance of acknowledging the range of possible futures for individual installations. The report used a multi-scenario approach to illustrate a range of plausible futures for coastal installation vulnerability. Though it leaves the policy decisions related to these uncertainties open, the report notes that a successful risk management framework leaves no room open for inaction in the face of these changes.

Another team of experts, from the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), conducted a robust analysis of 18 DoD installations and the surrounding civilian infrastructure deemed important for the continuity of defense operations. The UCS team analyzed how sea level rise is likely to affect storm surge inundation, tidal flooding, and permanent inundation of each site, and their analysis indicates that within the next three decades, these installations will be forced to manage more frequent flooding of all types. The same analysis found that by the end of the century, eight bases may lose a quarter to half of their land, and “Four installations—Naval Air Station Key West, Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Dam Neck Annex, and Parris Island—are at risk of losing between 75 and 95 percent of their land.”⁴⁰ This report provides a new angle on how decision makers need to consider coastal impacts. To date, much attention has focused on how sea level rise will exacerbate the damage caused by storm surges and affect infrastructure such as piers and dry docks that sit directly against the oceans. However, a number of bases may see even more daunting challenges from what is labeled “nuisance flooding”, or flooding that occurs regularly during extra-high tides.

In January 2018, the DoD published a report which provided Congress with an overview of the risks that climate poses to DoD infrastructure.⁴¹ The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations and Environment, surveyed a wide variety of asset and facilities categories, from training ranges and HQ Buildings, to airfield operations and intelligence systems.⁴² Approximately 50% of the 3,500 sites worldwide

reported effects resulting from flooding, drought, extreme temperatures, wind, and wildfire—with some facilities experiencing two or more effects. Over 25% of all sites were effected by flooding of some sort.⁴³ Data from the report illustrates that effected facilities are in every state (see below map).⁴⁴

Map 7 - Sites that Indicated Effects from Multiple Vulnerability Areas (Flooding, Extreme Temperatures, Wind, Drought, Wildfire)



SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, CLIMATE-RELATED RISK TO DoD INFRASTRUCTURE INITIAL VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT SURVEY (SLVAS) REPORT, JAN. 2018, 6.

HIGHLIGHT: Nuisance Flooding: Far More Than Just a “Nuisance”

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) describes nuisance flooding as flooding that “causes such public inconveniences as frequent road closures, overwhelmed storm drains and compromised infrastructure.” According to that same report, so-called nuisance flooding “has increased on all three U.S. coasts, between 300 and 925 percent since the 1960s.”⁴⁵

The term “nuisance,” defined as “a person, thing, or circumstance causing inconvenience or annoyance”⁴⁶ does not accurately capture the increasing extent of this type of flooding, and the damages it causes. Given the frequency and extent of the damage to military infrastructure and surrounding support communities from these regular flooding events, the term “nuisance” implies a significant underestimation of the risks associated with it.

All of these reports vary in methods, research discipline, and geographic or installation focus. Yet there are several clear trends in their recommendations for how research and policy responses should continue. These include the need for:

- Assessing sea level rise interactions with other coastal events;
- Addressing the near-term risks of sea level rise; and
- Embracing a range of projections and scenarios

Assessing how sea level rise interacts with other coastal events

The scientific community, the DoD, and other independent researchers are now looking at the interaction between sea level rise and factors such as storm events, tides, and land subsidence, in order to better understand how their effects may “layer” upon one another. The 2016 DoD scenario work includes vertical land change, extreme water level events such as storm surges, and extreme high tides. The UCS findings were based on an analysis of how sea level rise would influence the range of impacts caused by storm surges, permanent inundation, and tidal flooding. Likewise, the 2016 SERDP report (citing a 2014 study) noted:

“...often when sea-level change scenarios are merged with extreme water level conditions, the focus has been on rare events, such as hurricanes. But evidence is growing that the less severe but more frequent events (that will become even more frequent in the future) are of consequence and need to be factored into decisions.”⁴⁷

This type of research and its results are not limited to installations on the continental United States. New modeling conducted by the US Geological Survey as part of a study on DoD installations uses techniques that consider the interaction of higher sea levels with storm-induced “wave-driven” flooding that can be found on Pacific atolls. The results indicate that low-lying atolls may experience more severe inundation sooner than previously estimated, with “wave-driven water levels” causing twice as much land area to be flooded than currently predicted.⁴⁸ The multitude of dynamics captured in these and the other recent analyses are providing a more complete – and hopefully more realistic – understanding of the challenges that lie ahead for coastal military installations.

Addressing and integrating the near-term risks of sea level rise

The timeframe for identifying and projecting impacts is moving closer to the present. Projections of past decades tended to focus on climate change effects that were predicted to occur in the latter half of this century, often in the 2075-2100 timeframe. While long-term projections are important, the effects of climate change are already impacting coastal military installations.⁴⁹ Planners need to know what they may face in the coming decades. The 2016 SERDP report examines scenarios for 2035, 2065, and 2100, which were chosen

to align with various infrastructure investment time horizons. The UCS study authors used 2050, 2070, and 2100 for their analysis, and the authors of this report chose to focus on 2050 and 2070 for mapping and analysis. For the nearest term, the aforementioned GAO report authors interviewed officials at U.S. domestic and international installations, and the DoD's 2018 SLVAS report broadly surveyed military installations to identify the types of effects that are already occurring.⁵⁰

There is an extensive list of infrastructure at coastal installations that is slated for either upgrade or replacement. Integrating efforts to deal with sea level rise into already planned or forecasted construction design and execution will eliminate project duplication or conflicts in project execution, and can permit the development of realistic long-term infrastructure programming.

Embracing a range of projections

Finally, there is a growing consensus that planners and policy makers must consider a range of projections to inform their decisions. This concerted shift has taken root in the past few years, and shows a new mindset.⁵¹ In the past, a common tendency was to plan for median or most-likely scenarios as a singular “answer” to the question of what future impacts to expect. Analytical efforts conducted since 2015 show a distinct move toward including worst-case, best-case, and extreme-event projections in advice provided to decision makers.⁵² This diverse portfolio of scenarios allows planning and investment decisions that will account for a broader range of possibilities. Additionally, different scenarios can serve as tools for different planning functions. For example, those planning for the engineering and construction of more permanent critical infrastructure, such as cyber and communications architecture, may need to account for the more extreme plausible scenarios. Whereas, officials more focused on movable activities may be more likely to plan against most-likely changes to their respective locations.

Rain and heavy winds from Hurricane Isabel flood portions of Fleet Parking at Naval Station Norfolk, Va. September 2003.
US NAVY / PHOTOGRAPHER'S MATE 1ST CLASS MICHAEL PENDERGRASS.



VI COMBINED RISK OUTLOOK BASED ON RECENT STUDIES

The research to date paints a picture of the increasing exposure to sea level rise faced by military installations along the U.S. coastline and around the world. As early as 2050, the low-lying parts of some bases along the East and Gulf coasts of the United States could be underwater for “10 to 25 percent of the year” which, defense leadership has acknowledged, would have a significant impact on their ability to support military operations.^{53 54} According to the SERDP 2016 report, (and corresponding to data in the most recent *Climate Science Special Report*), under scenarios projecting a global average sea level rise of 3.3 feet (1 meter) or higher in 2065 and 2100, some DoD sites, including many in the northeastern U.S., will experience an additional 0.7 to 1.6 feet (0.2 to 0.5 meters) over the global average. In 2011 and 2014, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers produced a report also using a “multiple-scenario approach,” and suggested that a global mean sea level rise scenario of “1.5 meters by 2100” be used for planners (4.9 feet), but that “2.0 meters,” or 6.6 feet, “is a credible upper bound.”⁵⁵ These multiple-scenario exercises do not give us perfect information about risks to specific installations, but when the research is aggregated, they tell us enough to be able to plan against a wide range of scenarios. It is also important not to overlook the less dramatic but more frequent “slow-onset” events, such as so-called “nuisance” or “problem” flooding, which present consistent and sustained risk. The cost of such flooding to infrastructure and military readiness can be significant, and the risk is far more omnipresent than the more extreme short-duration flooding events.

Based on a review of existing research, this report concludes that sea level rise, coupled with projections of increasingly frequent and intense storms, present significant risks to critical coastal military installations at home and abroad. Further, this report concludes that these climate risks are already being experienced, and are likely to increase significantly during all the timescales explored in the recent literature – between 2035 to 2100. The following is an assessment of how current and future sea level rise-related risks to high value coastal U.S. military infrastructure will present risks to our nation’s military readiness, operations, and strategy.

VII DISCUSSION: SEA LEVEL RISE AND MILITARY READINESS, OPERATIONS, AND STRATEGY

The installations examined closely in this report (see page 26-48 for a list of case studies) represent only a portion of the high-value coastal military installations the United States possesses. Additional research, building from the 2016 SERDP report, and the 2018 DoD SLVAS report, is needed for a more comprehensive and detailed global survey of sea level rise implications for readiness, operations and strategy. Nonetheless, the risks to these sites alone pose significant challenges to the U.S. military. As is made clear by the reports mentioned above, and the case studies below, sea level rise and storm surge are already affecting a number of installations that support critical operations.⁵⁶

Throughout the course of the 21st century, even the best-case sea level rise scenarios will effect a broad range of sites that provide critical operational capabilities to the U.S. military, while the medium and worst-case scenarios present risks that could significantly impair the military's overall mission. That mission rests on three critical capabilities and measures of effectiveness for the U.S. Military:

- Readiness
- Operations
- Strategy

These three pillars of military effectiveness are expounded upon in the following chart, illustrating how sea level rise, in a broad sense, affects each. Based on this typology of military effectiveness, we have conducted a review of sea level rise risks to coastal installations as defined by their current and projected effects on military readiness, operations, and strategy. This review is limited by available data on both the exposure of military infrastructure to sea level rise, and projections for how that exposure will affect the military's current and future missions.

TABLE 1: Climate Change, Readiness, Operations and Strategy

	Definition - from DoD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms ⁵⁷	Example of how sea level rise could affect coastal installation
Readiness	Readiness — The ability of military forces to fight and meet the demands of assigned missions. See also national military strategy. ⁵⁸	Sea level rise may compromise coastal military installations that are critical for supporting, materially and logistically, timely operations.
Operations	<p>“Operational readiness — The capability of a unit/formation, ship, weapon system, or equipment to perform the missions or functions for which it is organized or designed. Also called OR. See also combat readiness.”⁵⁹</p> <p>Operational Effectiveness - Measure of the overall ability of a system to accomplish a mission when used by representative personnel in the environment planned or expected for operational employment of the system considering organization, doctrine, tactics, supportability, survivability, vulnerability, and threat.”⁶⁰</p>	<p>“Installation operations are likely to be affected by climate change. Lands required for training and testing operations may be reduced due to more frequent flooding, long term inundation, and coastline erosion.”⁶¹</p> <p>“Strategy — A prudent idea or set of ideas for</p>
Strategy	<p>employing the instruments of national power in a synchronized and integrated fashion to achieve theater, national, and/or multinational objectives. (JP 3-0)”</p> <p>“National military strategy — A document approved by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for distributing and applying military power to attain national security strategy and national defense strategy objectives. Also called NMS. See also national security strategy; strategy; theater strategy. (JP 1)”</p> <p>“Theater strategy — An overarching construct outlining a combatant commander’s vision for integrating and synchronizing military activities and operations with the other instruments of national power in order to achieve national strategic objectives. See also national military strategy; national security strategy; strategy. (JP 3-0)”</p> <p>Climate change will impact military and national</p>	<p>security strategy as it changes the current geographies of instability, affects geopolitical relationships, and influences the operations necessary to fulfill that strategy. Climate risks can increase the likelihood of militaries being called on to respond to conflicts, or provide post-conflict assistance. These evolving dynamics will necessitate adjustments to military strategies. Climate change will present additional challenges to areas of the world that are of strategic significance to the United States, for example the Middle East and North Africa,⁶² and the South China Sea.⁶³</p> <p>“Climate change — Variations in average weather</p>
Climate change	conditions that persist over multiple decades or longer that encompass increases and decreases in temperature, shifts in precipitation, and changing risk of certain types of severe weather events.” ⁶⁴	

READINESS AND OPERATIONS

A number of recent studies demonstrate that the effects of sea level rise on U.S. military installations, both at home and abroad, may have a significant impact the military's overall readiness. From the 2013 SERDP report:

“The effects of climate change will adversely impact military readiness and DoD natural and built infrastructure unless these risks are considered in DoD decisions. Environmental factors are already affecting DoD installations; as the climate continues to change, the nature and severity of these stressors will change as well. Many of the problems caused by changing climate stressors are expected to affect facilities located on and near the coasts; other impacts may affect inland installations as well. Considerations of future climate conditions need to be incorporated into the planning, design, and operations of military facilities, as well as in the strategic infrastructure decisions facing the military Services and DoD as a whole”⁶⁵

U.S. installations house, or are the launching point for an array of defense operations at home and overseas. Damage caused by singular disasters or the long-term effects of sea level rise could create serious lags in repair, maintenance, and scheduled operations for naval and coast guard vessels. If personnel cannot access their work sites for significant periods of time the follow on effects could disrupt force deployments and on-going operations.

Crewman Qualification Training students hit the surf at the Silver Strand beach in Coronado, California. September 2008.
DVIDsHUB / PETTY OFFICER 2ND CLASS CHRISTOPHER MENZIE



The 2015 Quadrennial Energy Review stated that “Department of Energy analysis examining the effects of climate change on infrastructure exposure to storm surge and sea level rise found that vulnerabilities are likely to increase for many energy sector assets.”⁶⁶ Electricity supply, cyber infrastructure, utility corridors, water supply, storm water conveyance systems and other civil infrastructure utilized by military installations may see reduced reliability, both during a storm surge and as an effect of longer-term processes exacerbated by sea level rise such as saline intrusion.⁶⁷ Flooding and tidal inundation may also impact the functionality of communications or surveillance equipment. Long-term civilian planning for climate adaptation in surrounding areas or communities may affect the options available to military installations, but can also act as an opportunity to improve resilience in ways that benefit military infrastructure and readiness.

Loss of training days caused by flooded ranges and training areas can also affect military readiness. Coastal erosion and flooding that accompany sea level rise can permanently damage or destroy training and testing areas that are difficult or costly to replicate, such as those used for amphibious assault training, coastal maneuver corridors, amphibious landing locations, airfields, and beach/bay training areas. Flooding impacts on transportation networks can impede operations that require cargo and personnel to be moved quickly and safely.⁶⁸ The Army listed climate change and extreme weather as “an emerging encroachment issue,” in its contribution to the DoD 2017 Sustainable Ranges Report to Congress, which highlighted the devastating impacts of flooding at both Fort Jackson in South Carolina, and Fort Benning in Georgia, resulting in “excessive damages to buildings, infrastructure, maneuver training lands, and range facilities...as well as impacts to unit training schedules.”⁶⁹

Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island, South Carolina, are illustrative cases. Under plausible scenarios, in 35-55 years, low-lying areas of these facilities could be underwater around one third of the year, which could have implications for amphibious assault training and other essential training functions at these installations.⁷⁰ Short-term alteration or cancellation of training activities due to flooding or erosion can have broader repercussions on monthly or yearly training schedules, as these changes may necessitate costly modifications to training facilities or changes in support personnel scheduling.⁷¹

The risks that sea level rise poses to military installations can also impact the ability to effectively carry out operations in support of their assigned missions, such as search and rescue and humanitarian assistance and disaster response. For example, under plausible highest-case sea level rise scenarios, half of the land area of U.S. Coast Guard Station Sandy Hook in New Jersey could be flooded by extreme tides in 2070, which could significantly impede search and rescue operations in the area.⁷² ⁷³ Naval Air Station Key West in Florida, which under all predictions may face regular extreme flooding during high tides by 2070, houses a Joint Interagency Task Force that coordinates counter-narcotics operations in Latin America and the Caribbean.⁷⁴ The loss of functionality poses challenges to maintaining operational capacity at these important coastal installations, and may drive difficult choices in the future.

The 2014 GAO report details another compelling example – in this case, the impact of sea level rise on the deployment of Navy submarines. As officials at Navy installations conveyed to the authors:

“...sea level rise and resulting storm surge are the two largest threats to their waterfront infrastructure. For example, they explained that they were planning to lengthen a Los Angeles–class submarine to convert it to a training platform and that this will entail cutting the submarine in half. During this process, the submarine will sit in a dry dock with its interior open. Officials explained that they were concerned about possible storms and associated storm surge, noting that if salt water was allowed to flood the submarine’s systems, it could result in severe damage. Such damage would delay completion of the submarine’s lengthening by 3 to 4 months. Officials from another Navy shipyard we visited stated that flooding of a submarine in dry dock could result in catastrophic damage inside the submarine and additional, severe damage to equipment on the floor of the dry dock.”⁷⁵

These threats go beyond the Navy and the Marine Corps. Langley Air Force Base, which is low lying and faces significant exposure to sea level rise and storm surge risks, is home to the majority of the U.S. military’s F-22 force, as well as the 480th Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance Wing. This is the heart of the Air Force’s Distributed Common Ground Station that drives primary intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance planning and execution for global operations. Disruptions to this base could have significant consequences for military operations across the globe.

Key operational hubs outside the United States also face significant exposure to sea level rise. Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, for example, is home to a joint U.K.-U.S. military facility that provides support for a range of critical war-fighting operations in the region, including as a staging area for special operations forces, submarine support for those special operations, and long-range bomber flights into Afghanistan.⁷⁶ ⁷⁷ Diego Garcia is, however, a low-lying atoll whose natural barriers to accelerating sea level rise and storm surge (coral reefs) are being significantly degraded by climate trends.⁷⁸ Projections for increasing hurricane intensity in the near-term increase its exposure even further, thus presenting a critical risk to US operations in a politically volatile region.⁷⁹

As the risk of more frequent or even cascading flooding at multiple bases grows with sea level rise, so does the risk of significant delays in depot level maintenance of ships, submarines and squadrons. This could lead to deployment delays that increase the risk that U.S. forces will not be able to adequately respond to threats and crises within their desired timeframes. Even a few days’ delay in responding to a threat such as sea mines in a maritime choke point could have significant implications for global security.

FIGURE 2: Contrasting Installation Sea Level Rise Vulnerability - The Importance of Place

	Naval Station Norfolk	Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton
Mission	Provides fleet support and facilities to ensure readiness for the US Atlantic Fleet	Amphibious assault training center supporting combined air, sea, and ground combat training
Setting	Located in a major metropolitan area of 4300 acres in Hampton Roads area of Virginia at the confluence of the Elizabeth and James Rivers	Primarily natural, undeveloped areas of 125,000 acres along the exposed Southern California coast between Orange County and San Diego
Stressors	Co-occurrence of storm surge, high tides and increasing sea level with heavy precipitation	Co-occurrence of large waves, high tides and increasing sea level
Pathways	Inundation and flooding from elevated sea level, but limited morphologic change	Beach and bluff erosion driven by the combined effect of waves and increasing sea level
Impact	Critical aboveground “built” infrastructure assets such as piers, pylons, distribution lines, and generators	Amphibious training areas, groundwater supply systems, and coastal natural resources

Source: This is a reproduction of a figure from ‘Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications’, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 2013, pg 17.

STRATEGY

Current understandings of the physical impacts of sea level rise on coastal installations raises questions around broader strategic impacts as climate change accelerates. How might military engagement and security cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region be affected if U.S. and partner-country installations are altered dramatically by sea level rise in the coming decades? How will sea level rise impacts on key nuclear installations affect the U.S. ability to maintain a secure and effective nuclear deterrent? If extreme weather events flood coastal military installations, how will this impact the military’s ability to respond to potential humanitarian disasters caused by this extreme weather?

There is an inherent element of uncertainty in assessing these risks and formulating robust responses. However, making decisions in an environment of uncertainty around future sea level rise, its impact on coastal military installations and consequences for readiness, operations and strategy, requires a skill set the national security community has developed for other circumstances. National security decision makers are beginning to apply this framework to decisions around climate risks, by using a range of possible scenarios, rather than determining a ‘most likely’ future condition.⁸⁰

For example, the key objectives of DoD’s Asia-Pacific Maritime Security Strategy are to ensure continued freedom of the seas, deter conflict and coercion, and promote adherence to international law and standards.⁸¹ The resilience and location of key operational capabilities in the Asia-Pacific region are also important for



The Military Sealift Command fleet ocean tug USNS Apache, and the Safeguard-class rescue and salvage ship USS Grapple endure a rare snow storm on board Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek, Va. February 2015.

US NAVY / PHOTOGRAPHER'S MATE 2ND CLASS DANIEL J. MCLAIN

the fulfillment of broader strategic goals of the military. As noted by Constantine Samaras in “The U.S. Asia-Pacific Rebalance, National Security and Climate Change”:

“The DoD estimates the replacement value of the structures they use in the Pacific to be nearly \$180 billion, which is greater than the combined 2014 annual budgets of the Departments of Commerce, Energy, Homeland Security, State, and Transportation. Given that level of government investment, DoD has recognized that climate resiliency at existing facilities should be integrated at the installation, Service and Departmental levels. Yet it is important that climate change impacts not be treated as just an environmental challenge, but be recognized as an issue that will define the landscape in which the future unfolds. In the rebalance to Asia, the choice of installation locations and the types of investments at each location enable a set of military capabilities in both the near- and long-term. The implementation of the rebalance provides an opportunity to assess the impacts of climate change on Pacific installations, estimate the corresponding effects on capabilities, and most importantly, take action to keep these capabilities going forward.”⁸²

Sea level rise at just one site can have a significant impact on strategy. Hampton Roads, Virginia, dubbed “the greatest concentration of military might in the world” by former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, is by itself an invaluable operational and strategic hub for both the United States and its allies.⁸³ It is home to NATO’s Allied Command Transformation, U.S. Fleet Forces Command, the U.S. Air Force’s Air Combat Command, U.S. Marine Corps Forces Command, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, and is the backbone of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet. It is also a low-lying site and very exposed to sea level rise and storm surge. If significant portions of the Hampton Roads infrastructure, including Naval Station Norfolk, were regularly inundated, as is projected under a number of scenarios for the years 2035-2100, the impediment to force deployments for critical Atlantic, Mediterranean and Pacific war-fighting and humanitarian operations – many of which are tied to core strategic goals of the United States – would be significant.⁸⁴ Due to these

risks to high-value operational and strategic capabilities, military planners have begun to make plans for adapting facilities to cope with a two-foot rise in sea level over the next 35 years.⁸⁵

A number of strategically-significant installations outside the United States also face exposure to sea level rise. The Marshall Islands in the Pacific hosts the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site, a pillar of U.S. Strategic Command, and a main missile testing asset for the DoD. The site allows the immediate detection of any missile launch emanating from Asia and prepares the United States against the possibility of nuclear attacks.⁸⁶ Given its location, it also acts as a strategic territorial bulwark in a time when the Chinese military is growing in strength and force projection. This strategic asset is under considerable risk. The Marshall Islands have seen the increasingly intense impact of storms and sea level rise, and recent studies suggest that they may become uninhabitable in mere decades.⁸⁷ Additional examples of the plausible strategic impacts of sea level rise are listed in the following chapter's case studies.



The Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands. August 2015. US ARMY

Despite these strategic concerns, a comprehensive assessment of sea level rise and broader climatic impacts on U.S. military and national security strategy has not yet been conducted. As noted in a 2013 SERDP report:

“...operations affecting mission readiness for a majority of installation personnel are likely to be deemed critical. Failure pathways should be evaluated critically. Climate change may reveal new vulnerabilities not previously considered. **At a strategic level, a similar analysis of the criticality of assets to mission accomplishment can be conducted [emphasis added].** This will help the military Services and DoD to focus vulnerability and impact assessments on the highest priority assets.”⁸⁸

Conducting assessments of strategic impacts will, however, not be sufficient. As illustrated by the variance in responses to a department-wide survey on the effects of climate to installations, and as noted in some of the DoD's most recent work on this topic, “[o]utside of decisions explicitly associated with climate change mitigation and adaptation, many climate-sensitive decisions are not currently recognized by decision-makers as such.”⁸⁹ Therefore, information on the implications of sea level rise risks to military installations,

and how it affects military and national security strategy, will need to find its way to senior leadership in order to drive high-level adjustments in strategic thinking about climate impacts. This includes ensuring that senior leadership accounts for increased demand for DoD humanitarian and disaster response capabilities as a result of climatic shifts. This should in turn drive prioritization of investments in the climate resilience of key, strategic defense installations.⁹⁰

HIGHLIGHT: Strategic Implications - The U.S. Asia-Pacific Rebalance

Sea level rise can present challenges for the U.S. military's existing strategic priorities. As noted by researcher Costas Samaras:

“More than 40,000 DoD buildings sit on Pacific installations and sites comprising more than 1,400 square miles, or 21 times the size of Washington, D.C. The [security environment in] Asia sets up a range of long-term choices about how the Department plans for the future, yet it is infrastructure that provides the footing for the objectives of its [long term strategy in this region]. U.S. bases in the Pacific serve many different roles

as they enable major systems, including force projection, training, equipping, Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR), supply, humanitarian, and other critical missions. These bases are a visible component of the U.S. security commitments to its allies, and are critical for deterrence, reassurance, and ensuring regional stability. Climate change impacts such as increased heat, changes in precipitation, and sea level rise will affect the performance and life cycle costs of DoD's existing and planned infrastructure, which will affect the military capabilities of the Pacific installations. Hence...DoD needs to ensure the military capabilities enabled by installations in the Pacific are maintained under a changing climate.”⁹¹



Source: Constantine Samaras, 'U.S. Military Basing Considerations during a Rebalance to Asia: Maintaining Capabilities under Climate Change Impact,' in 'The US Asia-Pacific Rebalance, National Security and Climate Change', The Center for Climate and Security, 2015.

VIII CASE STUDIES

The global reach of the U.S. military depends both on facilities that it operates within the continental United States (CONUS), as well as installations located in U.S. territories, and in allied and partner nations around the world. Many of these face significant challenges due to sea level rise and storm surge. Below is a brief survey of the risks to key, high-value coastal military installations, and the potential impact on readiness, operations and strategy. These cases are organized alphabetically by location. For information on the methodology and sources for the maps created by the Center for Climate and Security, see page 58.

California

Naval Base Coronado and Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. Naval Base Coronado is home to a number of installations including Naval Amphibious Base Coronado, one of the country's two amphibious training bases, and Naval Air Station North Island, part of the Navy's largest aerospace-industrial complex. At these sites, much of the critical infrastructure is located in low-lying areas. This includes runways, as well as facilities for weapons and munitions storage, aircraft and ship maintenance, and berthing. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton is home to a broad array of training facilities used by a variety of agencies and for a variety of purposes, including maintaining combat readiness for Fleet Marine Force units.

In an analysis from 2014, SERDP found that Naval Base Coronado has a:

“...high sensitivity...to inundation and flooding as a function of the generally low-lying nature of the installation, and the significant exposure along the open shoreline of the Pacific. For training areas, this translates into inundation impacts with average beach widths reduced to about 29% for 1.0 m SLR, and further reductions to a remaining area of 5% for 2.0 m SLR.”⁹²

The same analysis found overall financial vulnerability estimates for Camp Pendleton ranging from \$1 million to \$1600 million under a 6.6 feet (2 meter) sea level rise scenario.⁹³

U.S. Navy Gunner's Mate 3rd Class Dakota Griffin waits for personnel to debark a landing craft, air cushion onto a beach landing site aboard Camp Pendleton Calif., during Composite Training Unit Exercise. March 2015. DVIDsHUB / CPL. ELIZE MCKELVEY





SOURCE: NPR

Diego Garcia

Diego Garcia, a low-lying atoll in the Indian Ocean, is home to a joint U.K.-U.S. military facility that provides logistics and operations support for U.S., U.K. and Allied forces in the region. Navy Support Facility Diego Garcia replenishes naval surface combatants and guided-missile nuclear-powered submarines (SSGN) capable of carrying out strike and special operations.⁹⁴ Its Air Expeditionary Wing supports both tactical aircraft and long range strike operations occurring in Afghanistan.

Diego Garcia is also used for Special Forces staging and the prepositioning of Army and Marine Corps brigade sets.⁹⁵ Most of Diego Garcia does not exceed 6.5 feet (2 meters) in elevation. While mean sea level has actually been falling at this installation, it is vulnerable to increasing hurricane intensity in the near-term, and will be increasingly vulnerable to extreme water level events as sea level rise accelerates.⁹⁶ Additionally, as the corals surrounding the atoll are degraded by rising water temperatures or ocean acidification, the islet will become more vulnerable to wave attack, erosion and salinization of freshwater supplies.⁹⁷

Naval Support Facility
Diego Garcia.
MIRANDA MELCHER, WORD
PRESS






More than 70 aircraft fill U.S. Naval Air Station Key West Boca Chica Field's ramp; a facility for air-to-air combat fighter aircraft of all military services and provides world-class pierside support to U.S. and foreign naval vessels. January 2014.
US NAVY / MASS COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST 2ND CLASS BRIAN MORALES


Florida

Eglin Air Force Base, Naval Air Station Key West and Naval Station Mayport. These three installations based in Florida are critical testing, training and operational hubs, supporting important military operations in Latin America and the Caribbean. Eglin is a weapons training site and operational launch pad for the 7th Special Forces Group, whose area of responsibility includes 32 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, and which has also been active in supporting the missions in Iraq and Afghanistan.⁹⁸ Many of the base's test facilities, as well as its radar and communications systems, sit at low-elevation along the Gulf Coast, and are vulnerable to hurricane winds and storm surge - particularly the parts of the base on the Santa Rosa Barrier Island.⁹⁹



SOURCE: GOOGLE

Naval Air Station Key West is a training facility for tactical aviation squadrons from all branches of the Armed Forces, and houses important commands including Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATFS), which plays a significant operational role in countering narcotics trafficking - a core element of the U.S. counter-narcotics strategy in the region.¹⁰⁰ The JIATFS mission may change throughout the remainder of the 21st century, but it will likely continue to do interagency intelligence fusion, and moving the task force would carry a significant cost. As Naval Air Station Key West is located entirely on low-lying keys that



Naval Air Station Key West, FL.

MAP SOURCE: THE CENTER FOR CLIMATE AND SECURITY, PRODUCED FOR THIS REPORT.

- At-Risk Sites
- ◆ Electric Substation
- Electric Power Transmission Line
- Installation Boundaries (MIRTA)
- Sea Level Rise at 2050 (Average Daily Sea Level)
- Minimum Annual Flood Event at 2050 (99% Annual Exceedance Level)

cannot be protected by seawalls or levees, training and operations could be significantly affected by sea level rise, increased storm surge and attendant flooding, if alternative solutions are not implemented. Recent studies suggest that in 35 years, “extreme tide flooding could affect half of the station’s land area,” and by 2070 “daily high tides could flood 70-95 percent of Naval Air Station Key West.”¹⁰¹

Naval Station Mayport is the third-largest fleet concentration area in the US, and rising sea levels may have an increasingly significant impact on its ability to carry out mission requirements as time progresses. The most significant impact on the installation will likely come from recurrent flooding and flood events rather than from the permanent submergence of critical installation assets. As time progresses and overall water



Naval Station Mayport, FL.
THE CENTER FOR CLIMATE AND SECURITY, PRODUCED FOR THIS REPORT.

- At-Risk Sites
- ◆ Electric Substation
- Electric Power Transmission Line
- Installation Boundaries (MIRTA)
- Sea Level Rise at 2050 (Average Daily Sea Level)
- Minimum Annual Flood Event at 2050 (99% Annual Exceedance Level)

levels rise, current natural coastal defenses will prove less effective against storm surge up the St. Johns River. While such events may not pose a significant threat to military platforms, as ships do not remain in impacted ports during hurricanes, they will certainly impact base utilities, and could damage pier-side logistics and maintenance facilities.

According to our analysis, by 2050 NS Mayport's stormwater retention ponds and its current storm drainage outlets will most likely lay below sea level. Their permanent inundation would significantly reduce the ability of the installation to drain excess water. Annual flood events may also begin to have an impact on the ability of the installation to fulfill its mission requirements. Flood waters will most likely reach the current location of command and control, and logistics infrastructure near the basin at the center of the base, and are expected to impact several of the wharfs at this point. Flood events by 2050 are anticipated to impair both the transportation connections between the base and the surrounding community, and the installations' energy infrastructure. By 2070 flood events will impact a variety of command and control, personnel support, and logistical facilities, as well as public works facilities, including the base's wastewater management and refueling operations.

NS Mayport currently uses off-site power generation, and the electrical substations that the base depends on are located in low lying areas which will be impacted by annual flood events in the next few decades. Additionally, the connections between these substations and the regional power grid pass over areas that are highly susceptible to flooding, and damage to such connections during a storm or hurricane event may result in extended reliance on on-site energy generation. This risk to NS Mayport's energy security presents opportunities to explore alternative forms of energy generation.

Georgia

Hunter Army Airfield and Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay. Hunter Army Airfield supports nearby Fort Stewart with command, control, training, administration, logistical and civilian-military support; the Stewart/Hunter Military Complex is the Army's largest East Coast installation.¹⁰² The airfield features the longest runway on the East Coast (11,375 feet/3467 meters), a 350+ acre aircraft parking area, as well as a sizeable Arrival/Departure facility and nearby railhead, which facilitate

deployment of the 3rd Infantry Division from Fort Stewart.¹⁰³ Hunter Army Airfield is also home to Coast Guard Air Station Savannah, which is the largest helicopter unit in the Coast Guard and performs search and rescue functions in the area.¹⁰⁴ Although current flooding at the airfield primarily affects wetlands, the installation is dependent on materials and equipment arriving at the port in nearby Savannah, an area which is projected to flood 10 times a year on average in the latter half of the century.¹⁰⁵ This tidal flooding can also affect low-lying roadways and neighborhoods in the area, impacting housing and base access for workers and personnel. A quarter of the base is currently exposed to flooding from a Category 1 hurricane; this is projected to increase to 30-45 percent by the end of the century. A Category 4 storm in 2100 under the highest scenario would expose three quarters of the base to flooding, with more than half of that 10 feet (3 meters) or more deep.¹⁰⁶

Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay is the east coast homeport to six Ohio-class Trident ballistic missile submarines (SSBN) and two Ohio-class guided missile submarines (SSGN).¹⁰⁷ The SSBN deterrent mission is "to preserve world peace by remaining an undetected, battle ready presence as the most reliable deterrent against attack."¹⁰⁸ Nuclear submarine deterrent patrols in the Atlantic Ocean embark from Kings Bay where the SSGN mission is to "provide the Navy with unprecedented strike and special operation mission capabilities from a stealthy, clandestine platform. Armed with tactical missiles and equipped with superior communications capabilities, SSGNs are capable of directly supporting Combatant Commander's strike and Special Operation Forces (SOF) requirements."¹⁰⁹

Kings Bay holds five tenant commands: the Naval Submarine Support Center; the Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic; the Submarine Group 10; the Trident Refit Facility; and the Trident Training Facility. The Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic (SWFLANT) provides strategic missiles and weapons system support and provides support for guided missile submarines. SWFLANT is responsible for assembling the D-5 missile and processing missile guidance and launcher subsystem components. The Trident Refit Facility's mission is to provide industrial and logistics support for overhaul, modernization, and repair of Trident submarines and to provide global submarine supply support. The Trident Training Facility plays an essential role for the U.S. Navy, providing training in the operation and maintenance of Trident ballistic missile submarines and guided missile submarines and systems.¹¹⁰




Aerial Photo of King's Bay Naval Base. April 2001. EDIBOBB

The base currently experiences occasional tidal flooding in low-lying wetland areas. According to the UCS scenario analysis, the base would flood with every tide by 2070 under the highest scenario, reducing the protection these areas provide to inland parts of the base. Other low-lying areas of the base could become unusable land in the next 35 years, and by the end of the century tidal flooding is highly likely to inundate the roadways in the southern part of the base. A Category 1 hurricane currently exposes half of the base to storm surges, and about a fifth of it to 5 feet (1.5 meters) or more of flooding. By the end of the century, this type of storm would expose half of the base to this depth of flooding. Under the highest scenario, a Category 4 storm at the end of the century would expose 95 percent of the base to more than 20 feet (6.1 meters) of flooding.¹¹¹ Flooding of the surrounding community may also significantly hinder the movement of personnel and logistical support to and from the base.

This portends potential catastrophic impacts to the readiness and responsiveness of our strategic nuclear submarine force. The strategic deterrent mission at Kings Bay began in 1978 and has continued well beyond the end of the Cold War. Currently the Navy is performing development and design work on a new class of ballistic missile submarines, the Columbia class, to replace the Ohio-class Trident submarines as they reach the end of their service lives.¹¹² Therefore, continuous at-sea deterrent patrols are planned to continue into the second half of this century as Kings Bay grows ever more vulnerable to rising seas, storm and flooding.

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE KINGS BAY. MAP SOURCE: UCS, THE US MILITARY ON THE FRONT LINES OF RISING SEAS, 2016.





U.S. Marine Corps helicopter flies over a simulated amphibious beach assault at Marine Corps Base Hawaii. July 2014.

DoD / MASS COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST 1ST CLASS CHARLES E. WHITE

Hawaii

Though historical problems with storms and tsunamis have resulted in the construction of many U.S. military sites in Hawaii on higher ground (e.g. Schofield Barracks, Wheeler AAF), a number of Hawaii's critical defense installations are at or close to sea level. The islands house more than 100,000 active duty, National Guard, and Reserve forces and their dependents.¹¹³ The functions of these personnel and the sites at which they work range from serving as the headquarters of U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) and Pacific Fleet (the largest fleet command in the world), to contributing to the world's largest maritime defense force exercises, to civil defense and homeland security support, to hosting specialized chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear response forces. The scale of operations launched from military bases in Hawaii, ranging from humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations, to important mil-mil exercises with partner nations in the broader Asia-Pacific region, is significant.

These operations, launched from Hawaiian defense sites, form the backbone of the U.S. Asia-Pacific strategy in the region, which is designed to bolster support for U.S. allies and partners, expand partnerships with emerging economies, defend freedom of movement in critical geostrategic waterways, such as the South China Sea, and foster both competition and cooperation with China.


Sea level rise and storm surge are projected to affect installations at sea level in Hawaii, such as Pearl Harbor, Hickam and Kaneohe Bay, which could place strains on USPACOM's and the Pacific Fleet's capacity to mobilize quickly in support of both humanitarian and strategic missions. As a 2010 statewide assessment concluded, "The emerging consensus in Hawaii and the Pacific islands is that we will face a suite of challenges due to climate change; but the most immediate threat, and the one that we can most directly address is sea level rise."¹¹⁴

Maine

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is one of only four naval shipyards in the country, and only one of two facilities on the East Coast. It repairs, overhauls and modernizes the U.S. Navy’s nuclear powered submarines.¹¹⁵

According to a recent analysis: “By 2050, low-lying areas in this region could experience between 80 and 190 floods per year—compared to fewer than a dozen currently—depending on the scenario.”¹¹⁶ These flood events are projected to impact the service and construction facilities along the installation’s western edge. Crane tracks and maintenance facilities face impact along the river, and the northwest utilities corridor is projected to face occasional flooding. Of key concern is inundation of the shipyard’s drydocks.

By the end of the century, areas currently key to operations could become part of the tidal zone, and extreme tides could bisect the shipyard around a dozen times per year. Within this same timeframe, around a quarter of the base would be exposed to storm surges more than 5 feet (1.5 meters) deep from a Category 1 hurricane.¹¹⁷ By 2070, flooding in the drydock areas is all but certain if preventive measures are not taken, and inundation is also expected to impact maintenance, foundry, and construction facilities. Local communities in New Hampshire and Maine that support the shipyard, especially workers, already face challenges due to flooding of public road infrastructure, which is projected to increase with modest levels of



PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIP YARD.
 MAP SOURCE: THE CENTER FOR CLIMATE AND SECURITY,
 PRODUCED FOR THIS REPORT.

- At-Risk Sites
- ◆ Electric Substation
- Electric Power Transmission Line
- Installation Boundaries (MIRTA)
- Sea Level Rise at 2070 (Average Daily Sea Level)
- Minimum Annual Flood Event at 2070 (99% Annual Exceedance Level)

sea level rise.¹¹⁸ Access to the shipyard will also be inhibited as the annual flood events begin to effect Clarks Island and one of the shipyard's gates. These events, if not mitigated, would dramatically impede the ability to conduct and complete critical maintenance on the U.S. nuclear submarine fleet.

Unlike several other installations, Portsmouth does not face critical energy security vulnerabilities. The DoD Environmental Security Technology Certification Program provided funding for the development of a microgrid control system at the Shipyard. The microgrid allows the installation to shed nonessential loads and prioritize mission-critical systems in the event of a power-outage. The system also includes on-site generation and a battery energy storage system. This type of technology, if implemented on other military installations, could potentially be successful in mitigating the risk that storm surge, extreme weather, and sea level rise may have on energy infrastructure and critical operations.

Marshall Islands

The Marshall Islands, once the site of U.S. nuclear weapons testing, now support a variety of important military missions. The Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site, based in the Kwajalein Atoll and extending into nearly 700,000 square miles of surrounding ocean, is a key DoD asset for testing missile and missile defense systems and conducting work for U.S. Strategic Command, NASA, and other agencies. Kwajalein also hosts the new billion dollar “Space Fence” radar system and operations center that contribute to space situational awareness for U.S. forces.¹¹⁹ There, as described by *The Washington Post*, “the United States can practice launching or deflecting nuclear attacks, provide a territorial bulwark against China, immediately detect any launches out of Asia, and provide a rocket-launch apparatus to civilian companies such as SpaceX.”¹²⁰

The Marshall Islands have seen increasingly intense impacts of storms and sea level rise, both of which will continue to intensify in the decades to come. Regular headlines and multiple academic studies speak to the growing realization that the Marshall Islands may become uninhabitable in the decades ahead.¹²¹ One 2015 USGS-led study showed that for this and other low-lying Pacific Islands, “the combined effect of storm-induced wave-driven flooding and sea level rise on island atolls may be more severe and happen sooner than previous estimates of inundation predicted.”¹²² As a result, the country’s leaders are now playing a more prominent role in international diplomatic and legal mechanisms to reduce risks from both nuclear weapons and climate change, which many of its citizens link as comparable existential threats. Accordingly, if no measures are taken, the threat to military installations on these islands is also clear and existential.


Top: Kwajalein Atoll Satellite Image. April 2005. NASA

Bottom: MV Delta Mariner docks at Meck Island with support equipment for use in the Missile Defense Agency’s program. January 2009. U.S. MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY



Maryland

U.S. Naval Academy. The U.S. Naval Academy educates and trains future professional officers in the Navy and Marine Corps.¹²³ UCS analysis suggests that “[i]t is currently exposed to periodic tidal flooding, and by 2070 these flood-prone areas could be underwater 85 percent of the time, affecting up to 10 percent of the academy’s land area. By the end of the century, Category 2 hurricanes could expose a third of the academy to a 5-10 feet (1.5-3 meters) deep storm surge.”¹²⁴ These effects would render the current site of the U.S. Naval Academy unusable. Indeed, current tidal flooding is already a problem for workers residing in the surrounding community.¹²⁵ Therefore dramatic adaptation projects, including time-phased plans to protect and improve protection, must be considered in strategic infrastructure planning.




U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD.
MAP SOURCE: UCS, 2016.

New Jersey

U.S. Coast Guard Station Sandy Hook.

U.S. Coast Guard Station Sandy Hook houses response boats and Coast Guard cutters. It performs search and rescue operations and is responsible for law enforcement, environmental protection, and coastal security for waterways in the region.¹²⁶ This includes aforementioned key radar and VHF-FM communications equipment for the vessel traffic service in New York City, and a boat maintenance facility.¹²⁷ By 2070, extreme tides could expose over half of the base to flooding, and by the end of the century up to three quarters of the station's current land could flood daily with high tides. By 2100 a Category 1 hurricane could, under one high-impact set of scenarios, flood up to 80 percent of the base with a 5-10 feet (1.5-3 meter) deep storm surge.¹²⁸ Given that the base was severely crippled by Superstorm Sandy, and is not yet fully reconstituted today, this is not by any means an abstract projection.¹²⁹



SANDY HOOK, N.J.
MAP SOURCE: UCS, 2016.

Sailors load a patrol boat onto a trailer at U.S. Coast Guard Station Sandy Hook during hurricane relief efforts in Highlands, N.J. **US NAVY / MASS COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST 1ST CLASS MARTIN CUARON**



North Carolina

Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune. Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune is one of the United States Marine Corps' most important training bases. The base is home to amphibious assault training facilities and live fire ranges that not only serve to train marines, but also active-duty forces from the Navy, Army, Air Force and Coast Guard. Six additional nearby facilities, including Marine Corps Air Station New River, support the base.


Tidal flooding does not affect a high percentage of the base's area at present, but by 2035 Onslow Beach, a key barrier island which protects the northern side of the New River outlet, may be very much at risk to both sea level rise and flooding. The loss of such an island can increase the risk for storm surge vulnerability further up the river on base.

By 2070, extreme high tides are projected to flood roadways and further low-lying areas, including barrier islands and ocean-facing coast and river shorelines, some of which will be underwater 10-35 percent of the time. By 2100, flood events could span multiple high tide cycles, permanently inundating the base's barrier island 45-90 percent of the year. In this timeframe 25 percent of the base is exposed to flooding from a Category 1 hurricane, and a Category 4 storm exposes 40 percent of the base to flooding, 20 percent of it more than 20 feet (6.1 meters) deep.¹³⁰ Further, many of the housing, logistics, training, administrative, ammunition storage, and impact ranges at Camp Lejeune are clustered along the New River Estuary and along the ocean facing beaches.¹³¹ Among the impact ranges affected would be the MCB Rifle Range and the K-2 Impact Range. The Courthouse Bay area near the New River Inlet, as well as the built up area between the InterCoastal Waterway and Onslow Beach, would be especially vulnerable. The movement of personnel and logistics to and from Camp Lejeune will also likely be impeded by flooding of the main transportation infrastructure connecting Jacksonville and Wilmington.

Amphibious Assault Vehicles storm the beaches of Camp Lejeune, N.C., during a capabilities exercise. May 2005.

US NAVY / PHOTOGRAPHER'S MATE 3RD CLASS JULIANNE F. METZGER

Source: US DoD, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 'Shoreline Evolution and Coastal Resiliency at Two Military Installations: Investigating the Potential for the Loss of Protecting Barriers'




Marine Corps leadership has called energy a “critical vulnerability to [their] expeditionary capability,” and acknowledged that they “simply cannot meet [their] obligations to [the] country without reliable, sustainable and efficient energy to operate and train forces for assigned missions.”¹³² Power transmission along submerged roadways is vulnerable to storm and flood events; for instance, Category One Hurricane Matthew caused flooding which downed power lines for both the base and the surrounding community.¹³³ Resilience measures such as hardening infrastructure, improving energy efficiency and deploying distributed generation and advanced control systems can mitigate the impact on missions in case of a grid outage. The Marine Corps, recognizing this, has recently taken steps to understand and improve energy resilience on base. They have added on-site photovoltaic power generation, and identified HVAC upgrades, micro-grid, and battery storage at Camp Lejeune as potential projects which could mitigate future risk to the base’s missions.¹³⁴

South Carolina

Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort and Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island. Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort hosts Marine Corps and Navy fighter and attack squadrons, and has one of the world's largest airstrips. It is currently home to six Marine Corps F/A- 18 squadrons and one F-35B Fleet Replacement Squadron constituting all of the Marine strike fighters on the East Coast. When the transition to the F-35B is complete, all Marine and British pilots and maintenance personnel will be trained at Beaufort.^{135 136} Close to a quarter of the Marine Corps' entire inventory of tactical fighters will be homebased there, and the investment in Beaufort to support the F-35B runs into hundreds of millions of dollars.¹³⁷ Any curtailing of operations in Beaufort will have far-reaching consequences for both the U.S. and the United Kingdom. Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island is one of two places where Marine recruits are trained. A naval hospital and housing complex are adjacent to these sites.

Rising sea levels will create a number of critical vulnerabilities which could erode Parris Island's ability to fulfill its training mission requirements. The base is low-lying and exposed to the sea, but protected by surrounding wetlands. The wetlands will absorb much of the incoming water at first, but as sea levels rise and the wetlands are permanently lost, the installation will lose the natural protection from storm surges that such areas provide. Permanent inundation and land loss will present challenges to installation access, flooding at housing and barracks, damage to training locations, exposure to ecological and environmental hazards from an on-base superfund site, and critical damage to utilities such as storm water drainage, waste water treatment, electricity, and steam heating.

- At-Risk Sites
- ◆ Electric Substation
- Electric Power Transmission Line
- Installation Boundaries (MIRTA)
- Sea Level Rise at 2050 (Average Daily Sea Level)
- Minimum Annual Flood Event at 2050 (99% Annual Exceedance Level)



U.S. MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT PARRIS ISLAND. MAP SOURCE: THE CENTER FOR CLIMATE AND SECURITY, PRODUCED FOR THIS REPORT.

At present, tidal flooding affects low-lying areas on Parris Island around 10 times annually; by 2050 these areas may be underwater around one third of the year. As soon as 2035 rising sea levels will potentially impact the land connections between the installation and the mainland as well as transit routes within the installation. Later in the century, extreme tides could flood 85 percent of Parris Island around 10 times a year, and by 2100, three quarters of the island would be inundated daily by high tides. Both Beaufort and Parris Island are also exposed to storm surges, with 90 percent of Parris Island currently exposed to 5-10 feet (1.5-3 meters) of flooding from a Category 1 hurricane. By 2100, this increases to 70 percent of the installation exposed to 10-15 feet (3-4.6 meters) deep flooding. A Category 4 storm in 2100 would flood 90 percent of Parris Island and the third of MCAS Beaufort with more than 20 feet (6.1 meters) of water.¹³⁸

Installation energy security will also become a critical vulnerability as sea levels rise. Electrical transmission lines currently pass along roads that will be inundated with tidal flooding and stormwater. This may significantly increase the installation's reliance on in-site power generation as electrical utilities may preemptively cut off power transmission to prevent the possibility of live power in standing water. Storm damage to these lines will also be more challenging to repair, as the flooded roadways will impede their access. After Hurricane Matthew, the Marine Corps was forced to evacuate recruits from Parris Island until conditions were deemed safe and essential utilities were restored.¹³⁹ In an effort to offset this vulnerability and boost mission resilience, the Marine Corps is in the process of installing distributed power generation, including photovoltaics, energy storage, and micro-grid technologies.¹⁴⁰

One analysis shows that under some scenarios, by 2050, the training mission will begin to face significant impact from higher flood events. Training ranges, the urban operations training area, parade decks, and barracks will face at least partial flooding several times during the year. Parts of several ranges will be lost completely by the latter half of this century, and access to the southern part of the base may be cut off completely. All these scenarios have the potential to significantly reduce Marine recruit training days. While such training could theoretically be relocated, Parris Island offers unique and ideal conditions for the kind of training Marines require. Further, the best candidates for Marine training sites are along coastlines – with low-lying coastlines being particularly optimal. Such relocation would be undesirable, potentially costly and politically difficult, with implications for military readiness and operations. Without mitigating actions, the Marines ultimately may lose much of Parris Island to water.

U.S. MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT PARRIS ISLAND, SC.

MAP SOURCE: THE CENTER FOR CLIMATE AND SECURITY, PRODUCED FOR THIS REPORT.



- At-Risk Sites
- ◆ Electric Substation
- Electric Power Transmission Line
- ▭ Installation Boundaries (MIRTA)
- ▭ Sea Level Rise at 2070 (Average Daily Sea Level)
- ▭ Minimum Annual Flood Event at 2070 (99% Annual Exceedance Level)



The lone ship at the pier at the Naval Station, Norfolk, Va., USS Kearsarge endures the rain and heavy winds from Hurricane Isabel. September 2003. US NAVY / PHOTOGRAPHER'S MATE 1ST CLASS MICHAEL PENDERGRASS.

Virginia

Hampton Roads. In the Hampton Roads area of Virginia, natural subsidence, low-lying topography and changing ocean circulation patterns are contributing to a higher rate of sea level rise than the global average. Each military branch has facilities in Hampton Roads, with over 100,000 military and 40,000 civilian personnel serving in the area. Major military units and headquarters in Hampton Roads include NATO's Allied Command Transformation, U.S. Fleet Forces Command, the U.S. Air Force's Air Combat Command, U.S. Marine Corps Forces Command, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, and the largest regional concentration of U.S. Coast Guard capabilities and personnel. The collective operational and strategic value of these commands cannot be overestimated, as they serve as centers for fulfilling U.S. strategic objectives in the Pacific, the Middle East and North Africa, and Europe.

As mentioned previously, Joint Base Langley-Eustis houses most of the F-22 force as well as the 480th Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance Wing. This is the heart of the Air Force's Distributed Common Ground Station, which supports a broad array of global operations through primary intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance planning. Many of these critical, strategic defense assets in Hampton Roads, essential for overall military readiness and a range of critical operations, are quite vulnerable to sea level rise. According to NOAA's 2017 assessment, the rapid rate of sea level rise is occurring faster in Hampton Roads than the global average.¹⁴¹ The site already experiences an increase in periodic flooding of its low-lying areas. Commanding Officers at Naval Station Norfolk, a key installation in the Hampton Roads region, have reported that increased flooding on and off base creates frequent interruptions to day-to-day base operations, which costs time, attention, and budgetary resources.¹⁴²



- At-Risk Sites
- ▭ Installation Boundaries (MIRTA)
- ▭ Sea Level Rise at 2070 (Average Daily Sea Level)
- ▭ Minimum Annual Flood Event at 2070 (99% Annual Exceedance Level)

Naval Station Norfolk is a maximum of 10 feet (3 meters) above sea level.¹⁴³ Low-lying areas of the base flood periodically and in 35 years may be underwater 10 percent of the year.¹⁴⁴ By the end of the century, 10-60 percent of the station may be exposed to extra-high tides, with up to 20 percent of its land becoming permanently inundated.¹⁴⁵ All of Naval Station Norfolk is exposed to flooding from a Category 3 or 4 hurricane today. With sea level rise continuing at current rates, 55-95 percent of the station would be exposed to flooding more than 10

feet (3 meters) deep from a Category 4 storm in 2070-2100. Category 1 storms over the same time periods expose 35-75 percent of the station to flooding, with about 15 percent of the station below 5 or more feet (1.5 meters) of water by the end of the century.¹⁴⁶ Nearby Joint Base Langley-Eustis faces even more significant risks, with the highest plausible scenario in a recent study suggesting significant daily flooding by 2050.¹⁴⁷ In 2003, Hurricane Isabel, the costliest disaster in the history of Virginia, crippled the operational mission at Langley Air Force Base.¹⁴⁸

Driven by the importance of the federal presence to the regional economy (near 40% of regional GDP), from June 2014 to June 2016 the Hampton Roads region participated in one of three DoD pilot projects - convened to prepare the U.S. for the impacts of climate change.¹⁴⁹ More than 200 regional professionals from academia, federal, state and local governments, and a variety of non-profits and private businesses worked together, participating in voluntary working groups, committees, and stakeholder events to develop recommendations and strategies for cooperative resilience planning using a whole of government and community approach.¹⁵⁰

Washington, DC

Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling and Washington Navy Yard. Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling (JBAB) is situated between the Potomac and Anacostia rivers in Southeast DC, and is comprised of the former Naval Support Facility Anacostia and the former Bolling Air Force Base.¹⁵¹ JBAB hosts the Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters, which provides military intelligence to policymakers and force planners in the DoD and intelligence community.¹⁵²

By 2050, the tidal flooding which already periodically affects low-lying areas of JBAB could occur twice a day, and by 2070 roughly half of JBAB could flood daily, becoming part of the tidal zone.¹⁵³ By the end of the century, a Category 1 hurricane could expose 65-75 percent of the base to flooding, and under the highest scenario a Category 4 storm could flood 75 percent of Bolling AFB and over 95 percent of NSF Anacostia, over half of which would be more than 5 feet (1.5 meters) deep.¹⁵⁴ Severe infrastructure damage or outages could affect secure communications capabilities for a significant number of senior Air Force leaders.

Washington Navy Yard is home to the Commander of Navy Installations Command, as well as several other commands including the Naval Sea Systems Command, Naval Facilities Engineering Command and Naval Installations Command.¹⁵⁵ According to a recent study, “In the highest scenario, 30 percent of the base’s land area becomes part of the tidal zone by the end of the century, and a Category 4 hurricane could expose 75 percent of the base to a storm surge, although a portion of its land area has enough elevation to not be flooded.”¹⁵⁶ Critical equipment and communications infrastructure, including classified intelligence systems, and military housing would all be at risk. The Blue Plains waste treatment plant, already at risk, is building a sea wall designed to withstand a 500-year interval storm surge.¹⁵⁷

Aerial view of Navy Yard in the S.W. quadrant, Washington, D.C.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS / CAROL M. HIGHSMITH



HIGHLIGHT: Arctic Infrastructure

While risks to infrastructure in and near the Arctic were not a focus of this study, they should not be ignored or underestimated. As highlighted in a 2014 GAO study of climate risks to military infrastructure:¹⁵⁸

“At 8 out of 15 locations we visited or contacted, officials stated that they had observed rising temperatures and associated potential impacts or mission vulnerabilities, as described by DoD in the [Arctic] Roadmap. For example, the combination of thawing permafrost, decreasing sea ice, and rising sea level on the Alaskan coast have led to an increase in coastal erosion at several Air Force radar early warning and communication installations. According to installation officials, this erosion has damaged roads, utility infrastructure, seawalls, and runways. For example, at one radar early warning installation, 40 feet of shoreline has been lost as a result of erosion and the erosion has damaged half of the runway. As a result, only small planes or helicopters are able to land in this location, as opposed to larger planes that could land on the runway when it is fully functional. This means that access to the radar installation is limited. At another radar early warning installation, increased erosion has damaged a seawall, allowing increasingly large waves to damage the overrun area of a runway. According to installation officials, daily operations at these types of remote radar installations are at risk due to potential loss of runways, and such installations located close to the coastline could be at risk of radar failure if erosion of the coastline continues.”

Further research into implications for readiness, operations and strategy needed

Despite existing information about the projected extent of sea level rise and storm surge for coastal military installations in the 21st century, a more granular understanding of impacts is needed. Developing comprehensive, concrete, and accurate assessments of how sea level rise can impact readiness and operations requires detailed, site-specific examinations of installations’ and the surrounding community’s geographical features, and their exposure to extreme water levels, as well as an understanding of the “human terrain” of a region. Systematically combining this analysis with assessments of installations’ missions and activities, and how they relate to the coast, can help create vulnerability assessments specific to individual installations; these in turn can inform planning for how to maintain military readiness and infrastructure, part of which may involve prioritizing critical installation functions.¹⁵⁹

Work to develop these tools and frameworks is underway, alongside other efforts to integrate climate information into DoD readiness and mission requirements. These tools will form an important basis for more in-depth analysis of the implications of these challenges for military readiness and operations. For the most part, however, analysis of these third-order impacts on military strategy remains to be undertaken.


HIGHLIGHT: Protecting the “Jewels in Our Crown of Capability”

In a July 2016 speech, retired General Ron Keys, United States Air Force (former commander of Air Combat Command, headquartered at Langley AFB), described his concerns regarding sea level rise risks to some of Virginia’s key defense sites:

“[W]e have 19 bases that we consider jewels in our crown of capability that are going to be affected by sea level rise. And it doesn’t have to rise eight feet. It only has to rise a couple of inches, and a good nor’easter pulls in, and all of a sudden we’re under water. If you look at Langley Air Force Base where our Raptors reside, it’s only seven feet above mean sea level right now. The problem is the land is subsiding, sea level is rising, the currents are changing. We could, in about fifteen years, have 100 days of tidal flooding. Which means with just the normal high tide, we lose access to certain parts of our base...”

We need to start considering, what can we do? Now I can build a moat, or a barrier around Langley Air Force Base, but the problem is a lot of my people live in Newport News, live in Hampton. A lot of my electricity comes in from outside. My fuel comes in from outside. So at some point we get to the point: ‘I’ve got to move to higher ground.’ And we have started talking about that because that’s going to be a bloodletting when we tell the Congressman from Virginia that we’re picking up Langley Air Force Base and we’re going to Oklahoma. That’s not going to play well. So we need to start talking about that.”¹⁶⁰

Source: CNA Military Advisory Board Report, “National Security and the Accelerating Risks of Climate Change”



IX CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report finds that over the course of the 21st century, the U.S. military's coastal military installations, domestically and internationally, face significant risks from climate-related effects, namely sea level rise and the interaction of sea level rise with an increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. This report also finds that these risks, if not sufficiently mitigated, may eventually have wide-ranging effects on the military's ability to effectively fulfill its mission. This includes effects on military readiness, military operations and military and national security strategy. This report also concludes that policies and plans for addressing these risks will have to be commensurate to a scale of risk that goes beyond infrastructure resilience. Indeed, climate change effects such as sea level rise are not just an installation and facility issue for U.S. military forces, and these broader implications must be both better understood, planned for and prevented. The complex relationships to global readiness and responsiveness must be explored down to the operational level, across the Services and Joint forces, and to a strategic level as well. Given that these conclusions are widely shared by the DoD, the report authors recommend that policy-makers support comprehensive and preventive measures, in the near term, to address these risks. In this context, the Military Expert Panel offers the following specific recommendations.

1. Continuously identify and build capacity to address infrastructural, operational and strategic risks.

All of the country's defense installations, and the sites from which U.S. defense forces operate globally, support DoD's ability to perform its steady-state work, conduct whatever missions arise, and meet the goals established by the national security strategy. The types of impacts highlighted in this report, and past reports by the DoD and others, may indeed already be driving new operational and strategic risks, and will likely drive more in the future. In this context, policy-makers need to help bolster the DoD's capacity for comprehensively addressing the operational and strategic risks associated with a changing climate. For example, the DoD's 2015 SERDP report suggests a "systematic approach for monitoring and recording disaster losses and hazard events at military installations";¹⁶¹

2. Integrate climate impact scenarios and projections into regular planning cycles.

Military installations undergo regular maintenance and upgrades, often according to predictable cycles. Where it is not doing so already, the DoD and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) – for Coast Guard installations – should fold current and projected climate impact analyses into the plans used to make decisions as routine assessments and investments are made, and policy-makers should robustly support the recommended infrastructure modifications that flow from those analyses. Infrastructure modifications are long term (decades) in their execution, and the necessity for preparatory work must be understood. Policy-makers should therefore support long range planning and infrastructure upgrades and modifications that reduce and mitigate flood risks, as well as more short-notice funding as unforeseen risks become apparent. Additionally, the DoD and DHS should integrate climate change metrics and catastrophic weather event

scenarios into their assessment planning and vulnerability ratings in their Critical Infrastructure Protection Plans and seek out opportunities to build more resilient infrastructure;

3. Make climate-related decisions that incorporate the entire spectrum of risk projections.

If, continuing the trend of recent years, scenarios and projections of coastal impacts continue to grow more worrisome as they are refined, the defense community should assume that some of what we now believe are worst-case scenarios may actually become the median or even best-case scenarios. Put simply, the world is already seeing effects that are worse than projections of past decades indicated they would be – and they are occurring much earlier than the timescales predicted in the past. While trends may change, in terms of risks to defense readiness and budgets, it is possible that what we now see as worst-case effects may not actually be the worst we will see in the future. To ensure that the DoD is adequately prepared, policy-makers should support decisions by the DoD that take a full range of risk level projections and scenarios into account;

4. Model catastrophic scenarios and incorporate into planning and war-gaming exercises.

To fully understand the range of risks that could be triggered by the types of effects highlighted in this report and others, the U.S. government should begin to model impacts at a few critical bases, and their surrounding support communities, that are likely to see the most severe effects. This analysis should begin with installations that host unique functions not conducted at many other installations – for example, those that repair and refuel nuclear-powered naval assets – and should use the most severe credible scenarios developed to date for those sites. Things to consider would be warning times, dispersal options, impact on surrounding communities, impact on transportation and energy infrastructure, and impacts on supported forces;

5. Work with international counterparts at key coastal bases abroad.

The examples cited in this report for coastal risks globally show the importance of proactively working with allies and partners on risks to key defense sites. This international cooperation should take several forms, depending on the risks most relevant to the defense equities of each country involved. U.S. defense forces already conduct humanitarian assistance and disaster relief exercises that take climate trends into account. Other productive cooperative activities could include sharing sea level rise projections relevant to military and coast guard facilities, and sharing lessons regarding U.S. bases already being impacted by sea level rise, such as the critical defense sites in the Virginia Beach-Hampton Roads area. Where data or projections of relevant areas outside of U.S. territory need updating, DoD and other government agencies should seek to develop them in cooperation with other countries. This should include cooperation in reviewing whether data can be leveraged from existing terrestrial monitors and remote sensing assets.

Whether conducted bilaterally or multilaterally, this work can help fulfill U.S. strategic goals by increasing awareness of global operating environments, building the capacity of allied and partner nations, strengthening relationships in key regions such as the Asia-Pacific, and competing for influence with other global powers;

6. Track trends in climate impacts as uncertainty levels are reduced.

The scientific community will continue to reduce uncertainties related to projections of the coastal impacts of sea level rise and storm surge. As uncertainties are reduced, government and non-governmental experts should track whether the overall picture of possible impacts becomes worse or better. Decision makers will need confidence in the degree to which environmental trends are following model projections, and that they have time to change course if past projections are wrong (e.g., if sea level rise effects, flooding, and disasters are more extreme or otherwise different from what previous projections indicated). A 2016 DoD report indicated that this must extend to identifying the conditions under which weather and climatic impacts are most likely to prevent the conduct of specific missions. These variables “should be tracked and documented over time to ensure mission sustainability.”¹⁶² Tracking these trends, and identifying climate conditions that prevent specific missions, can be incorporated into existing processes, such as the planning work already conducted for the use of testing and training ranges;

7. Maintain close collaboration with adjacent civilian communities.

Many coastal installations are inextricably linked to neighboring “support communities” that provide housing for military personnel at the installation, the homes for critical personnel who work at the installation, and in some cases lifeline utility support for the installation. As the military continues to develop its plans for dealing with sea level rise and other climate-related effects at installations, it becomes critical to not only include civilian support communities in planning efforts, but also to determine how military and civilian communities can best work together to optimize the results. The efforts underway in the Hampton Roads area are indicative of the level of cooperation that can be established among multiple military services and the communities with which they work on a daily basis.

8. Continue to invest in improvements in climate data and analysis.

Throughout the process of producing this study, it became increasingly clear that the lack of trend data on sea level rise and storm surge implications regarding loss of training days, damage to equipment and infrastructure, repair and maintenance costs, and risks to support communities that are critical to base operations, is hindering proactive decision-making. This is the case for defense sites at home and abroad. While U.S. leaders will have to act in the face of uncertainty to prevent climate change from impairing operations, readiness, budgeting, and installation management, better data will help facilitate effective planning. Luckily, DoD recognizes the challenge. Even in its 2016 SERDP report, one of the most extensive bodies of work to date on climate impacts to coastal military sites, the authors note, “The limitations of currently available data sources and the manner in which the global models are used to provide information affected the manner in which scenario information could be provided spatially and temporally.”¹⁶³ As the authors explain, in many cases a lack of even basic information, such as tide gauge data, created difficulties in projecting future sea level rise and other issues. The difficulties were compounded for areas for which topographic or bathymetric data were relatively poor. In summary, the DoD report concludes that the “importance cannot be overstated” of improving data quality and consistency.¹⁶⁴ Many of the department’s ongoing studies of climate change effects in coastal areas are designed to help fill data gaps. Support for these projects and their expansion will be critical.

Notes

- 1 USGCRP, 2017: Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, 470 pp., doi: 10.7930/J0J964J6.
- 2 Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018), 7.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Hall, J.A., S. Gill, J. Obeysekera, W. Sweet, K. Knuuti, and J. Marburger. 2016. Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for Department of Defense Coastal Sites Worldwide. DoD: 2016.
- 5 Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018), 7.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Andrew Revkin, "Trump's Defense Secretary Cites Climate Change as National Security Challenge," ProPublica, March 14, 2017. https://www.propublica.org/article/trumps-defense-secretary-cites-climate-change-national-security-challenge?utm_campaign=bt_twitter&utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social.
- 8 United States Department of Defense, Base Structure Report, Fiscal Year 2015 Baseline, 2014.
- 9 Constantine Samaras, 'U.S. Military Basing Considerations during a Rebalance to Asia: Maintaining Capabilities under Climate Change Impact', in 'The US Asia-Pacific Rebalance, National Security and Climate Change', The Center for Climate and Security, 2015.
- 10 United States National Intelligence Council, 'National Intelligence Assessment on the National Security Implications of Global Climate Change to 2030', 2008.
- 11 Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018), 2.
- 12 See for example, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. 2016. Climate-Sensitive Decision-Making in the Department of Defense: Synthesis of Ongoing Research and Current Recommendations. US Department of Defense; the US Geological Survey's research project 'The Impact of Sea-Level Rise and Climate Change on Pacific Ocean Atolls that House Department of Defense Installations', <http://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/climate-change/atolls/>.
- 13 J. Walsh, D. Wuebbles, K. Hayhoe, J. Kossin, K. Kunkel, G. Stephens, P. Thorne, R. Vose, M. Wehner, J. Willis, D. Anderson, S. Doney, R. Feely, P. Hennon, V. Kharin, T. Knutson, F. Landerer, T. Lenton, J. Kennedy, and R. Somerville, "Our Changing Climate," Chapter 2, Climate Change Impacts in the United States: The Third National Climate Assessment, ed. J. M. Melillo, Terese (T.C.) Richmond, and G. W. Yohe U.S. Global Change Research Program, 2014, 19-67, doi:10.7930/J0KW5CXT, cited in Samaras, 'U.S. Military Basing Considerations during a Rebalance to Asia: Maintaining Capabilities under Climate Change Impact', 2015.
- 14 A. Parris, P. Bromirski, V. Burkett, D. Cayan, M. Culver, J. Hall, R. Horton, K. Knuuti, R. Moss, J. Obeysekera, A. Sallenger, and J. Weiss, "Global Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States National Climate Assessment," US Department of Commerce, 2012.
- 15 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 and 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 and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- 16 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 'Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications', US Department of Defense, 2013, 5.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Constantine Samaras, 'U.S. Military Basing Considerations during a Rebalance to Asia: Maintaining Capabilities under Climate Change Impact', in 'The US Asia-Pacific Rebalance, National Security and Climate Change', The Center for Climate and Security, 2015, 34-35.
- 19 United States Senate Committee on Armed Services, Confirmation hearing of Mr. James N. Mattis to be Secretary of Defense, Thursday, June 12, 2017. Source: Andrew Revkin, "Trump's Defense Secretary Cites Climate Change as National Security Challenge," ProPublica, March 14, 2017. https://www.propublica.org/article/trumps-defense-secretary-cites-climate-change-national-security-challenge?utm_campaign=bt_twitter&utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social.
- 20 C. Field, V. Barros, T. Stocker, Q. Dahe, D. Jon Dokken, G. Plattner, K. Ebi, S. Allen, M. Mastrandrea, M. Tignor, K. Mach, P. Midgley, "Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation," Special Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- 21 Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018), 17-18.
- 22 Hall, J.A., S. Gill, J. Obeysekera, W. Sweet, K. Knuuti, and J. Marburger. 2016. Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for Department of Defense Coastal Sites Worldwide. U.S. Department of Defense, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. 2-14. <https://www.serdp-estcp.org/News-and-Events/News-Announcements/Program-News/DoD-Report-on-Regional-Sea-Level-Scenarios>.

- 23 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, "Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications", US Department of Defense, 2013, 3.
- 24 The works cited in this report all have their limitations, in no small part due to the data limitations with which the authors and analysts themselves contended. The CCS Military Expert Panel has ensured this report references only analyses it finds credible and reliant on valid methods and models, while noting the improvements still needed to ensure U.S. leaders and defense installation managers can effectively plan for the types of challenges this report outlines.
- 25 USGCRP, 2017: Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, 470 pp., doi: 10.7930/J0J964J6.
- 26 Government Accountability Office, "Climate Change Adaptation: DoD Needs to Better Incorporate Adaptation into Planning and Collaboration at Overseas Installations," p. 77, November 2017, <https://www.gao.gov/assets/690/689077.pdf>.
- 27 Government Accountability Office, "2017 High Risk List," <https://www.gao.gov/highrisk/overview>.
- 28 DoD Office of Net Assessments, "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and its Implications for National Security," October, 2003, <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA469325>.
- 29 For example, see the chronology of US Government, Defense resources on climate change and security at The Center for Climate Change and Security, <https://climateandsecurity.org/resources/u-s-government/defense/>.
- 30 United States Department of Defense, DoD Directive 4715.21, "Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience", January 2016, <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/471521p.pdf>.
- 31 Department of Defense, "Quadrennial Defense Review Report," 2010, http://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/features/defenseReviews/QDR/QDR_as_of_29JAN10_1600.pdf.
- 32 Ibid, 85.
- 33 Ibid, 85.
- 34 U.S. Government Accountability Office, "DoD Can Improve Infrastructure Planning and Processes to Better Account for Potential Impacts," Report to Congressional Requesters, May 2014.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Ibid.; According to one report, "The coastal environs provide a strategic place in which DoD and the military Services can pilot efforts to develop appropriate policy and guidance related to climate change response and, further, to develop the institutional arrangements necessary to implement, learn from, and update such policy and guidance over time." Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, "Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications", US Department of Defense, 2013, 3.
- 37 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, "Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications", US Department of Defense, 2013.
- 38 U.S. Government Accountability Office, "DoD Can Improve Infrastructure Planning and Processes to Better Account for Potential Impacts," Report to Congressional Requesters, May 2014, 12-13.
- 39 Hall, J.A., S. Gill, J. Obeysekera, W. Sweet, K. Knuuti, and J. Marburger. 2016. Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for Department of Defense Coastal Sites Worldwide. U.S. Department of Defense, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. 224 pp. <https://www.serdp-estcp.org/News-and-Events/News-Announcements/Program-News/DoD-Report-on-Regional-Sea-Level-Scenarios>.
- 40 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas," Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-us-military-bases#.V6eMeE0rKGB>.
- 41 Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018).
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Ibid
- 45 NOAA, "What is nuisance flooding?", <http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/nuisance-flooding.html>.
- 46 Oxford Dictionaries, "Definition of Nuisance," <http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/nuisance-flooding.html>.
- 47 Hall, J.A., S. Gill, J. Obeysekera, W. Sweet, K. Knuuti, and J. Marburger. 2016. Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for Department of Defense Coastal Sites Worldwide. U.S. Department of Defense, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. ; William V. Sweet and Joseph Park, "From the extreme to the mean: Acceleration and tipping points of coastal inundation from sea level rise," Earth's Future, 2579–600, 2014.
- 48 Curt D. Storlazzi, Edwin P.L. Elias & Paul Berkowitz, 'Many Atolls May Be Uninhabitable Within Decades Due to Climate Change', Scientific Reports 5, Article number: 14546 (2015) doi:10.1038/srep14546, part of the US Geological Survey's research project 'The Impact of Sea-Level Rise and Climate Change on Pacific Ocean Atolls that House Department of Defense Installations.'
- 49 Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018), 2.

- 50 "Government Accountability Office, "Climate Change Adaptation: DOD Needs to Better Incorporate Adaptation into Planning and Collaboration at Overseas Installations," p. 77, November 2017."; Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018).
- 51 Hall, J.A., S. Gill, J. Obeysekera, W. Sweet, K. Knuuti, and J. Marburger. 2016. Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for Department of Defense Coastal Sites Worldwide. (DoD, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program: April 2016).
- 52 Ibid.
- 53 Spanger-Siegfried et al., "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas," Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016.
- 54 Secretary of Defense Leon E. Panetta, in a speech to the Hampton Roads Chamber of Commerce, Hampton Roads, VA, Friday, October 19, 2012, <http://archive.defense.gov/Speeches/Speech.aspx?SpeechID=1729>.
- 55 USACE. 2011. Sea-Level Change Considerations for Civil Works Programs. EC 1165-2-212. Washington, D.C.: USACE, and USACE. 2014. Procedures to Evaluate Sea Level Change: Impacts, Responses, and Adaptation. Engineer Technical Letter 1100-2-1. Washington, D.C.: USACE, cited in Hall et al., 2016. Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for Department of Defense Coastal Sites Worldwide. U.S. Department of Defense, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program.
- 56 The 2016 DoD Strategic Sustainability Plan asserts that climate change is a threat to military installations and their missions not just in the future, but today. DoD, Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan FY 2016 (Sept. 7, 2016).
- 57 The DoD Dictionary of Military Terms, http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 'Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan, Fiscal Year 2010', US Department of Defense, August 2010, <http://www.denix.osd.mil/sustainability/upload/DoD-SSPP-PUBLIC-26Aug10.pdf>.
- 62 Werrell and Femia, "The Arab Spring and Climate Change," A Climate and Security Correlations Series, The Center for Climate and Security, the Center for American Progress, the Stimson Center, 2013.
- 63 M. King, "Climate Change and Vietnamese Fisheries: Opportunities for Conflict Prevention," "The U.S.-Asia-Pacific Rebalance, National Security and Climate Change," Ed. Werrell and Femia, 2015.
- 64 United States Department of Defense, DoD Directive 4715.21, "Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience", January 2016, <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/471521p.pdf>.
- 65 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. 2013. Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications. US Department of Defense, 1.
- 66 Quadrennial Energy Review, Chapter II Increasing The Resilience, Reliability, Safety, and Asset Security of TS&D Infrastructure, 2-2.
- 67 <https://www.serdp-estcp.org/News-and-Events/Blog/Climate-Sensitive-Decision-Making-in-the-Department-of-Defense-Synthesis-and-Recommendations>.
- 68 'Hampton Roads Military Transportation Needs Study, Roadways Serving the Military and Sea Level Rise/ Storm Surge', Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization, 2013, <http://www.hrtpo.org/uploads/docs/Roadways%20Serving%20the%20Military%20&%20Sea%20Level%20Rise-Storm%20Surge%20Report.pdf>.
- 69 Department of Defense 2017 Sustainable Ranges report to Congress, (DoD: February 2017), 7-8.
- 70 Spanger-Siegfried et al., "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas," Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016.
- 71 Department of Defense 2017 Sustainable Ranges report to Congress, (DoD: February 2017), 7-8.
- 72 Kotamarthi, R., L. Mearns, K. Hayhoe, C.L. Castro, and D. Wuebble, 'Use of Climate Information for Decision- Making and Impacts Research: State of Our Understanding'. Prepared for the Department of Defense, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 2016.
- 73 United States Coast Guard, 1st Coast Guard District, 'Special Notice to Mariners', 2001, https://www.uscg.mil/d1/prevention/NavInfo/navinfo/documents/G-Other_Agencies.PDF.
- 74 Spanger-Siegfried et al., "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas," Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016.
- 75 U.S. Government Accountability Office, "DoD Can Improve Infrastructure Planning and Processes to Better Account for Potential Impacts," Report to Congressional Requesters, May 2014, pages 17-18.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 Water C. Ladwig III, Andrew S. Erickson, and Justin D. Mikolay. "Diego Garcia and American Security in the Indian Ocean," in Rebalancing U.S. Forces: Basing and Forward Presence in the Asia-Pacific, eds. Carnes Lord and Andrew Erickson, Naval Institute Press, 2014.
- 78 Quataert, E., Storlazzi, C., van Rooijen, A., Cheriton, O., and van Dongeren, A., 2015, The influence of coral reefs and climate change on wave-driven flooding of tropical coastlines, Geophysical Research Letters, 42, doi: 10.1002/2015GL064861, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064861>.
- 79 Committee on National Security Implications of Climate Change for U.S. Naval Forces, 'National Security Implications of Climate Change for U.S. Naval Forces', Naval Studies Board, Division on Engineering and Physical Sciences, National Research Council (2011).

- 80 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 'Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications', US Department of Defense, 2013, 3.
- 81 United States Department of Defense, Asia-Pacific Maritime Security Strategy, http://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/NDAAP%20A-P_Maritime_Security_Strategy-08142015-1300-FINALFORMAT.PDF.
- 82 Constantine Samaras, 'U.S. Military Basing Considerations during a Rebalance to Asia: Maintaining Capabilities under Climate Change Impact', in 'The US Asia-Pacific Rebalance, National Security and Climate Change', The Center for Climate and Security, 2015, 36.
- 83 Secretary of Defense Leon E. Panetta, in a speech to the Hampton Roads Chamber of Commerce, Hampton Roads, VA, Friday, October 19, 2012, <http://archive.defense.gov/Speeches/Speech.aspx?SpeechID=1729>.
- 84 Spanger-Siegfried et al., "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas," Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016.
- 85 U.S. Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP). "SAB Tours Norfolk." June 29, 2015. <https://www.serdp-estcp.org/News-and-Events/Blog/SAB-Tours-Norfolk>.
- 86 Dan Zak, "A ground zero forgotten: The Marshall Islands, once a U.S. nuclear test site, face oblivion again," The Washington Post, November 27, 2015, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/national/2015/11/27/a-ground-zero-forgotten/>.
- 87 USGS website, <http://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/climate-change/lowLat.html>.
- 88 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 'Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications', US Department of Defense, 2013, 22.
- 89 National Research Council of the National Academies, 'Science and Decisions: Advancing Risk Assessment', Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2009. doi:10.17226/12209, p 4. Cited in Kotamarthi et al., 'Use of Climate Information for Decision-Making and Impacts Research: State of Our Understanding', Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 2016.
- 90 Kotamarthi et al., 'Use of Climate Information for Decision-Making and Impacts Research: State of Our Understanding', Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 2016.
- 91 Constantine Samaras, 'U.S. Military Basing Considerations during a Rebalance to Asia: Maintaining Capabilities under Climate Change Impact', in 'The US Asia-Pacific Rebalance, National Security and Climate Change', The Center for Climate and Security, 2015, https://climateandsecurity.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/ccs_us_asia_pacific-rebalance_national-security-and-climate-change.pdf.
- 92 B. Chadwick, "A Methodology for Assessing the Impact of Sea Level Rise on Representative Military Installations in the Southwestern United States," SERDP, March, 2014, 612.
- 93 Ibid.
- 94 Water C. Ladwig III, Andrew S. Erickson, and Justin D. Mikolay. "Diego Garcia and American Security in the Indian Ocean," in Rebalancing U.S. Forces: Basing and Forward Presence in the Asia-Pacific, eds. Carnes Lord and Andrew Erickson, Naval Institute Press, 2014 (ISBN 978-1-61251-465-9).
- 95 Ibid.
- 96 Committee on National Security Implications of Climate Change for U.S. Naval Forces, 'National Security Implications of Climate Change for U.S. Naval Forces', Naval Studies Board, Division on Engineering and Physical Sciences, National Research Council, 2011.
- 97 Quataert, E., Storlazzi, C., van Rooijen, A., Cheriton, O., and van Dongeren, A., 2015, The influence of coral reefs and climate change on wave-driven flooding of tropical coastlines, Geophysical Research Letters, 42, doi: 10.1002/2015GL064861, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064861>.
- 98 7th Special Forces Group (Airborne) fact sheet, June 2016, <http://www.eglin.af.mil/About-Us/Fact-Sheets/Display/Article/810637/7th-special-forces-group-a>.
- 99 Joseph F. Donoghue, James B. Elsner, Bill X. Hu, Stephen A. Kish, Alan W. Niedoroda, Yang Wang, and Ming Ye, 'Effects of Near-Term Sea-Level Rise on Coastal Infrastructure', SERDP Project RC-1700, March 2013.
- 100 Commander, Naval Installations Command, 'Welcome to Naval Air Station Key West', http://www.cnic.navy.mil/regions/cnrse/installations/nas_key_west.html.
- 101 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Naval Air Station Key West, Florida", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-naval-air-station-key-west-florida#.V6thREOrKgA>.
- 102 'Hunter Army Airfield', <http://www.military.com/base-guide/hunter-army-airfield>.
- 103 Ibid.
- 104 'U.S. Army Garrison, Hunter Army Airfield History', <http://www.stewart.army.mil/units/history.asp?id=186>.
- 105 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-hunter-army-airfield#.V6toak0rKgA>.
- 106 Ibid.
- 107 https://www.cnic.navy.mil/regions/cnrse/installations/navsubbase_kings_bay/about/history.html.
- 108 James Kimber, "Commander, US Strategic Command Addresses Kings Bay Submariners," Jan. 24, 2011. <http://www.stratcom.mil/Media/News/News-Article-View/Article/983636/commander-us-strategic-command-addresses-kings-bay-submariners>.

- 109 http://www.navy.mil/navydata/fact_display.asp?cid=4100&ct=4&tid=300].
- 110 https://www.cnrc.navy.mil/regions/cnrse/installations/navsubbase_kings_bay/about/tenant_commands.html.
- 111 E. Spanger-Siegfried et al, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay, Georgia", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016. <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-naval-submarine-base-kings-bay#.V6toMU0rKgA>.
- 112 <https://fas.org/spp/crs/nuke/RL33640.pdf>.
- 113 James Hosek, Aviva Litovitz, Adam C. Resnick, "How Much Does Military Spending Add to Hawaii's Economy?" RAND Corporation, 2011, http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2011/RAND_TR996.pdf.
- 114 Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, "Hawaii Statewide Assessment of Forest Conditions and Resource Strategy 2010," page 143, http://research.fit.edu/sealevelriselibrary/documents/doc_mgr/436/Hawai'i_Statewide_Assessment_2010_CC_&SLR_Overview.pdf.
- 115 Naval Sea Systems Command, 'Portsmouth Naval Shipyard – Mission', <http://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/Shipyards/Portsmouth/>.
- 116 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Maine", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/07/on-front-lines-of-rising-seas-portsmouth-naval-shipyard.pdf>.
- 117 Ibid, 5.
- 118 Damon Yakovleff, 'Sustain Southern Maine Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment', Greater Portland Council of Governments, December 2013, http://www.cascobayestuary.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/SSM-Sea-Level-Rise-Vulnerability-Assessment_FINAL.pdf.
- 119 Lockheed Martin, "Construction Underway for U.S. Air Force Space Fence Radar in the Marshall Islands," Press Release, March 23, 2015, <http://www.lockheedmartin.com/us/news/press-releases/2015/march/150323-mst-ivssconstruction-underway-for-us-air-force-space-fence-radar.html>; Reagan Test Site homepage, <http://www.smdc.army.mil/rts.html>.
- 120 Dan Zak, "A ground zero forgotten: The Marshall Islands, once a U.S. nuclear test site, face oblivion again," The Washington Post, November 27, 2015, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/national/2015/11/27/a-ground-zero-forgotten/>.
- 121 USGS website, <http://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/climate-change/lowLat.html>.
- 122 U.S. Geological Survey, "Many Atolls May Be Uninhabitable Within Decades Due to Climate Change," News Release, October 1, 2015, <http://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/climate-change/atolls/news.html#oct15>; Coral Davenport, "The Marshall Islands Are Disappearing," The New York Times, December 2, 2015, <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/12/02/world/The-Marshall-Islands-Are-Disappearing.html>.
- 123 United States Naval Academy, 'About', <https://www.usna.edu/About/index.php>.
- 124 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at the US Naval Academy, Maryland", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-us-naval-academy#.V6tnNU0rKgA>.
- 125 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Melanie Fitzpatrick and Kristina Dahl, "Encroaching Tides: How Sea Level Rise and Tidal Flooding Threaten U.S. East and Gulf Coast Communities over the Next 30 Years", Union of Concerned Scientists, 2014, 27.
- 126 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at US Coast Guard Station Sandy Hook, New Jersey", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/07/front-lines-of-rising-seas-coast-guard-station-sandy-hook.pdf>.
- 127 United States Coast Guard, 'Project Execution – Active', May 2016, <https://www.uscg.mil/fdcc/projects.asp>.
- 128 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at US Coast Guard Station Sandy Hook, New Jersey", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-us-coast-guard-station-sandy-hook#.V6tmCk0rKgA>.
- 129 USCG active projects include recapitalizing shore facilities at Sandy Hook that were destroyed during Hurricane Sandy: 'Project Execution – Active', May 2016, <https://www.uscg.mil/fdcc/projects.asp>.
- 130 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-marine-corps-base-camp-lejeune#.V6tnZU0rKgA>.
- 131 Drs. P. Cunningham, I. Anderson, K. Baumann, M. Brush, N. Christensen, C. Currin, J. Fraser, M. Fonseca, S. Karpanty, J. Morris, J. McNinch, H. Paerl, P. Piehler, A. Rodriguez, C. Tobias and J. Walters. 'Defense Coastal/Estuarine Research Program (DCERP1), Final Research Report', Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program Project RC-1413, <https://www.serdp-estcp.org/content/download/19559/211462/file/RC-1413-DCERP1.pdf>.
- 132 Marine Corps Installations Command, Regional Energy Program, "MCIEAST Energy and Water Strategy." www.mcieast.marines.mil/Portals/33/Documents/COMREL/Energy-Awareness/2015-MCIEAST-Energy-and-Water-Strategy.pdf.
- 133 JDNews Newsroom Staff, "Area begins to clean up, return to normal after Hurricane Matthew," Oct 9, 2016. <http://www.jdnews.com/news/20161009/area-begins-to-clean-up-return-to-normal-after-hurricane-matthew>.

- 134 Presentation by Randy Monohan, HQMC Energy Projects Officer, Federal Utility Partnership Working Group, (April 13, 2017).
- 135 United States Marine Corps, 'Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort', <http://www.beaufort.marines.mil/About/>.
- 136 Lightning 2, Lockheed Martin, <https://www.f35.com/global/participation/united-kingdom>.
- 137 Marine Aviation Plan 2016, <https://marinecorpsconceptsandprograms.com/sites/default/files/files/Marine%20Aviation%20Plan%202016%20FINAL.pdf>.
- 138 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island and Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, South Carolina", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-marine-corps-parris-island-air-station-beaufort#.V6tn3k0rKgA>.
- 139 <https://www.stripes.com/news/operations-slowly-resuming-on-hurricane-affected-military-bases-1.433460>.
- 140 Presentation by Randy Monohan, HQMC Energy Projects Officer, Federal Utility Partnership Working Group, (April 13, 2017).
- 141 NOAA "Global Sea Level Rise Scenarios" January 7, 2017, 27.
- 142 U.S. Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP). "SAB Tours Norfolk." June 29, 2015. <https://www.serdp-estcp.org/News-and-Events/Blog/SAB-Tours-Norfolk>.
- 143 Matt Connolly, 'Hampton Roads, Virginia and the Military's Battle Against Sea Level Rise', Briefer No. 27, October 14, 2015, The Center for Climate and Security.
- 144 E. Spanger-Siegfried et al, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia", <http://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/07/front-lines-of-rising-seas-naval-station-norfolk.pdf>.
- 145 Ibid.
- 146 Ibid.
- 147 Ibid.
- 148 Department of Defense, Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report (DoD: January, 2018), 17.
- 149 "The State of the Region: Hampton Roads 2017," Old Dominion University, October, 2017, pg. 16. <https://www.odu.edu/forecasting/state-region-reports/2017>.
- 150 Hampton Roads Intergovernmental Pilot Project Reports, 2014-2017. https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/hripp_reports/.
- 151 Commander, Naval Installations Command, 'Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling – About', <http://www.cnic.navy.mil/regions/ndw/installations/jbab/about.html>.
- 152 Defense Intelligence Agency, 'About DIA', <http://www.dia.mil/About/>.
- 153 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling and Washington Navy Yard, Washington DC", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-joint-base-anacostia-bolling-and-washington-navy-yard#.V6tms00rKgA>.
- 154 Ibid.
- 155 Commander, Naval Installations Command, 'Naval Support Activity Washington, Tenant Commands and Other Agencies' http://www.cnic.navy.mil/regions/ndw/installations/nsa_washington/about/tenant_commands.html.
- 156 Erika Spanger-Siegfried, Kristina Dahl, Astrid Caldas, and Shana Udvardy, "The US Military on the Front Lines of Rising Seas: Exposure to Coastal Flooding at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling and Washington Navy Yard, Washington DC", Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/global-warming-impacts/sea-level-rise-flooding-joint-base-anacostia-bolling-and-washington-navy-yard#.V6tms00rKgA>.
- 157 Elizabeth Harball, 'Washington, DC Water Utility Adapts to Global Warming', Scientific American, January 23, 2014, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/washington-dc-water-utility-adapts-to-global-warming/>.
- 158 Government Accountability Office, "Climate Change Adaptation: DoD Can Improve Infrastructure Planning and Processes to Better Account for Potential Impacts," May 2014, 12-13, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/663734.pdf>.
- 159 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 'Assessing Impacts of Climate Change on Coastal Military Installations: Policy Implications', US Department of Defense, 2013.
- 160 Center for Climate and Security, "General Keys: The military thinks climate change is serious," July 7, 2016, <https://climateandsecurity.org/2016/07/07/general-keys-the-military-thinks-climate-change-is-serious/>.
- 161 Judsen Bruzgul, Molly Hellmuth, Rawlings Miller, Ricardo Saavedra, and Peter Schultz, "SERDP Report: Infrastructure Damage/Fragility Models and Data Quality Issues Associated with Department of Defense Climate Vulnerability and Impact Assessment," (DoD: January 2015), ix.
- 162 Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, "Climate-Sensitive Decision-Making in the Department of Defense: Synthesis of Ongoing Research and Current Recommendations," U.S. Department of Defense, 2016, ES-5.
- 163 Hall, J.A., S. Gill, J. Obeysekera, W. Sweet, K. Knuuti, and J. Marburger. 2016. Regional Sea Level Scenarios for Coastal Risk Management: Managing the Uncertainty of Future Sea Level Change and Extreme Water Levels for Department of Defense Coastal Sites Worldwide. U.S. Department of Defense, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, 2-2.
164. Ibid, 4-5.

Sea Level Rise Scenario Building Methodology and Sources Note:

The Center for Climate and Security's sea level rise projections were created using the best and latest publicly available data using the industry-standard tools and overseen by two GIS experts and an impact analyst. The projections are estimates for water levels. The tools utilized do not illustrate flood patterns, but provide reasonable estimates for potential impact at scenarios of intermediate-high risk in 2050 and 2070 to facilitate basic impact analysis in line with risk assessment best practices.

Data Sources:

Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI). (2017). ArcGIS Pro Release 2.0.0 Redlands, CA. 3D Elevation Program (3DEP). (2017). 1/9 Arc-Second and 1/3 Arc-Second Data Elevation Models. Reston, VA: United States Geological Survey

Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services. (2018). Tides and Currents Datums. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services. (2018). Tides and Currents Sea Level Trends. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services. (2018). Tides and Currents Extreme Water Levels. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

US Census Bureau. (2017) TIGER/Line Shapefiles: National Transportation Map. Suitland: MD

Homeland Infrastructure Foundation – Level Data. (2017) Electrical Substations and Transmission Lines. Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security.

Site Comprehensive Listing. (2017). National Priorities List (Superfund). Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency

Sweet et al. (2017). Technical Report NOS CO-OPS 083 Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

THE CENTER FOR
CLIMATE AND
SECURITY

Military Expert Panel Report
Sea Level Rise and the U.S. Military's Mission
2nd edition

February 2018

Military Expert Panel Members

General Ronald Keys, United States Air Force (Ret)
Lieutenant General John Castellaw, United States Marine Corps (Ret)
Vice Admiral Robert Parker, United States Coast Guard (Ret)
Rear Admiral Ann C. Phillips, United States Navy (Ret)
Rear Admiral Jonathan White, United States Navy (Ret)
Brigadier General Gerald Galloway, United States Army (Ret)

Military Expert Panel Chair

Heather Messera

Edited by

Francesco Femia