

Reply to RC1

1. In their manuscript, Lenk et al. use data on the cost of sea-dike construction from the Netherlands and Canada with the aim of producing typical unit costs for use in further studies. Such an effort is very much required, and therefore I believe this paper to be of potentially great value to the field. There has been a great deal of attention in recent years for the needs to assess adaptation costs, yet this aspect remains very much undercovered in the scientific literature compare to studies on the damages caused by natural hazards. The information in this paper can help researchers to start to make the important step towards also including the costs of the adaptation in their analyses. I believe that the paper is well-written, timely, succinct and therefore I would recommend publication subject to the author's addressing several points below.

> We appreciate the positive evaluation of our manuscript.

2. The lack of good quality costs estimates has hampered progress in the advance of large scale flood risk modelling. Whilst many advances have been made in assessing large scale flood risk (e.g. Hinkel et al., 2014; Ward et al., 2013; Arnell and Gosling, 2014), these studies either do not address the costs of adaptation, or do so in a simplified way (e.g. Hinkel et al., 2014). The need for data on the location and costs of dikes is called for also in a recent commentary by Ward et al. (2016). It would be useful to mention how the current manuscript can support such efforts (in the introduction or the discussion), which would make further explicit the wide implications of this paper.

> We agree with the reviewer (a similar point was raised by RC2) and have added 2 paragraphs discussing these issues (p.12, l.14-25).

3. The abstract states that the paper provides recommendations on how to improve the reporting and estimating of the costs (of sea-dikes) in order to support future adaptation studies worldwide. However, I did not really find anything in the manuscript to warrant such a statement; I was expecting some vision of how a database should be further developed. Whilst I don't think this is required in this paper, I believe that this statement in the abstract should be dropped.

> We agree and dropped the statement from the abstract (similar point was raised by R2).

4. I think that the paper would be improved by a more explicit discussion of how operation and maintenance costs are included in the datasets. The paper is intended to provide some kind of information and guidance for assessing adaptation costs. In terms of sea-dikes, O&M costs can be extremely high over the lifetime of a dike, perhaps as high as the investment costs. How should decision-makers deal with this? Are there rules of thumbs that can be prescribed, like taking a percentage of investment costs per year to represent O&M costs?

> We agree and have added a paragraph to the discussion (p.13, top).

5. Similar discussions to those sketched here are taking place in the field of river flood modeling. It would be worth mentioning to what extent this research is / is not useful for such studies.

> Again, we agree and have addressed this point in the above mentioned paragraph (see 2. item).

6. Small comments

- Page 2, line 6. Insert “the” between “While” and “climate” (i.e. “While the climate. . .”)
- Page 2, line 16: Replace “Using historic construction costs are. . .” with “Using historic construction costs is. . .”
- Page 3, line 27. “Replace “. . .affecting the exact shape to the dikes” with “. . .affecting the exact shape of the dikes”.

> We appreciate finding these mistakes. The mistakes have been corrected.

7. - Page 12, line 3: “Nevertheless, we do find neither statistical signatures of fixed costs nor of non-linearities for the costs of dikes we have analyses.” This sentence does not flow well, I am not sure what point the authors are trying to make.

> We agree simplified this sentence.

References

- Arnell, N.W., Gosling, S.N., 2014. The impacts of climate change on river flood risk at the global scale. *Climatic Change*, 134, 387-401.
- Hinkel et al., 2014. Coastal flood damage and adaptation costs under 21st century sea-level rise. *PNAS*, 111, 3292-3297.
- Ward, P.J. et al., 2013. Assessing flood risk at the global scale: Model setup, results, and sensitivity. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8, 044019.
- Ward, P.J., Jongman, B., Salamon, P., Simpson, A., Bates, P., De Groeve, T., Muis, S., Coughlan de Perez, E., Rudari, R., Trigg, M.A., Winsemius, H.C., 2015. Usefulness and limitations of global flood risk models. *Nature Climate Change*, 5, 712-715, doi:10.1038/nclimate2742.

> We thank the referee for providing these references and refer to these at appropriate places within the paper.

Reply to RC2

A. The authors apply an empirical approach to derive a functional form for the costs of construction of coastal dikes as a function of height. With this purpose, they set up several regression models with costs as predictand and several. They estimate the parameters of these models using cost data from the Netherlands and Canada. The main conclusion is that, somewhat surprisingly, the costs can be mainly described by a linear function of dike height, with no (or very small) fixed costs.

> We appreciate this insightful comment and agree with the surprising conclusion. As outlined in the manuscript, higher-order components contribute to the costs so that the linear function is indeed somewhat surprising. Other colleagues commonly use unit costs and implicitly make the assumption of a linear relationship. Our results give empirical support for this assumption.

B. My general evaluation of the manuscript is positive, although there are some issues that the authors may want to address in a revised version.

> We appreciate the positive evaluation.

1. One general point is that the English needs some editing. This does not deter from understanding the current version, but the text will benefit from copy-editing before eventual publication.

> We are sorry that the English is not of sufficient quality. A native speaker proof read the manuscript.

2. One main concern is that the authors quite freely extrapolate the results obtained from these two regions to offer recommendations 'worldwide'. I think this can be an oversimplification, especially the conclusion that the fixed costs seem to be so low. Will this conclusion also apply to other regions with a weaker tradition of adaptation to sea-level rise or to areas that so far have not been threatened by sea level rise so far? I can imagine that in those regions the fixed costs can be substantial.

> We agree with the reviewer. As suggested by RC1 we dropped the last sentence of the abstract where recommendations worldwide were mentioned. Moreover, we have added a paragraph discussing this point (p.12, l.14-19).

Some particular points

3. 'Sea-level rise represents the least uncertain consequence of climate change and there is considerable interest in comparing coastal flood damage with adaptation costs. It is not clear what the authors mean with this sentence. The range of estimations of future sea-level rise is very broad and it depends on physical mechanism, like land-ice dynamics, that is not well understood and that it is actually not implemented in current climate models. Perhaps the authors mean that it is certain that global sea-level will rise, but the magnitude and its regional distribution is very uncertain, much more than temperature. There may be areas where sea-level will fall or rise, for instance in the Northern Hemisphere at high latitudes, depending on the rate of melting of Greenland and Antarctica.

> The reviewer makes a good point. Our statement could be misleading. Accordingly, we have changed it to "Sea-level rise represents a foreseeable consequence of climate change and there is considerable interest in comparing coastal flood damage with adaptation costs".

4. 'The latter investigated costs for coastal protection of low-lying delta areas using project-oriented case studies for the Netherlands, New Orleans, and Vietnam.'

'The latter' is here too unspecific, as there is a sentence in between. It is not clear whom the authors are referring to.

> We agree and simply fixed the problem by providing the reference at the end of each sentence.

5. 'They also analysed the relationship between dike height, dike cross-section, and costs of raising dikes at a very coarse level and depending on the site' analyzed at a very coarse level and depending on the site the relationship... As it stands now the sentence could mean that the dikes were built at very coarse level.

> We thank the referee for finding this flaw and changed it accordingly.

6. 'Second, what is the range of uncertainty that needs to be considered?'

I think the authors mean what are the sources of uncertainty that need to be considered

> Here we disagree with the referee. We actually mean the range in the sense as mentioned eg in the abstract, ie the range enclosing 95% of spreading. But as this seems to be ambiguous that could lead to a misunderstanding we have inserted a clarifying statement to that effect (p.3, l.11-14).

7. 'The report provides high-level long-term estimates in the preparation phase and we do not have any information if any of the planned dike has actually been constructed to date' what does 'high-level' mean here?

> This terminology was taken from the Canadian report (p.25). But we agree with the referee that it is not clear. Accordingly, we dropped "high-level long-term".

8. 'provides information about the expected flood levels in 2100'

is this the expected relative mean sea-level rise or extreme sea-level rise events? If the latter, which percentile?

> The report is based on the "Sea Dike Guidelines" by Ausenco Sandwell (2011) and takes into account sea-level rise, subsidence, reference tide, storm surge, wind set-up, and wave height. Different return periods are mentioned for storm surges, estuarine reaches, and seismic design. For our work it is secondary how the necessary crest heights have been designed, we explore the provided crest heights and corresponding costs. Accordingly, we prefer not to confuse the reader by providing too many details.

9. 'dike constructions of 1 m to 5 m height or raise'
of raise? the sentence is unclear

> We agree and rephrased the sentence: "For the Canadian data ... it can be seen that the costs are spread over a wide range roughly between 5,000 EUR/m and 40,000 EUR/m for dike construction (or raise) with final heights of 1m to 5m."

10. 'In Fig. 1(a) it can be seen for the Canadian data, that the 4 models all have similar shapes and their deviations are small'

delete comma after data

> We agree.

11. 'Fig. 2. It can be seen, that the uncertainty encloses a rather large range which is increasing (due to the log-normal definition)'

delete comma after seen

> We agree.

12. 'The cost estimate for raising a dike in Canada by one metre encompass roughly 6,000 EUR ' encompass is not the right word here, I think

> We agree and simplified the statement by stating 'The cost for raising a dike in Canada by one metre is estimated to be 6,000 EUR where the range between $3.4x$ and $x/3.4$ contains 95% of the uncertainty.'

13. 'Nevertheless, few values are also located outside the 95 % ranges suggesting, that the log-normal distribution might only be a first approximation.'

delete comma after suggesting. The word 'also' is irritating here. Do the authors mean 'In addition, few values are...

> We agree and removed the comma as well as "also".

14. 'Moreover, it can be seen that the difference between the land uses is smaller than between the countries. '

This is a somewhat sloppy wording. The authors mean that the influence of land use is smaller than the influence of country

> We agree and changed the manuscript accordingly.

Costs of sea dikes – regressions and uncertainty estimates

Stephan Lenk¹, Diego Rybski¹, Oliver Heidrich², Richard J. Dawson², and Jürgen P. Kropp^{1,3}

¹Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research – PIK, Member of Leibniz Association, P.O. Box 601203, 14412 Potsdam, Germany

²School of Civil Engineering & Geosciences & Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK

³University of Potsdam, Institute of Earth and Environmental Science, Potsdam, Germany

Correspondence to: Diego Rybski (ca-dr@rybski.de)

Abstract. Failure to consider the costs of adaptation strategies can be seen by decision makers as a barrier ~~for to~~ implementing coastal protection measures. In order to validate adaptation strategies to sea-level rise in the form of coastal protection, a consistent and repeatable assessment of the costs is necessary. This paper significantly extends current knowledge on cost estimates by developing, and implementing using real coastal dike data, probabilistic functions of dike costs. ~~With the aim of~~
5 ~~providing a reproducible estimate of typical sea dike costs and their uncertainty we analyse data~~ Data from Canada and the Netherlands ~~and relate this is analysed and related~~ to published studies from the US, UK, and Vietnam ~~in order to provide a reproducible estimate of typical sea dike costs and their uncertainty.~~ We plot the costs divided by dike length as a function of height and test four different regression models. Our analysis shows that a linear function without intercept is sufficient to model the costs, i.e. fixed costs and higher order contributions such as ~~from that due to~~ the volume of core fill material are
10 less significant. We also characterise the spread around the regression models which represents an uncertainty stemming from factors beyond dike length and height. Drawing ~~the analogy to an analogy with~~ project cost overruns, we employ log-normal distributions and calculate that the range between $3x$ and $x/3$ contains 95% of the data, where x represents the corresponding regression value. We compare our estimates with previously published unit costs for other countries. We note that the unit costs not only depend on the country and land-use (urban/non-urban) of the sites where the dikes are being constructed but also
15 characteristics included in the costs, e.g. property acquisition, utility relocation, project management. This paper gives decision makers an order of magnitude on the protection costs which can help to remove potential barriers to developing adaptation strategies. Although the focus of this research is sea dikes, our approach is applicable and transferable to other adaptation measures. We provide recommendations how to improve the reporting and estimating of the costs in order to support future adaptation studies worldwide.

20 1 Introduction

Sea-level rise represents ~~the least uncertain a foreseeable~~ consequence of climate change and there is considerable interest in comparing coastal flood damage with adaptation costs (Hallegatte et al., 2013; Boettle et al., 2013b). In line with rising temperature and sea-levels, more frequent and severe storm surges need to be anticipated (Menéndez and Woodworth, 2010).

The construction of dikes and similar defensive measures has a long history and coastal protection represents a conventional means to adapt to the threat of sea-level rise (Jonkman et al., 2013). In 1990 it was estimated that protecting 360 000 km of the coasts globally against a 1 m sea-level rise ~~can~~would cost at least US\$ 500 billion over a 100-year period (Dronkers et al., 1990).

5 In order to estimate costs and benefits of adaptation to sea-level rise (Fankhauser, 1995; Jonkman et al., 2004; Dawson et al., 2009, 2011; Klijn et al., 2012; Boettle et al., 2013a; Eijgenraam et al., 2014; Jongmann et al., 2014; Kind, 2014; Kreibich et al., 2014; Boettle et al., 2016), various categories are required – in particular (i) the change of frequency and magnitude of coastal floods (Eijgenraam et al., 2014; Dawson and Hall, 2006), (ii) the expected (direct, monetary) damage without adaptation (Bouwer, 2013; Prah et al., 2015), (iii) the residual (direct, monetary) damage with adaptation (Kreibich et al., 2014), and (iv)
10 the construction costs of the adaptation measure (Jonkman et al., 2013; Aerts et al., 2013).

While the climate impact and adaptation research community has made progress in assessing the categories (i)-(iii), the construction costs of protection measures [category (iv)] are poorly reported in the literature. These are considered an engineering problem yet are also of utmost importance for decision makers in order to assess the scale of the investment that is required to provide protection, and is achievable for the resources available. Failure to consider the costs of strategies can invalidate,
15 or at least expose as impractical, recommendations from research studies. However, engineers hesitate to provide general and transferable costs. Academic literature is lacking ‘real life’ auditable cost information on adaptation measures (Heidrich et al., 2013) which can be of use to international, national, and local decision makers. Indeed, providing an order of magnitude and reduce uncertainties on the protection costs can remove potential barriers in designing and implementing adaptation strategies (Reckien et al., 2015; Heidrich et al., 2016).

20 One way to investigate construction costs is to study similar ~~constructions of~~ dikes that were planned or ~~even erected~~ constructed in the past. Using historic construction costs ~~are~~is referred to as the Elemental Costs Projection approach (BCIS, 2012)~~but~~. However, civil engineering works are profoundly influenced by ~~various~~ factors such as scale, nature, and characteristics of the project. This ~~makes means that~~ a straightforward use of this approach is not always sensible as rates, prices, and discounts can fluctuate dramatically over short periods of time and between projects ~~across the same regions of a country~~
25 ~~(MacDonald, 2013)~~. (MacDonald, 2013). For various reasons a synthesis of coastal protection costs is very limited. On the one hand, the costs of coastal protection projects in different countries and regions are ~~varied~~affected by socio-economic conditions like land value, land use, building prices, GDP, and ~~general income~~. the level of income. On the other hand, the comparability of projects is often hindered by heterogeneity and a lack of information about the site and project specifics, e.g. site preparation, site access, material sourcing etc. In addition, defence measures differ in engineering, design, and specific features like detailed dimensions and unit costs are not reported in the academic literature. Thus, it is difficult to make generalisable estimates of the costs of a sea dike project of length l and height h at a given site and country.

Most authors studying adaptation to sea-level rise and adjunctive costs refer to Hoozemans et al. (1993) or Jonkman et al. (2013). The former estimated unit costs for three coastal protection measures according to the Dutch standard including dike design, construction, taxes, fees, levies, and royalties (Hoozemans et al., 1993). The latter investigated costs for coastal protection of low-lying delta areas using project-oriented case studies for the Netherlands, New Orleans, and Vietnam

(Jonkman et al., 2013). The authors estimated unit costs for constructing and raising different types of hard and soft coastal protection measures. ~~They also and~~ analysed the relationship between dike height, dike cross-section, and costs of raising dikes ~~at a very coarse level and depending on the site.~~ Based on data from three countries it has been suggested that the estimates from Hoozemans et al. (1993) significantly over-estimate the costs of constructing dikes (Linham et al., 2010).

Many of the above mentioned studies use *unit costs*, i.e. the dike costs can be expressed per ~~meter-metre~~ height. This, however, implies the assumption that there is a linear relation without fixed costs – an assumption that to our knowledge has not been supported quantitatively so far. In addition, uncertainty is at most quantified ~~by means in terms~~ of a range, i.e. some upper or lower values. This paper significantly extends these approaches by developing ~~and implementing probabilistic functions of dike costs and implementing them~~ using real coastal dike data, ~~probabilistic functions of dike costs~~.

~~With the aim of~~ In order to provide a *reproducible* assessment of typical protection costs and their uncertainties, the work ~~in hand reported here~~ explores estimated construction costs for sea dikes in Canada (Metro Vancouver) and in the Netherlands. We address two questions. First, what is the appropriate functional form for the costs of a sea dike as a function of its height? Since both ~~the footprint and the volume~~ are proportional to the height of a dike, the costs of a unit of fixed length should increase linearly and quadratically with the height, respectively, leading to the question of the composite *functional form*.

Second, what is the range of uncertainty that needs to be considered? Although our findings are ~~in relation related~~ to sea dikes, our research approach and determination of uncertainty is potentially applicable and transferable to other adaptation measures. In the research on climate change adaptation, the ~~above listed constraints of constraints related to~~ quantifying coastal protection costs ~~listed above~~ represent an *uncertainty* which needs to be taken into account when cost effectiveness of adaptation measures is studied.

In order to quantify the uncertainty of the dike construction costs, we draw ~~the parallel to a parallel with~~ project cost overruns. Construction projects usually exhibit a difference between forecasted and actual construction costs (Flyvbjerg, 2007a, b; Flyvbjerg and Stewart, 2012). ~~Such cost overruns~~ These differences can have various origins, e.g. unexpected site conditions, ~~unforeseen unforeseen~~ events, and overall underlying complexity associated with the design and construction process (Love et al., 2013). Since cost overruns represent uncertainties, which the estimator is aware of but ~~without knowing cannot know~~ their magnitude, they are sometimes referred to as *known-unknowns*. Chou et al. (2009) demonstrated that log-normal distributions best fit the probabilistic costs of highway bridge replacement projects. Thus, here our starting point is to characterise the deviations (~~spreadingspread~~) around typical dike construction costs ~~by means of as~~ a log-normal distribution.

2 Data

We base our main analysis on two data sources, namely *Cost of Adaptation – Sea Dikes & Alternative Strategies* (Delcan Corporation, 2012) for Canada (Metro Vancouver) and *Kosten van maatregelen – Informatie ten behoeve van het project Waterveiligheid 21e eeuw* (de Grave and Baase, 2011) for the Netherlands. The advantage is that the ~~contained data is data~~ these reports contain are homogeneous (at least within each of both reports) since the cost figures come from the same sources,

the same case studies, and relate to similar constructions, i.e. sea and estuarine dikes. Moreover, local conditions, e.g. affecting the exact shape ~~to of~~ the dikes, have been taken into account.

2.1 Canada

5 Estimated costs to protect Vancouver and neighbouring municipalities against sea-level rise by 2100 are provided by Delcan Corporation (2012) – for a summary see Sec. A1. The protection measures are subdivided into 36 shoreline reaches of more than 250 km long between the Burrard Inlet and Boundary Bay. A reach is a general term for a length of a stream or river, usually suggesting a level, uninterrupted stretch. ~~The report provides high-level long-term~~ The Canadian report provides estimates in the preparation phase and we do not have any information ~~if whether~~ any of the planned dike has actually been constructed to
10 date. Since it is not specified, we assume all costs are given in Canadian Dollars (CAD) 2012.

The costs presented in the Canadian study are referred to as a “class D estimate” ~~in~~ (Delcan Corporation, 2012). According to Public Works and Government Services Canada this means an indicative ~~estimation~~ estimate giving unit costs ~~and being~~ based on a comprehensive assumptions and project requirements list. This kind of estimate is developed during the project feasibility and design stage (Public Works and Government Services Canada) and therefore subject to change.

15 ~~The~~ Tables 4.3A and 4.3B in (Delcan Corporation, 2012) list the length and estimated costs separated for each dike ~~so that we~~ which allows us to calculate the costs per unit length. In addition, Table 2.1 in (Delcan Corporation, 2012) provides information about the expected flood levels in 2100 and the required increase of the dike height or the height of the dike to be built. Accordingly, we can study the costs per length as a function of the height, i.e. CAD per length in ~~meters~~ metres vs. height in ~~meters~~ metres. Eight of the reaches with bespoke features (e.g. barrier, see Sec. A1) have been excluded from the analysis.
20 Additional information is included on whether the dikes are to be raised or newly constructed and whether the corresponding site is urban or rural.

As detailed in Sec. A1, the costs consist of (i) structural flood protection / embankment, (ii) utility relocation, pump stations, and flood boxes, (iii) property acquisition, (iv) seismic resilience measures, (v) environmental compensation, and (vi) site investigation, project management, and ~~Engineering~~ engineering.

25 2.2 Netherlands

The Dutch report (de Grave and Baase, 2011) provides the estimated costs needed to raise the height of dikes across the Netherlands ~~to such an extent that in order to decrease~~ the estimated risk of ~~a flooding is decreased by ten times in comparison~~ flooding by a factor of 10 relative to the present protection level. The estimates are broken down into 205 dikes of more than 2 600 km length and the associated costs are estimated for several steps of raising the dike height (25, 50, 100, 200 cm)
30 depending on the need (Tab. 4).

The Tables G and K in (de Grave and Baase, 2011) list the length, the height steps, and the associated cost estimates for two different scenarios. The first scenario assumes the flood risks according to the current installed protection and the current Dutch legislation. The second scenario takes into account the improvement of flood protection ~~into account that is planned to be made~~ planned between 2015 and 2020. According to Eijgenraam and Zwaneveld (2011) the second scenario is the more




Figure 1. Plot of dike costs versus crest height for all dikes with a linear fit without intercept, LWI [Eq. (1), red dashed line], a linear polynomial fit, LP [Eq. (2), blue dotted line], a quadratic polynomial fit, QP [Eq. (3), green double dashed line], and a power-law fit, PL [Eq. (4), orange dotted dashed line]. (a) 28 Canadian dikes with the obtained fits and (b) 205 dikes in the Netherlands with the obtained fits. The linear and quadratic polynomials collapse in (a) and the linear without intercept with the linear polynomial in (b), see main text.

realistic one and the first one is an underestimate. As, in addition, the second scenario is based on more recent developments, we choose to use only the cost estimates ~~of~~ from the second scenario in this study.

As detailed in Sec. A2 the costs consist of (i) ground work and construction measures per unit ~~of~~ length, (ii) special measures, (iii) adjustment or relocation of infrastructure, (iv) land acquisition, (v) environmental compensation, and (vi) additional costs for operations and maintenance.

3 Analysis

In the following we fit regressions to the data, quantify the uncertainty, and compare our results with ~~previous~~ previously published estimates.

3.1 Regressions

In Fig. 1 we plot the costs per ~~meter~~ metre length of dike as a function of ~~the raising~~ raising the height of the dikes. For the Canadian data [Fig. 1(a)] it can be seen ~~,~~ that the costs are spread over a wide range roughly between 5,000 EUR/m and 40,000 EUR/m for dike ~~constructions~~ construction (or raise) with final heights of 1 m to 5 m ~~height or raise~~. Only a weak tendency of reduced costs for lower heights can be ~~guessed~~ inferred visually from Fig. 1. The correlation coefficient is

$\rho_p = 0.43 [0.07, 0.69]$ ($[\cdot]$ denotes 95 % confidence). For the Netherlands [Fig. 1(b)] the spreading spread is overall smaller but most of the constructions are lower than 1 m and only a few values are available for a raise of roughly 3 m. Here, the correlation coefficient is $\rho_p = 0.79 [0.74, 0.84]$.

In order to find a suitable model for typical costs we test four regressions, namely (i) linear without intercept (LWI), (ii) linear polynomial (LP), (iii) quadratic polynomial (QP), and (iv) power-law (PL):

$$\text{LWI: } C(h) = bh \quad (1)$$

$$\text{LP: } C(h) = a + bh \quad (2)$$

$$\text{QP: } C(h) = a + bh + ch^2 \quad (3)$$

$$\text{PL: } C(h) = bh^\beta, \quad (4)$$

where $C(h)$ (in EUR/m) are the dike costs per meter length and for height metre length and h and is height (in m). a, b, c, β are parameters, where a denotes the intercept (fixed costs, which are independent of the dike height), b the slope, also known as *unit costs* (Hoozemans et al., 1993; Jonkman et al., 2013), c the quadratic term, and β the exponent of the power-law. The parameters have corresponding units, such as EUR/m³ for c . For simplicity, we omit the units of the parameters. Following Hudson et al. (2015) cost elements can be well split into (+) 1. Planning and design costs, e.g. consulting and survey costs; 2. Capital costs, e.g. enabling and construction costs; 3. Inspection costs, e.g. operational, public safety and monitoring program costs; and 4. maintenance costs, e.g. maintenance and replacement costs.

Equation (1) is the simplest form, i.e. a linear relation with slope b starting at 0 EUR/m² for $h = 0$ m. In principle, even for very small projects, costs can emerge independent from of the actual height (fixed costs), due to e.g. planning etc. Thus, Eq. (2) is similar to Eq. (1) but has an off-set, i.e. the intercept a , which is linked to the preparation costs. Since, the volume of the dike is proportional to the square of its height [see item 1(b) in Sec. A1], an additional quadratic term [see e.g. (Diaz, 2016)] in Eq. (3) leads to a second-order polynomial. Finally, the power-law Eq. (4) is inspired e.g. by Eq. (4) in (Hinkel et al., 2014) and by Eq. (7) in (Fankhauser, 1995). The fitting of the regressions was Regression fits were carried out using non-linear least squares optimisation of the fit parameters applying the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm (Marquardt, 1963). Using constraints of the parameters, we force the regressions to $C(0) \geq 0$ and to be monotonous monotonically increasing.

In Fig. 1(a) it can be seen for the Canadian data that the 4 models all have similar shapes and their deviations are small compared to the spreading spread of the data. It stands out is worth noting that the linear and the quadratic fits collapse, i.e. the best fit of Eq. (3) is the one with has a vanishing quadratic component term ($c \approx 0$) so that it becomes a linear regression which is then identical to fitting identical to Eq. (2). Since our fitting regression models vary strongly in the number of parameters (1...3), regressions those with more parameters are expected to perform better in terms of root mean squared error (RMSE). Thus, in order to compensate for this advantage, we explore the Akaike information criterion (AIC) (Akaike, 1974) which evaluates the trade-off between the goodness of fit and the complexity of the considered models models considered.

In Tab. 1 the obtained fit parameters and fit parameters obtained and the resulting AIC and RMSE values are listed. For the Canadian data, the linear model without fixed costs, Eq. (2), performs best in terms of AIC. It is followed by the power-law model, Eq. (4), comprising which generated the second lowest AIC value. The obtained exponent exponent obtained, however,

Table 1. Fit parameters according to Eq. (1)–(4), standard errors (\pm), and AIC and RMSE values for the regression types, and parameter σ of the log-normal distributions [\mathcal{LN} , Eq. (5)] fitted to the residuals, for the data from Canada (Delcan Corporation, 2012) and the Netherlands (de Grave and Baase, 2011). The root mean squared error is calculated according to $\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2}$, where \hat{Y}_i are the fitted values and Y_i are the measured ones. For both, AIC & RMSE, smaller values are better.

fit	fit parameters				AIC	RMSE	\mathcal{LN} σ
	a	b	c	β			
Vancouver – all dikes (# 28)							
linear, no intercept (LWI)	—	5.7 \pm 0.6	—	—	211.5	9.84	0.62 \pm 0.08
linear (LP)	5.0 \pm 6.1	4.3 \pm 1.8	—	—	212.8	9.72	—
quadratic (QP)	5.2 \pm 19.1	4.3 \pm 12.3	0.0 \pm 1.8	—	214.8	9.72	—
power-law (PL)	—	8.4 \pm 3.4	—	0.7 \pm 0.32	212.6	9.69	—
Vancouver – new dikes (# 14)							
linear, no intercept	—	1.3 \pm 0.5	—	—	95.3	2.40	0.90 \pm 0.19
Vancouver – raise dikes (# 14)							
linear, no intercept	—	2.0 \pm 0.7	—	—	122.9	4.01	1.03 \pm 0.19
Vancouver – urban dikes (# 21)							
linear, no intercept	—	1.8 \pm 0.5	—	—	166.8	4.53	0.97 \pm 0.15
Vancouver – rural dikes (# 7)							
linear, no intercept	—	0.6 \pm 0.1	—	—	21.0	2.11	0.50 \pm 0.13
Netherlands (# 205)							
linear, no intercept	—	8.7 \pm 0.3	—	—	1034.6	3.03	0.54 \pm 0.03
linear	0.1 \pm 0.4	8.6 \pm 0.5	—	—	1043.5	3.02	—
quadratic	1.6 \pm 0.7	5.2 \pm 1.4	1.2 \pm 0.4	—	1038.7	2.98	—
power-law	—	8.7 \pm 0.3	—	1.0 \pm 0.04	1043.0	3.02	—

indicates a curvature ~~opposite to the one in the opposite direction to that~~ expected from a quadratic ~~contribution polynomial~~ due to the volume ($\beta \approx 0.7 < 1$). The linear model, Eq. (2), ~~leads to has~~ an off-set, a , ~~whose standard error is bigger with a standard error greater~~ than the parameter itself, so it might be insignificant. As discussed above, the quadratic model, Eq. (3), is identical to the linear model (the quadratic contribution vanishes). It can be concluded ~~;~~ that the fixed costs and contributions due to the volume are weaker than the ~~spreading spread~~. Linear regression ~~seems also also seems~~ reasonable because all quantities contribute approximately linearly to the costs, except earth fill, which contributes quadratically. The core material, however,

represents a comparably small fraction of the total costs. Structural flood protection costs represent approximately 10 % of the total costs and the earth fill costs represent approximately 85 % of the former (see Sec. A1).

The regressions for the Netherlands data are shown in Fig. 1(b). Again, the fits are very similar and only the quadratic model, Eq. (3), deviates in the upper range $h > 3$ m. In Tab. 1 it can be seen ~~that~~ that according to AIC, the linear model without off-set, Eq. (1), performs best and the quadratic model, Eq. (3), does second best. Here, the power-law, Eq. (4), and the linear model without intercept, Eq. (1), collapse. The power-law fits best for $\beta \approx 1$ so that the two models are identical, which is also reflected in ~~the~~ similar resulting parameters b . A quadratic contribution might only take effect for heights beyond the available h -range, which is in agreement with (Jonkman et al., 2013). Moreover, the linear model, Eq. (2), leads to a rather small off-set $a \approx 0.1$ (in particular compared to the standard error of 0.4), so that it is almost identical to the regression without off-set. Again, we can conclude that the linear contribution dominates and fixed costs as well as non-linear contributions from the dike volume ~~of the~~ can be disregarded, i.e. non-linearities are not necessary.

3.2 Uncertainty

While the regressions characterise the typical relation between dike height and costs, next we want to study the ~~spreading~~ spread around the fits. These deviations of ~~the~~ individual dikes are due to site specific properties and design features which go beyond the height and length and are usually unavailable. Therefore, drawing the analogy with cost overruns, we employ log-normal distributions $\mathcal{LN}(\mu, \sigma)$ (Chou et al., 2009) to characterise the ~~spreading~~ spread.

Accordingly, we analyse the residuals of the fits as an estimate ~~for of~~ the uncertainty. The residuals were calculated as ~~ratio of the fitted values to the actually observed ones~~ the ratio of fitted to observed values. Then we fit log-normal probability distributions

$$\mathcal{LN}(r; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma r} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(r) - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (5)$$

where $r = \frac{\hat{C}(h)}{C(h)}$ denotes the residuals, μ the location parameter, and σ the scale parameter, using maximum likelihood estimation, and employ the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to evaluate the goodness of ~~the~~ fit.

Two features support the choice of the log-normal distribution in this context. First, the log-normal distribution by definition ~~excludes~~ negative values. Second, the statistical ~~spreading~~ spread is relative (for the same reason). Instead of a fixed uncertainty e.g. in EUR, it is defined as a fraction, or percentage, which is plausible since bigger projects typically have larger absolute uncertainty.

For the Canadian and the Netherlands data, the estimated uncertainties are displayed together with the LWI regressions in Fig. 2. It can be seen ~~that~~ that the uncertainty ~~envelopes~~ covers a rather large range which ~~is increasing~~ increases (due to the log-normal definition) from low to high dikes, achieving approximately 10,000 EUR–100,000 EUR for dikes of approximately 4 m–6 m height (see Tab. 1 for the obtained parameters and Sec. 3.3).

In the log-log scale (insets of Fig. 2) one can see qualitatively that the regressions and uncertainties ~~reasonably~~ represent the data ~~points~~ reasonably well. The cost ~~estimate~~ for raising a dike in Canada by one metre ~~encompass roughly~~ is estimated to be 6,000 EUR where the range between $3.4x$ and $x/3.4$ contains 95 % of the uncertainty ($x \approx 6,000$ EUR). Analogously, for the




Figure 2. Spreading-Spread of dike costs and estimated uncertainty. The dike costs are shown together with the linear regressions without intercept, Eq. (1), and with quantiles of estimated log-normal distributions. (a) Canadian dikes and (b) dikes in the Netherlands. The insets show the same items but in double logarithmic scale. The shades give the uncertainty including estimated 95%, 85%, 75%, and 65% of the values (from light to dark).

Netherlands, the estimate is about 9,000 EUR with an uncertainty factor 2.9. Nevertheless, few values are **also** located outside the 95 % ranges suggesting $\bar{\tau}$ that the log-normal distribution might only be a first approximation.

The Canadian data also includes information about whether the dikes are completely new or if existing dikes are to be raised. **Moreover**In addition, the land-use in terms of urban/rural is specified, which strongly affects the land price (see Sec. A1) and eventually the design of **the** construction. Thus, we analyse the data separately according to these four categories (new/raise, urban/rural). Due to the small sample size, we cannot fully disentangle all combinations, so that e.g. “new” includes both, urban and rural. We find that the fits for new and raised dikes are very similar but larger samples would be required to support this finding. In contrast, urban and rural dikes differ clearly in their costs and accordingly lead to different slopes. The resulting
 15 fit parameters, i.e. unit costs and log standard deviations, are also included in Tab. 1. For the Netherlands a similar difference between urban and rural has been reported by de Grave and Baase (2011). Mostly the land value **is-causing-causes a** the discrepancy between urban and rural dikes. The actual land value however is very site specific and is highly sensitive to land-use and socio-economic changes as discussed earlier.

3.3 Comparison with results from other studies

To compare our results with results from Hoozemans et al. (1993) and Jonkman et al. (2013) we converted all data to EUR for the Netherlands in 2012, involving three adjustments, namely currency, purchasing power, and reference year.

5 The easiest way of adjusting for different currencies would be to use the exchange rates. However, this does not take into account differences in purchasing power. Considering these, the exchange rates have to be adjusted. To do so, a method,

Table 2. GDP per capita, purchasing power parity (PPP) GDP per capita, and mean exchange rates ($e_{i,\text{USD}}$) of 2012 (World Bank, 2016) for Canada, the Netherlands, and the USA, as well as the PPP adjusted exchange rates $e_{i,\text{USD}}^*$ and $e_{i,\text{EUR}}^*$. The PPP adjusted exchange rates give the amount of money in the currency of the country having the same purchasing power as 1.00 USD and 1.00 EUR, respectively.

	GDP [USD]	GDP _{PPP} [PPP- $\$$]	$e_{i,\text{USD}}$ [USD $^{-1}$]	$e_{i,\text{USD}}^*$ [PPP- $\$^{-1}$]	$e_{i,\text{EUR}}^*$ [EUR $^{-1}$]
CA	52 733.5	42 280.8	1.00 CAD	1.25 CAD	1.51 CAD
NL	49 128.1	46 053.9	0.78 EUR	0.83 EUR	1.00 EUR
US	51 456.7	51 456.7	1.00 USD	1.00 USD	1.20 USD
GB	41 294.5	37 607.9	0.63 GBP	0.69 GBP	0.83 GBP

used e.g. by the World Bank, is to adjust the exchange rate of a currency i to US dollars (USD) $e_{i,\text{USD}}$ by correcting it using purchasing power parities (PPP). The World Bank provides both the gross domestic product (GDP) and the purchasing power parity adjusted GPD (GDP_{PPP}) for the countries of the world (World Bank, 2016). Using these, a correction factor c_e for the exchange rate can be derived by calculating the ratio of the GDP and the GDP_{PPP} of a country according to $c_e = \text{GDP}_{\text{PPP}}/\text{GDP}$, leading to an evaluation of how much currency i is over- or under-rated in comparison to USD. Then the given exchange rate $e_{i,\text{USD}}$ can be corrected according to $e_{i,\text{USD}}^* = e_{i,\text{USD}}/c_e$, i.e. by dividing it by the correcting factor c_e . This gives the amount of **money-of** currency i one has to spend to have the same purchasing power as one USD. **For converting To convert** the PPP adjusted exchange rate $e_{i,\text{USD}}^*$ into EUR, it is divided by the PPP adjusted exchange rate $e_{\text{EUR,USD}}^*$ from EUR into USD, which can be derived as described **just before above**. This leads to the result of $e_{\text{CAD,EUR}}^* = 1.51$ and $e_{\text{USD,EUR}}^* = 1.20$ for 2012, meaning that CAD 1.51 and USD 1.20 have the same purchasing power as 1.00 EUR in the Netherlands in 2012. Using these factors, the cost estimates given in CAD and USD can be converted into EUR.

For the data from Hoozemans et al. (1993) the USD prices of 1993 were adjusted to prices of 2012 first, by using implicit price deflator values for the GDP of the USA from the US Federal Reserve Bank (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2016). The price deflator index is set to $D_{2009} = 100$ for 2009. For 1993 it is $D_{1993} = 72.244$ and for 2012 it is $D_{2012} = 105.231$. The cost for 2012 is calculated according to $C_{2012} = (C_{1993} \cdot D_{2012})/D_{1993}$. Then these values were converted into EUR by dividing them by the PPP adjusted exchange rate $e_{\text{USD,EUR}}^*$ of Tab. 2.

Jonkman et al. (2013) give the costs in EUR **of for** 2009. To ensure comparability, these cost estimates **where were** adjusted to values of 2012 by applying the same procedure using price deflators given by the US Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2016). So the costs for 2012 C_{2012} is given by $C_{2012} = (C_{2009} \cdot D_{2012})/D_{2009}$, where C_{2009} is the cost given by Jonkman et al. (2013) and $D_{2009} = 99.2$ and $D_{2012} = 101.6$.

We also include results for Great Britain by using the dimensions of the dikes designed in the Canadian study to parameterise the calculation tool developed for the Environment Agency (Pettit and Robinson, 2012). We entered the dike dimensions and, utilising the 80th percentile of the costs, obtained estimations of the costs, if the dikes specified in (Delcan Corporation, 2012) (Sec. 2.1) **would be were** built in Great Britain.




Figure 3. Comparison of our results with data from different studies and countries in terms of unit cost estimates for raising dikes. Namely, a – (Hoozemans et al., 1993), b – this study based on (Delcan Corporation, 2012), c – (Jonkman et al., 2013), d – this study based on (de Grave and Baase, 2011), and e – [this study based on](#) (Pettit and Robinson, 2012) using data from (Delcan Corporation, 2012). Boxes represent single unit cost estimates, plain bars [given-give](#) ranges, and the boxes with error bars [indicate](#) our calculations with mean and 95% quantiles of the log-normal distributions. To make the data comparable, the values have been adjusted to Euros of 2012. [The studies differ partly in the components taken into account](#) (see main text). Please note that the cost axis is logarithmic.

In Fig. 3 we compare the various values reported in the literature with our estimates in terms of b [the slope \(the slope\)](#) known as unit costs as described [earlier above](#). According to the available information, we separate dikes constructed on urban and rural land, and those where land use is not specified. Moreover, we colour-code the 5 countries for which we have information, i.e. the Netherlands, Canada, the USA, Vietnam, and Great Britain. Where available, ranges [are plotted](#) and error bars (for 95 % uncertainty) [are plotted](#). It can be seen that the cost estimates by Hoozemans et al. (1993) are not in all cases underestimates as suggested by Jonkman et al. (2013). They line up quite well within the range of the other cost estimates for the Netherlands of de Grave and Baase (2011) and Jonkman et al. (2013). [Moreover Further](#), it can be seen that the [difference between the land uses-influence of land use, i.e. urban/rural](#), is smaller than [between the countries the influence of country where the dike is constructed](#). Nevertheless, when considering only [the](#) individual countries there are still differences between [the](#) land uses (as expected, urban dikes tend to be more expensive). [But overall it can be said that the Overall](#) costs of dikes constructed in the Netherlands [is are](#) the highest, followed by costs for dikes built in the USA, Canada, and Vietnam.

[The cost estimate for Great Britain differs quite largely from that for Canada. It is substantially lower and roughly on the level of Vietnam. One reason could be that, although taking into account also a fixed percentage for investment, operation, and maintenance costs, the approach of the Canadian study is more detailed leading to a higher cost estimate. Another reason could be, that the PPP-corrected GDP of Great Britain is about 11 lower than that of Canada leading to lower costs.](#)

4 Summary and Discussion

To reduce one of the potential barriers of planning and implementing adaptation strategies in relation to coastal dikes (Heidrich et al., 2016), we offer a rigorous empirical basis for the assumption of constant unit costs (i.e. linear with height, no fixed costs). Moreover, we characterise the deviations of these typical costs by means of log-normal distributions assuming the relative deviations are independent of the height. This variability captures influences which go beyond the two strongest factors, namely length and height. Although the data from the Netherlands covers mostly dikes, or dike raises, of less than 1m, whereas the data from Canada includes dikes as high as 7m, the uncertainty is of similar order of magnitude, i.e. in both cases the multiplication with and division by a factor of 3 includes approximately 95%.

Nevertheless, we do not find neither statistical signatures of fixed costs nor of non-linearities for the costs of dikes we have analysed. For both coastal protection projects, i.e. in Canada and the Netherlands, it is sufficient to express the typical costs of dikes per height and length, which is compatible with assumptions made in previous publications, e.g. in (Jonkman et al., 2013). We offer a rigorous empirical basis for the assumption of constant unit costs (i.e. linear with height, no fixed costs). Moreover, we characterise the deviations of these typical costs by means of with a log-normal distributions distribution assuming the relative deviations are independent of the height. This variability captures influences which go beyond the two strongest factors, namely length and height. Although the data from the Netherlands covers cover mostly dikes, or dike raises, of less than 1 m, whereas while the data from Canada includes up to almost dikes as high as 7 m, the uncertainty is of similar order of magnitude, i.e. in both cases the multiplication with and division by a factor of 3 includes approximately 95%. In addition, we did not find statistical signatures of fixed costs or non-linearities for the dikes that we have analysed.

The uncertainty considered here stems from a lack of knowledge, i.e. by studying the costs only as a function of length and height, as we did not have more detailed information on the local conditions and requirements of the dikes available (although we assume that the authors of the reports did have a better greater knowledge). Hence, we borrow the concept of cost overruns to characterise the uncertainty of dike constructions. Worth noting, It is worth noting that when erected, the constructions may be affected by real cost overruns (the original Canadian study included 50% contingency), which would increase both increase both the overall costs and the spreadingspread. Thus, in particular in regard of the with regard to uncertainty, our results are probably only lower estimates. Another aspect to be mentioned considered is that we assume all dikes to have equal probability, i.e. each dot in Fig. 1 is equally likely. However, which dike design and corresponding costs are required depends on the local topography and their likelihood is characteristic to of the case study. Moreover, we are not accounting do not account for any economic shock that would affect the costs, e.g. raw material and fuel costs but also, labour shocks, shocks affecting imports, etc.

We also want to discuss another aspect that comes into play, when the total costs of an ensemble of dikes are aggregated, e.g. according to $C_{tot} = \sum_i l_i C(h_i)$, where i are the indices of considered dikes dikes considered. Due to the central limit theorem, the standard deviation decreases with the square root of the sample size. If the costs of the dikes are independent from of each other, then one can expect that the relative uncertainty will decrease with the number of dikes. In reality, however, it

5 can be expected that the costs of ~~the various different~~ dikes are correlated so that the relative uncertainty of the total costs is likely not to shrink [Prahl et al. (2012) treat spatial correlations in a different context].

The transfer of our findings and conclusions to other countries needs to be done with caution. Although plausible, we have no proof that the analogous parameters and consequent conclusions hold true in other countries. Especially it cannot be excluded that fixed costs could represent a significant contribution in countries with weaker tradition in coastal protection or in countries that so far have not been threatened by sea-level rise. Similar arguments could also apply to the unit costs. Further research is necessary to better understand the unit costs so that they can be transferred to other countries and circumstances.

10 In the context of riverine floods, the lack of good quality cost estimates has hampered progress in the advance of large scale flood risk modelling. There is an urgent need for data on the location of dikes as well as their costs and uncertainty (Ward et al., 2015). Given the information of flood management in place (i.e. existing protection levels), this could be done by automatised identification of the required protection courses (Boettle et al., 2017, 2014), and our method and results could help to estimate the dike costs. Certainly, coastal and riverine dikes have different requirements, in particular regarding wave run-up and duration of floods. However, it is plausible that our main conclusions regarding linear cost function and uncertainty also apply to riverine dikes.

15 Comparing our estimates with the figures provided in the literature, we find that the costs differ more between the countries than between the land uses. Nevertheless, within the countries the differences from the due to land uses are still pronounced and pronounced and, as expected, urban dikes tend to be more costly than rural ones. However, when comparing such cost estimates it is crucial which components are actually included in the figures. While in the Canadian report (Delcan Corporation, 2012) all components of the costs are disclosed, in other cases it might not be clear if e.g. costs of property acquisition or project management are included, or if they refer to the pure costs of the physical construction.

25 Costs of operation and maintenance are another complication. Such costs depend on frequency of inspections, annual maintenance requirements, and long-term intermittent maintenance activities (Keating et al., 2015). Typical activities include repairs, vegetation cutting, weed and vermin control, and maintenance costs can vary by over an order of magnitude (Keating et al., 2015). While the Netherlands data does include maintenance, the Canadian data and the Great Britain estimates do not. The annual operation costs are usually given as a percentage of the construction costs over the lifetime of the dike. If we assume 1 % of annual maintenance costs over a lifetime of 100 years, then maintenance adds up to 100 % of the construction costs (disregarding any discounting) so that maintenance can represent a substantial contribution to the costs. In terms of accounting, construction costs usually represent one-time expenses and operation costs are spread out over many years.

30 To conclude, this study gives decision makers an order of magnitude on the protection costs which can remove potential barriers in-to designing and implementing adaptation strategies worldwide in other countries. Future research may focus on the creation of a “best practice” approach to understand how potential impacts are accounted for, and to deliver to decision makers ways in which climate adaptation options such as sea dikes are can be understood and measured, both in terms of investment needed economically but also and in reducing risks of flooding and reduced damage costs.

Appendix A: Explicit cost estimates

A1 Canada

The total costs [from Table 4.2 in (Delcan Corporation, 2012)] consist of

1. Structural flood protection / embankment
10 9 % of total costs
For a dike of length l , footprint f , height h the following components are included, whereas ' \sim ' represents proportionality.
 - (a) Site preparation: clearing and removal of topsoil (costs/ $l \sim ht$, where t is the thickness of the layer), estimated unit cost CAD 15/m³.
 - 15 (b) Core material: supplying and installing the dike material (costs/ $l \sim fh$, approximately costs/ $l \sim h^2$), estimated unit cost CAD 40/m³.
 - (c) Rip-rap: stone protection for the water side of the dike (costs/ $l \sim ht$, where t is the thickness of the layer), estimated unit cost CAD 50/m³.
 - (d) Surface restoration: construction of a typical asphalt road in case there is already a road at the site, applies to 5/36
20 reaches (costs/ $l \sim f \sim h$, assuming surface $\sim lf$), estimated unit cost CAD 100/m².
2. Utility relocation, pump stations, and flood boxes
4 % of total costs
 - (a) It was assumed that dike construction will include 25 % extra in urban areas and 5 % for rural areas for utility relocation.
 - 25 (b) Upgrades of existing pump stations. This applies to 16/36 reaches, with an estimated unit cost of CAD 2.5 million.
 - (c) Adjustment of drainage behind the dike and small pump station installation. This applies to 18/36 reaches, with an estimated unit cost of CAD 0.5 million.
3. Property acquisition
17 % of total costs
30 The area of property to be acquired is determined by the footprint, i.e. costs/ $l \sim f$, approximately costs/ $l \sim h$. Full purchase costs have been included, i.e. as derived from previous constructions. Residential property has double the value of commercial/industrial property and commercial/industrial property has five times the value of agricultural property.
 - (a) agricultural: 3 % of total costs, 9/36 reaches, 86 % of total area, estimated unit cost CAD 22/m²;
 - (b) residential: 6 % of total costs, 7/36 reaches, 4 % of total area, estimated unit cost CAD 850/m²;
 - 5 (c) commercial/industrial: 8 % of total costs, 11/36 reaches, 11 % of total area, estimated unit cost CAD 400/m².

4. Seismic resilience (vibro-replacement, deep soil mixing, toe berm)

34 % of total costs

Because the Vancouver area is seismic active, it is necessary to make dikes seismically resilient. Depending on the soil profile at the dike location vibro-replacement, deep soil mixing or installing a toe berm is necessary.

10 (a) vibro-replacement: 10/36 reaches, estimated unit cost CAD 22 /m²;

(b) deep soil mixing: 3/36 reaches, estimated unit cost CAD 250 /m²;

(c) toe berm: 10/36 reaches.

5. Environmental compensation

1 % of total costs, 4/36 reaches, estimated unit cost CAD 250 /m².

15 6. Site Investigation, Project Management, and Engineering (15 % on top of previous items)

2 % of total costs

7. Contingency (50 % on top of all previous items)

33 % of total costs

Prior to beginning the analysis, we perform a few steps:

20 – exclude the following reaches:

#4 (floodwall), #5 (flood proofing, no information), #10 (barrier), #16 (double dike), #17 (flood proofing, no information), #23 (retreat), #27 (barrier), #28 (flood proofing, no information);

– disregard deep soil mixing of reaches #7, #8, #22; and

– disregard 50% contingency on top of the total costs.

25 This leads to a total of 28 reaches being analysed. The complete data ~~is~~are provided in Tab. 3.

A2 Netherlands

The dike raising costs of the Dutch study are based on a system of cost functions. To obtain the cost function for one dike reach there are eight calculation steps taken into account:

1. Identify the needed dike height raising by modelling the hydraulical strain for a given dike height and return level interval.

2. Process the information about the current and the required dike profile to determine the needed ground and construction measures. This step takes into account:

(a) the dike height of the initial situation,

Table 3. Cost estimates after (Delcan Corporation, 2012) for Metro Vancouver without contingency for 28 dikes (out of 36). Total costs have been estimated using the reach length and increased dike height and the unit costs given in (Delcan Corporation, 2012).

reach number	reach name	action	land use	increase [m]	reach length [m]	unit costs [kEUR/m]
1A	South Vancouver	new	urban	2.2	3 245	11.7
1B	South Vancouver	new	urban	2.2	11 325	11.7
2	Burnaby	new	urban	2.8	7 710	17.1
3	Queensborough	raise	urban	3.1	7 190	18.7
6	Richmond Urban / high density	raise	urban	2.7	9 015	14.5
7	Richmond Rural / low density / north	raise	rural	2.8	11 440	5.1
8	Richmond Rural / low density / south	raise	rural	2.3	16 190	6.5
9	Richmond West dike	raise	urban	4.5	6 390	19.2
11A	Sea Island	raise	urban	3.9	4 850	15.7
11B	Sea Island	raise	urban	2.2	10 550	16.6
12	Tilbury/Sunbury	raise	urban	2.2	15 450	19.3
13	Ladner	raise	urban	2.7	4 300	30.7
14A	Westham Island	new	rural	4.6	4 560	12.1
14B	Westham Island	new	rural	3.3	6 940	10.8
15	Delta West dike	raise	rural	4.5	8 840	12.3
18	Boundary Bay Village	new	urban	4.8	1 215	28.6
19	Boundary Bay Regional Park	new	rural	4.6	2 205	6.2
20	Beach Grove	raise	urban	4.8	1 165	27.8
21	Boundary Bay	raise	rural	4.0	14 775	6.4
22	Surrey	raise	urban	2.8	7 150	14.1
24	Crescent Beach	raise	urban	3.8	2 590	25.5
25	Annacis Island	new	urban	2.7	13 550	12.1
26	Kitsilano and English Bay	new	urban	2.1	1 280	3.0
29	West Vancouver	new	urban	5.2	7 300	30.8
30	District of North Vancouver	new	urban	1.7	5 800	8.1
31	City of North Vancouver	new	urban	3.2	2 000	12.4
32	Port Moody	new	urban	1.2	875	1.3
33	White Rock / South Surrey	new	urban	4.3	2 500	25.7

(b) the benching height of the initial situation if there is benching on the land side,

(c) the distance between the outer dike crest and the dike foot on the land side,

- 5 (d) the required raising of the base body of the dike (corresponding to the required raising of the dike crest including an additional raising for settling and compaction),
- (e) broadening of the dike base for increasing macrostability,
- (f) broadening of the dike base for piping.

3. Determination of the range of ground and construction measures according to a four step expulsion list with the following
10 combinations of measures:

- M1 complete solution with exclusively ground measures,
- M2 raising and fortification of the dike body with a combination of ground measures and one construction measure on the dike toes on the land side,
- M3 dike raising in the ground and steepening of the (inside) embankment on one side in combination with one construction measure within the dike body,
15
- M4 dike raising in the ground and steepening of both dike embankments in combination with a cofferdam construction within the dike body.

According to the selected combination of measures, the new dike profile, the type and extent of the required construction measures, the additional footprint of the dike, the direct ground work and construction costs per unit of length, the
20 length of the dike section to which the measures are applied, the total construction costs and the additional costs for administration and maintenance are calculated.

4. Calculation of costs needed for dike reaches with special conditions. These special conditions consist of the construction of a cofferdam. The costs for this is estimated using both the horizontal and vertical length, the height and a standard cost function.
- 25 5. Estimation of costs needed for the adjustment of infrastructure. This applies if there is an existing road or other type of traffic infrastructure which has to be reallocated. This also applies if there are crossroads or railways located above the dike which interfere with the raising of the dike. This may require the construction of a new dike section.
6. Identification of costs for purchase of land. To estimate this kind of costs there are four cases which are being differentiated, namely built-up area, non built-up area, urban and rural. For the two categories built-up and urban the land acquisition costs are considered to be high and for non built-up and rural comparatively low.
30
7. Determination of costs for countryside and environment compensation measures. If a dike reach crosses a nature reserve or an area of special scenic importance, it is necessary to acquire land create appropriate compensation measures.
8. Estimation of the volume of the total investment costs and additional annual costs for administration and maintenance. The total investment costs are formed by summing up the costs (including their administration and maintenance costs)

5 of the previous seven steps. Based on this, the total administration and maintenance costs are defined as percentage of the total investment costs.

The complete data ~~is~~are provided in Tab. 4.

Acknowledgements. We thank H. Costa ~~and~~ B. Pahl for useful discussions~~-,~~ M. Olonscheck for her translation skills, and C. Hewett for help with the manuscript. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework

10 Programme under Grant Agreement No. 308497 (Project RAMSES).

References

- Aerts, J. C. J. H., Botzen, W. J. W., Moel, H. d., and Bowman, M.: Cost estimates for flood resilience and protection strategies in New York City, *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.*, 1294, 1–104, doi:10.1111/nyas.12200, 2013.
- Akaike, H.: A new look at the statistical model identification, *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, AC-19, 716–723, doi:10.1109/TAC.1974.1100705, 15 1974.
- BCIS: Elemental Standard Form of Cost Analysis, Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, London, 4th (nrm) edn., http://www.rics.org/Global/BCIS_Elemental_Standard_Form_of_Cost_Analysis_4th__NRM__Edition_2012.pdf, 2012.
- Boettle, M., Rybski, D., and Kropp, J. P.: How changing sea level extremes and protection measures alter coastal flood damages, *Water Resour. Res.*, 49, 1199–1210, doi:10.1002/wrcr.20108, 2013a.
- 20 Boettle, M., Rybski, D., and Kropp, J. P.: Adaptation to Sea Level Rise: Calculating Costs and Benefits for the Case Study Kalundborg, Denmark, in: *Climate Change Adaptation in Practice*, edited by Schmidt-Thomé, P. and Klein, J., chap. 3, pp. 25–34, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, UK, 2013b.
- Boettle, M., Costa, L., Kriewald, S., Kropp, J. P., Prahl, B. F., and Rybski, D.: Development of a library of impact functions and general uncertainty measures (Deliverable 1.2), Tech. rep., RAMSES project: Reconciling Adaptation, Mitigation and Sustainable Development 25 for Cities, http://www.ramses-cities.eu/fileadmin/uploads/Deliverables_Uploaded/Development_of_a_library_of_impact_functions_and_general_uncertainty_measures_D1.2.pdf, 2014.
- Boettle, M., Rybski, D., and Kropp, J. P.: Quantifying the Effect of Sea Level Rise and Flood Defence – A Point Process Perspective on Coastal Flood Damage, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 16, 559–576, doi:10.5194/nhess-16-559-2016, 2016.
- Boettle, M., Costa, L., Vousdoukas, M., Costa, H., Floater, G., Kriewald, S., Zhou, B., Chen, P.-Y., Kropp, J. P., and Rybski, D.: Coastal 30 Floods in European Cities: Damage and Adaptation Functions, in preparation, 2017.
- Bouwer, L. M.: Projections of Future Extreme Weather Losses Under Changes in Climate and Exposure, *Risk. Anal.*, 33, 915–930, doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01880.x, 2013.
- Chou, J.-S., Yang, I.-T., and Chong, W. K.: Probabilistic simulation for developing likelihood distribution of engineering project cost, *Automat. Constr.*, 18, 570–577, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2008.12.001, 2009.
- 35 Dawson, R. and Hall, J.: Adaptive importance sampling for risk analysis of complex infrastructure systems, *P. Roy. Soc. A – Math. Phys.*, 462, 3343–3362, doi:10.1098/rspa.2006.1720, 2006.
- Dawson, R. J., Dickson, M. E., Nicholls, R. J., Hall, J. W., Walkden, M. J. A., Stansby, P. K., Mokrech, M., Richards, J., Zhou, J., Milligan, J., Jordan, A., Pearson, S., Rees, J., Bates, P. D., Koukoulas, S., and Watkinson, A. R.: Integrated analysis of risks of coastal flooding and cliff erosion under scenarios of long term change, *Climatic Change*, 95, 249–288, doi:10.1007/s10584-008-9532-8, 2009.
- Dawson, R. J., Ball, T., Werritty, J., Werritty, A., Hall, J. W., and Roche, N.: Assessing the effectiveness of non-structural flood management 5 measures in the Thames Estuary under conditions of socio-economic and environmental change, *Global Environ. Chang.*, 21, 628–646, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.01.013, 2011.
- de Grave, P. and Baase, G.: *Kosten van maatregelen*, technical report, Deltares, Delft, Netherlands, 2011.
- Delcan Corporation: *Cost of Adaptation – Sea Dikes & Alternative Strategies*, FINAL REPORT EB3762, British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Vancouver, http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wsd/public_safety/flood/pdfs_word/cost_of_adaptation-final_report_oct2012.pdf, 2012.
- 10

- Diaz, D. B.: Estimating global damages from sea level rise with the Coastal Impact and Adaptation Model (CIAM), *Climatic Change*, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1675-4, 2016.
- Dronkers, J., Gilbert, J. T. E., Butler, L., Carey, J. J., Campbell, J., James, E., McKenzie, C., Misdorp, R., Quin, N., Ries, K. L., Schroder, P. C., Spradley, J. R., Titus, J. G., Vallianos, L., and von Dadelszen, J.: Strategies for Adaption to Sea Level Rise, Report, IPCC Coastal Zone Management Subgroup: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Geneva, <http://papers.risingsea.net/IPCC-1990-Strategies-for-Adaption-to-Sea-Level-Rise.html>, 1990.
- Eijgenraam, C., Kind, J., Bak, C., Brekelmans, R., den Hertog, D., Duits, M., Roos, K., Vermeer, P., and Kuijken, W.: Economically Efficient Standards to Protect the Netherlands Against Flooding, *Interfaces*, 44, 7–21, doi:10.1287/inte.2013.0721, 2014.
- Eijgenraam, C. J. J. and Zwaneveld, P. J.: Second Opinion Kosten-batenanalyse Waterveiligheid 21e eeuw, CPB notitie, Centraal Planbureau, Den Haag, Netherlands, 2011.
- Fankhauser, S.: Protection versus retreat: the economic costs of sea-level rise, *Environ. Plann. A*, 27, 299–319, doi:10.1068/a270299, 1995.
- Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis: Gross Domestic Product: Implicit Price Deflator, <https://research.stlouisfed.org/fred2/series/GDPDEF>, last accessed: 1 March 2016, 2016.
- Flyvbjerg, B.: Policy and Planning for Large-Infrastructure Projects: Problems, Causes, Cures, *Environ. Plann. B*, 34, 578–597, doi:10.1068/b32111, 2007a.
- Flyvbjerg, B.: Cost Overruns and Demand Shortfalls in Urban Rail and Other Infrastructure, *Transport. Plan. Techn.*, 30, 9–30, doi:10.1080/03081060701207938, 2007b.
- Flyvbjerg, B. and Stewart, A.: Olympic Proportions: Cost and Cost Overrun at the Olympics 1960–2012, Working paper, Saïd Business School – University of Oxford, Oxford, doi:10.2139/ssrn.2238053, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2238053>, 2012.
- Hallegatte, S., Green, C., Nicholls, R. J., and Corfee-Morlot, J.: Future flood losses in major coastal cities, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, 3, 802–806, doi:10.1038/nclimate1979, 2013.
- Heidrich, O., Dawson, R. J., Reckien, D., and Walsh, C. L.: Assessment of the climate preparedness of 30 urban areas in the UK, *Climatic Change*, 120, 771–784, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0846-9, 2013.
- Heidrich, O., Reckien, D., Olazabal, M., Foley, A., Salvia, M., Gregorio Hurtado, S. d., Orru, H., Flacke, J., Geneletti, D., Pietrapertosa, F., Hamann, J. J.-P., Tiwary, A., Feliu, E., and Dawson, R. J.: National climate policies across Europe and their impacts on cities strategies, *J. Environ. Manage.*, 168, 36–45, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.11.043, 2016.
- Hinkel, J., Lincke, D., Vafeidis, A. T., Perrette, M., Nicholls, R. J., Tol, R. S. J., Marzeion, B., Fettweis, X., Ionescu, C., and Levermann, A.: Coastal flood damage and adaptation costs under 21st century sea-level rise, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 111, 3292–3297, doi:10.1073/pnas.1222469111, 2014.
- Hoozemans, F. M. J., Marchand, M., and Pennekamp, H. A.: A Global Vulnerability Analysis: Vulnerability Assessment for Population, Coastal Wetlands and Rice Production on a Global Scale, Delft Hydraulics, Delft, the Netherlands, 1993.
- Hudson, T., Keating, K., and Pettit, A.: Cost estimation for coastal protection – summary of evidence, Report SC080039/R7, Environment Agency, Bristol, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/411178/Cost_estimation_for_coastal_protection.pdf, 2015.
- Jongmann, B., Hochrainer-Stigler, S., Feyen, L., Aerts, J. C. J. H., Mechler, R., Botzen, W. J. W., Bouwer, L. M., Pflug, G., Rojas, R., and Ward, P. J.: Increasing stress on disaster-risk finance due to large floods, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, 4, 264–268, doi:10.1038/NCLIMATE2124, 2014.

- Jonkman, S. N., Brinkhuis-Jak, M., and Kok, M.: Cost benefit analysis and flood damage mitigation in the Netherlands, *Heron*, 49, 95–111, 2004.
- Jonkman, S. N., Hillen, M. M., Nicholls, R. J., Kanning, W., and van Ledden, M.: Costs of Adapting Coastal Defences to Sea-Level Rise—New Estimates and Their Implications, *J. Coastal Res.*, 29, 1212–1226, doi:10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-12-00230.1, 2013.
- 15 Keating, K., Pettit, A., and Wood, A.: Cost estimation for fluvial defences – summary of evidence, Research Contractor Report SC080039/R2, Environment Agency, Bristol, UK, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/411171/Cost_estimation_for_fluvial_defences.pdf, JBA Consulting, 2015.
- Kind, J. M.: Economically efficient flood protection standards for the Netherlands, *J. Flood Risk Management*, 7, 103–117, doi:10.1111/jfr3.12026, 2014.
- 20 Klijn, F., M., K. J., Ligtoet, W., and Mens, M. J. P.: In search of robust flood risk management alternatives for the Netherlands, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 12, 1469–1479, doi:10.5194/nhess-12-1469-2012, 2012.
- Kreibich, H., van den Berg, J. C. J. M., Bouwer, L. M., Bubeck, P., Ciavola, P., Green, C., Hallegatte, S., Logar, I., Meyer, V., Schwarze, R., and Thieken, A. H.: Costing Natural Hazards, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 4, 303–306, doi:10.1038/nclimate2182, 2014.
- Linham, M. M., Green, C. H., and Nicholls, R. J.: Costs of adaptation to the effects of climate change in the world’s large port cities, Report 25 AV/WS2/D1/R14, AVOID: Avoiding dangerous climate change, www.avoid.uk.net, work stream 2, 2010.
- Love, P. E. D., Wang, X., Sing, C.-P., and Tiong, R. L. K.: Determining the Probability of Project Cost Overruns, *J. Constr. Eng. Manage.*, 139, 321–330, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000575, 2013.
- MacDonald, M.: CESMM4 Carbon & Price Book 2013, ICE Publishing, London, doi:10.1680/ccpb2013.58125, <http://www.icevirtuallibrary.com/doi/abs/10.1680/ccpb2013.58125>, 2013.
- 30 Marquardt, D. W.: An Algorithm for Least-Squares Estimations of Nonlinear Parameters, *J. Soc. Ind. Appl. Math.*, 11, 431–441, 1963.
- Menéndez, M. and Woodworth, P. L.: Changes in extreme high water levels based on a quasi-global tide-gauge data set, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, C10011, doi:10.1029/2009JC005997, 2010.
- Pettit, A. and Robinson, P.: Supporting Spreadsheet for the Long Term Costing Project, in: Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Research and Development Programme, JBA Consulting and Environment Agency (EA), Environment Agency (EA), Bristol, UK, 2012.
- 35 Prah, B. F., Rybski, D., Kropp, J. P., Burghoff, O., and Held, H.: Applying stochastic small-scale damage functions to German winter storms, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, L06 806, doi:10.1029/2012GL050961, 2012.
- Prah, B. F., Rybski, D., Boettle, M., and Kropp, J. P.: Damage functions for climate-related hazards: unification and uncertainty analysis, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discussions*, 3, 6845–6881, doi:10.5194/nhessd-3-6845-2015, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/6845/2015/>, 2015.
- 530 Public Works and Government Services Canada: Cost estimation definitions, <http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/biens-property/sngp-npms/bi-rp/conn-know/couts-cost/definition-eng.html>, last accessed: 18 January 2016, last modified 2 March 2015.
- Reckien, D., Flacke, J., Olazabal, M., and Heidrich, O.: The Influence of Drivers and Barriers on Urban Adaptation and Mitigation Plans—An Empirical Analysis of European Cities, *PLoS One*, 10, 1–21, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0135597, 2015.
- Ward, P. J., Jongman, B., Salamon, P., Simpson, A., Bates, P., De Groeve, T., Muis, S., de Perez, E. C., Rudari, R., Trigg, M. A., and 535 Winsemius, H. C.: Usefulness and limitations of global flood risk models, *Nature Clim. Change*, 5, 712–715, doi:10.1038/nclimate2742, 2015.
- World Bank: World Development Indicators, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.PP.CD>, last accessed: 1 March 2016, 2016.

Table 4. Cost estimates after de Grave and Baase (2011) for the Netherlands adjusted for 2012. The cost estimates given here are according to the second reference situation in (de Grave and Baase, 2011). The unit costs represent the costs needed to build a dike of the length of one meter-metre with the given height.

reach code	reach name	length [m]	increase [m]	unit costs [kEUR/m]	reach code	reach name	length [m]	increase [m]	unit costs [kEUR/m]
1-1-1	Schiermonnikoog	3930	0.65	4.7	29-1-2	Walcheren-West	750	0.86	9.6
2-1-1	Ameland	16590	0.64	4.3	29-2-1	Walcheren-Oost	20840	0.90	8.9
3-1-1	Terschelling	14000	0.54	3.6	30-1-1	Zuid-Beveland-West	24190	1.06	6.8
4-1-1	Vlieland	1340	0.52	5.4	30-1-2	Zuid-Beveland-West	15970	0.87	7.2
5-1-1	Texel	1000	0.65	3.1	30-1-3	Zuid-Beveland-West	14290	0.44	2.9
5-1-2	Texel	25100	0.65	4.7	30-1-4	Zuid-Beveland-West	8000	0.30	1.7
6-1-1	Friesland-Groningen-Lauwersmeer	2700	0.78	4.2	31-1-1	Zuid-Beveland-Oost	20130	1.28	8.9
6-1-2	Friesland-Groningen-Lauwersmeer	8950	0.80	7.7	31-1-2	Zuid-Beveland-Oost	21200	0.60	2.9
6-2-1	Friesland-Groningen-Groningen	57390	0.88	7.1	31-1-3	Zuid-Beveland-Oost	7290	0.30	3.5
6-2-2	Friesland-Groningen-Groningen	27440	0.92	6.9	32-1-1	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-West	21590	1.08	6.9
6-3-1	Friesland-Groningen-NoordFriesland	72470	0.74	5.0	32-1-2	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-West	3010	1.14	14.6
6-4-1	Friesland-Groningen-IJselmeer	14790	0.58	3.6	32-1-3	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-West	1600	1.17	9.6
6-4-2	Friesland-Groningen-IJselmeer	9450	0.32	1.4	32-1-4	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-West	3440	1.19	9.8
6-4-3	Friesland-Groningen-IJselmeer	9650	0.32	2.9	32-1-5	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-West	2650	1.26	11.2
6-4-4	Friesland-Groningen-IJselmeer	19060	0.40	0.5	32-1-6	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-West	530	1.22	21.3
6-4-5	Friesland-Groningen-IJselmeer	8700	0.55	4.8	32-1-7	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-West	760	0.91	5.4
7-1-1	Noordoostpolder	31540	0.97	3.9	32-2-1	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-Oost	19860	1.28	16.2
7-1-2	Noordoostpolder	13000	0.85	3.0	32-2-2	Zeeuwisch Vlaanderen-Oost	24760	1.28	8.3
7-1-3	Noordoostpolder	11240	0.25	1.3	34-1-1	West-Brabant	26720	0.61	4.4
8-1-1	Flevoland-Noordoost	5150	0.72	5.6	34-1-2	West-Brabant	10670	0.63	4.6
8-1-2	Flevoland-Noordoost	12420	1.00	5.8	34-1-3	West-Brabant	9900	0.42	3.9
8-1-3	Flevoland-Noordoost	17560	1.08	5.7	34a-1-1	Geertrudenberg	2760	0.73	2.6
8-1-4	Flevoland-Noordoost	5190	0.93	8.5	34a-1-2	Geertrudenberg	7180	0.42	3.6
8-2-1	Flevoland-ZuidWest	23380	0.57	5.0	35-1-1	Donge	16260	0.61	2.4
8-2-2	Flevoland-ZuidWest	5620	0.43	3.1	35-1-2	Donge	12270	0.42	6.8
8-2-3	Flevoland-ZuidWest	25540	0.45	3.0	36-1-1	Land van Heusen de Maaskant	63240	0.51	1.8
9-1-1	Vollenhove	8010	0.38	2.3	36-1-2	Land van Heusen de Maaskant	17230	0.55	3.7
9-1-2	Vollenhove	34730	0.40	2.0	36-1-3	Land van Heusen de Maaskant	3900	0.56	4.5
10-1-1	Mastenbroek	3730	0.56	2.5	36-1-4	Land van Heusen de Maaskant	11370	0.53	4.5
10-1-2	Mastenbroek	11160	0.43	4.2	36-1-5	Land van Heusen de Maaskant	1000	0.51	2.0
10-1-3	Mastenbroek	19480	0.35	3.5	36-1-6	Land van Heusen de Maaskant	2780	0.50	7.4
10-1-4	Mastenbroek	13350	0.39	3.5	36-1-7	Land van Heusen de Maaskant	5000	0.51	3.1
11-1-1	IJsseldelta	4690	1.23	5.0	36a-1-1	Keent	4400	0.51	1.4
11-1-2	IJsseldelta	21380	0.42	6.2	37-1-1	Nederhermert	1360	0.54	3.0
11-1-3	IJsseldelta	6810	0.37	4.4	38-1-1	Bommelerwaard-Waal	29580	0.56	6.0
12-1-1	Wieringen	11610	0.84	4.5	38-2-1	Bommelerwaard-Maas	2520	0.54	2.8
12-1-2	Wieringen	20690	0.41	1.8	38-2-2	Bommelerwaard-Maas	10510	0.57	3.7
13-1-1	Noord-Holland-Noord	12430	0.72	6.9	38-2-3	Bommelerwaard-Maas	2160	0.58	6.6
13-1-2	Noord-Holland-Noord	2630	0.64	17.1	38-2-4	Bommelerwaard-Maas	5020	0.56	5.5
13-1-3	Noord-Holland-Noord	5610	0.67	5.8	39-1-1	Alem	4750	0.51	5.8
13-1-4	Noord-Holland-Noord	5680	2.43	15.9	40-1-1	Heerenwaarden-Waal	5280	0.45	2.5
13-2-1	Noord-Holland-Westfriesland	26430	0.41	5.2	40-2-1	Heerenwaarden-Maas	6380	0.63	3.9
13-2-2	Noord-Holland-Westfriesland	29920	0.41	4.7	41-1-1	Land van Maas en Waal-Waal	40670	0.58	6.5
13-4-1	Noord-Holland-Waterland	24730	0.36	7.2	41-1-2	Land van Maas en Waal-Waal	990	0.58	4.1
13-4-2	Noord-Holland-Waterland	15300	0.32	5.8	41-2-1	Land van Maas en Waal-Maas	43810	0.52	3.5
13a-1-1	Noord-Holland-Waterland	1530	0.21	4.0	41-2-2	Land van Maas en Waal-Maas	4380	0.54	3.7
13a-1-2	Noord-Holland-Waterland	6420	0.26	1.0	42-1-1	Ooij en Millingen	8080	0.59	4.7
13a-1-3	Noord-Holland-Waterland	3260	0.26	0.6	42-1-2	Ooij en Millingen	9350	0.59	6.0
13a-1-4	Noord-Holland-Waterland	1630	0.21	0.6	42-1-3	Ooij en Millingen	42600	0.59	4.7
13b-1-1	Marken	8630	0.29	2.6	43-1-1	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	16470	0.39	3.5
14-1-1	Zuid-Holland-Kust	2820	3.00	29.1	43-1-2	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	7680	0.38	2.8
14-1-2	Zuid-Holland-Kust	1640	3.00	28.7	43-1-3	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	18320	0.35	2.7
14-1-3	Zuid-Holland-Kust	1400	3.46	32.9	43-1-4	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	17020	0.34	3.0
14-1-4	Zuid-Holland-Kust	5000	2.89	29.1	43-1-5	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	4500	0.30	1.8
14-2-1	Zuid-Holland-NweWaterweg-West	4590	0.97	8.7	43-1-6	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	10790	0.41	4.4
14-3-1	Zuid-Holland-NweWaterweg-Oost	26030	0.84	8.6	43-1-7	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	7450	0.56	3.3
14-3-2	Zuid-Holland-NweWaterweg-Oost	10150	0.71	13.0	43-1-8	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	41640	0.60	7.8
15-1-1	Lopiker- en Krimpenerwaard	23060	0.35	4.1	43-1-9	Betuwe, Tieler- en C'waarden	46600	0.58	6.2
15-1-2	Lopiker- en Krimpenerwaard	2500	0.39	11.1	44-1-1	Kromme Rijn-Rijn	32480	0.36	2.6
15-1-3	Lopiker- en Krimpenerwaard	17210	0.32	10.2	44-2-1	Kromme Rijn-Meren	15630	0.35	3.1
15-1-4	Lopiker- en Krimpenerwaard	4850	0.39	13.7	44-2-2	Kromme Rijn-Meren	3250	0.23	4.4
16-1-1	Alblasserwaard en de Vijfheerenlanden	32230	0.43	6.4	44-2-3	Kromme Rijn-Meren	4700	0.55	2.4
16-1-2	Alblasserwaard en de Vijfheerenlanden	16660	0.45	6.2	45-1-1	Gelderse Ballei-Rijn	5350	0.37	2.7
16-1-3	Alblasserwaard en de Vijfheerenlanden	10590	0.45	8.0	45-2-1	Gelderse Ballei-Maren	9920	0.79	4.3
16-1-4	Alblasserwaard en de Vijfheerenlanden	17350	0.46	17.2	45-2-2	Gelderse Ballei-Maren	7520	0.24	2.0
16-1-5	Alblasserwaard en de Vijfheerenlanden	9390	0.42	9.8	45-2-3	Gelderse Ballei-Maren	10390	0.18	1.3
17-1-1	IJsselmonde	24800	0.58	5.6	46-1-1	Eempoller	1100	0.56	5.6
17-1-2	IJsselmonde	8560	0.44	1.0	46-1-2	Eempoller	7310	0.17	4.5