

## 14. Rural Communities

### 2 Convening Lead Authors

3 David Hales, Second Nature, Inc.  
4 William Hohenstein, U.S. Department of Agriculture

### 6 Lead Authors

7 Marcie D. Bidwell, Mountain Studies Institute  
8 Craig Landry, East Carolina University  
9 David McGranahan, U.S. Department of Agriculture  
10 Joseph Molnar, Auburn University  
11 Lois Wright Morton, Iowa State University  
12 Marcela Vasquez, University of Arizona


### 14 Contributing Authors

15 Jenna Jadin, U.S. Department of Agriculture

### 16 Key Messages

- 17 **1. Rural communities are highly dependent upon natural resources for their**  
18 **livelihoods and social structures. Climate change related impacts are currently**  
19 **affecting rural communities. These impacts will progressively increase over this**  
20 **century and will shift the locations where rural economic activities (like agriculture,**  
21 **forestry, and recreation) can thrive.**
- 22 **2. Rural communities face particular geographic and demographic obstacles in**  
23 **responding to and preparing for climate change risks. In particular, physical**  
24 **isolation, limited economic diversity, and higher poverty rates, combined with an**  
25 **aging population, increases the vulnerability of rural communities. Systems of**  
26 **fundamental importance to rural populations are already stressed by remoteness**  
27 **and limited access.**
- 28 **3. Responding to additional challenges from climate change impacts will require**  
29 **significant adaptation within rural transportation and infrastructure systems, as**  
30 **well as health and emergency response systems. Governments in rural communities**  
31 **have limited institutional capacity to respond to, plan for, and anticipate climate**  
32 **change impacts.**

33 More than 95% of U.S. land area is classified as rural (Ch. 13: Land Use & Land Cover Change),  
34 but is home to just 19% of the population.<sup>1</sup> Rural America's importance to the country's  
35 economic and social well-being is disproportionate to its population, however, since rural areas  
36 provide natural resources that much of the rest of the U.S. depends on for food, energy, water,  
37 forests, recreation, national character, and quality of life.<sup>2</sup> Rural economic foundations and  
38 community cohesion are intricately linked to these natural systems, which are inherently  
39 vulnerable to climate change. Urban areas that depend on goods and services from rural areas  
40 will also be affected by climate change driven impacts across the countryside.



1


2 **Figure 14.1:** Rural Counties

3 **Caption:** Although the majority of the U.S. population lives in urban areas, most of the  
 4 country is still classified as rural. In this map, counties are classified as rural if they do  
 5 not include any cities with populations of 50,000 or more. (Figure source: USDA  
 6 Economic Research Service 2013<sup>3</sup>).

7 Warming trends, climate volatility, extreme weather events, and environmental change are  
 8 already affecting the economies and cultures of rural areas. Many rural communities face  
 9 considerable risk to their infrastructure, livelihoods, and quality of life from observed and  
 10 projected climate shifts (Ch. 12: Indigenous Peoples). These changes will progressively increase  
 11 volatility in food commodity markets, shift the ranges of plant and animal species, and,  
 12 depending on the region, increase water scarcity, exacerbate flooding and coastal erosion, and  
 13 increase the intensity and frequency of wildfires across the rural landscape.

14 Climate changes will severely challenge many rural communities, shifting locations where  
 15 particular economic activities are capable of thriving. Changes in the timing of seasons,  
 16 temperatures, and precipitation will alter where commodities, value-added crops, and

1 recreational activities are best suited. Because many rural communities are less diverse than  
 2 urban areas in their economic activities, changes in the viability of one traditional economic  
 3 sector will place disproportionate stresses on community stability.



4  
 5 **Figure 14.2:** Economic Dependence Varies by Region

6 **Caption:** Much of the rural U.S. depends on agriculture, mining, and manufacturing.  
 7 Climate changes will affect each region and each economic sector in complex and  
 8 interrelated ways. The economic dependence classification used in the map indicates the  
 9 largest share of earnings and employment in the county. (Figure source: USDA  
 10 Economic Research Service 2013<sup>3</sup>).

11 Climate change impacts will not be uniform or consistent across rural areas, and some  
 12 communities may benefit from climate change. In the short term, the U.S. agricultural system is  
 13 expected to be fairly resilient to climate change due to the system’s flexibility to engage in  
 14 adaptive behaviors such as expansion of irrigated acreage, regional shifts in acreage for specific  
 15 crops, crop rotations, changes to management decisions (such as choice and timing of inputs and  
 16 cultivation practices), and altered trade patterns compensating for yield changes (Ch. 6:

1 Agriculture; Key Message 5).<sup>4</sup> Recreation, tourism, and leisure activities in some regions will  
2 benefit from shifts in temperature and precipitation.

3 Negative impacts from projected climate changes, however, will ripple throughout rural  
4 America. Agricultural systems in some areas may need to undergo more transformative changes  
5 to keep pace with future climate change (Ch. 6: Agriculture; Key Message 5). In lakes and  
6 riparian areas, warming is projected to increase the growth of algae and invasive species,  
7 particularly in areas already facing water quality impairments.<sup>5</sup> Mountain species and cold water  
8 fish, such as salmon, are expected to face decreasing range sizes due to warming, while ranges  
9 could expand for some warm water fish, such as bass.<sup>6</sup> Alaska, with its reliance on commercial  
10 and subsistence fishing catch, is particularly vulnerable. Warmer weather and higher water  
11 temperatures will reduce salmon harvests, creating hardships for the rural communities and tribes  
12 that depend upon these catches (Ch. 12: Indigenous Peoples, Key Message 1).<sup>7</sup> Communities in  
13 Guam and American Samoa, which depend on fish for 25% to 69% of their protein, are expected  
14 to be particularly hard hit, as climate change alters the composition of coral reef ecosystems.<sup>8</sup>


15 Across the U.S., rural areas provide ecosystem services – like carbon absorption in forests, water  
16 filtration in wetlands, wildlife habitat in prairies, and environmental flows in rivers and streams –  
17 whose value tends to be overlooked. Preserving these ecosystem services sustains the quality of  
18 life in rural communities and also benefits those who come to rural communities for second  
19 homes, tourism, and other amenities. They also provide urban residents with vital resources –  
20 like food, energy, and fresh water – that meet essential needs. This layered connection between  
21 rural areas and populous urban centers suggests that maintaining the health of rural areas is a  
22 national, and not simply a local, concern.

### 23 *Rural Economies*

24 **Rural communities are highly dependent upon natural resources for their livelihoods and**  
25 **social structures. Climate change related impacts are currently affecting rural**  
26 **communities. These impacts will progressively increase over this century and will shift the**  
27 **locations where rural economic activities (like agriculture, forestry, and recreation) can**  
28 **thrive.**

29 Rural America has already experienced some of the impacts of climate change related weather  
30 effects, including crop and livestock loss from severe drought and flooding,<sup>9</sup> infrastructure  
31 damage to levees and roads from extreme storms,<sup>10</sup> shifts in planting and harvesting times in  
32 farming communities,<sup>11</sup> and large-scale losses from fires and other weather-related disasters.<sup>12</sup>  
33 These impacts have profound effects, often significantly affecting the health and well-being of  
34 rural residents as well as the communities, and are amplified by the essential economic link that  
35 many of these communities have to their natural resource base.

## Growing Season Lengthens



1

2 **Figure 14.3:** Growing Season Lengthens

3 **Caption:** The left map shows that if emissions continue to increase (A2 scenario), the  
 4 U.S. growing season (or frost-free season) will lengthen by as much as 30 to 80 days by  
 5 the end of the century (2070-2099 as compared to 1971-2000). The right map shows a  
 6 reduction in the number of frost days (days with minimum temperatures below freezing)  
 7 by 20 to 80 days in much of the U.S. in the same time period. While changes in the  
 8 growing season may have positive effects for some crops, reductions in the number of  
 9 frost days can result in early bud-bursts or blooms, consequently damaging some  
 10 perennial crops grown in the U.S. (See also Ch. 6: Agriculture). White areas experienced  
 11 no freezes in the reference period (1971-2000), and gray areas experienced more than 10  
 12 freeze-free years in the reference period. (Figure source: NOAA NCDC / CICS-NC).

13 Rural communities are often characterized by their natural resources and associated economic  
 14 activity. Dominant economic drivers include agriculture, forestry, mining, energy, outdoor  
 15 recreation, and tourism. In addition, many rural areas with pleasant climates and appealing  
 16 landscapes are increasingly reliant on second-home owners and retirees for their tax base and  
 17 community activities.

18 Nationally, fewer than 7% of rural workers are directly employed in agriculture, but the nation's  
 19 two million farms occupy more than 40% of U.S. land mass – and many rural communities rely  
 20 extensively on farming and ranching (Ch. 6 Agriculture; Ch. 13 Land Use & Land Cover  
 21 Change).<sup>13</sup> Farmers are responding to climate change by shifting cropping patterns and altering  
 22 the timing of planting and harvesting. This may result in additional use of herbicides and  
 23 pesticides with the accompanying human exposure to additional health risks.<sup>14</sup> Changes in  
 24 rainfall, temperature, and extreme weather events will increase the risk of poor yields and  
 25 reduced crop profitability. For example, the increased frequency and intensity of heavy

1 downpours will accelerate soil erosion rates, increasing deposition of nitrogen and phosphorous  
2 into water bodies, and diminishing water quality.<sup>15</sup>


3 Many areas will face increasing competition for water among household, industrial, agricultural,  
4 and urban users (Ch. 3: Water).<sup>16</sup> Reduced surface water will place more stress on surface water  
5 systems as well as groundwater systems (Ch. 3: Water; Key Message 4). In-stream flow  
6 requirements for the maintenance of environmental resources are an equally important water  
7 demand. While irrigated cropland is an important and growing component of the farm  
8 economy,<sup>17</sup> water withdrawals necessary for generating electricity in thermal power plants are  
9 already roughly equal to irrigation withdrawals.<sup>18</sup> As climate change increases water scarcity in  
10 some regions, there will be increased competition for water between energy production and  
11 agriculture.<sup>19</sup> Mining also requires large quantities of water, and scarcity resulting from drought  
12 associated with climate change may affect operations. Changes in seasonality and intensity of  
13 precipitation will increase costs of runoff containment. Climate change impacts on forestry have  
14 important implications for timber and forest-amenity-based rural communities. Shifting forest  
15 range and composition, as well as increased attacks from pests and diseases, will have negative  
16 effects on biodiversity and will increase wildfire risks (Ch. 7 Forests).<sup>8,20</sup> Shifts in the  
17 distribution and abundance of many economically important tree species would affect the pulp  
18 and wood industry. As ranges shift and the distribution of plant species in forests changes, the  
19 range of other forest-dependent animal species will also change, causing additional economic  
20 and sociocultural impacts.

21 Tourism contributes significantly to rural economies. Changes in the length and timing of  
22 seasons, temperature, precipitation, and severe weather events can have a direct impact on  
23 tourism and recreation activities by influencing visitation patterns and tourism-related economic  
24 activity.

25 Climate change impacts on tourism and recreation will vary significantly by region. For instance,  
26 some of Florida's top tourist attractions, including the Everglades and Florida Keys, are  
27 threatened by sea level rise,<sup>21</sup> with estimated revenue losses of \$9 billion by 2025 and \$40 billion  
28 by the 2050s. The effects of climate change on the tourism industry will not be exclusively  
29 negative. In Maine, coastal tourism could increase due to warmer summer months, with more  
30 people visiting the state's beaches.<sup>22</sup> Employing a Tourism Climatic Index (Figure 14.4) that  
31 accounts for temperature, precipitation, sunshine, and wind, one study finds that conditions  
32 conducive for outdoor recreation will be shifting northward with climate change, though it is  
33 unclear whether absolute conditions or relative weather conditions will be more important in  
34 influencing future tourist behaviors.<sup>23</sup>



Climate Change Impacts on Summertime Tourism



**Figure 14.4:** Climate Change Impacts on Summertime Tourism

**Caption:** Tourism is often climate-dependent as well as seasonally-dependent. Increasing heat and humidity projected for summers in the Midwest, Southeast, and parts of the Southwest by mid-century (compared to the period 1961-1990) is likely to create unfavorable conditions for summertime outdoor recreation and tourism activity. The figures illustrate projected changes in climatic attractiveness (based on maximum daily temperature and minimum daily relative humidity, average daily temperature and relative humidity, precipitation, sunshine, and wind speed) in July for much of North America. In the coming century, the distribution of these conditions is projected to shift from acceptable to unfavorable across most of the southern Midwest and a portion of the Southeast, and from very good or good to acceptable conditions in northern portions of the Midwest, under a high emissions scenario (A2a). (Figure source: Nicholls et al. 2005<sup>24</sup>).

Climate change will also influence the distribution and composition of plants and animals across the United States. Hunting, fishing, bird watching, and other wildlife-related activities will be affected as habitats shift and relationships among species change.<sup>25</sup> Cold-weather recreation and tourism will be adversely affected by climate change. Snow accumulation in the western U.S. has decreased, and is expected to continue to decrease, as a result of observed and projected warming. Reduced snow accumulation also reduces the amount of spring snowmelt, decreasing warm-season runoff in mid- to high-latitude regions.

1 Similar changes to snowpack are expected in the Northeast. {Pietrowsky, 2012 #1788} Adverse  
2 impacts on winter sports are projected to be more pronounced in the Northeast and Southwest  
3 regions of the United States.<sup>8</sup> Coastal areas will be adversely affected by sea level rise and  
4 increased severity of storms.<sup>22,26</sup> Changing environmental conditions, such as wetland loss and  
5 beach erosion in coastal areas<sup>27</sup> and increased risk of natural hazards such as wildfire, flash  
6 flooding, storm surge, river flooding, drought, and extremely high temperatures can alter the  
7 character and attraction of rural areas as tourist destinations.

8 The implications of climate change on communities that are dependent on resource extraction  
9 (coal, oil, natural gas, and mining) have not been well studied. Attributes of economic  
10 development in these communities, such as cyclical growth, transient workforce, rapid  
11 development, pressure on infrastructure, and lack of economic diversification suggest that these  
12 communities could face challenges in adapting to climate change.<sup>13,28,29</sup>

### 13 *Responding to Risks*

14 **Rural communities face particular geographic and demographic obstacles in responding to**  
15 **and preparing for climate change risks. In particular, physical isolation, limited economic**  
16 **diversity, and higher poverty rates, combined with an aging population, increases the**  
17 **vulnerability of rural communities. Systems of fundamental importance to rural**  
18 **populations are already stressed by remoteness and limited access.**


19 Relatively rapid changes in demographics, economic activity, and climate are particularly  
20 challenging in rural communities, where local, agrarian values often run generations deep.  
21 Changing rural demographics, influenced by new immigration patterns, fluctuating economic  
22 conditions, and evolving community values add to these challenges – especially with regard to  
23 climate changes.

24 Modern rural populations are generally older, less affluent, and less educated than their urban  
25 counterparts. Rural areas are characterized by higher unemployment, more dependence on  
26 government transfer payments, less diversified economies, and fewer social and economic  
27 resources needed for resilience in the face of major changes.<sup>8,30</sup> In particular, the combination of  
28 an aging population and poverty increases the vulnerability of rural communities to climate  
29 fluctuations.

30



## Many Rural Areas are Losing Population



**Figure 14.5:** Many Rural Areas are Losing Population

**Caption:** Census data show significant population decreases in many rural areas, notably in the Great Plains. Many rural communities' existing vulnerabilities to climate change, including physical isolation, reduced services like health care, and an aging population, are projected to increase as population decreases. (Figure Source: USDA Economic Research Service 2013<sup>3</sup>).

There has been a trend away from manufacturing, resource extraction, and farming to amenity-based economic activity in many rural areas of the United States.<sup>31</sup> Expanding amenity-based economic activities in rural areas include recreation and leisure, e-commuting residents, tourism, and second home and retirement home development. This shift has stressed traditional cultural values<sup>32</sup> and put pressure on infrastructure<sup>33</sup> and natural amenities<sup>34</sup> that draw people to rural areas. Changes in climate and weather are likely to increase these stresses. Rural components of transportation systems are particularly vulnerable to risks from flooding and sea level rise.<sup>35</sup> Since rural areas often have fewer transportation options and fewer infrastructure redundancies, any disruptions in road, rail, or air transport will deeply affect rural communities.

1 Power and communication outages resulting from extreme events often take longer to repair in  
2 rural areas, contributing to the isolation and vulnerability of elderly residents who may not have  
3 cell phones. The lack of cellular coverage in some rural areas can create problems for emergency  
4 response during power failures.<sup>36</sup>

5 In some parts of the country there has been a recent trend in Hispanic population growth in rural  
6 regions that have not been traditional migrant destinations. New Hispanic immigrants are often  
7 highly segregated residentially and isolated from mainstream institutions,<sup>37</sup> making them more  
8 vulnerable to changes in climate. Low wages, unstable work, language barriers, and inadequate  
9 housing are critical obstacles to managing climate risk.

10 Rural communities rely on various transportation modes, both for export and import of critical  
11 goods (Ch. 5: Transportation). Climate changes will result in increased erosion and maintenance  
12 costs for local road and rail systems, as well as changes in streamflows and predictability that  
13 will result in increased maintenance costs for waterways. More frequent disruption of shipping is  
14 projected, with serious economic consequences. For example, in 2010, about 40 million tons of  
15 cereal grains were shipped by water to Louisiana, while less than 4 million tons traveled by  
16 rail.<sup>10</sup> While rail can help ameliorate small-scale or off-peak capacity limitations on the  
17 Mississippi River, it seems unlikely that the rail system can fully replace the river system in the  
18 event of a prolonged harvest-time disruption. Events that affect both rail and barge traffic would  
19 be particularly damaging to rural communities that depend upon these systems to get  
20 commodities to market.

21 Health and emergency response systems also face additional demands from substantial direct and  
22 indirect health risks associated with global climate changes. Indirect risks, particularly those  
23 posed by emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases, are more difficult to assess, but pose  
24 looming threats to economically challenged communities where health services are limited.  
25 Direct threats (such as extreme heat, storm events, and coastal and riparian flooding) tend to be  
26 more associated with specific local vulnerabilities, so the risks are somewhat easier to assess.<sup>38</sup>

27 The socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of rural areas interact with climate change  
28 to create health concerns that differ from those of urban and suburban communities. Older  
29 populations with lower income and educational levels in rural areas spend a larger proportion of  
30 their income on health care than their urban counterparts. Moreover, health care access declines  
31 as geographic isolation increases. Overall, rural residents already have higher rates of age-  
32 adjusted mortality, disability, and chronic disease than do urban populations.<sup>39</sup> These trends are  
33 likely to be exacerbated by climate change (Ch. 9: Human Health).

34 Governments in rural areas are generally ill-prepared to respond quickly and effectively to large-  
35 scale events, although individuals and voluntary associations often show significant resilience.  
36 Health risks are exacerbated by limitations in the health service systems characteristic of rural  
37 areas, including the distance between rural residents and health care providers and the reduced  
38 availability of medical specialists.

1 The effects of climate change on mental health merit special consideration. Rural residents are  
2 already at a heightened risk from mental health issues because of the lack of access to mental  
3 health providers. The adverse impact of severe weather disasters on mental health is well  
4 established,<sup>40</sup> and there is emerging evidence that climate change in the form of increasing heat  
5 waves and droughts has harmful effects on mental health (Ch. 9: Human Health; Key Message  
6 1). Droughts often result in people relocating to seek other employment, causing a loss of home  
7 and social networks. Studies have shown that springtime droughts in rural areas cause a decrease  
8 in life satisfaction.<sup>41</sup> The primary care physicians who form the backbone of rural health care  
9 often have heavy caseloads and lack specialized training in mental health issues.<sup>39</sup> Additionally,  
10 patients referred to mental health specialists often experience significant delays.<sup>42</sup>

11 The frequency and distribution of infectious diseases is also projected to increase with rising  
12 temperatures and associated seasonal shifts. Increased rates of mutation and increased resistance  
13 to drugs and other treatments are already evident in the behavior of infectious disease-causing  
14 bacteria and viruses.<sup>43</sup> In addition, changes in temperature, surface water, humidity, and  
15 precipitation affect the distribution and abundance of disease-carriers and intermediate hosts, and  
16 result in larger distributions for many parasites and diseases. Rural residents who spend  
17 significant time outdoors have an increased risk of exposure to these disease-carriers, like ticks  
18 and mosquitoes (Ch. 9: Human Health).

### 19 *Adaptation*

20 **Responding to additional challenges from climate change impacts will require significant**  
21 **adaptation within rural transportation and infrastructure systems, as well as health and**  
22 **emergency response systems. Governments in rural communities have limited institutional**  
23 **capacity to respond to, plan for, and anticipate climate change impacts.**

24 Climate variability and increases in temperature, extreme events (such as storms, floods, heat  
25 waves, and droughts), and sea level rise are expected to have widespread impacts on the  
26 provision of services from state, regional, local, and tribal governments. Emergency  
27 management, energy use and distribution systems, transportation and infrastructure planning, and  
28 public health will all be affected.

29 Rural governments often depend heavily on volunteers to meet community challenges like fire  
30 protection or flood response. In addition, rural communities have limited locally available  
31 financial resources to help deal with the effects of climate change. Small community size tends  
32 to make services expensive or available only by traveling some distance.

33 Local governance structures tend to de-emphasize planning capacity, compared to urban areas.  
34 While 73% of metropolitan counties have land-use planners, only 29% of rural counties not  
35 adjacent to a metropolitan county had one or more planners. Moreover, rural communities are  
36 not equipped to deal with major infrastructure expenses.<sup>44</sup>

37 Communities across the U.S. are experiencing infrastructure losses, water scarcity, unpredictable  
38 water availability, and increased frequency and intensity of wildfires. However, local authorities  
39 often do not explicitly associate these observed changes with climate, and responses rarely take

1 climate disruption into account. Even in communities where there is increasing awareness of  
2 climate change and interest in comprehensive adaptation planning, lack of funding, human  
3 resources, access to information, training, and expertise provide significant barriers for many  
4 rural communities.<sup>45</sup>

5 If rural communities are to respond adequately to future climate changes, they will likely need  
6 help assessing their risks and vulnerabilities, prioritizing and coordinating projects, funding and  
7 allocating financial and human resources, and deploying information-sharing and decision  
8 support tools (Ch. 26: Decision Support). There is still little systematic research on the  
9 vulnerability of rural communities and there is a need for additional empirical research in this  
10 area. Impacts due to climate change will cross community and regional lines, making solutions  
11 dependent upon meaningful participation of numerous stakeholders from federal, state, local, and  
12 tribal governments, science and academia, the private sector, non-profit organizations, and the  
13 general public (Ch. 28: Adaptation; Key Message 3).

14 Effective adaptation measures are closely tied to specific local conditions and needs and take into  
15 account existing social networks.<sup>46,47</sup> The economic and social diversity of rural communities  
16 affects the ability of both individuals and communities to adapt to climate changes, and  
17 underscores the need to assess climate change impacts on a local basis. The quality and  
18 availability of natural resources, legacies of past use, and changing industrial needs affect the  
19 economic, environmental, and social conditions of rural places and are critical factors to be  
20 assessed.<sup>13,29,48</sup> Successful adaptation to climate change requires balancing immediate needs with  
21 long-term development goals, as well as development of local-level capacities to deal with  
22 climate change.<sup>47,49</sup>

23 Potential national climate change mitigation responses (Ch. 27: Mitigation) – especially those  
24 that require extensive use of land, such as permanent reforestation, constructing large solar or  
25 wind arrays, hydroelectric generation, and biofuel cropping – are also likely to significantly  
26 affect rural communities, with both positive and negative effects.<sup>50</sup> As with the development of  
27 rural resource-intensive economic activities, where national or multi-national companies tend to  
28 wield ownership and control, local residents and communities are unlikely to be the primary  
29 investors in or beneficiaries of this kind of new economic activity. For example, mitigation  
30 policies that affect coal production could have a substantial economic impact on many rural  
31 communities, as could policies to promote production of non-fossil-fuel energy such as wind.

32 Decisions regarding adaptation responses for both urban and rural populations can occur at  
33 various scales (federal, state, local, tribal, private sector, and individual) but need to take  
34 interdependencies into account. Many decisions that significantly affect rural communities may  
35 not be under the control of local governments or rural residents. Given that timing is a critical  
36 aspect of adaptation, as well as mitigation, engaging rural residents early in decision processes  
37 about investments in public infrastructure, protection of shorelines, changes in insurance  
38 provision, or new management initiatives can influence individual behavior and choice in ways  
39 that enhance positive outcomes of adaptation and mitigation.

40

**1 Box: Local Responses to Climate Change in the San Juan Mountains**

2 The San Juan Mountains region straddles the southern edge of the Southern Rocky Mountains  
3 and the northeastern tip of the arid Southwest. The high mountain headwaters of the Rio Grande,  
4 San Juan, and major tributaries of the Upper Colorado River are critical water towers for five  
5 states: Texas, Nevada, California, Arizona, and New Mexico. The diversity of the landforms,  
6 high plateaus, steep mountains, deep canyons, and foothills leads to a complex and diverse mix  
7 of coniferous and deciduous forested landscapes.<sup>51</sup> County populations in the area range from  
8 700 to 51,000 people. Population changes between 2000 and 2010 ranged from a 25% decline to  
9 an 86% increase. Public lands account for 69% of the land base.<sup>52</sup> Over half of the local  
10 economies are dependent upon natural resources to support tourism, minerals and natural gas  
11 extraction, and second home development.

12 Average annual temperatures in the San Juan Mountains have risen 1.1°F in only three decades,<sup>53</sup>  
13 a rate of warming greater than any other region of the U.S. except Alaska.<sup>54</sup> The timing of  
14 snowmelt has shifted two weeks earlier between 1978 and 2007, and this earlier seasonal release  
15 of water resources is of particular concern to all western states.<sup>55</sup> Current challenges for the  
16 region include changes in forests due to pests and diseases, intensive recreation use, fire  
17 management for natural and prescribed fires, and increasing development in the wildland-urban  
18 interface. Communities are vulnerable to changes from a warmer and drier climate that would  
19 affect the frequency and intensity of wildfires, shift vegetation and range of forest types, and  
20 increase pressures on water supplies.

21 In response, the San Juan Climate Initiative drew together stakeholders, including natural  
22 resource managers, community planners, elected officials, industry representatives, resource  
23 users, citizens, non-profit organizations, and scientists. By combining resources and capabilities,  
24 stakeholders have been able to accomplish much more together than if they had worked  
25 independently. For example, local governments developed a plan to reduce greenhouse gas  
26 emissions and identify strategies for adaptation, signing the U.S. Mayor's Climate Protection  
27 Agreement in 2009. Climate modelers at University of Colorado and National Center for  
28 Atmospheric Research analyzed regional trends in temperature, precipitation, snowpack, and  
29 streamflow. Researchers at Mountain Studies Institute, University of Colorado, and Fort Lewis  
30 College are partnering with San Juan National Forest to monitor alpine plant communities and  
31 changes in climate across the region, and to document carbon resources. San Juan National  
32 Forest is developing strategies for adapting to climate changes in the region related to drought,  
33 wildfire, and other potential effects. La Plata County is leading an effort to plan for sustainable  
34 transportation and food networks that will be less dependent upon carbon-based fuels, while the  
35 Mountain Studies Institute is leading citizen science programs to monitor changes to sensitive  
36 species like the American pika.

37 -- end box --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

## Traceable Accounts

### Chapter 14: Rural Communities

**Key Message Process:** The key messages were initially developed at a meeting of the authors in Charleston, South Carolina, in February, 2012. This initial discussion was supported by a series of conference calls from March through June, 2012. These ensuing discussions were held after a thorough review of the technical inputs and associated literature, including the Rural Communities Workshop Report prepared for the NCA<sup>56</sup> and additional technical inputs on a variety of topics.

<b>Key message #1/3</b>	<b>Rural communities are highly dependent upon natural resources for their livelihoods and social structures. Climate change related impacts are currently affecting rural communities. These impacts will progressively increase over this century and will shift the locations where rural economic activities (like agriculture, forestry, and recreation) can thrive.</b>
<b>Description of evidence base</b>	<p>The key message and supporting text summarizes extensive evidence documented in the Rural Communities’ Workshop Report<sup>56</sup> and 31 technical input reports on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input.</p> <p>Evidence that the impacts of climate change are increasing is compelling and widespread. This evidence is based on historical records and observations and on global climate models, including those driven by B1 (substantial emissions reduction) and A2 (continued increases in global emissions) Scenarios. This evidence is clearly summarized and persuasively referenced in the “Our Changing Climate” chapter of this Assessment and in the Scenarios developed for the NCA.<sup>57</sup></p> <p>The dependency of rural communities on their natural resources has been demonstrated,<sup>13</sup> with a number of studies showing that climate change results in crop and livestock loss,<sup>9</sup> infrastructure damage to levees and roads,<sup>10</sup> shifts in agriculture practices,<sup>11</sup> and losses due to disasters.<sup>12</sup> A number of publications project these impacts to increase, with effects on the natural environment<sup>8,15,20</sup> and increased competition for water between agriculture and energy.<sup>19</sup> Studies have projected that tourism locations in the Everglades and Florida Keys are threatened.<sup>21</sup> Meanwhile, Maine’s tourism could increase,<sup>22</sup> which coincides with a projected northern shift in outdoor recreation.<sup>23</sup> Hunting, fishing, and bird watching will be affected by beach erosion and wetland loss,<sup>27</sup> and changing plant and animal habitats and inter-species relationships (see also Ch. 8: Ecosystems). Outdoor recreation and tourism in many areas in the U.S. are affected by early snowpack melt.<sup>8,58</sup></p>
<b>New information and remaining uncertainties</b>	Key remaining uncertainties relate to the precise magnitude, timing, and location of impacts at regional and local scales.
<b>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</b>	<p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>very high</b> confidence that rural communities are highly dependent on natural resources that are expected to be affected by climate change, especially the many communities that rely on farming, forestry or tourism for their livelihoods.</p> <p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that climate change is currently affecting rural communities.</p> <p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>very high</b> confidence that impacts will increase (See Ch 2: Our Changing Climate).</p>



Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is **high** confidence about shifts in locations of economic activities.

1

<b>CONFIDENCE LEVEL</b>			
<b>Very High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
Strong evidence (established theory, multiple sources, consistent results, well documented and accepted methods, etc.), high consensus	Moderate evidence (several sources, some consistency, methods vary and/or documentation limited, etc.), medium consensus	Suggestive evidence (a few sources, limited consistency, models incomplete, methods emerging, etc.), competing schools of thought	Inconclusive evidence (limited sources, extrapolations, inconsistent findings, poor documentation and/or methods not tested, etc.), disagreement or lack of opinions among experts

2

DRAFT

1 **Chapter 14: Rural Communities**

2 **Key Message Process:** See Key Message #1

<b>Key message #2/3</b>	<b>Rural communities face particular geographic and demographic obstacles in responding to and preparing for climate change risks. In particular, physical isolation, limited economic diversity, and higher poverty rates, combined with an aging population, increases the vulnerability of rural communities. Systems of fundamental importance to rural populations are already stressed by remoteness and limited access.</b>
<b>Description of evidence base</b>	The key message and supporting text summarizes extensive evidence documented in the Rural Communities’ Workshop Report <sup>56</sup> and 31 technical input reports on a wide range of topics that were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input.  With studies showing that rural communities are already stressed, <sup>32,33,34</sup> a number of publications have explored the barriers of rural communities to preparing and responding to climate change. <sup>8,30</sup> Some studies provide in-depth looks at the obstacles created by limited economic diversity <sup>31</sup> and an aging population. <sup>39</sup>
<b>New information and remaining uncertainties</b>	Projecting the interactions of these variables with each other and applying this analysis to local or regional realities is complex at best, with uncertainties at every level of analysis.
<b>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</b>	Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that the obstacle of physical isolation will hamper some communities’ ability to adapt or have an adequate response during extreme events.  Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that the obstacle of limited economic diversity will hinder rural communities’ ability to adapt.  Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that the obstacle of higher poverty rates will significantly increase vulnerability of many communities from adapting properly.  Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that the obstacle of an aging population will hinder some rural communities and prevent them from having an adequate response.  Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that fundamental systems in rural communities are already stressed by remoteness and limited access.

3

<b>CONFIDENCE LEVEL</b>			
<b>Very High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
Strong evidence (established theory, multiple sources, consistent results, well documented and accepted methods, etc.), high consensus	Moderate evidence (several sources, some consistency, methods vary and/or documentation limited, etc.), medium consensus	Suggestive evidence (a few sources, limited consistency, models incomplete, methods emerging, etc.), competing schools of thought	Inconclusive evidence (limited sources, extrapolations, inconsistent findings, poor documentation and/or methods not tested, etc.), disagreement or lack of opinions among experts

4

1 **Chapter 14: Rural Communities**

2 **Key Message Process:** See Key Message #1

<b>Key message #3/3</b>	<b>Responding to additional challenges from climate change impacts will require significant adaptation within rural transportation and infrastructure systems, as well as health and emergency response systems. Governments in rural communities have limited institutional capacity to respond to, plan for, and anticipate climate change impacts.</b>
<b>Description of evidence base</b>	<p>The key message and supporting text summarize extensive evidence documented in the Rural Communities’ Workshop Report<sup>56</sup> and 31 technical input reports on a wide range of topics that were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input.</p> <p>Rural communities are not equipped to deal with major infrastructure expenses.<sup>44</sup> Work has been performed illustrating the need to tie adaptation measures to specific local conditions and needs and take into account existing social networks.<sup>46,47</sup> Publications have shown that there are a number of critical factors to be assessed, including the quality and availability of natural resources, legacies of past use of resources, and changing industrial needs that affect economic, environmental, and social conditions.<sup>13,29,48</sup> Additionally, studies have expressed the requirement of accounting for both near- and long-term needs for climate change adaptation to be successful.<sup>49</sup></p>
<b>New information and remaining uncertainties</b>	<p>It is difficult to fully capture the complex interactions of the entire socio-economic-ecological system within which the effects of climate change will interact, especially in regard to local and regional impacts. Impact assessments and adaptation strategies require improved understanding of capacity and resilience at every level, international to local. The policy context in which individuals and communities will react to climate effects is vague and uncertain. Identification of informational needs alone indicates that adaptation will be expensive.</p>
<b>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</b>	<p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that rural communities have limited capacity to respond to impacts, because of their remoteness, age, lack of diversity, and other reasons described in the text.</p> <p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that rural communities have limited capacity to plan for impacts, as explained in the text.</p> <p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that rural communities will have limited capacity to anticipate impacts because of the lack of infrastructure and expertise available in rural communities.</p> <p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that significant climate change adaptation is needed for transportation in rural communities.</p> <p>Given the evidence and uncertainties, there is <b>high</b> confidence that significant climate change adaptation is needed for health care and emergency response in rural communities, so that rural communities can handle climate change impacts.</p>

3

4

<b>CONFIDENCE LEVEL</b>			
<b>Very High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
Strong evidence (established theory, multiple sources, consistent results, well documented and accepted methods, etc.), high consensus	Moderate evidence (several sources, some consistency, methods vary and/or documentation limited, etc.), medium consensus	Suggestive evidence (a few sources, limited consistency, models incomplete, methods emerging, etc.), competing schools of thought	Inconclusive evidence (limited sources, extrapolations, inconsistent findings, poor documentation and/or methods not tested, etc.), disagreement or lack of opinions among experts

1

2

DRAFT

1 **References**

- 2 1. HRSA, cited 2012: Defining the Rural Population. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health  
3 Resources and Services Administration. [Available online at  
4 [http://www.hrsa.gov/ruralhealth/policy/definition\\_of\\_rural.html](http://www.hrsa.gov/ruralhealth/policy/definition_of_rural.html)];
- 5 U.S. Census Bureau, cited 2012: United States Census 2010. U.S. Census Bureau,. [Available online at  
6 <http://www.census.gov/2010census/>];
- 7 —, cited 2012: 2010 Census Urban and Rural Classification and Urban Area Criteria. U.S. Census Bureau,  
8 U.S. Department of Commerce. [Available online at <http://www.census.gov/geo/reference/frn.html>];
- 9 USDA, cited 2012: Atlas of Rural and Small-Town America. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic  
10 Research Service. [Available online at [http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/atlas-of-rural-and-small-town-](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/atlas-of-rural-and-small-town-america/go-to-the-atlas.aspx)  
11 [america/go-to-the-atlas.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/atlas-of-rural-and-small-town-america/go-to-the-atlas.aspx)]
- 12 2. ERS, cited 2012: Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service, U.S.  
13 Department of Agriculture. [Available online at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/rurality/newdefinitions/>]
- 14 3. USDA, cited 2013: Atlas of Rural and Small-Town America. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic  
15 Research Service. [Available online at [http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/atlas-of-rural-and-small-town-](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/atlas-of-rural-and-small-town-america/go-to-the-atlas.aspx)  
16 [america/go-to-the-atlas.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/atlas-of-rural-and-small-town-america/go-to-the-atlas.aspx)]
- 17 4. Walthall, C., P. Backlund, J. Hatfield, L. Lengnick, E. Marshall, M. Walsh, S. Adkins, M. Aillery, E. A. Ainsworth,  
18 C. Amman, C. J. Anderson, I. Bartomeus, L. H. Baumgard, F. Booker, B. Bradley, D. M. Blumenthal, J. Bunce, K.  
19 Burkey, S. M. Dabney, J. A. Delgado, J. Dukes, A. Funk, K. Garrett, M. Glenn, D. A. Grantz, D. Goodrich, S. Hu,  
20 R. C. Izaurralde, R. A. C. Jones, S.-H. Kim, A. D. B. Leaky, K. Lewers, T. L. Mader, A. McClung, J. Morgan, D. J.  
21 Muth, M. Nearing, D. M. Oosterhuis, D. Ort, C. Parmesan, W. T. Pettigrew, W. Polley, R. Rader, C. Rice, M.  
22 Rivington, E. Roskopf, W. A. Salas, L. E. Sollenberger, R. Srygley, C. Stöckle, E. S. Takle, D. Timlin, J. W. White,  
23 R. Winfree, L. Wright-Morton, and L. H. Ziska, 2012: *Climate Change and Agriculture in the United States:*  
24 *Effects and Adaptation*. USDA Technical Bulletin 1935, 186 pp., U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S.  
25 Global Change Research Program, Unpublished. [Available online at  
26 [http://www.usda.gov/oce/climate\\_change/effects\\_2012/CC%20and%20Agriculture%20Report%20\(02-04-](http://www.usda.gov/oce/climate_change/effects_2012/CC%20and%20Agriculture%20Report%20(02-04-2013)b.pdf)  
27 [2013\)b.pdf](http://www.usda.gov/oce/climate_change/effects_2012/CC%20and%20Agriculture%20Report%20(02-04-2013)b.pdf)]
- 28 5. Hansson, L. A., A. Nicolle, W. Granéli, P. Hallgren, E. Kritzberg, A. Persson, J. Björk, P. A. Nilsson, and C.  
29 Brönmark, 2012: Food-chain length alters community responses to global change in aquatic systems. *Nature*  
30 *Climate Change*, **3**, 228-233, doi:10.1038/nclimate1689
- 31 6. Janetos, A., L. Hansen, D. Inouye, B. P. Kelly, L. Meyerson, B. Peterson, and R. Shaw, 2008: Biodiversity. *The*  
32 *effects of climate change on agriculture, land resources, water resources, and biodiversity in the United*  
33 *States. A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change*  
34 *Research*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 151-181. [Available online at  
35 [http://library.globalchange.gov/products/assessments/2004-2009-synthesis-and-assessment-products/sap-3-](http://library.globalchange.gov/products/assessments/2004-2009-synthesis-and-assessment-products/sap-3-4-the-effects-of-climate-change-on-agriculture-land-resources-water-resources-and-biodiversity)  
36 [4-the-effects-of-climate-change-on-agriculture-land-resources-water-resources-and-biodiversity](http://library.globalchange.gov/products/assessments/2004-2009-synthesis-and-assessment-products/sap-3-4-the-effects-of-climate-change-on-agriculture-land-resources-water-resources-and-biodiversity)]
- 37 7. NTAA, cited 2012: Impacts of Climate Change on Tribes of the United States. National Tribal Air Association.  
38 [Available online at [http://www.tribesandclimatechange.org/docs/tribes\\_95.pdf](http://www.tribesandclimatechange.org/docs/tribes_95.pdf)]
- 39 8. Lal, P., J. R. R. Alavalapati, and E. D. Mercer, 2011: Socio-economic impacts of climate change on rural United  
40 States. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **16**, 819-844, doi:10.1007/s11027-011-9295-  
41 9. [Available online at [http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/2011/ja\\_2011\\_lal\\_002.pdf](http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/2011/ja_2011_lal_002.pdf)]
- 42 9. Peterson, T. C., P. A. Stott, and S. Herring, 2012: Explaining extreme events of 2011 from a climate  
43 perspective. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, **93**, 1041-1067, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-12-  
44 00021.1. [Available online at <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/pdf/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00021.1>]

- 1 10. DOT, cited 2010: Freight Analysis Framework (Version 3) Data Tabulation Tool, Total Flows. U.S. Department  
2 of Transportation. [Available online at <http://faf.ornl.gov/fafweb/Extraction1.aspx>]
- 3 11. Kunkel, K. E., D. R. Easterling, K. Hubbard, and K. Redmond, 2009: 2009 Update to Data Originally Published in  
4 "Temporal variations in frost-free season in the United States: 1895–2000". *Geophysical Research Letters*, **31**,  
5 L03201, doi:10.1029/2003GL018624. [Available online at  
6 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2003GL018624/full>]
- 7 12. Westerling, A. L., H. G. Hidalgo, D. R. Cayan, and T. W. Swetnam, 2006: Warming and earlier spring increase  
8 western U.S. forest wildfire activity. *Science*, **313**, 940-943, doi:DOI 10.1126/science.1128834
- 9 13. Brown, D. L., and K. A. Schafft, 2011: *Rural People and Communities in the 21st Century: Resilience and*  
10 *Transformation*. Polity Press, 224 pp. [Available online at [http://books.google.com/books?id=ZODb\\_USsxCEC](http://books.google.com/books?id=ZODb_USsxCEC)]
- 11 14. Wolfe, D. W., J. Comstock, A. Lakso, L. Chase, W. Fry, C. Petzoldt, R. Leichenko, and P. Vancura., 2011: Ch. 7:  
12 *Agriculture. Responding to Climate Change in New York State: The ClimAID Integrated Assessment for*  
13 *Effective Climate Change Adaptation in New York State*, C. Rosenzweig, W. Solecki, A. DeGaetano, M.  
14 O'Grady, S. Hassol, and P. Grabhorn, Eds., Blackwell Publishing, 217-254. [Available online at  
15 <http://www.nyserda.ny.gov/~media/Files/Publications/Research/Environmental/EMEP/climaid/11-18->  
16 [response-to-climate-change-in-nys-chapter6.ashx](http://www.nyserda.ny.gov/~media/Files/Publications/Research/Environmental/EMEP/climaid/11-18-response-to-climate-change-in-nys-chapter6.ashx)]
- 17 15. Delgado, J. A., P. M. Groffman, M. A. Nearing, T. Goddard, D. Reicosky, R. Lal, N. R. Kitchen, C. W. Rice, D.  
18 Towery, and P. Salon, 2011: Conservation practices to mitigate and adapt to climate change. *Journal of Soil*  
19 *and Water Conservation*, **66**, 118A-129A, doi:<http://www.jswconline.org/content/66/4/118A.full.pdf+html>.  
20 [Available online at <http://www.jswconline.org/content/66/4/118A.full.pdf+html>]
- 21 16. Iverson, L. R., A. M. Prasad, S. N. Matthews, and M. Peters, 2008: Estimating potential habitat for 134 eastern  
22 US tree species under six climate scenarios. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **254**, 390-406,  
23 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2007.07.023. [Available online at  
24 [http://nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/jrnl/2008/nrs\\_2008\\_iverson\\_002.pdf](http://nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/jrnl/2008/nrs_2008_iverson_002.pdf)]
- 25 17. NRC, 2010: *Toward Sustainable Agricultural Systems in the 21st Century*. National Academies Press, 598  
26 pp. [Available online at [http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\\_id=12832&page=1](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=12832&page=1)]
- 27 18. Hutson, S. S., N. L. Barber, J. F. Kenny, K. S. Linsey, D. S. Lumia, and M. A. Maupin, 2004: *Estimate Use of*  
28 *Water in the United States in 2000: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1268*. Vol. 1268, U.S. Geological Survey, 46  
29 pp
- 30 19. CCSP, 2007: *Effects of Climate Change on Energy Production and Use in the United States. A Report by the*  
31 *U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research*. T. J. Wilbanks, V.  
32 Bhatt, D. E. Bilello, S. R. Bull, J. Ekmann, W. C. Horak, Y. J. Huang, M. D. Levine, M. J. Sale, D. K. Schmalzer, and  
33 M. J. Scott, Eds., 160 pp., Department of Energy, Office of Biological & Environmental Research, Washington,  
34 D.C. [Available online at <http://www.climatechange.gov/Library/sap/sap4-5/final-report/sap4-5-final-all.pdf>];  
35 —, 2008: *Decision-Support Experiments and Evaluations using Seasonal-to-Interannual Forecasts and*  
36 *Observational Data: A Focus on Water Resources. A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and*  
37 *the Subcommittee on Global Change Research*. N. Beller-Simms, H. Ingram, D. Feldman, N. Mantua, K. L.  
38 Jacobs, and A. M. Waple, Eds., 190 pp., U.S. Climate Change Science Program, Washington, D.C.
- 39 20. Negron, J. F., J. D. McMillin, J. A. Anhold, and D. Coulson, 2009: Bark beetle-caused mortality in a drought-  
40 affected ponderosa pine landscape in Arizona, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **257**, 1353-1362,  
41 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.12.002. [Available online at  
42 <http://ddr.nal.usda.gov/bitstream/10113/25620/1/IND44159281.pdf>]
- 43 21. Stanton, E. A., and F. Ackerman, 2007: *Florida and Climate Change: The Cost of Inaction*. Tufts University,  
44 Global Development and Environment Institute, Stockholm Environment Institute-US Center. [Available  
45 online at [http://www.broward.org/NaturalResources/ClimateChange/Documents/Florida\\_lr.pdf](http://www.broward.org/NaturalResources/ClimateChange/Documents/Florida_lr.pdf)]



- 1 22. Burkett, V., and M. Davidson, 2012: *Coastal Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerabilities: A Technical Input to the*  
2 *2013 National Climate Assessment*. Island Press, 216 pp
- 3 23. Amelung, B., S. Nicholls, and D. Viner, 2007: Implications of global climate change for tourism flows and  
4 seasonality. *Journal of Travel Research*, **45**, 285-296, doi:10.1177/0047287506295937
- 5 24. Nicholls, S., B. Ameling, and D. Viner, 2005: Implications of climate change for recreation in the United States.  
6 *National Association of Recreation Resource Planners Annual Conference*.
- 7 25. Allen, C. D., C. Birkeland, I. Chapin, F.S., P. M. Groffman, G. R. Guntenspergen, A. K. Knapp, A. D. McGuire, P. J.  
8 Mulholland, D. P. C. Peters, D. D. Roby, and G. Sugihara, 2009: Thresholds of climate change in ecosystems:  
9 Final Report, Synthesis and Assessment Product 4.2, 172 pp., U.S. Geological Survey, University of Nebraska  
10 Lincoln. [Available online at  
11 <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1009&context=usgspubs>];
- 12 USGS, 2012: Climate change impacts on biodiversity, ecosystems, and ecosystem services: Technical Input to  
13 the National Climate Assessment. S. F. Carter, I. S. Chapin, N. Grimm, P. Kareiva, M. Ruckelshaus, M.  
14 Staudinger, A. Staudt, and B. Stein, Eds., U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA
- 15 26. Hoyos, C. D., P. A. Agudelo, P. J. Webster, and J. A. Curry, 2006: Deconvolution of the factors contributing to  
16 the increase in global hurricane intensity. *Science*, **312**, 94-97, doi:DOI 10.1126/science.1123560. [Available  
17 online at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3845986?origin=JSTOR-pdf>];
- 18 Rygel, L., D. O'Sullivan, and B. Yarnal, 2006: A method for constructing a Social Vulnerability Index: an  
19 application to hurricane storm surges in a developed country. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global*  
20 *Change*, **11**, 741-764, doi:10.1007/s11027-006-0265-6. [Available online at  
21 [http://www.cara.psu.edu/about/publications/Rygel\\_et\\_al\\_MASGC.pdf](http://www.cara.psu.edu/about/publications/Rygel_et_al_MASGC.pdf)];
- 22 Wu, S. Y., B. Yarnal, and A. Fisher, 2002: Vulnerability of coastal communities to sea-level rise: a case study of  
23 Cape May County, New Jersey, USA. *Climate Research*, **22**, 255-270, doi:10.3354/cr022255
- 24 27. Galgano, F. A., and B. C. Douglas, 2000: Shoreline position prediction: methods and errors. *Environmental*  
25 *Geosciences*, **7**, 23-31, doi:10.1046/j.1526-0984.2000.71006.x
- 26 28. Austin, D. E., 2006: Coastal exploitation, land loss, and hurricanes: a recipe for disaster. *American*  
27 *Anthropologist*, **108**, 671-691, doi:10.1525/aa.2006.108.4.671;
- 28 Krannich, R. S., 2012: Social change in natural resource-based rural communities: the evolution of sociological  
29 research and knowledge as influenced by William R. Freudenburg. *Journal of Environmental Studies and*  
30 *Sciences*, **2**, 18-27, doi:10.1007/s13412-011-0051-y
- 31 29. Stedman, R. C., M. N. Patriquin, and J. R. Parkins, 2012: Dependence, diversity, and the well-being of rural  
32 community: building on the Freudenburg legacy. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, **2**, 28-38,  
33 doi:10.1007/s13412-011-0055-7
- 34 30. Isserman, A. M., E. Feser, and D. E. Warren, 2009: Why some rural places prosper and others do not.  
35 *International Regional Science Review*, **32**, 300-342, doi:10.1177/0160017609336090
- 36 31. English, D. B. K., D. W. Marcouiller, and H. K. Cordell, 2000: Tourism dependence in rural America: estimates  
37 and effects. *Society & Natural Resources*, **13**, 185-202, doi:10.1080/089419200279054 ;
- 38 Green, G. P., 2001: Amenities and community economic development: strategies for sustainability. *Journal of*  
39 *Regional Analysis and Policy*, **31**, 61-76. [Available online at Add [http://www.irap-](http://www.irap-journal.org/pastvolumes/2000/v31/31-2-5.pdf)  
40 [journal.org/pastvolumes/2000/v31/31-2-5.pdf](http://www.irap-journal.org/pastvolumes/2000/v31/31-2-5.pdf)];
- 41 Kim, K. K., D. W. Marcouiller, and S. C. Deller, 2005: Natural amenities and rural development: understanding  
42 spatial and distributional attributes. *Growth and Change*, **36**, 273-297, doi:10.1111/j.1468-

- 1 2257.2005.00277.x. [Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468->  
2 [2257.2005.00277.x/pdf](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2257.2005.00277.x/pdf)]
- 3 32. Green, G. P., D. Marcouiller, S. Deller, D. Erkkila, and N. R. Sumathi, 1996: Local dependency, land use  
4 attitudes, and economic development: comparisons between seasonal and permanent residents. *Rural*  
5 *Sociology*, **61**, 427-445, doi:10.1111/j.1549-0831.1996.tb00627.x. [Available online at  
6 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1549-0831.1996.tb00627.x/pdf>]
- 7 33. Reeder, R. J., and D. M. Brown, 2005: *Recreation, tourism, and rural well-being. Economic Research Report*  
8 *Number 7*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 38 pp. [Available online at  
9 [http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/302182/err7\\_1\\_.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/302182/err7_1_.pdf)]
- 10 34. Cohen, E., 1978: The impact of tourism on the physical environment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **5**, 215-237,  
11 doi:10.1016/j.0160-7383(78)90221-9
- 12 35. Gill, S. K., R. Wright, J. G. Titus, R. Kafalenos, and K. Wright, 2009: Ch. 7: Population, Land Use, and  
13 Infrastructure. *Coastal Sensitivity to Sea Level Rise: A Focus on the Mid-Atlantic Region. A report by the U.S.*  
14 *Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research*, U.S. Environmental  
15 Protection Agency, 105-116. [Available online at  
16 <http://library.globalchange.gov/downloads/download.php?id=29>]
- 17 36. Jacob, K., N. Maxemchuk, G. Deodatis, A. Morla, E. Schlossberg, I. Paung, M. Lopeman, R. Horton, D. Bader, R.  
18 Leichenko, P. Vancura, and Y. Klein, 2011: Ch. 10: Telecommunications. *Responding to Climate Change in New*  
19 *York State: The ClimAID Integrated Assessment for Effective Climate Change Adaptation in New York State*, C.  
20 Rosenzweig, W. Solecki, A. DeGaetano, M. O'Grady, S. Hassol, and P. Grabhorn, Eds., New York State Energy  
21 Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA), 363-396. [Available online at [www.nyserda.ny.gov/climaid](http://www.nyserda.ny.gov/climaid)]
- 22 37. Lichter, D. T., D. Parisi, S. M. Grice, and M. C. Taquino, 2007: National estimates of racial segregation in rural  
23 and small-town America. *Demography*, **44**, 563-581, doi:10.1353/dem.2007.0030
- 24 38. Phelps, P. B., cited 2012: Conference on Human Health and Global Climate Change: Summary of the  
25 Proceedings. National Academies Press. [Available online at  
26 [http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\\_id=9100&page=R1](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=9100&page=R1)]
- 27 39. Jones, C. A., T. S. Parker, M. Ahearn, A. K. Mishra, and J. N. Variyam, 2009: Health Status and Health Care  
28 Access of Farm and Rural Populations. Economic Information Bulletin Number 57143792154X, 72 pp., U.S.  
29 Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Services Division. [Available online at  
30 [http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/155453/eib57\\_1\\_.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/155453/eib57_1_.pdf)]
- 31 40. Salcioglu, E., M. Basoglu, and M. Livanou, 2007: Post-traumatic stress disorder and comorbid depression  
32 among survivors of the 1999 earthquake in Turkey. *Disasters*, **31**, 115-129, doi:10.1111/j.1467-  
33 7717.2007.01000.x
- 34 41. Hart, C. R., H. L. Berry, and A. M. Tonna, 2011: Improving the mental health of rural New South Wales  
35 communities facing drought and other adversities. *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, **19**, 231-238,  
36 doi:10.1111/j.1440-1584.2011.01225.x
- 37 42. Rost, K., J. Fortney, M. Zhang, J. Smith, and G. R. Smith, Jr., 1999: Treatment of depression in rural arkansas:  
38 Policy implications for improving care. *The Journal of Rural Health*, **15**, 308-315, doi:10.1111/j.1748-  
39 0361.1999.tb00752.x
- 40 43. Alanis, A. J., 2005: Resistance to antibiotics: are we in the post-antibiotic era? *Archives of medical research*,  
41 **36**, 697-705, doi:10.1016/j.arcmed.2005.06.009
- 42 44. Kraybill, D. S., and L. Lobao, 2001: The Emerging Roles of County Governments in Rural America: Findings  
43 from a Recent National Survey. American Agricultural Economics Association (New Name 2008: Agricultural

- 1 and Applied Economics Association), 20 pp. [Available online at  
2 <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/20697/1/sp01kr01.pdf>]
- 3 45. Romsdahl, R. J., L. Atkinson, and J. Schultz, 2013: Planning for climate change across the US Great Plains:  
4 concerns and insights from government decision-makers. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, **3**, 1-  
5 14, doi:10.1007/s13412-012-0078-8
- 6 46. Berkes, F., 2007: Understanding uncertainty and reducing vulnerability: lessons from resilience thinking.  
7 *Natural Hazards*, **41**, 283-295, doi:10.007/s11069-006-9036-7;
- 8 Ostrom, E., 2009: A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science*, **325**,  
9 419-422, doi:10.1126/science.1172133. [Available online at [http://www.era-  
mx.org/biblio/Ostrom,%202009.pdf](http://www.era-<br/>10 mx.org/biblio/Ostrom,%202009.pdf)]
- 11 47. Nelson, D. R., 2011: Adaptation and resilience: responding to a changing climate. *Wiley Interdisciplinary  
12 Reviews: Climate Change*, **2**, 113-120, doi:10.1002/wcc.91. [Available online at  
13 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wcc.91/pdf>]
- 14 48. Adger, W. N., and D. R. Nelson, 2010: Ch. 5: Fair decision making in a new climate of risk. *Climate Change,  
15 Ethics and Human Security*, K. O'Brien, A. L. St Clair, and B. Kristoffersen, Eds., Cambridge University Press, 83-  
16 94;
- 17 Bark, R. H., and K. L. Jacobs, 2009: Indian water rights settlements and water management innovations: the  
18 role of the Arizona Water Settlements Act. *Water Resources Research*, **45**, W05417,  
19 doi:10.1029/2008WR007130;
- 20 Flora, C. B., Ed., 2001: *Interactions between agroecosystems and rural communities*. CRC Press, 296 pp;
- 21 Oliver-Smith, A., 2006: Disasters and forced migration in the 21st Century. *Social Science Research Council  
22 Understanding Katrina: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*, Social Science Research Council;
- 23 Peacock, W. G., and C. Girard, 1997: Ch. 9: Ethnic and racial inequalities in hurricane damage and insurance  
24 settlements. *Hurricane Andrew: Ethnicity, Gender, and the Sociology of Disasters*, Routledge, 272. [Available  
25 online at <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415168113/>];
- 26 Peguero, A. A., 2006: Latino Disaster Vulnerability The Dissemination of Hurricane Mitigation Information  
27 Among Florida's Homeowners. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, **28**, 5-22,  
28 doi:10.1177/0739986305284012;
- 29 Vásquez-León, M., 2009: Hispanic farmers and farmworkers: social networks, institutional exclusion, and  
30 climate vulnerability in Southeastern Arizona. *American Anthropologist*, **111**, 289-301, doi:10.1111/j.1548-  
31 1433.2009.01133.x
- 32 49. Furman, C., C. Roncoli, T. Crane, and G. Hoogenboom, 2011: Beyond the "fit": introducing climate forecasts  
33 among organic farmers in Georgia (United States). *Climatic Change*, **109**, 791-799, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-  
34 0238-y;
- 35 O'Brien, K., 2009: Ch. 10: Do values subjectively define the limits to climate change adaptation. *Adapting to  
36 climate change. Thresholds, values, governance*, W. N. Adger, I. Lorenzoni, and K. L. O'Brien, Eds., Cambridge  
37 University Press, 164-180. [Available online at  
38 [http://www.sv.uio.no/iss/personer/vit/karenob/obrien\\_chapter10\\_values1.pdf](http://www.sv.uio.no/iss/personer/vit/karenob/obrien_chapter10_values1.pdf)]
- 39 50. van der Horst, D., 2007: NIMBY or not? Exploring the relevance of location and the politics of voiced opinions  
40 in renewable energy siting controversies. *Energy Policy*, **35**, 2705-2714, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2006.12.012;
- 41 Lovich, J. E., and J. R. Ennen, 2011: Wildlife conservation and solar energy development in the desert  
42 southwest, United States. *BioScience*, **61**, 982-992, doi:10.1525/bio.2011.61.12.8;

- 1 Abbasi, S. A., and N. Abbasi, 2000: The likely adverse environmental impacts of renewable energy sources.  
2 *Applied Energy*, **65**, 121-144, doi:10.1016/S0306-2619(99)00077-X
- 3 51. Romme, W. H., M. L. Floyd, and D. Hanna, 2009: *Historical Range of Variability and Current Landscape*  
4 *Condition Analysis: South Central Highlands Section, Southwestern Colorado & Northwestern New Mexico*.  
5 Colorado Forest Restoration Institute at Colorado State University and Region 2 of the U.S. Forest Service, 256  
6 pp
- 7 52. USFS, 2008: Ch. 3: Timber Management and Wood Products. *San Juan National Forest Land and Resource*  
8 *Management Plan Revision Draft Environmental Impact Statement* San Juan Public Lands Center, 3208
- 9 53. Rangwala, I., and J. R. Miller, 2010: Twentieth century temperature trends in Colorado's San Juan Mountains.  
10 *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research*, **42**, 89-97, doi:10.1657/1938-4246-42.1.89. [Available online at  
11 <http://www.bioone.org/doi/pdf/10.1657/1938-4246-42.1.89> ]
- 12 54. Ray, A. J., J. J. Barsugli, K. B. Averyt, K. Wolter, M. Hoerling, N. Doesken, B. Udall, and R. S. Webb, 2008:  
13 Climate change in Colorado: a synthesis to support water resources management and adaptation. Report for  
14 the Colorado Water Conservation Board, 58 pp., University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. [Available online at  
15 [http://www.colorado.edu/publications/reports/WWA\\_ClimateChangeColoradoReport\\_2008.pdf](http://www.colorado.edu/publications/reports/WWA_ClimateChangeColoradoReport_2008.pdf) ]
- 16 55. Clow, D. W., 2010: Changes in the timing of snowmelt and streamflow in Colorado: a response to recent  
17 warming. *Journal of Climate*, **23**, 2293-2306, doi:10.1175/2009JCLI2951.1
- 18 56. Hauser, R., and J. Jadin, 2012: Rural Communities Workshop Technical Report to the 2013 National Climate  
19 Assessment, 38 pp
- 20 57. Kunkel, K. E., L. E. Stevens, S. E. Stevens, L. Sun, E. Janssen, D. Wuebbles, and J. G. Dobson, 2013: Regional  
21 Climate Trends and Scenarios for the U.S. National Climate Assessment: Part 9. Climate of the Contiguous  
22 United States. NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 142-9, 85 pp, National Oceanic and Atmospheric  
23 Administration, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, Washington, D.C. [Available  
24 online at [http://www.nesdis.noaa.gov/technical\\_reports/NOAA\\_NESDIS\\_Tech\\_Report\\_142-9-](http://www.nesdis.noaa.gov/technical_reports/NOAA_NESDIS_Tech_Report_142-9-Climature_of_the_Contiguous_United_States.pdf)  
25 [Climate of the Contiguous United States.pdf](http://www.nesdis.noaa.gov/technical_reports/NOAA_NESDIS_Tech_Report_142-9-Climature_of_the_Contiguous_United_States.pdf)]
- 26 58. Pietrowsky, R., D. Raff, C. McNutt, M. Brewer, T. Johnson, T. Brown, M. Ampleman, C. Baranowski, J. Barsugli,  
27 L. D. Brekke, L. Brekki, M. Crowell, D. Easterling, A. Georgakakos, N. Gollehon, J. Goodrich, K. A. Grantz, E.  
28 Greene, P. Groisman, R. Heim, C. Luce, S. McKinney, R. Najjar, M. Nearing, D. Nover, R. Olsen, C. Peters-  
29 Lidard, L. Poff, K. Rice, B. Rippey, M. Rodgers, A. Rypinski, M. Sale, M. Squires, R. Stahl, E. Z. Stakhiv, and M.  
30 Strobel, 2012: Water Resources Sector Technical Input Report in Support of the U.S. Global Change Research  
31 Program, National Climate Assessment - 2013, 31 pp
- 32