

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

22. Alaska

Convening Lead Authors

F. Stuart Chapin III, University of Alaska Fairbanks
Sarah F. Trainor, University of Alaska Fairbanks

Lead Authors

Patricia Cochran, Alaska Native Science Commission
Henry Huntington, Huntington Consulting
Carl Markon, U.S. Geological Survey
Molly McCammon, Alaska Ocean Observing System
A. David McGuire, U.S. Geological Survey and University of Alaska Fairbanks
Mark Serreze, University of Colorado

Key Messages

- 1. Arctic summer sea ice is receding faster than previously projected and is expected to virtually disappear before mid-century. This is altering marine ecosystems and leading to greater ship access, offshore development opportunity, and increased community vulnerability to coastal erosion.**
- 2. Most glaciers in Alaska and British Columbia are shrinking substantially. This trend is expected to continue and has implications for hydropower production, ocean circulation patterns, fisheries, and global sea level rise.**
- 3. Permafrost temperatures in Alaska are rising, a thawing trend that is expected to continue, causing multiple vulnerabilities through drier landscapes, more wildfire, altered wildlife habitat, increased cost of maintaining infrastructure, and the release of heat-trapping gases that increase climate warming.**
- 4. Current and projected increases in Alaska’s ocean temperatures and changes in ocean chemistry are expected to alter the distribution and productivity of Alaska’s marine fisheries, which lead the U.S. in commercial value.**
- 5. The cumulative effects of climate change in Alaska strongly affect Native communities, which are highly vulnerable to these rapid changes but have a deep cultural history of adapting to change.**

1 **Introduction**

2 Alaska is the United States' only arctic region. Its marine, tundra, boreal (northern) forest, and
3 rainforest ecosystems differ from most of those in other states and are relatively intact. Alaska is
4 home to millions of migratory birds, hundreds of thousands of caribou, some of the world's
5 largest salmon runs, a significant proportion of the nation's marine mammals, and half of the
6 nation's fish catch.¹

7 Energy production is the main driver of the state's economy, providing more than 80% of state
8 government revenue and thousands of jobs.² Continuing pressure for oil, gas, and mineral
9 development on land and offshore in ice-covered waters increases the demand for infrastructure,
10 placing additional stresses on ecosystems. Land-based energy exploration will be affected by a
11 shorter season when ice roads are viable, yet reduced sea ice extent may create more opportunity
12 for offshore development. Climate also affects hydropower generation.³ Mining and fishing are
13 the second and third largest industries in the state, with tourism rapidly increasing since the
14 1990s.² Fisheries are vulnerable to changes in fish abundance and distribution that result from
15 both climate change and fishing pressure. Tourism might respond positively to warmer springs
16 and autumns⁴ but negatively to less favorable conditions for winter activities and increased
17 summer smoke from wildfire.⁵

18 Alaska is home to 40% (229 of 566) of the federally recognized tribes in the United States.⁶ The
19 small number of jobs, high cost of living, and rapid social change make rural, predominantly
20 Native communities highly vulnerable to climate change through impacts on traditional hunting
21 and fishing and cultural connection to the land and sea. Because most of these communities are
22 not connected to the state's road system or electrical grid, the cost of living is high, and it is
23 challenging to supply food, fuel, materials, health care, and other services. Climate impacts on
24 these communities are magnified by additional social and economic stresses. However, Alaskan
25 Native communities have for centuries dealt with scarcity and high environmental variability and
26 thus have deep cultural reservoirs of flexibility and adaptability.

27 **Observed Climate Change**

28 Over the past 60 years, Alaska has warmed more than twice as rapidly as the rest of the U.S.,
29 with state-wide average annual air temperature increasing by 3°F and average winter temperature
30 by 6°F, with substantial year-to-year and regional variability (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate, Key
31 Message 3). This warming involves more extremely hot days and fewer extremely cold days (Ch.
32 2: Our Changing Climate, Key Message 7).^{7,8} Because of its cold-adapted features and rapid
33 warming, climate-change impacts on Alaska are already pronounced, including earlier spring
34 snowmelt, reduced sea ice, widespread glacier retreat, warmer permafrost, drier landscapes, and
35 more extensive insect outbreaks and wildfire, as described below.




Figure 22.1: Alaska Will Continue to Warm Rapidly

Caption: Northern latitudes are warming faster than more temperate regions, and Alaska has already warmed much faster than the rest of the country. Maps show changes in temperature, relative to 1971-1999, projected for Alaska in the early, middle, and late parts of this century, if heat-trapping gas emissions continue to increase (higher emissions, A2), or are substantially reduced (lower emissions, B1). (Figure source: adapted from Stewart et al. 2013⁸).

Projected Climate Change

Average annual temperatures in Alaska are projected to rise by an additional 2°F to 4°F by 2050. If global emissions continue to increase during this century, temperatures can be expected to rise 10°F to 12°F in the north, 8°F to 10°F in the interior, and 6°F to 8° in the rest of the state. Even with substantial emissions reductions, Alaska is projected to warm by 6°F to 8°F in the north and 4°F to 6°F in the rest of the state by the end of the century (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate, Key Message 3).^{8,9}

Annual precipitation is projected to increase, especially in northwestern Alaska,⁸ as part of the broad pattern of increases projected for high northern latitudes. Annual precipitation increases of about 15% to 30% are projected for the region by late this century if global emissions continue to increase (A2). All models project increases in all four seasons.⁸ However, increases in evaporation due to higher air temperatures and longer growing seasons are expected to reduce water availability in most of the state.¹⁰ Projected increases in length of growing season,¹¹ which continue a 45% increase in length of growing season over the last century in interior Alaska,¹²


1 could improve conditions for agriculture where moisture is adequate, but will reduce water
2 storage and increase the risks of more extensive wildfire and insect outbreaks across much of
3 Alaska.^{13,14} Changes in dates of snowmelt and freeze-up would influence seasonal migration of
4 birds and other animals, increase the likelihood and rate of northerly range expansion of native
5 and non-native species, alter the habitats of both ecologically important and endangered species,
6 and affect ocean currents.¹⁵

7 *Disappearing Sea Ice*

8 **Arctic summer sea ice is receding faster than previously projected and is expected to**
9 **virtually disappear before mid-century. This is altering marine ecosystems and leading to**
10 **greater ship access, offshore development opportunity, and increased community**
11 **vulnerability to coastal erosion.**

12 Arctic sea ice extent and thickness have declined substantially, especially in late summer
13 (September), when there is now only about half as much sea ice as at the beginning of the
14 satellite record in 1979 (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate, Key Message 11).^{16,17} The six Septembers
15 with the lowest ice extent all occurred in the past six years. As sea ice declines, it becomes
16 thinner, with less ice build-up over multiple years, and therefore more vulnerable to further
17 melting.¹⁷ Models that best match historical trends project northern waters that are virtually ice-
18 free by late summer by the 2030s.^{18,19} Within the general downward trend in sea ice there will be
19 time periods with both rapid ice loss and temporary recovery,²⁰ making it challenging to predict
20 short-term changes in ice conditions.

Declining Sea Ice Extent



1

2 **Figure 22.2:** Declining Sea Ice Extent

3 **Caption:** Average September extent of arctic sea ice in 1980 (second year of satellite
4 record and year of greatest September sea ice extent; outer red boundary), 1998 (about
5 halfway through the time series; outer pink boundary) and 2012 (recent year of record
6 and year of least September sea ice extent; outer white boundary). September is typically
7 the month when sea ice is least extensive. Inset is the complete time series of average
8 September sea ice extent (1979-2013). (Figure source: NSIDC 2012; Data from Fetterer
9 et al. 2013²¹).

10 Reductions in sea ice increase the amount of the sun's energy that is absorbed by the ocean. This
11 leads to a self-reinforcing climate cycle, because the warmer ocean melts more ice, leaving more
12 dark open water that gains even more heat. In autumn and winter, there is a strong release of this
13 extra ocean heat back to the atmosphere. This is a key driver of the observed increases in air
14 temperature in the Arctic.²² This strong warming linked to ice loss can influence atmospheric
15 circulation and patterns of precipitation, both within and beyond the Arctic (for example,²³).
16 There is growing evidence that this has already occurred²⁴ through more evaporation from the

1 ocean, which increases water vapor in the lower atmosphere²⁵ and autumn cloud cover west and
2 north of Alaska.²⁶

Sea Ice Loss Brings Big Changes to Arctic Life



3
4 **Figure 22.3:** Sea Ice Loss Brings Big Changes to Arctic Life

5 **Caption:** Reductions in sea ice alter food availability for many species from polar bear to
6 walrus, make hunting less safe for Alaska Native hunters, and create more accessibility
7 for Arctic Ocean marine transport, requiring more Coast Guard coverage. (Photo credits:
8 (top left) G. Carleton Ray; (top right) Patrick Kelley).

9 With reduced ice extent, the Arctic Ocean is more accessible for marine traffic, including trans-
10 arctic shipping, oil and gas exploration, and tourism.²⁷ This facilitates access to the substantial
11 deposits of oil and natural gas under the seafloor in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas, as well as
12 raising the risk to people and ecosystems from oil spills and other drilling and maritime-related
13 accidents. A seasonally ice-free Arctic Ocean also increases sovereignty and security concerns as
14 a result of potential new international disputes and increased possibilities for marine traffic
15 between the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans.⁹

16 Polar bears are one of the most sensitive arctic marine mammals to climate warming because
17 they spend most of their lives on sea ice.²⁸ Declining sea ice in northern Alaska is associated
18 with smaller bears, probably because of less successful hunting of ice-dependent seals.²⁹
19 Although bears can give birth to cubs on sea ice, increasing numbers of female bears now come
20 ashore in Alaska in the summer and fall³⁰ and den on land.³¹ In Hudson Bay, Canada, the most
21 studied population in the Arctic, sea ice is now absent for three weeks longer than just a few
22 decades ago, resulting in less body fat, reduced survival of both the youngest and oldest bears,³²
23 and a population now estimated to be in decline³³ and projected to be in jeopardy.³⁴ Similar polar
24 bear population declines are projected for the Beaufort Sea region.³⁵

1 Walrus depend on sea ice as a platform for giving birth, nursing, and resting between dives to the
2 seafloor, where they feed.³⁶ In recent years, when summer sea ice in the Chukchi Sea retreated
3 over waters that were too deep for walrus to feed,³⁷ large numbers of walrus abandoned the ice
4 and came ashore. The high concentration of animals results in increased competition for food
5 and can lead to stampedes when animals are startled, resulting in trampling of calves.³⁸ This
6 movement to land first occurred in 2007 and has happened three times since then, suggesting a
7 threshold change in walrus ecology.

8 With the late-summer ice edge located farther north than it used to be, storms produce larger
9 waves and more coastal erosion.⁹ An additional contributing factor is that coastal bluffs that were
10 “cemented” by ice-rich permafrost are beginning to thaw in response to warmer air and ocean
11 waters, and are therefore more vulnerable to erosion.³⁹ Standard defensive adaptation strategies
12 to protect coastal communities from erosion, such as use of rock walls, sandbags, and rip-rap,
13 have been largely unsuccessful.⁴⁰ Several coastal communities are seeking to relocate to escape
14 erosion that threatens infrastructure and services but, because of high costs and policy constraints
15 on use of federal funds for community relocation, only one Alaskan village has begun to relocate
16 (See also Ch. 12: Indigenous Peoples).^{41,42}

17 **Box 1. Living on the Front Lines of Climate Change**

18 *“Not that long ago the water was far from our village and could not be easily seen from our*
19 *homes. Today the weather is changing and is slowly taking away our village. Our boardwalks*
20 *are warped, some of our buildings tilt, the land is sinking and falling away, and the water is*
21 *close to our homes. The infrastructure that supports our village is compromised and affecting the*
22 *health and well-being of our community members, especially our children.”*

23 Alaska Department of Commerce and Community and Economic Development, 2012⁴³

24 Newtok, a Yup’ik Eskimo community on the seacoast of western Alaska is on the front lines of
25 climate change. Between October 2004 and May 2006, three storms accelerated the erosion and
26 repeatedly “flooded the village water supply, caused raw sewage to be spread throughout the
27 community, displaced residents from homes, destroyed subsistence food storage, and shut down
28 essential utilities.”⁴⁴ The village landfill, barge ramp, sewage treatment facility, and fuel storage
29 facilities were destroyed or severely damaged.⁴⁵ The loss of the barge landing, which delivered
30 most supplies and heating fuel, created a fuel crisis. Salt water is intruding into the community
31 water supply. Erosion is projected to reach the school, the largest building in the community, by
32 2017.



1

2 **Figure 22.4:** Newtok, Alaska

3 **Caption:** Residents in Newtok, Alaska are living with the effects of climate change, with
4 thawing permafrost, tilting houses, sinking boardwalks, in conjunction with aging fuel
5 tanks and other infrastructure that cannot be replaced because of laws that prevent public
6 investment in flood-prone localities. (Photo credit: F. S. Chapin III, 2012).

7 Recognizing the increasing danger from coastal erosion, Newtok has worked for a generation to
8 relocate to a safer location. However, current federal legislation does not authorize federal or
9 state agencies to assist communities in relocating, nor does it authorize them to repair or upgrade
10 storm-damaged infrastructure in flood-prone locations like Newtok.⁴¹ Newtok therefore cannot
11 safely remain in its current location nor can it access public funds to adapt to climate change
12 through relocation.

13 Newtok's situation is not unique. At least two other Alaskan communities, Shishmaref and
14 Kivalina, also face immediate threat from coastal erosion and are seeking to relocate, but have
15 been unsuccessful in doing so. Many of the world's largest cities are coastal and are also exposed
16 to climate-induced flood risks.⁴⁶

17 -- end box --

1 *Shrinking Glaciers*

2 **Most glaciers in Alaska and British Columbia are shrinking substantially. This trend is**
3 **expected to continue and has implications for hydropower production, ocean circulation**
4 **patterns, fisheries, and global sea level rise.**

5 Alaska is home to some of the largest glaciers and fastest loss of glacier ice on Earth.^{47,48,49} This
6 rapid ice loss is primarily a result of rising temperatures (for example,^{50,51,52}; Ch. 2: Our
7 Changing Climate, Key Message 11). Loss of glacial volume in Alaska and neighboring British
8 Columbia, Canada currently contributes 20% to 30% as much surplus fresh water to the oceans
9 as does the Greenland Ice Sheet – about 40 to 70 gigatons per year,^{48,53,54,55} comparable to 10%
10 of the annual discharge of the Mississippi River.⁵⁶ Glaciers continue to respond to climate
11 warming for years to decades after warming ceases, so ice loss is expected to continue, even if
12 air temperatures were to remain at current levels. The global decline in glacial and ice-sheet
13 volume is predicted to be one of the largest contributors to global sea level rise during this
14 century (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate, Key Message 10).^{57,58}

15 Water from glacial landscapes is also recognized as an important source of organic carbon,^{59,60}
16 phosphorus,⁶¹ and iron⁶² that contribute to high coastal productivity, so changes in these inputs
17 could alter critical nearshore fisheries.^{60,63}


18 Glaciers supply about half of the total freshwater input to the Gulf of Alaska.⁶⁴ Glacier retreat
19 currently increases river discharge and hydropower potential in south central and southeast
20 Alaska, but over the longer term might reduce water input to reservoirs and therefore
21 hydropower resources.³

22 *Thawing Permafrost*

23 **Permafrost temperatures in Alaska are rising, a thawing trend that is expected to continue,**
24 **causing multiple vulnerabilities through drier landscapes, more wildfire, altered wildlife**
25 **habitat, increased cost of maintaining infrastructure, and the release of heat-trapping gases**
26 **that increase climate warming.**

27 Alaska differs from most of the rest of the U.S. in having permafrost – frozen ground that
28 restricts water drainage and therefore strongly influences landscape water balance and the design
29 and maintenance of infrastructure. Permafrost near the Alaskan arctic coast has warmed 4°F to
30 5°F at 65 foot depth^{65,66} since the late 1970s and 6°F to 8°F at 3.3 foot depth since the mid-
31 1980s.⁶⁷ In Alaska, 80% of land is underlain by permafrost, and of this, more than 70% is
32 vulnerable to subsidence upon thawing because of ice content that is either variable, moderate, or
33 high.⁶⁸ Thaw is already occurring in interior and southern Alaska and in northern Canada, where
34 permafrost temperatures are near the thaw point.⁶⁹ Models project that permafrost in Alaska will
35 continue to thaw,^{70,71} and some models project that near-surface permafrost will be lost entirely
36 from large parts of Alaska by the end of the century.⁷²

The Big Thaw



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

Figure 22.5: The Big Thaw

Caption: Projections for average annual ground temperature at a depth of 3.3 feet over time if emissions of heat-trapping gases continue to grow (higher emissions scenario, A2), and if they are substantially reduced (lower emissions scenario, B1). Blue shades represent areas below freezing at a depth of 3.3 feet, and yellow and red shades represent areas above freezing at that depth, based on the GIPL 1.0 model. (Figure source: Permafrost Lab, Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska Fairbanks).

Uneven sinking of the ground in response to permafrost thaw is estimated to add between \$3.6 and \$6.1 billion (10% to 20%) to current costs of maintaining public infrastructure such as buildings, pipelines, roads, and airports over the next 20 years.⁷³ In rural Alaska, permafrost thaw will likely disrupt community water supplies and sewage systems,^{74,75,76} with negative effects on human health.⁷⁷ The period during which oil and gas exploration is allowed on tundra has decreased by 50% since the 1970s as a result of permafrost vulnerability.¹⁰

Mounting Expenses from Permafrost Thawing




Figure 22.6: Mounting Expenses from Permafrost Thawing

Caption: Effects of permafrost thaw on houses in interior Alaska (2001, top left), roads in eastern Alaska (1982, top right), and the estimated costs (with and without climate change) of replacing public infrastructure in Alaska assuming a mid-range emissions scenario (A1B, with some decrease from current emissions growth trends). (Photo credits: (top left) Larry Hinzman; (top right) Joe Moore. Figure source: adapted from Larsen and Goldsmith 2007⁷⁸).

On average, lakes have decreased in area in the last 50 years in the southern two-thirds of Alaska,^{79,80,81} due to a combination of permafrost thaw, greater evaporation in a warmer climate, and increased soil organic accumulation during a longer season for plant growth. In some places, however, lakes are getting larger because of lateral permafrost degradation.⁸⁰ Future permafrost thaw will likely increase lake area in areas of continuous permafrost and decrease lake area in places where the permafrost zone is more fragmented.⁷⁰

Drying Lakes and Changing Habitat



Figure 22.7: Drying Lakes and Changing Habitat

Caption: Progressive drying of lakes in northern forest wetlands in the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska. Foreground orange area was once a lake. Mid-ground lake once extended to the shrubs. (Photo credit: May-Le Ng).

A continuation of the current drying of Alaskan lakes and wetlands could affect waterfowl management nationally because Alaska accounts for 81% of the National Wildlife Refuge System and provides breeding habitat for millions of migratory birds that winter in more southerly regions of North America and on other continents.⁸² Wetland loss would also reduce waterfowl harvest in Alaska, where it is an important food source for Alaska Natives and other rural residents.

Both wetland drying and the increased frequency of warm dry summers and associated thunderstorms have led to more large fires in the last ten years than in any decade since record-keeping began in the 1940s.¹³ In Alaskan tundra, which was too cold and wet to support extensive fires for approximately the last 5,000 years,⁸³ a single large fire in 2007 released as much carbon to the atmosphere as had been absorbed by the entire circumpolar arctic tundra during the previous quarter-century.⁸⁴ Even if climate warming were curtailed by reducing heat-trapping gas (also known as greenhouse gas) emissions (as in the B1 scenario), the annual area burned in Alaska is projected to double by mid-century and to triple by the end of the century,⁸⁵ thus fostering increased emissions of heat-trapping gases, higher temperatures, and increased fires. In addition, thick smoke produced in years of extensive wildfire represents a human health risk (Ch. 9: Human Health). More extensive and severe wildfires could shift the forests of Interior Alaska during this century from dominance by spruce to broadleaf trees for the first time in the past 4,000 to 6,000 years.^{86,87}

Wildfire has mixed effects on habitat. It generally improves habitat for berries, mushrooms, and moose,^{57,88} but reduces winter habitat for caribou because lichens, a key winter food source for caribou, require 50 to 100 years to recover after wildfire.⁸⁹ These habitat changes are

1 nutritionally and culturally significant for Alaska Native Peoples.^{88,90} In addition, exotic plant
2 species that were introduced along roadways are now spreading onto river floodplains and
3 recently burned forests,⁹¹ potentially changing the suitability of these lands for timber production
4 and wildlife. Some invasive species are toxic to moose, on which local people depend for food.⁹²

5 Changes in terrestrial ecosystems in Alaska and the Arctic may be influencing the global climate
6 system. Permafrost soils throughout the entire Arctic contain almost twice as much carbon as the
7 atmosphere.⁹³ Warming and thawing of these soils increases the release of carbon dioxide and
8 methane through increased decomposition. Thawing permafrost also delivers organic-rich soils
9 to lake bottoms, where decomposition in the absence of oxygen releases additional methane.⁹⁴

10 Extensive wildfires also release carbon that contributes to climate warming.^{85,95} The capacity of
11 the Yukon River Basin in Alaska and adjacent Canada to store carbon has been substantially
12 weakened since the 1960s by the combination of warming and thawing of permafrost and by
13 increased wildfire.⁹⁶ Expansion of tall shrubs and trees into tundra makes the surface darker and
14 rougher, increasing absorption of the sun's energy and further contributing to warming.⁹⁷ This
15 warming is likely stronger than the potential cooling effects of increased carbon dioxide uptake
16 associated with tree and shrub expansion.⁹⁸ The shorter snow-covered seasons in Alaska further
17 increase energy absorption by the land surface, an effect only slightly offset by the reduced
18 energy absorption of highly reflective post-fire snow-covered landscapes.⁹⁸ This spectrum of
19 changes in Alaskan and other high-latitude terrestrial ecosystems jeopardizes efforts by society
20 to use ecosystem carbon management to offset fossil fuel emissions.^{93,99}

21 *Changing Ocean Temperatures and Chemistry*

22 **Current and projected increases in Alaska's ocean temperatures and changes in ocean**
23 **chemistry are expected to alter the distribution and productivity of Alaska's marine**
24 **fisheries, which lead the U.S. in commercial value.**

25 Ocean acidification, rising ocean temperatures, declining sea ice, and other environmental
26 changes interact to affect the location and abundance of marine fish, including those that are
27 commercially important, those used as food by other species, and those used for
28 subsistence.^{100,101,102} These changes have allowed some near-surface fish species such as salmon
29 to expand their range northward along the Alaskan coast.¹⁰³ In addition, non-native species are
30 invading Alaskan waters more rapidly, primarily through ships releasing ballast waters and
31 bringing southerly species to Alaska.^{9,104} These species introductions could affect marine
32 ecosystems, including the feeding relationships of fish important to commercial and subsistence
33 fisheries.

34 Overall habitat extent is expected to change as well, though the degree of the range migration
35 will depend upon the life history of particular species. For example, reductions in seasonal sea
36 ice cover and warmer surface temperatures may open up new habitat in polar regions for some
37 important fish species, such as cod, herring, and pollock.¹⁰⁵ However, continued presence of cold
38 bottom-water temperatures on the Alaskan continental shelf could limit northward migration into
39 the northern Bering Sea and Chukchi Sea off northwestern Alaska.¹⁰⁶ In addition, warming may
40 cause reductions in the abundance of some species, such as pollock, in their current ranges in the
41 Bering Sea¹⁰⁷ and reduce the health of juvenile sockeye salmon, potentially resulting in
42 decreased overwinter survival.¹⁰⁸ If ocean warming continues, it is unlikely that current fishing

1 pressure on pollock can be sustained.¹⁰⁹ Higher temperatures are also likely to increase the
2 frequency of early Chinook salmon migrations, making management of the fishery by multiple
3 user groups more challenging.¹¹⁰

4 The changing temperature and chemistry of the Arctic Ocean and Bering Sea are likely changing
5 their role in global ocean circulation and as carbon sinks for atmospheric CO₂, although the
6 importance of these changes in the global carbon budget remains unresolved. The North Pacific
7 Ocean is particularly susceptible to ocean acidification (See also Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate,
8 Key Message 12; Ch. 24: Oceans).¹¹¹ Acidifying changes in ocean chemistry have potentially
9 widespread impacts on the marine food web, including commercially important species.

10 **Box 2. Ocean Acidification in Alaska**

11 Ocean waters globally have become 30% more acidic due to absorption of large amounts of
12 human-produced carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the atmosphere. This CO₂ interacts with ocean
13 water to form carbonic acid that lowers the ocean's pH (ocean acidification). The polar ocean is
14 particularly prone to acidification because of low temperature^{112,113} and low salt content, the
15 latter resulting from the large fresh water input from melting sea ice¹¹⁴ and large rivers. Acidity
16 reduces the capacity of key plankton species and shelled animals to form and maintain shells and
17 other hard parts, and therefore alters the food available to important fish species.^{112,115} The rising
18 acidity will have particularly strong societal effects on the Bering Sea on Alaska's west coast
19 because of its high productivity of commercial and subsistence fisheries.^{101,116}

20 Shelled pteropods, which are tiny planktonic snails near the base of the food chain, respond
21 quickly to acidifying conditions and are an especially critical link in high-latitude food webs, as
22 commercially important species such as pink salmon depend heavily on them for food.¹¹⁷ A 10%
23 decrease in the population of pteropods could mean a 20% decrease in an adult pink salmon's
24 body weight.¹¹⁸ Pteropod consumption by juvenile pink salmon in the northern Gulf of Alaska
25 varied 45% between 1999 and 2001, although the reason for this variation is unknown.¹¹⁹

26 At some times of year, acidification has already reached a critical threshold for organisms living
27 on Alaska's continental shelves.¹²⁰ Certain algae and animals that form shells (such as clams,
28 oysters, and crab) use carbonate minerals (aragonite and calcite) that dissolve below that
29 threshold. These organisms form a crucial component of the marine food web that sustains life in
30 the rich waters off Alaska's coasts. In addition, Alaska oyster farmers are now indirectly affected
31 by ocean acidification impacts farther south because they rely for oyster spat (attached oyster
32 larvae) on Puget Sound farmers who are now directly affected by the recent upwelling of acidic
33 waters along the Washington and Oregon coastline (Ch. 24: Oceans; Ch. 21: Northwest).¹²¹

34 *Native Communities*

35 **The cumulative effects of climate change in Alaska strongly affect Native communities,**
36 **which are highly vulnerable to these rapid changes but have a deep cultural history of**
37 **adapting to change.**

38 With the exception of oil-producing regions in the north, rural Alaska is one of the most
39 extensive areas of poverty in the U.S. in terms of household income, yet residents pay the highest
40 prices for food and fuel.¹²² Alaska Native Peoples, who are the most numerous residents of this

1 region, depend economically, nutritionally, and culturally on hunting and fishing for their
 2 livelihoods.^{123,124,125} Hunters speak of thinning sea and river ice that makes harvest of wild foods
 3 more dangerous,¹²⁶ changes to permafrost that alter spring run-off patterns, a northward shift in
 4 seal and fish species, and rising sea levels with more extreme tidal fluctuations (see Ch. 12:
 5 Indigenous Peoples).^{127,128} Responses to these changes are often constrained by regulations.^{76,128}
 6 Coastal erosion is destroying infrastructure. Impacts of climate change on river ice dynamics and
 7 spring flooding are threats to river communities but are complex, and trends have not yet been
 8 well documented.¹²⁹

Alaska Coastal Communities Damaged



9

10 **Figure 22.8:** Alaska Coastal Communities Damaged

11 **Caption:** One effect of the reduction in Alaska sea ice is that storm surges that used to be
 12 buffered by the ice are now causing more shoreline damage. Photos show infrastructure
 13 damage from coastal erosion in Tuntutuliak (left) and Shishmaref, Alaska (right). (Photo
 14 credits: (left) Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation; (right) Ned Rozell).

15 Major food sources are under stress due to many factors, including lack of sea ice for marine
 16 mammals.¹³⁰ Thawing of near-surface permafrost beneath lakes and ponds that provide drinking
 17 water cause food and water security challenges for villages. Sanitation and health problems also
 18 result from deteriorating water and sewage systems, and ice cellars traditionally used for storing
 19 food are thawing (See also Ch. 12: Indigenous Peoples).^{74,77} Warming also releases human-
 20 caused pollutants, such as poleward-transported mercury and organic pesticides, from thawing
 21 permafrost and brings new diseases to arctic plants and animals, including subsistence food
 22 species, posing new health challenges, especially to rural communities.¹³¹ Positive health effects
 23 of warming include a longer growing season for gardening and agriculture.^{9,132}

24 Development activities in the Arctic (for example, oil and gas, minerals, tourism, and shipping)
 25 are of concern to indigenous communities, from both perceived threats and anticipated
 26 benefits.¹²⁵ Greater levels of industrial activity might alter the distribution of species, disrupt
 27 subsistence activities, increase the risk of oil spills, and create various social impacts. At the
 28 same time, development provides economic opportunities, if it can be harnessed appropriately.¹³³

1 Alaska Native Elders say, “We must prepare to adapt.” However, the implications of this
2 simple instruction are multi-faceted. Adapting means more than adjusting hunting
3 technologies and foods eaten. It requires learning how to garner information from a rapidly
4 changing environment. Permanent infrastructure and specified property rights increasingly
5 constrain people’s ability to safely use their environment for subsistence and other
6 activities. Traditional knowledge now facilitates adaptation to climate change as a
7 framework for linking new local observations with western science.^{123,134} The capacity of
8 Alaska Natives to survive for centuries in the harshest of conditions reflects their
9 resilience.⁹⁰ Communities must rely not only on improved knowledge of changes that are
10 occurring, but also on support from traditional and other institutions – and on strength from
11 within – in order to face an uncertain future.¹²³

DRAFT

1 **Traceable Accounts**

2 **Chapter 22: Alaska**

3 **Key Message Process:** A central component of the assessment process was the Alaska Regional Climate assessment
 4 workshop that was held September 12-15, 2012 in Anchorage with approximately 20 attendees; it began the process
 5 leading to a foundational Technical Input Report (TIR).⁹ The report consists of 148 pages of text, 45 figures, 8
 6 tables, and 27 pages of references. Public and private citizens or institutions were consulted and engaged in its
 7 preparation and expert review by the various agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) represented by
 8 the 11-member TIR writing team. The key findings of the report were presented at the Alaska Forum on the
 9 Environment and in a regularly scheduled, monthly webinar by the Alaska Center for Climate Assessment & Policy,
 10 with feedback then incorporated into the report.

11 The chapter author team engaged in multiple technical discussions via regular teleconferences. These included
 12 careful expert review of the foundational TIR⁹ and of approximately 85 additional technical inputs provided by the
 13 public, as well as the other published literature, and professional judgment. These discussions were followed by
 14 expert deliberation of draft key messages by the writing team in a face-to-face meeting before each key message was
 15 selected for inclusion in the Report. These discussions were supported by targeted consultation with additional
 16 experts by the lead author of each message, and they were based on criteria that help define “key vulnerabilities”
 17 (Ch. 26: Decision Support).

Key message #1/5	Arctic summer sea ice is receding faster than previously projected and is expected to virtually disappear before mid-century. This is altering marine ecosystems and leading to greater ship access, offshore development opportunity, and increased community vulnerability to coastal erosion.
Description of evidence base	<p>The key message and supporting chapter text summarize extensive evidence documented in the Alaska TIR.⁹ Technical input reports (85) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input.</p> <p>Although various models differ in the projected rate of sea ice loss, more recent CMIP5 models¹⁹ that most accurately reconstruct historical sea ice loss project that late-summer sea ice will virtually disappear by the 2030s, leaving only remnant sea ice.</p> <p>Evidence is strong about the impacts of sea ice loss.⁹ Because the sea ice cover plays such a strong role in human activities and Arctic ecosystems, loss of the ice cover is nearly certain to have substantial impacts.¹⁶</p>
New information and remaining uncertainties	<p>Important new evidence confirmed many of the findings from a prior Alaska assessment (http://nca2009.globalchange.gov/alaska), which informed the prior NCA.¹³⁵</p> <p>Evidence from improved models (for example,¹⁹) and updated observational data from satellite, especially new results, clearly show rapid decline in not only extent but also mass and thickness of multi-year ice,¹⁷ information that was not available in prior assessments.</p> <p>Nearly all studies to date published in the peer-reviewed literature agree that summer Arctic sea ice extent is rapidly declining and that, if heat-trapping gas concentrations continue to rise, an essentially ice-free summer Arctic ocean will be realized before mid-century. However, there remains uncertainty in the rate of sea ice loss, with the models that most accurately project historical sea ice trends currently suggesting nearly ice-free conditions sometime between 2021 and 2043 (median 2035).¹⁹ Uncertainty across all models stems from a combination of large differences in projections among different climate models, natural climate</p>

	<p>variability, and uncertainty about future rates of fossil fuel emissions.</p> <p>Ecosystems: There is substantial new information that ocean acidification, rising ocean temperatures, declining sea ice, and other environmental changes are affecting the location and abundance of marine fish, including those that are commercially important, those used as food by other species, and those used for subsistence.^{100,101} However, the relative importance of these potential causes of change is highly uncertain.</p> <p>Regarding offshore oil and gas development, a key uncertainty is the price of fossil fuels. Viable avenues to improving the information base are determining the primary causes of variation among different climate models and determining which climate models exhibit the best ability to reproduce the observed rate of sea ice loss.</p> <p>Coastal erosion: There is new information that lack of sea ice causes storms to produce larger waves and more coastal erosion.⁹ An additional contributing factor is that coastal bluffs that were “cemented” by permafrost are beginning to thaw in response to warmer air and ocean waters, and are therefore more vulnerable to erosion.³⁹ Standard defensive adaptation strategies to protect coastal communities from erosion such as use of rock walls, sandbags, and rip-rap have been largely unsuccessful.⁴⁰ There remains considerable uncertainty, however, about the spatial patterns of future coastal erosion.</p>
<p>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</p>	<p>Given the evidence base and remaining uncertainties:</p> <p>Very high confidence for summer sea ice decline. High confidence for summer sea ice disappearing by mid-century.</p> <p>Very high confidence for altered marine ecosystems, greater ship access, and increased vulnerability of communities to coastal erosion.</p> <p>High confidence regarding offshore development opportunity.</p>

1

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

2

1 **Chapter 22: Alaska**

2 **Key Message Process:** See key message #1.

Key message #2/5	Most glaciers in Alaska and British Columbia are shrinking substantially. This trend is expected to continue and has implications for hydropower production, ocean circulation patterns, fisheries, and global sea level rise.
Description of evidence base	<p>The key message and supporting chapter text summarize extensive evidence documented in the Alaska Technical Input Report.⁹ Technical input reports (85) 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 glaciers in Alaska and British Columbia are shrinking is strong and is based on field studies,⁵⁵ energy balance models,⁵⁸ LIDAR remote sensing,^{50,51} and satellite data, especially new lines of evidence from the Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) satellite.^{47,51,54}</p> <p>Evidence is also strong that Alaska ice mass loss contributes to global sea level rise,⁵⁷ with latest results permitting quantitative evaluation of losses globally.⁴⁸</p> <p>Numerous peer-reviewed publications describe implications of recent increases, but likely longer-term declines, in water input from glacial rivers to reservoirs and therefore hydropower resources.^{3,9,64}</p> <p>Glacial rivers account for 47% of the fresh water input to the Gulf of Alaska⁶⁴ and are an important source of organic carbon,^{59,60} phosphorus,⁶¹ and iron⁶² that contribute to the high productivity of near-shore fisheries.^{60,63} Therefore, it is projected that the changes in discharge of glacial rivers will affect ocean circulation patterns and major U.S. and locally significant fisheries.</p>
New information and remaining uncertainties	<p>Important new evidence confirmed many of the findings from a prior Alaska assessment (http://nca2009.globalchange.gov/alaska), which informed the prior NCA.¹³⁵</p> <p>As noted above, major advances from GRACE and other datasets now permit analyses of glacier mass loss that were not possible previously.</p> <p>Key uncertainties remain related to large year-to-year variation, the spatial distribution of snow accumulation and melt, and the quantification of glacier calving into the ocean and lakes. Although most large glaciated areas of the state are regularly measured observationally, extrapolation to unmeasured areas carries uncertainties due to large spatial variability.</p> <p>Although there is broad agreement that near-shore circulation in the Gulf of Alaska is influenced by the magnitude of freshwater inputs, little is known about the mechanisms by which near-term increases and subsequent longer-term decreases in glacier runoff (as the glaciers disappear) will affect the structure of the Alaska Coastal Current and smaller-scale ocean circulation, both of which have feedback on fisheries.</p> <p>The magnitude and timing of effects on hydropower production depend on changes in glacial mass, as described above.</p>
Assessment of confidence based on evidence	<p>High confidence that glacier mass loss in Alaska and British Columbia is high, contributing 20% to 30% as much to sea level rise as does shrinkage of the Greenland Ice Sheet.</p> <p>High confidence that due to glacier mass loss there will be related impacts on</p>

1

	hydropower production, ocean circulation, fisheries, and global sea level rise.
--	---

2

CONFIDENCE LEVEL			
Very High	High	Medium	Low
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

DRAFT

1 **Chapter 22: Alaska**

2 **Key Message Process:** See key message #1.

Key message #3/5	Permafrost temperatures in Alaska are rising, a thawing trend that is expected to continue, causing multiple vulnerabilities through drier landscapes, more wildfire, altered wildlife habitat, increased cost of maintaining infrastructure, and the release of heat-trapping gases that increase climate warming.
Description of evidence base	<p>The key message and supporting chapter text summarize extensive evidence documented in the Alaska Technical Input Report.⁹ Technical input reports (85) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input.</p> <p>Previous evidence that permafrost is warming⁶⁵ has been confirmed and enhanced by more recent studies.⁶⁹ The most recent modeling efforts (for example,^{70,72}) extend earlier results⁷¹ and project that permafrost will be lost from the upper few meters from large parts of Alaska by the end of this century.</p> <p>Evidence that permafrost thaw leads to drier landscapes^{80,81} is beginning to accumulate, especially as improved remote sensing tools are applied to assess more remote regions.⁷⁰</p> <p>Satellite data has expanded the capacity to monitor wildfire across the region, providing additional evidence of wildfire extent.⁸⁶ This new evidence has led to increased study that is beginning to reveal impacts on ecosystems and wildlife habitat, but much more work is needed to understand the extent of natural resilience.</p> <p>Impacts of permafrost thaw on the maintenance of infrastructure^{10,73,74,75,76} is currently moderate but rapidly accumulating. Evidence that permafrost thaw will jeopardize efforts to offset fossil fuel emissions is suggestive (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate).^{93,99}</p>
New information and remaining uncertainties	<p>Important new evidence confirmed many of the findings from a prior Alaska assessment (http://nca2009.globalchange.gov/alaska), which informed the prior NCA.¹³⁵</p> <p>This evidence included results from improved models and updated observational data. The assessment included insights from stakeholders collected in a series of distributed engagement meetings that confirm the relevance and significance of the key message for local decision-makers.</p> <p>Key uncertainties involve: 1) the degree to which increases in evapotranspiration versus permafrost thaw are leading to drier landscapes; 2) the degree to which it is these drier landscapes associated with permafrost thaw, versus more severe fire weather associated with climate change, that is leading to more wildfire; 3) the degree to which the costs of the maintenance of infrastructure are associated with permafrost thaw caused by climate change versus disturbance of permafrost due to other human activities; and 4) the degree to which climate change is causing Alaska to be a sink versus a source of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere.</p>
Assessment of confidence based on evidence	<p>Very high confidence that permafrost is warming.</p> <p>High confidence that landscapes in interior Alaska are getting drier, although the relative importance of different mechanisms is not completely clear.</p> <p>Medium confidence that thawing permafrost results in more wildfires. There is high confidence that wildfires have been increasing in recent decades, even if it is not clear whether permafrost thaw or hotter and drier weather is more important.</p> <p>High confidence that climate change will lead to increased maintenance costs in</p>

	<p>future decades. Low confidence that climate change has led to increased maintenance costs of infrastructure in recent decades.</p> <p>Very high confidence that ecological changes will cause Alaska to become a source of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere, even though evidence that Alaska is currently a carbon source is only suggestive.</p>
--	---

1

CONFIDENCE LEVEL			
Very High	High	Medium	Low
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 22: Alaska**

2 **Key Message Process:** See key message #1.

Key message #4/5	Current and projected increases in Alaska’s ocean temperatures and changes in ocean chemistry are expected to alter the distribution and productivity of Alaska’s marine fisheries, which lead the U.S. in commercial value.
Description of evidence base	<p>The key message and supporting chapter text summarize extensive evidence documented in the Alaska Technical Input Report.⁹ Technical input reports (85) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input.</p> <p>Numerous peer-reviewed publications describe evidence that ocean temperatures are rising and ocean chemistry, especially pH, is changing.⁹ New observational data from buoys and ships document increasing acidity and aragonite under-saturation (that is, the tendency of calcite and aragonite in shells to dissolve) in Alaskan coastal waters.</p> <p>Accumulating strong evidence suggests that these changes in ocean temperature and chemistry, including pH, will likely affect major Alaska marine fisheries, although the relative importance of these changes and the exact nature of response of each fishery are uncertain.^{100,101,102}</p> <p>Alaska’s commercial fisheries account for roughly 50 percent of the United States’ total wild landings. Alaska led all states in both volume and ex-vessel value of commercial fisheries landings in 2009, with a total of 1.84 million metric tons (MT) worth 1.3 billion dollars.¹</p>
New information and remaining uncertainties	<p>Important new evidence confirmed many of the findings from a prior Alaska assessment (http://nca2009.globalchange.gov/alaska), which informed the prior NCA.¹³⁵</p> <p>The new evidence included results from improved models and updated observational data. The assessment included insights from stakeholders collected in a series of distributed engagement meetings that confirm the relevance and significance of the key message for local decision-makers.</p> <p>A key uncertainty is what the actual impacts of rising temperatures and changing ocean chemistry, including increase in ocean acidification, will be on a broad range of marine biota and ecosystems. More monitoring is needed to document the extent and location of changes. Additional research is needed to assess how those changes will affect productivity of key fishery resources and their food and prey base.</p>
Assessment of confidence based on evidence	<p>Given the evidence base and remaining uncertainties:</p> <p>High confidence of increased ocean temperatures and changes in chemistry.</p> <p>Medium confidence that fisheries will be impacted.</p>

3

4

CONFIDENCE LEVEL			
Very High	High	Medium	Low
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 **Chapter 22: Alaska**

2 **Key Message Process:** See key message #1.

Key message #5/5	The cumulative effects of climate change in Alaska strongly affect Native communities, which are highly vulnerable to these rapid changes but have a deep cultural history of adapting to change.
Description of evidence base	<p>The key message and supporting chapter text summarize extensive evidence documented in the Alaska Technical Input Report.⁹ Technical input reports (85) 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 exists in recorded local observational accounts as well as in the peer reviewed scientific literature of the cumulative effects of climate-related environmental change on Native communities in Alaska; these effects combine with other socio-economic stressors to strain rural Native communities (Ch. 12: Indigenous Peoples).^{123,124,125,130} Increasing attention to impacts of climate change is revealing new aspects, such as impacts to health and hunter safety (for example, ^{77,133}). There is also strong evidence for the cultural adaptive capacity of these communities and peoples over time.^{90,129,134}</p>
New information and remaining uncertainties	<p>Important new evidence confirmed many of the findings from a prior Alaska assessment (http://nca2009.globalchange.gov/alaska), which informed the prior NCA.¹³⁵</p> <p>The precise mechanisms by which climate change affects Native communities are poorly understood, especially in the context of rapid social, economic, and cultural change. Present day responses to environmental change are poorly documented. More research is needed on the ways that Alaska Natives respond to current biophysical climate change and to the factors that enable or constrain contemporary adaptation.</p> <p>Alaska Native communities are already being affected by climate-induced changes in the physical and biological environment, from coastal erosion threatening the existence of some communities, to alterations in hunting, fishing, and gathering practices that undermine the intergenerational transfer of culture, skill, and wisdom. At the same time, these communities have a long record of adaptation and flexibility. Whether such adaptability is sufficient to address the challenges of climate change depends both on the speed of climate-induced changes and on the degree to which Native communities are supported rather than constrained in the adaptive measures they need to make.¹²³</p>
Assessment of confidence based on evidence	There is high confidence that cumulative effects of climate change in Alaska strongly affect Native communities, which are highly vulnerable to these rapid changes but have a deep cultural history of adapting to change.

3

4

CONFIDENCE LEVEL			
Very High	High	Medium	Low
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
3
4

DRAFT

1 **References**
2

- 3 1. NMFS, 2010: Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2009. U.S. Dept. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo.
4 NOAA Fisheries-F/SPO-118, 179 pp., National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD. [Available online at
5 <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/econ/2009/FEUS%202009%20ALL.pdf>]
- 6 2. Leask, K., M. Killorin, and S. Martin, 2001: Trends in Alaska's People and Economy, 16 pp., Institute of Social
7 and Economic Research, University of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska. [Available online at
8 <http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/Publications/Alaska2020.pdf>]
- 9 3. Cherry, J. E., S. Walker, N. Fresco, S. Trainor, and A. Tidwell, 2010: Impacts of Climate Change and Variability
10 on Hydropower in Southeast Alaska: Planning for a Robust Energy Future, 28 pp. [Available online at
11 http://ine.uaf.edu/accap/documents/seak_report_final.pdf]
- 12 4. Yu, G., Z. Schwartz, J. E. Walsh, and W. L. Chapman, 2009: A weather-resolving index for assessing the impact
13 of climate change on tourism related climate resources. *Climatic Change*, **95**, 551-573, doi:10.1007/s10584-
14 009-9565-7
- 15 5. Trainor, S. F., F. S. Chapin, III, A. D. McGuire, M. Calef, N. Fresco, M. Kwart, P. Duffy, A. L. Lovecraft, T. S. Rupp,
16 L. O. DeWilde, O. Huntington, and D. C. Natcher, 2009: Vulnerability and Adaptation to Climate-Related Fire
17 Impacts in Rural and Urban Interior Alaska. *Polar Research*, **28**, 100-118, doi:10.1111/j.1751-
18 8369.2009.00101.x
- 19 6. BIA, cited 2012: Alaska Region Overview. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. [Available
20 online at <http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/RegionalOffices/Alaska/>]
- 21 7. CCSP, 2008: Weather and Climate Extremes in a Changing Climate - Regions of Focus - North America, Hawaii,
22 Caribbean, and U.S. Pacific Islands. A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the
23 Subcommittee on Global Change Research. T. R. Karl, G. A. Meehl, C. D. Miller, S. J. Hassol, A. M. Waple, and
24 W. L. Murray, Eds., 164 pp., Department of Commerce, NOAA's National Climatic Data Center, Washington,
25 D.C. [Available online at <http://downloads.climate-science.gov/sap/sap3-3/sap3-3-final-all.pdf>]
- 26 8. Stewart, B. C., K. E. Kunkel, L. E. Stevens, L. Sun, and J. E. Walsh, 2013: Regional Climate Trends and Scenarios
27 for the U.S. National Climate Assessment: Part 7. Climate of Alaska. NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 142-7, 60
28 pp
- 29 9. Markon, C. J., S. F. Trainor, and F. S. Chapin, III, Eds., 2012: *The United States National Climate Assessment –*
30 *Alaska Technical Regional Report. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1379.* U. S. Geological Survey, 148
31 pp. [Available online at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/circ/1379/pdf/circ1379.pdf>]
- 32 10. Hinzman, L. D., N. D. Bettez, W. R. Bolton, F. S. Chapin, III, M. B. Dyrgerov, C. L. Fastie, B. Griffith, R. D.
33 Hollister, A. Hope, H. P. Huntington, A. M. Jensen, G. J. Jia, T. Jorgenson, D. L. Kane, D. R. Klein, G. Kofinas, A.
34 H. Lynch, A. H. Lloyd, A. D. McGuire, F. E. Nelson, W. C. Oechel, T. E. Osterkamp, C. H. Racine, V. E.
35 Romanovsky, R. S. Stone, D. A. Stow, M. Sturm, C. E. Tweedie, G. L. Vourlitis, M. D. Walker, D. A. Walker, P. J.
36 Webber, J. M. Welker, K. S. Winker, and K. Yoshikawa, 2005: Evidence and implications of recent climate
37 change in Northern Alaska and other Arctic regions. *Climatic Change*, **72**, 251-298. [Available online at
38 <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/s10584-005-5352-2>]
- 39 11. UAF, cited 2013: Scenarios Network for Alaska & Arctic Planning. University of Alaska Fairbanks. [Available
40 online at <http://www.snap.uaf.edu/datamaps.php>]
- 41 12. Wendler, G., and M. Shulski, 2009: A Century of Climate Change for Fairbanks, Alaska. *Arctic*, **62**, 295-300.
42 [Available online at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40513307>]
- 43 13. Kasischke, E. S., D. L. Verbyla, T. S. Rupp, A. D. McGuire, K. A. Murphy, R. Jandt, J. L. Barnes, E. E. Hoy, P. A.
44 Duffy, M. Calef, and M. R. Turetsky, 2010: Alaska's changing fire regime — implications for the vulnerability of

- 1 its boreal forests. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, **40**, 1313-1324, doi:10.1139/X10-098. [Available online
2 at <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/X10-098>]
- 3 14. McGuire, A. D., R. W. Ruess, A. Lloyd, J. Yarie, J. S. Clein, and G. P. Juday, 2010: Vulnerability of white spruce
4 tree growth in interior Alaska in response to climate variability: dendrochronological, demographic, and
5 experimental perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, **40**, 1197-1209, doi:10.1139/x09-206
- 6 15. Hezel, P. J., X. Zhang, C. M. Bitz, B. P. Kelly, and F. Massonnet, 2012: Projected decline in spring snow depth
7 on Arctic sea ice caused by progressively later autumn open ocean freeze-up this century. *Geophysical*
8 *Research Letters*, **39**, L17505, doi:10.1029/2012GL052794
- 9 16. Maslowski, W., J. Clement Kinney, M. Higgins, and A. Roberts, 2012: The future of Arctic sea ice. *Annual*
10 *Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, **40**, 625-654, doi:10.1146/annurev-earth-042711-105345. [Available
11 online at <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-earth-042711-105345>]
- 12 17. Stroeve, J. C., M. C. Serreze, M. M. Holland, J. E. Kay, J. Malanik, and A. P. Barrett, 2012: The Arctic's rapidly
13 shrinking sea ice cover: A research synthesis. *Climatic Change*, **110**, 1005-1027, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-
14 0101-1. [Available online at <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10584-011-0101-1.pdf>]
- 15 18. Stroeve, J., M. M. Holland, W. Meier, T. Scambos, and M. Serreze, 2007: Arctic sea ice decline: Faster than
16 forecast. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **34**, L09501, doi:10.1029/2007GL029703. [Available online at
17 <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2007/2007GL029703.shtml>];
- 18 Wang, M., and J. E. Overland, 2009: A sea ice free summer Arctic within 30 years? *Geophysical Research*
19 *Letters*, **36**, L07502, doi:10.1029/2009GL037820. [Available online at
20 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2009GL037820/pdf>]
- 21 19. —, 2012: A sea ice free summer Arctic within 30 years: An update from CMIP5 models. *Geophysical*
22 *Research Letters*, **39**, L18501, doi:10.1029/2012GL052868. [Available online at
23 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2012GL052868/pdf>]
- 24 20. Tietsche, S., D. Notz, J. H. Jungclaus, and J. Marotzke, 2011: Recovery mechanisms of Arctic summer sea ice.
25 *Geophysical Research Letters*, **38**, L02707, doi:10.1029/2010GL045698. [Available online at
26 <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2011/2010GL045698.shtml>]
- 27 21. Fetterer, F., K. Knowles, W. Meier, and M. Savoie, 2002: Sea Ice Index. [Monthly Sea Ice Extent and Area].
28 Updated 2013. National Snow and Ice Data Center, Boulder, CO. [Available online at
29 <http://dx.doi.org/10.7265/N5QJ7F7W>]
- 30 22. Screen, J. A., and I. Simmonds, 2010: The central role of diminishing sea ice in recent Arctic temperature
31 amplification. *Nature*, **464**, 1334-1337. [Available online at
32 <ftp://ftp.soest.hawaii.edu/coastal/Climate%20Articles/Arctic%20sea%20ice%202010.pdf>];
- 33 Serreze, M. C., A. P. Barrett, J. C. Stroeve, D. N. Kindig, and M. M. Holland, 2008: The emergence of surface-
34 based Arctic amplification. *The Cryosphere Discussions*, **2**, 601-622. [Available online at [http://the-](http://the-cryosphere-discuss.net/2/601/2008/tcd-2-601-2008.pdf)
35 [cryosphere-discuss.net/2/601/2008/tcd-2-601-2008.pdf](http://the-cryosphere-discuss.net/2/601/2008/tcd-2-601-2008.pdf)]
- 36 23. Porter, D. F., J. J. Cassano, and M. C. Serreze, 2012: Local and large-scale atmospheric responses to reduced
37 Arctic sea ice and ocean warming in the WRF model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, **117**,
38 D11115, doi:10.1029/2011JD016969
- 39 24. Francis, J. A., and S. J. Vavrus, 2012: Evidence linking Arctic amplification to extreme weather in mid-latitudes.
40 *Geophysical Research Letters*, **39**, L06801, doi:10.1029/2012GL051000 [Available online at
41 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2012GL051000/pdf>]
- 42 25. Serreze, M. C., A. P. Barrett, and J. Stroeve, 2012: Recent changes in tropospheric water vapor over the Arctic
43 as assessed from radiosondes and atmospheric reanalyses. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **117**, 1-21,
44 doi:10.1029/2011JD017421. [Available online at

- 1 http://icdc.zmaw.de/fileadmin/user_upload/icdc_Dokumente/serrezeetal_RecentChangesinTroposphericWaterVaporovertheArcticassessedfromRadiosondesandAtmosphericReanalyses_117_D10104_2012.pdf
- 2
- 3 26. Wu, D. L., and J. N. Lee, 2012: Arctic low cloud changes as observed by MISR and CALIOP: Implication for the
4 enhanced autumnal warming and sea ice loss. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **117**,
5 doi:10.1029/2011JD017050
- 6 27. Smith, L. C., and S. R. Stephenson, 2013: New Trans-Arctic shipping routes navigable by midcentury.
7 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **110**, E1191–E1195, doi:10.1073/pnas.1214212110.
8 [Available online at <http://www.pnas.org/content/110/13/E1191.full.pdf+html>]
- 9 28. Laidre, K. L., I. Stirling, L. F. Lowry, Ø. Wiig, M. P. Heide-Jørgensen, and S. H. Ferguson, 2008: Quantifying the
10 sensitivity of Arctic marine mammals to climate-induced habitat change. *Ecological Applications*, **18**, S97-
11 S125, doi:10.1890/06-0546.1. [Available online at <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/06-0546.1>]
- 12 29. Rode, K. D., S. C. Amstrup, and E. V. Regehr, 2010: Reduced body size and cub recruitment in polar bears
13 associated with sea ice decline. *Ecological Applications*, **20**, 768-782, doi:10.1890/08-1036.1;
- 14 Rode, K. D., E. Peacock, M. Taylor, I. Stirling, E. W. Born, K. L. Laidre, and Ø. Wiig, 2012: A tale of two polar
15 bear populations: ice habitat, harvest, and body condition. *Population Ecology*, **54**, 3-18, doi:10.1007/s10144-
16 011-0299-9
- 17 30. Schliebe, S., K. D. Rode, J. S. Gleason, J. Wilder, K. Proffitt, T. J. Evans, and S. Miller, 2008: Effects of sea ice
18 extent and food availability on spatial and temporal distribution of polar bears during the fall open-water
19 period in the Southern Beaufort Sea. *Polar Biology*, **31**, 999-1010, doi:10.1007/s00300-008-0439-7. [Available
20 online at <http://alaska.fws.gov/fisheries/mmm/polarbear/pdf/SchliebeEtAl.pdf>]
- 21 31. Fischbach, A. S., S. C. Amstrup, and D. C. Douglas, 2007: Landward and eastward shift of Alaskan polar bear
22 denning associated with recent sea ice changes. *Polar Biology*, **30**, 1395-1405, doi:10.1007/s00300-007-0300-
23 4 [Available online at <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/s00300-007-0300-4>]
- 24 32. Stirling, I., M. J. Lunn, and J. Iacozza, 1999: Long-term trends in the population ecology of polar bears in
25 Western Hudson Bay in relation to climate change. *Arctic*, **52**, 294-306. [Available online at
26 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40511782>]
- 27 33. Regehr, E. V., N. J. Lunn, S. C. Amstrup, and I. Stirling, 2007: Effects of earlier sea ice breakup on survival and
28 population size of polar bears in western Hudson Bay. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **71**, 2673-2683,
29 doi:10.2193/2006-180. [Available online at <http://www.bioone.org/doi/pdf/10.2193/2006-180>]
- 30 34. Molnár, P. K., A. E. Derocher, T. Klanjscek, and M. A. Lewis, 2011: Predicting climate change impacts on polar
31 bear litter size. *Nature Communications*, **2**, 1-8, doi:10.1038/ncomms1183 [Available online at
32 <http://www.nature.com/ncomms/journal/v2/n2/pdf/ncomms1183.pdf>]
- 33 35. Hunter, C. M., H. Caswell, M. C. Runge, E. V. Regehr, S. C. Amstrup, and I. Stirling, 2010: Climate change
34 threatens polar bear populations: a stochastic demographic analysis. *Ecology*, **91**, 2883-2897, doi:10.1890/09-
35 1641.1. [Available online at <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/09-1641.1>]
- 36 36. Fay, F. H., 1982: *Ecology and Biology of the Pacific Walrus, *Odobenus rosmarus divergens* Illiger*. U.S.
37 Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 279 pp. [Available online at
38 <http://www.fwspubs.org/doi/pdf/10.3996/nafa.74.0001>]
- 39 37. Douglas, D. C., 2010: Arctic sea ice decline: Projected changes in timing and extent of sea ice in the Bering and
40 Chukchi Seas: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2010-1176, 32 pp., U.S. Department of the Interior,
41 U.S. Geological Survey. [Available online at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2010/1176/>];
- 42 Kelly, B. P., 2001: Climate change and ice breeding pinnipeds. *"Fingerprints" of Climate Change*, G. R. Walther,
43 C. A. Burga, and P. J. Edwards, Eds., Springer US, 43-55. [Available online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8692-4_3]
- 44

- 1 38. Fay, F. H., and B. P. Kelly, 1980: Mass natural mortality of walrus (*Odobenus rosmarus*) at St. Lawrence
2 Island, Bering Sea, autumn 1978. *Arctic*, **33**. [Available online at
3 <http://arctic.synergiesprairies.ca/arctic/index.php/arctic/article/view/2558>];
- 4 Fischbach, A. S., D. H. Monson, and C. V. Jay, 2009: Enumeration of Pacific Walrus Carcasses on Beaches of
5 the Chukchi Sea in Alaska Following a Mortality Event, September 2009. Open-File Report 2009-1291, 10 pp.,
6 U.S. Geological Survey. [Available online at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2009/1291/>]
- 7 39. Overeem, I., R. S. Anderson, C. W. Wobus, G. D. Clow, F. E. Urban, and N. Matell, 2011: Sea ice loss enhances
8 wave action at the Arctic coast. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **38**, L17503. [Available online at
9 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2011GL048681/pdf>]
- 10 40. State of Alaska, cited 2011: Adaptation Advisory Group of the Governor's Sub-Cabinet on Climate Change.
11 State of Alaska. [Available online at <http://www.climatechange.alaska.gov/aag/aag.htm>]
- 12 41. Bronen, R., 2011: Climate-induced community relocations: creating an adaptive governance framework based
13 in human rights doctrine. *NYU Review Law & Social Change*, **35**, 357-408. [Available online at
14 <http://socialchangenyu.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/climate-induced-migration-bronen-35-2.pdf>]
- 15 42. GAO, 2009: Alaska native villages: Limited progress has been made on relocating villages threatened by
16 flooding and erosion. Government Accountability Office Report GAO-09-551, 53 pp., U.S. Government
17 Accountability Office. [Available online at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09551.pdf>]
- 18 43. Alaska Department of Commerce and Community and Economic Development, 2012: Relocation Report:
19 Newtok to Mertarvik. C. George, A. Elconin, D. Vought, G. Owletuck, and G. McConnell, Eds., 58 pp., Alaska
20 Department of Commerce and Community and Economic Development, Anchorage, AK. [Available online at
21 http://commerce.alaska.gov/dca/planning/npg/pub/Mertarvik_Relocation_Report.pdf]
- 22 44. USACE, 2008: Revised environmental assessment: finding of no significant impact: Newtok Evacuation Center:
23 Mertarvik, Nelson Island, Alaska, 64 pp., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, Anchorage, Alaska.
24 [Available online at
25 [http://www.commerce.state.ak.us/dcra/planning/pub/Newtok Evacuation Center EA & FONSI July 08.pdf](http://www.commerce.state.ak.us/dcra/planning/pub/Newtok_Evacuation_Center_EA_&_FONSI_July_08.pdf)
26 f]
- 27 45. —, 2008: Section 117 Project fact sheet. Alaska Baseline Erosion Assessment, Erosion Information Paper.
28 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, Koyukuk, AK
- 29 46. Nicholls, R. J., P. P. Wong, V. R. Burkett, J. O. Codignotto, J. E. Hay, R. F. McLean, S. Ragoonaden, and C. D.
30 Woodroffe, 2007: Ch. 6: Coastal Systems and Low-lying Areas. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptations*
31 *and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental*
32 *Panel on Climate Change*, M. L. Parry, O. F. Canziani, J. P. Palutikof, P. J. Van der Linden, and C. E. Hanson,
33 Eds., Cambridge University Press, 316-356. [Available online at
34 <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1192&context=scipapers>]
- 35 47. Berthier, E., E. Schiefer, G. K. C. Clarke, B. Menounos, and F. Rémy, 2010: Contribution of Alaskan glaciers to
36 sea-level rise derived from satellite imagery. *Nature Geoscience*, **3**, 92-95, doi:10.1038/ngeo737. [Available
37 online at <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/ngeo737>]
- 38 48. Jacob, T., J. Wahr, W. T. Pfeffer, and S. Swenson, 2012: Recent contributions of glaciers and ice caps to sea
39 level rise. *Nature*, **482**, 514-518, doi:10.1038/nature10847. [Available online at
40 <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/nature10847>]
- 41 49. Larsen, C. F., R. J. Motyka, A. A. Arendt, K. A. Echelmeyer, and P. E. Geissler, 2007: Glacier changes in
42 southeast Alaska and northwest British Columbia and contribution to sea level rise. *Journal of Geophysical*
43 *Research*, **112**, F01007, doi:10.1029/2006JF000586. [Available online at
44 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2006JF000586/pdf>]

- 1 50. Arendt, A. A., K. A. Echelmeyer, W. D. Harrison, C. S. Lingle, and V. B. Valentine, 2002: Rapid wastage of
2 Alaska glaciers and their contribution to rising sea level. *Science*, **297**, 382-386
- 3 51. Arendt, A. A., S. B. Luthcke, and R. Hock, 2009: Glacier changes in Alaska: can mass-balance models explain
4 GRACE mascon trends? *Annals of Glaciology*, **50**, 148-154, doi:10.3189/172756409787769753
- 5 52. Oerlemans, J., 2005: Extracting a climate signal from 169 glacier records. *Science*, **308**, 675-677. [Available
6 online at <http://www.geology.byu.edu/wp-content/uploads/file/Readings/Oerlemans%202005.pdf>]
- 7 53. Kaser, G., J. G. Cogley, M. B. Dyurgerov, M. F. Meier, and A. Ohmura, 2006: Mass balance of glaciers and ice
8 caps: Consensus estimates for 1961–2004. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **33**, L19501,
9 doi:10.1029/2006GL027511. [Available online at
10 <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2006/2006GL027511.shtml>]
- 11 54. Luthcke, S. B., A. A. Arendt, D. D. Rowlands, J. J. McCarthy, and C. F. Larsen, 2008: Recent glacier mass
12 changes in the Gulf of Alaska region from GRACE mascon solutions. *Journal of Glaciology*, **54**, 767-777,
13 doi:10.3189/002214308787779933;
- 14 Pritchard, H. D., S. B. Luthcke, and A. H. Fleming, 2010: Understanding ice-sheet mass balance: Progress in
15 satellite altimetry and gravimetry. *Journal of Glaciology*, **56**, 1151-1161, doi:10.3189/002214311796406194.
16 [Available online at [http://openurl.ingenta.com/content/xref?genre=article&issn=0022-
17 1430&volume=56&issue=200&page=1151](http://openurl.ingenta.com/content/xref?genre=article&issn=0022-1430&volume=56&issue=200&page=1151)]
- 18 55. Pelto, M., 2011: Utility of late summer transient snowline migration rate on Taku Glacier, Alaska. *The
19 Cryosphere Discuss*, **5**, 1365-1382, doi:10.5194/tcd-5-1365-2011. [Available online at [http://www.the-
20 cryosphere-discuss.net/5/1365/2011/tcd-5-1365-2011.pdf](http://www.the-cryosphere-discuss.net/5/1365/2011/tcd-5-1365-2011.pdf)];
- 21 Van Beusekom, A. E., S. R. O'Neel, R. S. March, L. C. Sass, and L. H. Cox, 2010: Re-analysis of Alaskan
22 benchmark glacier mass-balance data using the index method. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations
23 Report 2010-5247, 16 pp., U.S. Geological Survey Washington, D.C. [Available online at
24 <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2010/5247/pdf/sir20105247.pdf>]
- 25 56. Dai, A., T. Qian, K. E. Trenberth, and J. D. Milliman, 2009: Changes in continental freshwater discharge from
26 1948 to 2004. *Journal of Climate*, **22**, 2773-2792, doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2592.1. [Available online at
27 <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/2008JCLI2592.1>]
- 28 57. Maier, J. A. K., J. M. Ver Hoef, A. D. McGuire, R. T. Bowyer, L. Saperstein, and H. A. Maier, 2005: Distribution
29 and density of moose in relation to landscape characteristics: effects of scale. *Canadian Journal of Forest
30 Research*, **35**, 2233-2243. [Available online at <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/x05-123>]
- 31 58. Radić, V., and R. Hock, 2011: Regionally differentiated contribution of mountain glaciers and ice caps to
32 future sea-level rise. *Nature Geoscience*, **4**, 91-94, doi:10.1038/ngeo1052 [Available online at
33 <http://www.nature.com/ngeo/journal/v4/n2/full/ngeo1052.html>]
- 34 59. Bhatia, M. P., S. B. Das, K. Longnecker, M. A. Charette, and E. B. Kujawinski, 2010: Molecular characterization
35 of dissolved organic matter associated with the Greenland ice sheet. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, **74**,
36 3768-3784, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2010.03.035
- 37 60. Hood, E., J. Fellman, R. G. M. Spencer, P. J. Hernes, R. Edwards, D. D'Amore, and D. Scott, 2009: Glaciers as a
38 source of ancient and labile organic matter to the marine environment. *Nature*, **462**, 1044-1047,
39 doi:10.1038/nature08580. [Available online at <http://www.nature.com/doi/abs/10.1038/nature08580>]
- 40 61. Hood, E., and D. Scott, 2008: Riverine organic matter and nutrients in southeast Alaska affected by
41 glacial coverage. *Nature Geoscience*, **1**, 583-587, doi:10.1038/ngeo280. [Available online at
42 <http://www.nature.com/doi/abs/10.1038/ngeo280>]
- 43 62. Schroth, A. W., J. Crusius, F. Chever, B. C. Bostick, and O. J. Rouxel, 2011: Glacial influence on the
44 geochemistry of riverine iron fluxes to the Gulf of Alaska and effects of deglaciation. *Geophysical Research*

- 1 *Letters*, **38**, 1-6, doi:10.1029/2011GL048367. [Available online at [http://hal-sde.archives-](http://hal-sde.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/64/58/79/PDF/GRL-Rouxel_al-2011.pdf)
2 [ouvertes.fr/docs/00/64/58/79/PDF/GRL-Rouxel_al-2011.pdf](http://hal-sde.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/64/58/79/PDF/GRL-Rouxel_al-2011.pdf)]
- 3 63. Fellman, J. B., R. G. M. Spencer, P. J. Hernes, R. T. Edwards, D. V. D'Amore, and E. Hood, 2010: The impact of
4 glacier runoff on the biodegradability and biochemical composition of terrigenous dissolved organic matter in
5 near-shore marine ecosystems. *Marine Chemistry*, **121**, 112-122, doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2010.03.009;
- 6 Hood, E., and L. Berner, 2009: Effects of changing glacial coverage on the physical and biogeochemical
7 properties of coastal streams in southeastern Alaska. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **114**,
8 doi:10.1029/2009JG000971. [Available online at
9 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2009JG000971/pdf>];
- 10 Royer, T. C., and C. E. Grosch, 2006: Ocean warming and freshening in the northern Gulf of Alaska.
11 *Geophysical Research Letters*, **33**, L16605, doi:10.1029/2006GL026767
- 12 64. Neal, E. G., E. Hood, and K. Smikrud, 2010: Contribution of glacier runoff to freshwater discharge into the Gulf
13 of Alaska. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **37**, 1-5, doi:10.1029/2010GL042385. [Available online at
14 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2010GL042385/pdf>]
- 15 65. Osterkamp, T. E., and V. E. Romanovsky, 1999: Evidence for warming and thawing of discontinuous
16 permafrost in Alaska. *Permafrost and Periglacial Processes*, **10**, 17-37, doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-
17 1530(199901/03)10:1<17::AID-PPP303>3.0.CO;2-4. [Available online at
18 [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1530\(199901/03\)10:1%3C17::AID-
19 PPP303%3E3.0.CO;2-4/pdf](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1530(199901/03)10:1%3C17::AID-PPP303%3E3.0.CO;2-4/pdf)]
- 20 66. Romanovsky, V. E., S. L. Smith, H. H. Christiansen, N. I. Shiklomanov, D. S. Drozdov, N. G. Oberman, A. L.
21 Kholodov, and S. S. Marchenko, 2012: [The Arctic] Permafrost [in "State of the Climate in 2011"]. *Bulletin of*
22 *the American Meteorological Society*, **93**, S137-S138, doi:10.1175/2012BAMSStateoftheClimate.1. [Available
23 online at <http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cmb/bams-sotc/climate-assessment-2011-lo-rez.pdf>]
- 24 67. Romanovsky, V. E., S. S. Marchenko, R. Daanen, D. O. Sergeev, and D. A. Walker, 2008: Soil climate and frost
25 heave along the Permafrost/Ecological North American Arctic Transect. *Proceedings of the Ninth International*
26 *Conference on Permafrost*, Institute of Northern Engineering, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 1519-1524 pp
- 27 68. Jorgenson, T., K. Yoshikawa, M. Kanevskiy, Y. Shur, V. Romanovsky, S. Marchenko, G. Grosse, J. Brown, and B.
28 Jones, 2008: Permafrost characteristics of Alaska. *Extended Abstracts of the Ninth International Conference*
29 *on Permafrost, June 29-July 3, 2008.*, D. L. Kane, and K. M. Hinkel, Eds., University of Alaska Fairbanks, 121-
30 123. [Available online at
31 [http://permafrost.gi.alaska.edu/sites/default/files/AlaskaPermafrostMap_Front_Dec2008_Jorgenson_etal_2
32 008.pdf](http://permafrost.gi.alaska.edu/sites/default/files/AlaskaPermafrostMap_Front_Dec2008_Jorgenson_etal_2008.pdf)]
- 33 69. French, H., 2011: Geomorphic Change in Northern Canada. *Changing Cold Environments: A Canadian*
34 *Perspective*, H. French, and O. Slaymaker, Eds., John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 200-221;
- 35 Romanovsky, V. E., S. L. Smith, and H. H. Christiansen, 2010: Permafrost thermal state in the polar Northern
36 Hemisphere during the international polar year 2007-2009: A synthesis. *Permafrost and Periglacial Processes*,
37 **21**, 106-116, doi:10.1002/ppp.689. [Available online at
38 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ppp.689/pdf>]
- 39 70. Avis, C. A., A. J. Weaver, and K. J. Meissner, 2011: Reduction in areal extent of high-latitude wetlands in
40 response to permafrost thaw. *Nature Geoscience*, **4**, 444-448, doi:10.1038/ngeo1160
- 41 71. Euskirchen, E. S., A. D. McGuire, D. W. Kicklighter, Q. Zhuang, J. S. Clein, R. J. Dargaville, D. G. Dye, J. S.
42 Kimball, K. C. McDonald, J. M. Melillo, V. E. Romanovsky, and N. V. Smith, 2006: Importance of recent shifts in
43 soil thermal dynamics on growing season length, productivity, and carbon sequestration in terrestrial high-
44 latitude ecosystems. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 731-750, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01113.x [Available
45 online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01113.x/pdf>];

- 1 Lawrence, D. M., and A. G. Slater, 2008: Incorporating organic soil into a global climate model. *Climate*
2 *Dynamics*, **30**, 145-160, doi:10.1007/s00382-007-0278-1. [Available online at
3 <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/s00382-007-0278-1>]
- 4 72. Jafarov, E. E., S. S. Marchenko, and V. E. Romanovsky, 2012: Numerical modeling of permafrost dynamics in
5 Alaska using a high spatial resolution dataset. *The Cryosphere Discuss.*, **6**, 89-124, doi:10.5194/tcd-6-89-2012
- 6 73. Larsen, P. H., S. Goldsmith, O. Smith, M. L. Wilson, K. Strzepek, P. Chinowsky, and B. Saylor, 2008: Estimating
7 future costs for Alaska public infrastructure at risk from climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, **18**,
8 442-457, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.03.005. [Available online at
9 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0959378008000216>]
- 10 74. Alessa, L., A. Kliskey, R. Busey, L. Hinzman, and D. White, 2008: Freshwater vulnerabilities and resilience on
11 the Seward Peninsula: Integrating multiple dimensions of landscape change. *Global Environmental Change*,
12 **18**, 256-270, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.01.004
- 13 75. Jones, B. M., C. D. Arp, K. M. Hinkel, R. A. Beck, J. A. Schmutz, and B. Winston, 2009: Arctic lake physical
14 processes and regimes with implications for winter water availability and management in the National
15 Petroleum Reserve Alaska. *Environmental Management*, **43**, 1071-1084, doi:10.1007/s00267-008-9241-0
- 16 76. White, D. M., S. C. Gerlach, P. Loring, A. C. Tidwell, and M. C. Chambers, 2007: Food and water security in a
17 changing arctic climate. *Environmental Research Letters*, **2**, 045018, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/2/4/045018.
18 [Available online at http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/2/4/045018/pdf/1748-9326_2_4_045018.pdf]
- 19 77. Brubaker, M., J. Berner, R. Chavan, and J. Warren, 2011: Climate change and health effects in Northwest
20 Alaska. *Global Health Action*, **4**, 1-5, doi:10.3402/gha.v4i0.8445. [Available online at
21 <http://www.globalhealthaction.net/index.php/gha/article/view/8445/12705>]
- 22 78. Larsen, P., and S. Goldsmith, 2007: How much might climate change add to future costs for public
23 infrastructure? Understanding Alaska research summary #8, 8 pp., Institute of Social and Economic Research,
24 University of Alaska Anchorage, Anchorage, AK. [Available online at
25 <http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/Publications/Juneclimatefinal.pdf>]
- 26 79. Klein, E., E. E. Berg, and R. Dial, 2005: Wetland drying and succession across the Kenai Peninsula Lowlands,
27 south-central Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, **35**, 1931-1941, doi:10.1139/x05-129. [Available
28 online at <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/x05-129>];
- 29 Riordan, B., D. Verbyla, and A. D. McGuire, 2006: Shrinking ponds in subarctic Alaska based on 1950–2002
30 remotely sensed images. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **111**, G04002, doi:10.1029/2005JG000150.
31 [Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2005JG000150/pdf>]
- 32 80. Roach, J., B. Griffith, D. Verbyla, and J. Jones, 2011: Mechanisms influencing changes in lake area in Alaskan
33 boreal forest. *Global Change Biology*, **17**, 2567-2583, doi:2486.2011.02446.x. [Available online at
34 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02446.x/pdf>]
- 35 81. Rover, J., L. Ji, B. K. Wylie, and L. L. Tieszen, 2012: Establishing water body areal extent trends in interior
36 Alaska from multi-temporal Landsat data. *Remote Sensing Letters*, **3**, 595-604,
37 doi:10.1080/01431161.2011.643507
- 38 82. Griffith, B., and A. D. McGuire, 2008: National Wildlife Refuges Case Study - Alaska and the Central Flyway.
39 *Annex A of Preliminary Review of Adaptation Options for Climate-Sensitive Ecosystems and Resources - A*
40 *Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research*, S. H.
41 Julius, and J. M. West, Eds., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, A-36 - A-46. [Available online at
42 <http://www.climatechange.gov/Library/sap/sap4-4/final-report/sap4-4-final-report-all.pdf>]
- 43 83. Hu, F. S., P. E. Higuera, J. E. Walsh, W. L. Chapman, P. A. Duffy, L. B. Brubaker, and M. L. Chipman, 2010:
44 Tundra burning in Alaska: Linkages to climatic change and sea ice retreat. *Journal of Geophysical Research*,
45 **115**, G04002, doi:10.1029/2009jg001270. [Available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2009JG001270>]

- 1 84. Mack, M. C., M. S. Bret-Harte, T. N. Hollingsworth, R. R. Jandt, E. A. G. Schuur, G. R. Shaver, and D. L. Verbyla,
2 2011: Carbon loss from an unprecedented Arctic tundra wildfire. *Nature*, **475**, 489-492,
3 doi:10.1038/nature10283. [Available online at
4 <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v475/n7357/pdf/nature10283.pdf>]
- 5 85. Balshi, M. S., A. D. McGuire, P. Duffy, M. Flannigan, J. Walsh, and J. Melillo, 2008: Assessing the response of
6 area burned to changing climate in western boreal North America using a Multivariate Adaptive Regression
7 Splines (MARS) approach. *Global Change Biology*, **15**, 578-600, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01679.x.
8 [Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01679.x/pdf>]
- 9 86. Barrett, K., A. D. McGuire, E. E. Hoy, and E. S. Kasischke, 2011: Potential shifts in dominant forest cover in
10 interior Alaska driven by variations in fire severity. *Ecological Applications*, **21**, 2380-2396, doi:10.190/10-
11 0896.1
- 12 87. Johnstone, J. F., T. S. Rupp, M. Olson, and D. Verbyla, 2011: Modeling impacts of fire severity on successional
13 trajectories and future fire behavior in Alaskan boreal forests. *Landscape Ecology*, **26**, 487-500,
14 doi:10.1007/s10980-011-9574-6
- 15 88. Nelson, J. L., E. S. Zavaleta, and F. S. Chapin, III, 2008: Boreal fire effects on subsistence resources in Alaska
16 and adjacent Canada. *Ecosystems*, **11**, 156-171, doi:10.1007/s10021-007-9114-z
- 17 89. Joly, K., F. S. Chapin, III, and D. R. Klein, 2010: Winter habitat selection by caribou in relation to lichen
18 abundance, wildfires, grazing, and landscape characteristics in northwest Alaska. *Ecoscience*, **17**, 321-333,
19 doi:10.2980/17-3-3337. [Available online at <http://www.bioone.org/doi/pdf/10.2980/17-3-3337>];
20 Rupp, T. S., M. Olson, L. G. Adams, B. W. Dale, K. Joly, J. Henkelman, W. B. Collins, and A. M. Starfield, 2006:
21 Simulating the influences of various fire regimes on caribou winter habitat. *Ecological Applications*, **16**, 1730-
22 1743. [Available online at http://www.lter.uaf.edu/dev2009/pdf/985_Rupp_Olson.pdf]
- 23 90. Kofinas, G. P., F. S. Chapin, III, S. BurnSilver, J. I. Schmidt, N. L. Fresco, K. Kielland, S. Martin, A. Springsteen,
24 and T. S. Rupp, 2010: Resilience of Athabaskan subsistence systems to interior Alaska's changing climate.
25 *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, **40**, 1347-1359, doi:10.1139/X10-108. [Available online at
26 <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/pdf/10.1139/X10-108>]
- 27 91. Cortes-Burns, H., I. Lapina, S. Klein, M. Carlson, and L. Flagstad, 2008: Invasive Plant Species Monitoring and
28 Control: Areas Impacted by 2004 and 2005 Fires in Interior Alaska: A survey of Alaska BLM lands along the
29 Dalton, Steese, and Taylor Highways, 162 pp., Bureau of Land Management – Alaska State Office. Alaska
30 Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska, Anchorage, AK. [Available online at
31 http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/Cortes_etal_2008.pdf];
32 Lapina, I., and M. L. Carlson, 2004: Non-Native Plant Species of Susitna, Matanuska, and Copper River Basins:
33 Summary of Survey Findings and Recommendations for Control Actions, 64 pp., University of Alaska
34 Anchorage, Anchorage, AK. [Available online at [http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/enri/publications/upload/Non-
35 native_Plants_final-report.pdf](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/enri/publications/upload/Non-native_Plants_final-report.pdf)]
- 36 92. Grove, C., 2011: Chokecherry trees are deadly for 3 Anchorage moose. *Anchorage Daily News*, February 16,
37 2011. [Available online at [http://www.adn.com/2011/02/16/1706123/ornamental-vegetation-kills-
38 three.html](http://www.adn.com/2011/02/16/1706123/ornamental-vegetation-kills-three.html)]
- 39 93. Schuur, E. A. G., and B. Abbott, 2011: Climate change: High risk of permafrost thaw. *Nature*, **480**, 32-33,
40 doi:10.1038/480032a. [Available online at
41 [http://www.seas.harvard.edu/climate/eli/Courses/EPS134/Sources/19-Biosphere-feedbacks-amazon-
42 rainforest-and-permafrost/permafrost/Schuur-Abbott-2011_High-risk-of-permafrost-thaw.pdf](http://www.seas.harvard.edu/climate/eli/Courses/EPS134/Sources/19-Biosphere-feedbacks-amazon-rainforest-and-permafrost/permafrost/Schuur-Abbott-2011_High-risk-of-permafrost-thaw.pdf)]
- 43 94. Walter, K. M., S. A. Zimov, J. P. Chanton, D. Verbyla, and F. S. Chapin, III, 2006: Methane bubbling from
44 Siberian thaw lakes as a positive feedback to climate warming. *Nature*, **443**, 71-75, doi:10.1038/nature05040

- 1 95. French, N. H. F., P. Goovaerts, and E. S. Kasischke, 2004: Uncertainty in estimating carbon emissions from
2 boreal forest fires. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, **109**, D14S08, doi:10.1029/2003JD003635.
3 [Available online at <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2004/2003JD003635.shtml>];
- 4 Zhuang, Q., J. M. Melillo, A. D. McGuire, D. W. Kicklighter, R. G. Prinn, P. A. Steudler, B. S. Felzer, and S. Hu,
5 2007: Net emissions of CH₄ and CO₂ in Alaska - Implications for the region's greenhouse gas budget.
6 *Ecological Applications*, **17**, 203-212, doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2007)017[0203:NEOCAC]2.0.CO;2
- 7 96. Yuan, F. M., S.-H. Yi, A. D. McGuire, K. D. Johnson, J. Liang, J. W. Harden, E. S. Kasischke, and W. A. Kurz, 2012:
8 Assessment of boreal forest historical C dynamics in the Yukon River Basin: relative roles of warming and fire
9 regime change. *Ecological Applications*, **22**, 2091-2109, doi:10.1890/11-1957.1
- 10 97. Chapin, F. S., III, M. Strum, M. C. Serreze, J. P. McFadden, J. R. Key, A. H. Lloyd, A. D. McGuire, T. S. Rupp, A. H.
11 Lynch, J. P. Schimel, J. Beringer, W. L. Chapman, H. E. Epstein, E. S. Euskirchen, L. D. Hinzman, G. Jia, C. L. Ping,
12 K. D. Tape, C. D. C. Thompson, D. A. Walker, and J. M. Welker, 2005: Role of land-surface changes in Arctic
13 summer warming. *Science*, **310**, 657-660, doi:10.1126/science.1117368
- 14 98. Euskirchen, E. S., A. D. McGuire, F. S. Chapin, III, S. Yi, and C. C. Thompson, 2009: Changes in vegetation in
15 northern Alaska under scenarios of climate change, 2003-2100: implications for climate feedbacks. *Ecological*
16 *Applications*, **19**, 1022-1043, doi:10.1890/08-0806.1
- 17 99. MacDougall, A. H., C. A. Avis, and A. J. Weaver, 2012: Significant contribution to climate warming from the
18 permafrost carbon feedback. *Nature Geoscience*, **5**, 719-721, doi:10.1038/ngeo1573;
- 19 McGuire, A. D., L. G. Anderson, T. R. Christensen, S. Dallimore, L. Guo, D. J. Hayes, M. Heimann, T. D.
20 Lorenson, R. W. MacDonald, and N. Roulet, 2009: Sensitivity of the carbon cycle in the Arctic to climate
21 change. *Ecological Monographs*, **79**, 523-555, doi:10.1890/08-2025.1. [Available online at
22 <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/08-2025.1>]
- 23 100. Allison, E. H., M.-C. Badjeck, and K. Meinhold, 2011: Ch. 17: The Implications of Global Climate Change for
24 Molluscan Aquaculture. *Shellfish Aquaculture and the Environment*, S. E. Shumway, Ed., Wiley-Blackwell, 461-
25 490;
- 26 Doney, S. C., V. J. Fabry, R. A. Feely, and J. A. Kleypas, 2009: Ocean acidification: the other CO₂ problem.
27 *Annual Review of Marine Science*, **1**, 169-192, doi:10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163834. [Available online
28 at <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163834>];
- 29 Pauly, D., 2010: *Gasping fish and panting squids : oxygen, temperature and the growth of water-breathing*
30 *animals*. International Ecology Institute, 216 pp;
- 31 Pörtner, H. O., and R. Knust, 2007: Climate change affects marine fishes through the oxygen limitation of
32 thermal tolerance. *Science*, **315**, 95-97, doi:10.1126/science.1135471. [Available online at
33 <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.1135471>];
- 34 Sumaila, U. R., W. W. L. Cheung, V. W. Y. Lam, D. Pauly, and S. Herrick, 2011: Climate change impacts on the
35 biophysics and economics of world fisheries. *Nature Climate Change*, **1**, 449-456. [Available online at
36 <http://www.nature.com/doi/abs/10.1038/nclimate1301>]
- 37 101. Cooley, S. R., and S. C. Doney, 2009: Anticipating ocean acidification's economic consequences for
38 commercial fisheries. *Environmental Research Letters*, **4**, 8, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/4/2/024007. [Available
39 online at http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/4/2/024007/pdf/1748-9326_4_2_024007.pdf]
- 40 102. Gaines, S. D., B. Gaylord, and J. L. Largier, 2003: Avoiding current oversights in marine reserve design.
41 *Ecological Applications*, **13**, S32-S46, doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2003)013[0032:ACOIMR]2.0.CO;2. [Available
42 online at [http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/1051-](http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/1051-0761%282003%29013%5B0032%3AACOIMR%5D2.0.CO%3B2)
43 [0761%282003%29013%5B0032%3AACOIMR%5D2.0.CO%3B2](http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/1051-0761%282003%29013%5B0032%3AACOIMR%5D2.0.CO%3B2)]

- 1 103. Grebmeier, J. M., J. C. Prisco, R. D'Arrigo, H. W. Ducklow, C. Fleener, K. E. Fray, and C. Rosa, 2011: *Frontiers in*
2 *understanding climate change and polar ecosystems summary of a workshop*. National Academies Press, 86
3 pp.[Available online at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13132];
- 4 Moore, S. E., and H. P. Huntington, 2008: Arctic marine mammals and climate change: Impacts and resilience.
5 *Ecological Applications*, **18**, S157-S165-S157-S165. [Available online at
6 <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/06-0571.1>];
- 7 Grebmeier, J. M., 2012: Shifting Patterns of Life in the Pacific Arctic and Sub-Arctic Seas. *Annual Review of*
8 *Marine Science*, **4**, 63-78, doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-120710-100926
- 9 104. Ruiz, G. M., P. W. Fofonoff, J. T. Carlton, M. J. Wonham, and A. H. Hines, 2000: Invasion of coastal marine
10 communities in North America: Apparent patterns, processes, and biases. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
11 *Systematics*, **31**, 481-531. [Available online at
12 <http://www.math.ualberta.ca/~mwonham/reprints/Ruiz.etal.2000.ARES.pdf>]
- 13 105. Loeng, H., K. Brander, E. Carmack, S. Denisenko, K. Drinkwater, B. Hansen, K. Kovacs, P. Livingston, F.
14 McLaughlin, and E. Sakshaug, 2005: Ch. 9: Marine Systems. *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*, C. Symon, L.
15 Arris, and B. Heal, Eds., Cambridge University Press, 453-538. [Available online at
16 http://www.acia.uaf.edu/PDFs/ACIA_Science_Chapters_Final/ACIA_Ch09_Final.pdf]
- 17 106. Sigler, M. F., M. Renner, S. L. Danielson, L. B. Eisner, R. R. Lauth, K. J. Kuletz, E. A. Longerwell, and G. L. Hunt,
18 2011: Fluxes, fins, and feathers: Relationships among the Bering, Chukchi, and Beaufort seas in a time of
19 climate change. *Oceanography*, **24**, 250-265, doi:10.5670/oceanog.2011.77. [Available online at
20 http://bsierp.nprb.org/results/documents/24-3_sigler_Oceanography.pdf];
- 21 Stabeno, P. J., E. V. Farley, Jr., N. B. Kachel, S. Moore, C. W. Mordy, J. M. Napp, J. E. Overland, A. I. Pinchuk,
22 and M. F. Sigler, 2012: A comparison of the physics of the northern and southern shelves of the eastern
23 Bering Sea and some implications for the ecosystem. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in*
24 *Oceanography*, **65-70**, 14-30, doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2012.02.019
- 25 107. Mueter, F. J., N. A. Bond, J. N. Ianelli, and A. B. Hollowed, 2011: Expected declines in recruitment of walleye
26 pollock (*Theragra chalcogramma*) in the eastern Bering Sea under future climate change. *ICES Journal of*
27 *Marine Science*, **68**, 1284-1296. [Available online at
28 <http://icesjms.oxfordjournals.org/content/68/6/1284.full.pdf+html>]
- 29 108. Farley, E. V., Jr, J. M. Murphy, B. W. Wing, J. H. Moss, and A. Middleton, 2005: Distribution, migration
30 pathways, and size of Western Alaska juvenile salmon along the eastern Bering Sea shelf. *Alaska Fishery*
31 *Research Bulletin*, **11**, 15-26. [Available online at
32 <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/home/library/PDFs/afrb/farlv11n1.pdf>]
- 33 109. Hunt, G. L., Jr., K. O. Coyle, L. B. Eisner, E. V. Farley, R. A. Heintz, F. Mueter, J. M. Napp, J. E. Overland, P. H.
34 Ressler, S. Salo, and P. J. Stabeno, 2011: Climate impacts on eastern Bering Sea foodwebs: a synthesis of new
35 data and an assessment of the Oscillating Control Hypothesis. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **68**, 1230-1243,
36 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsr036. [Available online at
37 <http://icesjms.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/icesjms/fsr036>]
- 38 110. Mundy, P. R., and D. F. Evenson, 2011: Environmental controls of phenology of high-latitude Chinook salmon
39 populations of the Yukon River, North America, with application to fishery management. *ICES Journal of*
40 *Marine Science*, **68**, 1155-1164, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsr080. [Available online at
41 <http://icesjms.oxfordjournals.org/content/68/6/1155.full.pdf+html>]
- 42 111. NOAA Ocean Acidification Steering Committee, 2010: Oceans, 143 pp., National Oceanic and Atmospheric
43 Administration. [Available online at [http://www.research.noaa.gov/oceans/ocean-](http://www.research.noaa.gov/oceans/ocean-acidification/feel3500_without_budget_rfs.pdf)
44 [acidification/feel3500_without_budget_rfs.pdf](http://www.research.noaa.gov/oceans/ocean-acidification/feel3500_without_budget_rfs.pdf)]

- 1 112. Orr, J. C., V. J. Fabry, O. Aumont, L. Bopp, S. C. Doney, R. A. Feely, A. Gnanadesikan, N. Gruber, A. Ishida, F.
2 Joos, R. M. Key, K. Lindsay, E. Maier-Reimer, R. Matear, P. Monfray, A. Mouchet, R. G. Najjar, G.-K. Plattner, K.
3 B. Rodgers, C. L. Sabine, J. L. Sarmiento, R. Schlitzer, R. D. Slater, I. J. Totterdell, M.-F. Weirig, Y. Yamanaka,
4 and A. Yool, 2005: Anthropogenic ocean acidification over the twenty-first century and its impact on
5 calcifying organisms. *Nature*, **437**, 681-686, doi:10.1038/nature04095
- 6 113. Steinacher, M., F. Joos, T. L. Frölicher, G. K. Plattner, and S. C. Doney, 2009: Imminent ocean acidification in
7 the Arctic projected with the NCAR global coupled carbon cycle-climate model. *Biogeosciences*, **6**, 515-533,
8 doi:10.5194/bg-6-515-2009. [Available online at <http://www.biogeosciences.net/6/515/2009/>]
- 9 114. Yamamoto-Kawai, M., F. A. McLaughlin, E. C. Carmack, S. Nishino, and K. Shimada, 2009: Aragonite
10 undersaturation in the Arctic ocean: Effects of ocean acidification and sea ice melt. *Science*, **326**, 1098-1100,
11 doi:10.1126/science.1174190
- 12 115. Lombard, F., R. E. de Roacha, J. Bijma, and J.-P. Gattuso, 2010: Effect of carbonate ion concentration and
13 irradiance on calcification in planktonic foraminifera. *Biogeosciences*, **7**, 247-255. [Available online at
14 <http://epic.awi.de/21680/1/Lom2010a.pdf>];
- 15 Moy, A. D., W. R. Howard, S. G. Bray, and T. W. Trull, 2009: Reduced calcification in modern Southern Ocean
16 planktonic foraminifera. *Nature Geoscience*, **2**, 276-280, doi:10.1038/NGEO460
- 17 116. Sambrotto, R. N., C. Mordy, S. I. Zeeman, P. J. Stabeno, and S. A. Macklin, 2008: Physical forcing and nutrient
18 conditions associated with patterns of Chl a and phytoplankton productivity in the southeastern Bering Sea
19 during summer. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, **55**, 1745-1760
- 20 117. Fabry, V. J., J. B. McClintock, J. T. Mathis, and J. M. Grebmeier, 2009: Ocean acidification at high latitudes: the
21 bellwether. *Oceanography*, **22**, 160-171, doi:10.5670/oceanog.2009.105 [Available online at
22 http://www.tos.org/oceanography/archive/22-4_fabry.pdf]
- 23 118. Aydin, K. Y., G. A. McFarlane, J. R. King, B. A. Megrey, and K. W. Myers, 2005: Linking oceanic food webs to
24 coastal production and growth rates of Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.), using models on three scales.
25 *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, **52**, 757-780, doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2004.12.017
- 26 119. Armstrong, J. L., J. L. Boldt, A. D. Cross, J. H. Moss, N. D. Davis, K. W. Myers, R. V. Walker, D. A. Beauchamp,
27 and L. J. Haldorson, 2005: Distribution, size, and interannual, seasonal and diel food habits of northern Gulf of
28 Alaska juvenile pink salmon, *Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in*
29 *Oceanography*, **52**, 247-265, doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2004.09.019. [Available online at
30 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0967064504002401>]
- 31 120. Mathis, J. T., J. N. Cross, and N. R. Bates, 2011: The role of ocean acidification in systemic carbonate mineral
32 suppression in the Bering Sea. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **38**, L19602, doi:10.1029/2011GL048884.
33 [Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2011GL048884/pdf>]
- 34 121. Donkersloot, R., 2012: Ocean Acidification and Alaska Fisheries - Views and Voices of Alaska's Fisherman,
35 Marine Industries and Coastal Residents. Alaska Marine Conservation Council, Anchorage, AK. [Available
36 online at [http://www.akmarine.org/publications/ocean-acidification-alaskas-fisheries-final-full-report-spring-](http://www.akmarine.org/publications/ocean-acidification-alaskas-fisheries-final-full-report-spring-2012)
37 [2012](http://www.akmarine.org/publications/ocean-acidification-alaskas-fisheries-final-full-report-spring-2012)]
- 38 122. Goldsmith, S., 2008: Understanding Alaska's Remote Rural Economy, 12 pp., UA Research Summary.
39 [Available online at http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/Publications/researchsumm/UA_RS10.pdf]
- 40 123. Cochran, P., O. H. Huntington, C. Pungowiyi, S. Tom, F. S. Chapin, III, H. P. Huntington, N. G. Maynard, and S.
41 F. Trainor, 2013: Indigenous frameworks for observing and responding to climate change in Alaska. *Climatic*
42 *Change*, **120**, 557-567, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0735-2
- 43 124. Huntington, H. P., S. Fox, F. Berkes, and I. Krupnik, 2005: The Changing Arctic – Indigenous Perspectives.
44 *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*, Cambridge University Press, 61-98. [Available online at
45 www.cambridge.org/9780521865098]

- 1 125. Kruse, J. A., 1991: Alaska Inupiat subsistence and wage employment patterns: understanding individual
2 choice. *Human Organization*, **50**, 317-326
- 3 126. Berner, J., C. Furgal, P. Bjerregaard, M. Bradley, T. Curtis, E. D. Fabo, J. Hassi, W. Keatinge, S. Kvernmo, S.
4 Nayha, H. Rintamaki, and J. Warren, 2005: Ch. 15: Human Health. *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*,
5 Cambridge University Press, 863-906. [Available online at
6 http://www.acia.uaf.edu/PDFs/ACIA_Science_Chapters_Final/ACIA_Ch15_Final.pdf];
- 7 Loring, P. A., and C. Gerlach, 2010: Food security and conservation of Yukon River salmon: Are we asking too
8 much of the Yukon River? *Sustainability*, **2**, 2965-2987. [Available online at [http://www.mdpi.com/2071-](http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/2/9/2965/pdf)
9 [1050/2/9/2965/pdf](http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/2/9/2965/pdf)];
- 10 McNeeley, S. M., and M. D. Shulski, 2011: Anatomy of a closing window: Vulnerability to changing seasonality
11 in Interior Alaska. *Global Environmental Change*, **21**, 464-473, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.02.003;
- 12 Moerlein, K. J., and C. Carothers, 2012: Total environment of change: Impacts of climate change and social
13 transitions on subsistence fisheries in northwest Alaska. *Ecology and Society*, **17**, doi:10.5751/ES-04543-170.
14 [Available online at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol17/iss1/art10/>]
- 15 127. Davis, M., 2012: Climate Change - Our Voices, Sharing Ways Forward. Alaska Forum on the Environment,
16 February 7, 2012, Anchorage, Alaska. [Available online at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/circ/1379/pdf/circ1379.pdf>];
- 17 Downing, A., and A. Cuerrier, 2011: A synthesis of the impacts of climate change on the First Nations and Inuit
18 of Canada. *Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge*, **10**, 57-70. [Available online at
19 <http://nopr.niscair.res.in/bitstream/123456789/11066/1/IJK%2010%281%29%2057-70.pdf>];
- 20 Krupnik, I., and D. Jolly, Eds., 2002: *The Earth Is Faster Now: Indigenous Observations of Arctic Environmental*
21 *Change. Frontiers in Polar Social Science*. Arctic Research Consortium of the United States, 383 pp
- 22 128. McNeeley, S. M., 2012: Examining barriers and opportunities for sustainable adaptation to climate change in
23 Interior Alaska. *Climate Change*, **111**, 835-857, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0158-x. [Available online at
24 <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10584-011-0158-x>]
- 25 129. Lindsey, S., 2011: Spring breakup and ice-jam flooding in Alaska. *Alaska Climate Dispatch*, 1-5. [Available
26 online at http://accap.uaf.edu/sites/default/files/2011a_Spring_Dispatch.pdf]
- 27 130. Galloway McLean, K., A. Ramos-Costillo, T. Gross, S. Johnston, M. Vierros, and R. Noa, 2009: Report on the
28 Indigenous Peoples' Global Summit on Climate Change. Darwin, Australia, United Nations University –
29 Traditional Knowledge Initiative, 116 pp. [Available online at
30 http://www.unutki.org/downloads/File/Publications/UNU_2009_Climate_Change_Summit_Report.pdf]
- 31 131. McLaughlin, J. A., A. DePaola, C. A. Bopp, K. A. Martinek, N. P. Napolilli, C. G. Allison, S. L. Murray, E. C.
32 Thompson, M. M. Bird, and J. P. Middaugh, 2005: Outbreak of *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* gastroenteritis
33 associated with Alaskan oysters. *New England Journal of Medicine*, **353**, 1463-1470,
34 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa051594. [Available online at <http://www.nejm.org/doi/pdf/10.1056/NEJMoa051594>];
- 35 Macdonald, R. W., T. Harner, and J. Fyfe, 2005: Recent climate change in the Arctic and its impact on
36 contaminant pathways and interpretation of temporal trend data. *Science of The Total Environment*, **342**, 5-
37 86, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2004.12.059
- 38 132. Weller, G., 2005: Summary and Synthesis of the ACIA. *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*, Cambridge
39 University Press, 989-1020. [Available online at [http://www.amap.no/documents/doc/arctic-arctic-climate-](http://www.amap.no/documents/doc/arctic-arctic-climate-impact-assessment/796)
40 [impact-assessment/796](http://www.amap.no/documents/doc/arctic-arctic-climate-impact-assessment/796)]
- 41 133. Baffrey, M., and H. P. Huntington, 2010: Social and economic effects of oil and gas activities in the Arctic.
42 *Assessment 2007: Oil and Gas Activities in the Arctic – Effects and Potential Effects. Volume One.*, Arctic
43 Monitoring and Assessment Program, 3.1-3.71. [Available online at

- 1 [http://www.amap.no/documents/doc/assessment-2007-oil-and-gas-activities-in-the-arctic-effects-and-](http://www.amap.no/documents/doc/assessment-2007-oil-and-gas-activities-in-the-arctic-effects-and-potential-effects.-volume-1/776)
2 [potential-effects.-volume-1/776](http://www.amap.no/documents/doc/assessment-2007-oil-and-gas-activities-in-the-arctic-effects-and-potential-effects.-volume-1/776)]
- 3 134. Krupnik, I., and G. C. Ray, 2007: Pacific walruses, indigenous hunters, and climate change: bridging scientific
4 and indigenous knowledge. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, **54**, 2946-2957,
5 doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2007.08.011;
- 6 Laidler, G. J., 2006: Inuit and scientific perspectives on the relationship between sea ice and climate change:
7 The ideal complement? *Climatic Change*, **78**, 407-444, doi:10.1007/s10584-006-9064-z;
- 8 Riewe, R., and J. Oakes, Eds., 2006: *Climate Change: Linking Traditional and Scientific Knowledge*. Aboriginal
9 Issues Press, University of Manitoba, 289 pp
- 10 135. Karl, T. R., J. T. Melillo, and T. C. Peterson, Eds., 2009: *Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States*.
11 Cambridge University Press, 189 pp.[Available online at
12 <http://www.globalchange.gov/publications/reports/scientific-assessments/us-impacts>]
13

DRAFT