

1 **25. Coastal Zone Development and Ecosystems**

2 **Convening Lead Authors**

3 Susanne C. Moser, Susanne Moser Research & Consulting, Stanford University

4 Margaret A. Davidson, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

5

6 **Lead Authors**

7 Paul Kirshen, University of New Hampshire

8 Peter Mulvaney, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP

9 James F. Murley, South Florida Regional Planning Council

10 James E. Neumann, Industrial Economics, Inc.

11 Laura Petes, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

12 Denise Reed, The Water Institute of the Gulf

13

14 **Key Messages**

15

16 **1. Coastal lifelines, such as water supply and energy infrastructure and evacuation**
17 **routes, are increasingly vulnerable to higher sea levels and storm surges, inland**
18 **flooding, erosion, and other climate-related changes.**

19 **2. Nationally important assets, such as ports, tourism and fishing sites, in already-**
20 **vulnerable coastal locations, are increasingly exposed to sea level rise and related**
21 **hazards. This threatens to disrupt economic activity within coastal areas and the**
22 **regions they serve and results in significant costs from protecting or moving these**
23 **assets.**

24 **3. Socioeconomic disparities create uneven exposures and sensitivities to growing**
25 **coastal risks and limit adaptation options for some coastal communities, resulting in**
26 **the displacement of the most vulnerable people from coastal areas.**

27 **4. Coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change because many**
28 **have already been dramatically altered by human stresses; climate change will**
29 **result in further reduction or loss of the services that these ecosystems provide,**
30 **including potentially irreversible impacts.**

31 **5. Leaders and residents of coastal regions are increasingly aware of the high**
32 **vulnerability of coasts to climate change, and are developing plans to prepare for**
33 **potential impacts on citizens, businesses, and environmental assets. Significant**
34 **institutional, political, social, and economic obstacles to implementing adaptation**
35 **actions remain.**

36

Population Change in U.S. Coastal Watershed Counties (1970-2010)




Figure 25.1: Population Change in U.S. Coastal Watershed Counties (1970-2010)

Caption: U.S. population growth in coastal watershed counties has been most significant over the past 40 years in urban centers such as Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, southern California, Houston, south Florida and the northeast metropolitan corridor. A coastal watershed county is defined as one where either 1) at a minimum, 15% of the county's total land area is located within a coastal watershed or 2) a portion of or an entire county accounts for at least 15% of a coastal USGS 8-digit cataloging unit.¹ Residents in these coastal areas can be considered "the U.S. population that most directly affects the coast."¹ We use this definition of "coastal" throughout the chapter unless otherwise specified. (Data from U.S. Census Bureau).

Introduction

Each year, more than 1.2 million people move to the coast, collectively adding the equivalent of nearly one San Diego, or more than three Miami's, to the Great Lakes or open-ocean coastal watershed counties and parishes of the United States. As a result, 164 million – more than 50% – Americans now live in these mostly densely populated areas^{1,2} (Figure 25.1) and help generate 58% of the national gross domestic product (GDP).³ People come – and stay – for the diverse and growing employment opportunities in recreation and tourism, commerce, energy and mineral production, vibrant urban centers, and the irresistible beauty of our coasts.⁴ Residents, combined with the more than 180 million tourists that flock to the coasts each year,^{5,6} place heavy demands on the unique natural systems and resources that make coastal areas so attractive and productive.⁷

1 Meanwhile, public agencies and officials are charged with balancing the needs of economic
2 vitality and public safety, while sustaining the built and natural environments in the face of risks
3 from well-known natural hazards such as storms, flooding, and erosion.⁸ Although these risks
4 play out in different ways along the United States' more than 94,000 miles of coastline,⁹ all
5 coasts share one simple fact: no other region concentrates so many people and so much economic
6 activity on so little land, while also being so relentlessly affected by the sometimes violent
7 interactions of land, sea, and air.

8 Humans have heavily altered the coastal environment through development, changes in land use,
9 and overexploitation of resources. Now, the changing climate is imposing additional stresses,¹⁰
10 making life on the coast more challenging (Figure 25.2). The consequences will ripple through
11 the entire nation, which depends on the productivity and vitality of coastal regions.

12 **Box: Coastal Resilience Defined**

13 Resilience means different things to different disciplines and fields of practice. In this chapter
14 resilience generally refers to an ecological, human or physical system's ability to persist in the
15 face of disturbance or change and continue to perform certain functions.¹¹ Natural or physical
16 systems do so through absorbing shocks, reorganizing after disturbance and adapting;¹² social
17 systems additionally can also consciously learn.¹³

18 -- end box --

Flooding During High Tides



19

20 **Figure 25.2:** Flooding During High Tides

21 **Caption:** Sea level rise is not just a problem of the future, but is already affecting
22 coastal communities such as Charleston, South Carolina, and Olympia in South Puget
23 Sound through flooding during high tides. (Photo credits: (left) NOAA Coastal Services
24 Center; (right) Ray Garrido, January 6, 2010, reprinted with permission by the
25 Washington Department of Ecology).

26 Events like Superstorm Sandy in 2012 have illustrated that public safety and human well-being
27 become jeopardized by the disruption of crucial lifelines, such as water, energy, and evacuation

1 routes. As climate continues to change, repeated disruption of lives, infrastructure functions, and
2 nationally and internationally important economic activities will pose intolerable burdens on
3 people who are already most vulnerable, and aggravate existing impacts on valuable and
4 irreplaceable natural systems. Planning long-term for these changes, while balancing different
5 and often competing demands, are vexing challenges for decision-makers (Ch. 26: Decision
6 Support).

7 **Climate-related Drivers of Coastal Change**


8 The primary climatic forces affecting the coasts are changes in temperature, sea and water levels,
9 precipitation, storminess, ocean acidity, and ocean circulation.⁷

- 10 • Sea surface temperatures are rising¹⁴ and are expected to rise faster over the next few
11 decades,¹⁵ with significant regional variation, and the possibility for more intense
12 hurricanes as oceans warm (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate).
- 13 • Global average sea level is rising, and has been doing so for more than 100 years (Ch.2:
14 Our Changing Climate), and greater rates of sea level rise are expected in the future.¹⁶
15 Higher sea levels cause more coastal erosion, changes in sediment transport and tidal
16 flows, more frequent flooding from higher storm surges, landward migration of barrier
17 shorelines, fragmentation of islands, and saltwater intrusion into aquifers and
18 estuaries.^{7,17,18,19}
- 19 • Rates of sea level rise are not uniform along U.S. coasts,^{20,21} and can be exacerbated
20 locally by land subsidence or reduced by uplift.^{22,23} Along the shorelines of the Great
21 Lakes, lake level changes are uncertain (Ch. 18: Midwest), but erosion and sediment
22 migration will be exacerbated by increased lakeside storm events, tributary flooding, and
23 increased wave action due to loss of ice cover.²⁴
- 24 • Patterns of precipitation change are affecting coastal areas in complex ways (Ch. 2: Our
25 Changing Climate). In regions where precipitation increases, coastal areas will see heavier
26 runoff from inland areas, with the already observed trend toward more intense rainfall
27 events continuing to increase the risk of extreme runoff and flooding. Where precipitation
28 is expected to decline and droughts to increase, freshwater inflows to the coast will be
29 reduced (Ch. 3: Water).
- 30 • There has been an overall increase in storm activity near the Northeast and Northwest
31 coastlines since about 1980.²⁵ Winter storms have increased slightly in frequency and
32 intensity and their storm tracks have shifted northward.²⁶ The most intense tropical
33 storms have increased in intensity in the last few decades.²⁷ Future projections suggest
34 increases in hurricane rainfall and intensity (with a greater number of the strongest –
35 Category 4 and 5 – hurricanes), a slight decrease in the frequency of tropical cyclones,
36 and possible shifts in storm tracks, though the details remain uncertain (Ch. 2: Our
37 Changing Climate).
- 38 • Marine ecosystems are being threatened by climate change and ocean acidification. The
39 oceans are absorbing more carbon dioxide as the concentration in the atmosphere
40 increases, resulting in ocean acidification and threatening coral reefs and shellfish.^{28,29,30}

1 Coastal fisheries are also affected by rising water temperatures³¹ and climate-related
 2 changes in oceanic circulation (Ch. 24: Oceans).^{32,33} Wetlands and other coastal habitats
 3 are threatened by sea level rise, especially in areas of limited sediment supply or where
 4 barriers prevent onshore migration.³⁴ The combined effects of saltwater intrusion,
 5 reduced precipitation, and increased evapotranspiration will elevate soil salinities and
 6 lead to an increase in salt-tolerant vegetation^{35,36} and the dieback of coastal swamp
 7 forests.³⁷

8 None of these changes operate in isolation. The combined effects of climate changes with other
 9 human-induced stresses makes predicting the effects of climate change on coastal systems
 10 challenging. However, it is certain that these factors will create increasing hazards to the coasts'
 11 densely populated areas.^{38,39,40}

Projected Sea Level Rise and Flooding by 2050



12
 13 **Figure 25.3:** Projected Sea Level Rise and Flooding by 2050

14 **Caption:** The amount of sea level rise (SLR) by 2050 will vary along different
 15 stretches of the U.S. coastline and under different SLR scenarios, mostly due to land
 16 subsidence or uplift (Ch.2: Our Changing Climate).¹⁶ The upper panels show feet of sea
 17 level above 1992 levels at different tide gauge stations based on a) an 8 inch SLR and b)

1 a 1.24 foot SLR by 2050. The flood level that has a 1% chance of occurring in any
2 given year (“return level”) is similarly projected to differ by region as a result of varying
3 storm surge risk. Panel c) shows return levels for a 1.05 foot SLR by 2050. Finally, panel
4 d) shows how a 1.05 foot SLR by 2050 could cause the level of flooding that occurs
5 during today’s 100-year storm to occur more frequently by mid-century, in some regions
6 as often as once a decade or even annually. (Source: Replicated Tebaldi et al. 2012²³
7 analysis with NCA sea level rise scenarios¹⁶ for panels a) and b); data/ensemble SLR
8 projections used for panels c) and d) from Tebaldi et al. 2012²³; all estimates include the
9 effect of land subsidence).

10

11 **Figure 25.4 (below): Social Vulnerability (a), Probability of Shoreline Erosion (b),**
12 **Climate-Related Threats (c), and Adaptation Activities (d) along U.S. Coastal**
13 **Regions**



14 (a) Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) at the Census tract level. The Social Vulnerability
15 Index provides a quantitative, integrative measure for comparing the degree of
16 vulnerability of human populations across the nation. A high SoVI (dark pink) typically
17 indicates some combination of high exposure and high sensitivity to the effects of climate
18 change and low capacity to deal with them. Specific index components and weighting are
19 unique to each region (North Atlantic, South Atlantic, Gulf, Pacific, and Great Lakes). All
20 index components are constructed from readily available Census data and include
21 measures of poverty, age, family structure, location (rural versus urban), foreign-born
22 status, wealth, gender, Native American status, and occupation.

23 (b) Probability of Shoreline Erosion greater than 3.3 feet per year. Probability is based on
24 historical conditions only and does not reflect the possibility of acceleration due to
25 increasing rates of sea level rise.

26 (c) Regional Threats from Climate Change are compiled from technical input reports, the
27 regional chapters in this report, and from scientific literature.

28 (d) Examples of Adaptation Activities in Coastal Areas of the U.S. and Affiliated Island
29 States are compiled from technical input reports, the regional chapters in this report,
30 scientific literature.

31







1 ***Coastal Lifelines at Risk***

2 **Coastal lifelines, such as water supply and energy infrastructure and evacuation routes, are**
3 **increasingly vulnerable to higher sea levels and storm surges, inland flooding, erosion, and**
4 **other climate-related changes.**

5 Key coastal vulnerabilities arise from complex interactions among climate change and other
6 physical, human, and ecological factors. These vulnerabilities have the potential to fundamentally
7 alter life at the coast and disrupt coast-dependent economic activities.

8 Coastal infrastructure is exposed to climate change impacts from both the landward and ocean
9 sides.^{41,42,43,44,45} Some unique characteristics increase the vulnerability of coastal infrastructure to
10 climate change (Ch. 11: Urban).^{7,46} For instance, many coastal regions were settled long ago,
11 making much of the infrastructure older than in other locations.⁴⁷ Also, inflexibility of some
12 coastal, water-dependent infrastructure, such as onshore gas and oil facilities, port facilities,
13 thermal power plants, and some bridges, makes landward relocation difficult (Figure 25.5), and
14 build-up of urban and industrial areas inland from the shoreline can inhibit landward relocation.⁷

15 Infrastructure is built to certain site-specific design standards (such as the once-in-10-year, 24-
16 hour rainstorm or the once-in-100-year flood) that take account of historical variability in climate,
17 coastal, and hydrologic conditions. Impacts exceeding these standards can shorten the expected
18 lifetime, increase maintenance costs, and decrease services. In general, higher sea levels,
19 especially when combined with inland changes from flooding and erosion, will result in
20 accelerated infrastructure impairment, with associated indirect effects on regional economies and
21 a need for infrastructure upgrades, redesign, or relocation.^{7,41,42,43,48}

22 The more than 60,000 miles of coastal roads⁴⁹ are essential for human activities in coastal areas
23 (Ch. 5: Transportation), especially in case of evacuations during coastal emergencies.^{50,51}
24 Population growth to date and expected additional growth place increasing demands on these
25 roads, and climate change will decrease their functionality unless adaptation measures are
26 taken.^{52,53} Already, many coastal roads are affected during storm events⁵⁴ and extreme high
27 tides.⁵⁵ Moreover, as coastal bridges, tunnels and roads are built or redesigned, engineers must
28 account for inland and coastal changes, including drainage flooding, thawing permafrost, higher
29 groundwater levels, erosion, and increasing saturation of roadway bases.⁵⁶ During Hurricane
30 Katrina, many bridges failed because they had only been designed for river flooding but were
31 also unexpectedly exposed to storm surges.^{52,57}

Adapting Coastal Infrastructure to Sea Level Rise and Land Loss



Figure 25.5: Adapting Coastal Infrastructure to Sea Level Rise and Land Loss

Caption: This “mock-up” shows the existing Highway LA-1 and Leeville Bridge in coastal Louisiana (on the right) with a planned new, elevated bridge that would retain functionality under future, higher sea level conditions (center left). (Current sea level and sinking bridge are shown here.) A 7-mile portion of the planned bridge has been completed and opened to traffic in December 2011. (Source: Greater Lafourche Port Commission, reprinted with permission).

Wastewater management and drainage systems constitute critical infrastructure for coastal businesses and residents (Ch. 3: Water). Wastewater treatment plants are typically located at low elevations to take advantage of gravity-fed sewage collection. Increased inland and coastal flooding make such plants more vulnerable to disruption, while increased inflows will reduce treatment efficiency.^{44,58,59} Drainage systems – designed using mid-1900s rainfall records – will become overwhelmed in the future with increased rainfall intensity over more impervious surfaces, such as asphalt and concrete.^{27,60,61,62} Sea level rise will increase pumping requirements for coastal wastewater treatment plants, reduce outlet capacities for drainage systems, and increasingly infiltrate sewer lines, while salt water intrusion into coastal aquifers will affect coastal water supplies and salt fronts will advance farther up into coastal rivers impacting water supply intakes (Ch. 3: Water).^{19,63} Together, these impacts increase the risks of urban flooding, combined sewer overflows, deteriorating coastal water quality, and human health impacts (Ch. 11: Urban; Ch. 9: Human Health).^{64,65,66} Coastal infrastructure adaptation options include (but are not limited to):

- integrating both green and gray infrastructure to reduce stormwater runoff and wave attack, including, where feasible, creative use of dredge material from nearby coastal locations in the build-up of wetlands and berms (Figure 25.6)
- constructing seawalls around wastewater treatment plants and pump stations
- pumping effluent to higher elevations to keep up with sea level rise

- 1 • pumping freshwater into coastal aquifers to reduce infiltration of saltwater and
2 • reusing water after treatment to replace diminished water supplies due to sea level
3 rise.^{67,68}

4 Technical and financial feasibility may limit how well and how long coastal infrastructure can be
5 protected in place before it needs to be moved or abandoned. An estimate of nationwide
6 adaptation costs to utilities for wastewater systems alone ranges between \$123 billion and \$252
7 billion by 2050 and, while not specific to coastal systems, gives a sense of the magnitude of
8 necessary expenditures to avert climate change impacts.⁶⁷

9 The nation's energy infrastructure, such as power plants, oil and gas refineries, storage tanks,
10 transformers, and electricity transmission lines, are often located directly in the coastal
11 floodplain.^{45,69} Roughly two-thirds of imported oil enters the U.S. through Gulf of Mexico
12 ports,⁵² where it is refined and then transported inland. Unless adaptive measures are taken,
13 storm-related flooding, erosion, and permanent inundation from sea level rise will disrupt these
14 refineries (and related underground infrastructure) and, in turn, will constrain the supply of
15 refined products to the rest of the nation (Ch. 4: Energy; Ch. 10: Energy, Water, and Land)
16 (Figure 25.5).⁷⁰⁷¹

17

Ecosystem Restoration



18

19 **Figure 25.6:** Ecosystem Restoration

20 **Caption:** A coastal ecosystem restoration project in New York City integrates
21 revegetation (green infrastructure) with bulkheads and riprap (gray or built
22 infrastructure). Investments in coastal ecosystem conservation and restoration can protect
23 coastal waterfronts and infrastructure, while providing additional benefits, such as habitat
24 for commercial and recreational fish, birds, and other animal and plant species, that are not
25 offered by built infrastructure. (Source: Department of City Planning, New York
26 City, reprinted with permission).

1 Coastal communities have a variety of options to protect, replace, and redesign existing
2 infrastructure, including flood proofing and flood protection through dikes, berms, pumps,
3 integration of natural landscape features (green infrastructure), elevation, more frequent upgrades,
4 or relocation.⁷² Relocation of large coastal infrastructure away from the coastline can be very
5 expensive and, for some facilities such as port installations, impossible due to their need to have
6 direct access to the shoreline. In most instances, the addition of new flood-proofed infrastructure
7 in high-hazard zones has been viewed as a more cost-effective near-term option than relocation.⁷³
8 In these cases, significantly higher removal costs may be incurred later when sea level is higher,
9 or if the facility needs to be abandoned altogether in the future. This suggests that adaptation
10 options are best assessed in a site-specific context, comprehensively weighing social, economic,
11 and ecological considerations over multiple timeframes. A combination of gray and green
12 infrastructure is increasingly recognized as a potentially cost-effective approach^{64,74} to reducing
13 risks to communities and economies while preserving or restoring essential ecosystems and thus
14 their benefits to human welfare (Figure 25.6).^{7,75}

15 **BOX 25.1: Assessing Flood Exposure of Critical Facilities and Roads**

16 NOAA’s Critical Facilities Flood Exposure Tool provides an initial assessment of the risk to a
17 community’s critical facilities and roads within the “100-year” flood zone established by the
18 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (the 100-year flood zone is the areal extent of
19 a flood that has a 1% chance of occurring or being exceeded in any given year). The tool helps
20 coastal managers quickly learn which facilities may be at risk – providing information that can be
21 used to increase flood risk awareness and to inform a more detailed analysis and ultimately flood
22 risk reduction measures. The critical facilities tool was initially created to assist
23 Mississippi/Alabama Sea Grant in conducting its “Coastal Resiliency Index: A Community Self-
24 Assessment” workshops and is now available for communities nationwide. For additional
25 information contact: <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/tools/criticalfacilities>.

26 -- end box --

1 ***Economic Disruption***

2 **Nationally important assets, such as ports, tourism, and fishing sites, in already-vulnerable**
3 **coastal locations, are increasingly exposed to sea level rise and related hazards. This threatens**
4 **to disrupt economic activity within coastal areas and the regions they serve and results in**
5 **significant costs from protecting or moving these assets.**


6 Economic activity in coastal counties accounts for approximately 66 million jobs and \$3.4 trillion
7 in wages⁷⁶ through diverse industries and commerce. In many instances, economic activity is
8 fundamentally dependent on the physical and ecological characteristics of the coast. These
9 features provide the template for coastal economic activities, including natural protection from
10 waves, access to beaches, flat land for port development and container storage, and wetlands that
11 support fisheries and provide flood protection.

12 More than 5,790 square miles and more than \$1 trillion of property and structures are at risk of
13 inundation from sea level rise of two feet above current sea level – an elevation which could be
14 reached by 2050 under a high rate of sea level rise of approximately 6.6 feet by 2100,¹⁶ 20 years
15 later assuming a lower rate of rise (4 feet by 2100) (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate), and sooner in
16 areas of rapid land subsidence.^{77,78} Roughly half of the vulnerable property value is located in
17 Florida, and the most vulnerable port cities are Miami, Greater New York, New Orleans, Tampa-
18 St. Petersburg, and Virginia Beach.^{38,42,77,79}

19 Although comprehensive national estimates are not yet available, regional studies are indicative
20 of the potential risk: the incremental annual damage of climate change to capital assets in the Gulf
21 region alone could be \$2.7 to \$4.6 billion by 2030, and \$8.3 to \$13.2 billion by 2050; about 20%
22 of these at-risk assets are in the oil and gas industry.⁸⁰ Investing approximately \$50 billion for
23 adaptation over the next 20 years could lead to approximately \$135 billion in averted losses over
24 the lifetime of adaptive measures.^{80,81}

25 More than \$1.9 trillion in imports came through U.S. ports in 2010, with commercial ports
26 directly supporting more than 13 million jobs⁷⁶ and providing 90% percent of consumer goods.⁸²
27 Ports damaged during major coastal storms can be temporarily or permanently replaced by other
28 modes of freight movement, but at greater cost (Ch. 5: Transportation). The stakes are high and
29 resources exist for ports to take proactive adaptation steps, such as elevating and interconnecting
30 port- and land-based infrastructure or developing offsite storage capability (off-dock intermodal yards)
31 for goods and related emergency response procedures.⁸³ However, a recent survey showed that most
32 U.S. ports have not yet taken actions to adapt their operations to rising seas, increased flooding,
33 and the potential for more extreme coastal storms.⁸⁴

Coast-to-Inland Economic Connections



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Figure 25.7: Coast-to-Inland Economic Connections

Caption: Ports are deeply interconnected with inland areas through the goods imported and exported each year. Climate change impacts on ports can thus have far-reaching implications for the nation’s economy. These maps show the exports and imports in 2010 (in tons/year) and freight flows (in trucks per day) from four major U.S. ports to other U.S. areas designated in the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Freight Analysis Framework (FAF): Los Angeles, Houston, New York/New Jersey, and Seattle. Note: Highway Link Flow less than 5 FAF Trucks/Day are not shown. (Figure source: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Freight Management and Operations, Freight Analysis Framework, version 3.4, 2012).⁸⁵

Coastal recreation and tourism comprises the largest and fastest-growing sector of the U.S. service industry, accounting for 85% of the \$700 billion annual tourism-related revenues,^{5,86} making this sector particularly vulnerable to increased impacts from climate change.⁸⁷ Historically, development of immediate shoreline areas with hotels, vacation rentals, and other tourism-related establishments has frequently occurred without adequate regard for coastal hazards, shoreline dynamics (for example, inlet migration), or ecosystem health.⁸⁸ Hard shoreline protection against the encroaching sea (like building sea walls or riprap) generally aggravates erosion and beach loss, and causes negative effects on coastal ecosystems, undermining the

1 attractiveness of beach tourism. Thus, “soft protection,” such as beach replenishment or
2 conservation and restoration of sand dunes and wetlands, is increasingly preferred to “hard
3 protection” measures. Increased sea level rise means sand replenishment would need to be
4 undertaken more frequently, and thus at growing expense.^{34,89,90,91}

5 Natural shoreline protection features have some capacity to adapt to sea level rise and storms
6 (Figure 25.6) and can also provide an array of ecosystem services benefits⁹² that may offset some
7 maintenance costs. A challenge ahead is the need to integrate climate considerations (for
8 example, temperature change and sea level rise) into coastal ecosystem restoration and
9 conservation efforts,⁹³ such as those underway in the Gulf of Mexico, Chesapeake Bay, and
10 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, to ensure that these projects have long-term effectiveness.

11 U.S. oceanic and Great Lakes coasts are important centers for commercial and recreational
12 fishing due to the high productivity of coastal ecosystems. In 2009, the U.S. seafood industry
13 supported approximately 1 million full- and part-time jobs and generated \$116 billion in sales
14 and \$32 billion in income.⁹⁴ Recreational fishing also contributes to the economic engine of the
15 coasts, with some 74 million saltwater fishing trips along U.S. coasts in 2009 generating \$50
16 billion in sales and supporting over 327,000 jobs.⁹⁴ Climate change threatens to disrupt fishing
17 operations, through direct and indirect impacts to fish stocks (for example, temperature-related
18 shifts in species ranges, changes in prey availability, and loss of coastal nursery habitat), as well as
19 storm-related disruptions of harbor installations (Ch. 24: Oceans).

20

1 *Uneven Social Vulnerability*

2 **Socioeconomic disparities create uneven exposures and sensitivities to growing coastal risks** 3 **and limit adaptation options for some coastal communities, resulting in the displacement of** 4 **the most vulnerable people from coastal areas.**

5 In 2010, almost 2.8% of the U.S. population, or more than 8.6 million Americans, lived within the
6 area subject to coastal floods that have at least a 1% chance of occurring in any one year.^{95,96}
7 More than 120 million Americans live in counties that border the open ocean or Great Lakes
8 coasts and/or have a 100-year coastal floodplain within them.⁹⁶ Two trends will place even
9 more people at risk in the future: 1) the expansion of the floodplain as sea level rises, and 2) the
10 continuing immigration of people to coastal areas.

11 By 2100, the fraction of the U.S. population living in coastal counties is expected to increase by
12 50% (46.2 million) to 144% (131.2 million) depending on alternative projections of future
13 housing.⁹⁷ While specific population projections for future 100-year flood zones are only
14 available for some locations,⁹⁸ many of these new arrivals can be expected to locate in high-
15 hazard areas. Thus, coastal population densities, along with increasing economic development,
16 will continue to be an important factor in the overall exposure to climate change.^{3,7,39,99}

17 Despite persistent beliefs that living on the coast is reserved for the wealthy,^{77,100} there are large
18 social disparities in coastal areas that vary regionally.^{101,102} Full understanding of risk for coastal
19 communities requires consideration of social vulnerability factors limiting people's ability to
20 adapt. These factors include lower income; minority status; low educational achievement;
21 advanced age; income dependencies; employment in low-paying service, retail, and other
22 sectors, as well as being often place-bound; less economically and socially mobile; and much
23 less likely to be insured than wealthy property owners (see panel (a) in Figure 25.4).¹⁰³

24 For example, in California, an estimated 270,000 people are currently exposed to a 100-year
25 flood; this number could increase to 480,000 by 2100 as a result of a 4.6 foot sea level rise alone
26 (roughly equivalent to the high end of the 1 to 4 foot range of sea level rise projections, Ch.2: Our
27 Changing Climate).³⁸ Approximately 18% of those exposed to high flood risk by the end of this
28 century also are those who currently fall into the "high social vulnerability" category.⁷⁹ This
29 means that while many coastal property owners at the shorefront tend to be less socially
30 vulnerable, adjacent populations just inland are often highly vulnerable.

31 The range of adaptation options for highly socially vulnerable populations is limited.⁷⁹ Native
32 communities in Alaska, Louisiana, and other coastal locations already face this challenge today
33 (Textbox 25.2; Ch. 12: Indigenous Peoples).^{104,105} As sea level rises faster and coastal storms,
34 erosion, and inundation cause more frequent or widespread threats, relocation (also called
35 (un)managed retreat or realignment), while not a new strategy in dynamic coastal environments,
36 may become a more pressing option. In some instances relocation may become unavoidable, and
37 for poorer populations sooner than for the wealthy. Up to 50% of the areas with high social
38 vulnerability face the prospect of unplanned displacement under the 1 to 4 foot range of projected
39 sea level rise (Ch.2: Our Changing Climate), for several key reasons: they cannot afford
40 expensive protection measures themselves, public expense is not financially justified (often because
41 social, cultural and ecological factors are not considered), or there is little social and political support
42 for a more orderly retreat process. By contrast, only 5% to 10% of the low social vulnerability

1 areas expected to face relocation.¹⁰² This suggests that climate change could displace many
2 socially vulnerable individuals and lead to significant social disruptions in some coastal
3 areas.^{106,107,108}

4 **BOX 25.2: Unique Challenges for Coastal Tribes**

5 Coastal Native American and Native Alaskan people, with their traditional dependencies upon
6 natural resources and specific land areas, exhibit unique vulnerabilities. Tribal adaptation options
7 can be limited because tribal land boundaries are typically bordered by non-reservation lands, and
8 climate change could force tribes to abandon traditionally important locations, certain cultural
9 practices, and natural resources on which they depend. Tribes pride themselves for their
10 experience and persistence in adapting to challenging situations (Ch. 12: Indigenous Peoples).¹⁰⁹

11 Some tribes are exploring unique adaptation approaches. In Louisiana’s Isle de Jean Charles, for
12 example, the Biloxi-Chitimacha-Choctaw Indian community partnered with a local academic center
13 and a religious congregation to work toward relocating scattered tribal members with those seeking a
14 communal safe haven, while working to save their ancestral land, aiming for community and cultural
15 restoration and for the redevelopment of traditional livelihoods.^{107,110} Coastal food sources are also
16 threatened, including salmon and shellfish. Climate change could affect other food species as well,
17 worsening already existing health problems such as obesity, diabetes, and cancer.

18 -- end box --

19 ***Vulnerable Ecosystems***

20 **Coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change because many have**
21 **already been dramatically altered by human stresses; climate change will result in further**
22 **reduction or loss of the services that these ecosystems provide, including potentially**
23 **irreversible impacts.**

24 Coastal ecosystems provide a suite of valuable benefits (ecosystem services) on which humans
25 depend, including reducing the impacts from floods, buffering from storm surge and waves, and
26 providing nursery habitat for important fish and other species, water filtration, carbon storage,
27 and opportunities for recreation and enjoyment.^{93,111,112}




1

2 **Figure 25.8:** Coastal Ecosystem Services

3 **Caption:** Coastal ecosystems provide a suite of valuable benefits (ecosystem services) on
 4 which humans depend for food, economic activities, inspiration, and enjoyment. This
 5 schematic illustrates many of these services situated in a Pacific or Caribbean island
 6 setting, but many of them can also be found along mainland coastlines.

7 However, many of these ecosystems and the services they provide are rapidly being degraded by
 8 human impacts, including pollution, habitat destruction, and the spread of invasive species. For
 9 example, 75% of U.S. coral reefs in the Atlantic, Caribbean, and Gulf of Mexico are already in
 10 “poor” or “fair” condition;^{113,114} all Florida reefs are currently rated as “threatened.”¹¹⁵ Coastal
 11 barrier ecosystems continue to be degraded by human development, even in cases where
 12 development has slowed (for example, ¹¹⁶). Coastal wetlands are being lost at high rates in
 13 southeastern Louisiana

1 (Figure 25.9).¹¹⁷ In addition, the incidence of low-oxygen “dead zones” in coastal waters has
 2 increased 30-fold in the U.S. since 1960, with over 300 coastal water bodies now experiencing
 3 stressful or lethal oxygen levels (Ch. 8: Ecosystems).¹¹⁸



4
 5 **Figure 25.9:** Projected Land Loss from Sea Level Rise in Coastal Louisiana

6 **Caption:** These maps show expected future land change in coastal Louisiana under two
 7 different sea level rise scenarios without protection or restoration actions. Red indicates a
 8 transition from land (either wetlands or barrier islands) to open water. Green indicates
 9 new land built over previously open water. Land loss is influenced by factors other than
 10 sea level rise including subsidence, river discharge and sediment load, and precipitation
 11 patterns. However, all these factors except sea level rise were held constant for this
 12 analysis. The panel on the left shows land change with a sea level rise of 10.6 inches
 13 between 2010 and 2060, while the one on the right assumes 31.5 inches of sea level
 14 rise for the same period. These amounts of sea level rise are within the projected
 15 ranges for this time period (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate) (Figure source: State of
 16 Louisiana, reprinted with permission).¹¹⁹

17 These existing stresses on coastal ecosystems will be exacerbated by climate change effects, such
 18 as increased ocean temperatures that lead to coral bleaching,³⁰ altered river flows affecting the
 19 health of estuaries,¹²⁰ and acidified waters threatening shellfish.¹²¹ Climate change affects the
 20 survival, reproduction, and health of coastal plants and animals in different ways. For example,
 21 changes in the timing of seasonal events (such as breeding and migration), shifts in species
 22 distributions and ranges, changes in species interactions, and declines in biodiversity all combine
 23 to produce fundamental changes in ecosystem character, distribution, and functioning.²⁸ Species
 24 with narrow physiological tolerance to change, low genetic diversity, specialized resource
 25 requirements, and poor competitive abilities are particularly vulnerable.^{122,123} Where the rate of
 26 climate change exceeds the pace at which plants and animals can acclimate or adapt, impacts on
 27 coastal ecosystems will be profound.^{35,124,125} For example, high death rates of East Coast
 28 intertidal mussels at their southern range boundary have occurred because of rising temperatures
 29 between 1956 and 2007.¹²⁶ The presence of physical barriers (for example, hardened shorelines
 30 or reduced sediment availability) and other non-climatic stressors (such as pollution, habitat
 31 destruction, and invasive species) will further exacerbate the ecological impacts of climate change

1 and limit the ability of these ecosystems to adapt.^{127,128,129} Onshore migration of coastal marshes
2 as sea level rises is often limited by bulkheads or roads (a phenomenon often called “coastal
3 squeeze”), ultimately resulting in a reduction in wetland area.^{35,125,127,130,131,132}

4 Of particular concern is the potential for coastal ecosystems to cross thresholds of rapid change
5 (“tipping points”), beyond which they exist in a dramatically altered state or are lost entirely from
6 the area; in some cases, these changes will be irreversible.¹³³ These unique, “no-analog”
7 environments present serious challenges to resource managers, who are confronted with
8 conditions never seen before.^{134,135,136} The ecosystems most susceptible to crossing such tipping
9 points are those that have already lost some of their resilience due to degradation or depletion by
10 non-climatic stressors.¹³⁷ Certain coastal ecosystems are already rapidly changing as a result of
11 interactions between climatic and non-climatic factors, and others have already crossed tipping
12 points. Eelgrass in the Chesapeake Bay died out almost completely during the record-hot summer
13 of 2005, when temperatures exceeded the species’ tolerance threshold of 86°F,¹³⁸ and subsequent
14 recovery has been poor.¹³⁹ Severe low-oxygen events have emerged as a new phenomenon in the
15 Pacific Northwest due to changes in the timing and duration of coastal upwelling.^{32,140} These
16 have led to high mortality of Dungeness crabs³³ and the temporary disappearance of rockfish,³²
17 with consequences for local fisheries. Reducing non-climatic stressors at the local scale can
18 potentially prevent crossing some of these tipping points.¹⁴¹

19 *The State of Coastal Adaptation Planning*

20 **Leaders and residents of coastal regions are increasingly aware of the high vulnerability of**
21 **coasts to climate change, and are developing plans to prepare for potential impacts on**
22 **citizens, businesses, and environmental assets. Significant institutional, political, social, and**
23 **economic obstacles to implementing adaptation actions remain.**

24 Considerable progress has been made since the last National Climate Assessment in both coastal
25 adaptation science and practice (Figure 25.4, panel (d)), though significant gaps in understanding,
26 planning, and implementation remain.^{20,142,143,144} U.S. coastal managers pay increasing attention
27 to adaptation, but are mostly still at an early stage of building their capacities for adaptation rather
28 than implementing structural or policy changes (Ch. 28: Adaptation).^{20,145,146} Although many
29 non-structural (land use planning, fiscal, legal, educational), and structural adaptation tools are
30 available through the Coastal Zone Management Act, Coastal Barriers Resources Act and other
31 frameworks, and while coastal managers are well familiar with these historical approaches to
32 shoreline protection, they are less familiar with some of the more innovative approaches to
33 coastal adaptation, such as rolling easements, ecosystem-based adaptation, or managed
34 realignment.^{108,130,143,147} Federal, state, and local management approaches have also been found
35 to be at odds at times,¹⁴⁸ making successful integration of adaptation more difficult.¹⁴⁴ There is
36 only limited evidence of more substantial (“transformational”) adaptation occurring, that is, of
37 adaptations that are “adopted at a much larger scale, that are truly new to a particular region or
38 resource system, and that transform places and shift locations,”¹⁴⁹ such as relocation of
39 communities in coastal Alaska and Louisiana (Ch. 22: Alaska).^{81,108,149,150} While more research is
40 needed to explain limited transformational adaptation, it may be due to the relatively early stage
41 of recognizing climate change and sea level rise risks, the perception that impacts are not yet
42 severe enough, and that social objectives can still be met.¹⁵¹

1 Coastal leaders and populations, however, are increasingly concerned about climate related impacts
2 and support the development of adaptation plans,^{152,153,154} but support for development
3 restrictions or managed retreat is limited.^{155,156,157} Economic interests and population trends tend
4 to favor continued (re)development and in-fill in near-shore locations. Current disaster recovery
5 practices frequently promote rapid rebuilding on site with limited consideration for future
6 conditions¹⁵⁸ despite clear evidence that more appropriate siting and construction can
7 substantially reduce future losses.^{159,160}

8 Enacting measures that increase resilience in the face of current hazards, while reducing long-
9 term risks due to climate change, continues to be challenging.^{161,162,163} This is particularly
10 difficult in coastal flood zones that are subject to a one percent or greater chance of flooding in
11 any given year, including those areas that experience additional hazards from wave action.
12 According to FEMA, policy/property data maintained by the National Flood Insurance Program's
13 (NFIP) Bureau and Statistical Agent, nearly half of the NFIP's repetitive flood losses occur in
14 those areas.^{164,165} A robust finding is that the cost of inaction is 4 to 10 times greater than the cost
15 associated with preventive hazard mitigation.^{77,159} Even so, prioritizing expenditures now whose
16 benefits accrue far in the future is difficult.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, cumulative costs to the economy of
17 responding to sea level rise and flooding events alone could be as high as \$325 billion by 2100
18 for 4 feet of sea level rise, with \$130 billion expected to be incurred in Florida and \$88 billion in
19 the North Atlantic region.⁷⁸ The projected costs associated with one foot of sea level rise by 2100
20 are roughly \$200 billion. These figures only cover costs of beach nourishment, hard protective
21 structures, and losses of inundated land and property where protection is not warranted, but
22 exclude losses of valuable ecosystem services, as well as indirect losses from business
23 disruption, lost economic activity, impacts on economic growth, or other non-market
24 losses.^{78,167,168} Such indirect losses, even in regions generally well prepared for disaster events,
25 can be substantial (in the case of Superstorm Sandy, followed by a nor'easter, in fall 2012,
26 insured losses and wider economic damages added up to at least \$65 billion).¹⁶⁹ Sequences of
27 extreme events that occur over a short period not only reduce the time available for natural and
28 social systems to recover and for adaptation measures to be implemented, but also increase the
29 cumulative effect of back-to-back extremes compared to the same events occurring over a longer
30 period.^{163,170} The cost of managed retreat requires further assessment.

31 Property insurance can serve as an important mode of financial adaptation to climate risks,¹⁷¹ but
32 the full potential of leveraging insurance rates and availability has not yet been realized.^{7,172,173} The
33 Government Accountability Office (GAO) listed the National Flood Insurance Program as a
34 "high-risk area" for the first time in 2006, indicating its significance in terms of federal fiscal
35 exposure (nearly \$1.3 trillion in 2012).¹⁷⁴ In the context of identifying climate change as a high
36 risk to federal operations, the GAO in 2013 singled out the National Flood Insurance Program
37 again, recognizing growing risks and liabilities due to climate change and sea level rise and the
38 increase in erosion and flooding they entail.¹⁷⁵ While insured assets in coastal areas represent only
39 a portion of this total liability, taxpayers are responsible for more than \$510 billion of insured
40 assets in the coastal Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) alone.^{50,176} A number of reforms in the
41 National Flood Insurance Program have been enacted in 2012 to ensure that the program is more
42 fiscally sound and hazard mitigation is improved, though various challenges remain.¹⁷⁷

43 Climate adaptation efforts that integrate hazard mitigation, natural resource conservation, and
44 restoration of coastal ecosystems can enhance ecological resilience and reduce the exposure of

1 property, infrastructure, and economic activities to climate change impacts (Figure 25.6).^{112,178}
2 Yet, the integration and translation of scientific understanding of the benefits provided by
3 ecosystems into engineering design and hazard management remains challenging.¹⁷⁹ Moreover,
4 interdependencies among functioning infrastructure types and coastal uses require an integrated
5 approach across scientific disciplines and levels of government, but disconnected scientific efforts
6 and fragmented governance at the managerial, financial, and regulatory levels, and narrow
7 professional training, job descriptions, and agency missions pose significant barriers (Ch. 11:
8 Urban; Ch. 28: Adaptation).^{144,180,181} Adaptation efforts to date that have begun to connect across
9 jurisdictional and departmental boundaries and create innovative solutions are thus extremely
10 encouraging.^{7,144,182,183}

11

DRAFT

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

Traceable Accounts

Chapter 25: Coastal Zone, Development and Ecosystems

Key Message Process: A central component of the assessment process was a Chapter Lead Authors meeting held in St. Louis, Missouri in April 2012. The key messages were initially developed at this meeting. Key vulnerabilities were operationally defined as those challenges that can fundamentally undermine the functioning of human and natural coastal systems. They arise when these systems are highly exposed and sensitive to climate change and (given present or potential future adaptive capacities) insufficiently prepared or able to respond. The vulnerabilities that the team decided to focus on were informed by ongoing interactions of the author team with coastal managers, planners, and stakeholders, as well as a review of the existing literature. In addition, the author team conducted a thorough review of the technical input reports (TIR) and associated literature, including the coastal zone foundational TIR prepared for the National Climate Assessment (NCA).⁷ Chapter development was supported by numerous chapter author technical discussions via teleconference from April to June 2012.

Key message #1/5	Coastal lifelines, such as water supply and energy infrastructure and evacuation routes, are increasingly vulnerable to higher sea levels and storm surges, inland flooding, erosion, and other climate-related changes.
Description of evidence base	<p>Coastal infrastructure is defined here to include: buildings, roads, railroads, airports, port facilities, subways, tunnels, bridges, water supply systems, wells, sewer lines, pump stations, wastewater treatment plants, water storage and drainage systems, port facilities, energy production and transmission facilities on land and offshore, flood protection systems such as levees and seawalls, and telecommunication equipment. Lifelines are understood in the common usage of that term in hazards management.</p> <p>The key message and supporting text summarize extensive evidence documented in the coastal zone technical input report¹⁸³ as well as a technical input report on infrastructure.⁴⁵ Technical input reports (68) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input, along with the extant scientific literature. Additional evidence is provided in other chapters on hurricanes (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate, Key Message 8), global sea level rise (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate, Key Message 10), water supply vulnerabilities (Ch. 3: Water); key coastal transportation vulnerabilities (Ch. 5: Transportation), and energy-related infrastructure (Ch. 4: Energy). This key message focuses mainly on water supply and energy infrastructure and evacuation routes, as these constitute critical lifelines.</p> <p>The evidence base for exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity to higher sea levels and storm surges is very strong, both from empirical observation and historical experience and from studies projecting future impacts on critical coastal infrastructure. There are numerous publications concerning the effects of sea level rise and storm surges on roadways, coastal bridges, and supply of refined products.^{7,38,40,61,91,146,161} The information on roadways came from various reports (for example,^{52,53}) and other publications (for example,⁸¹). The impact on coastal bridges is documented in Department of Transportation reports.^{52,56} A number of publications explored the impacts on supply of refined oil-based products such as gasoline.^{70,71}</p> <p>The evidence base is moderate for the interaction of inland and coastal flooding. There are many and recent publications concerning impacts to wastewater treatment plants^{44,58} and drainage systems.^{18,27,61,62,68} These impacts lead to increased risk of urban flooding and disruption of essential services to urban residents.</p>
New information and remaining	The projected rate of sea level rise (SLR) is fully accounted for through the use of common scenarios. We note, however, that there is currently limited impacts

<p>uncertainties</p>	<p>literature yet that uses the lowest or highest 2100 scenario and none that specifically use the broader range of SLR (0.2-2m, or 0.7 to 6.6 feet, by 2100) ¹⁶ and NCA land-use scenarios (60% to 164% increase in urban and suburban land area).¹⁸⁴</p> <p>The severity and frequency of storm damage in any given location cannot yet be fully accounted for due to uncertainties in projecting future extratropical and tropical storm frequency, intensity, and changes in storm tracks for different regions (Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate).⁷</p> <p>The timely implementation and efficacy of adaptation measures, including planned retreat, in mitigating damages is accounted for in the underlying literature (for example, by varying assumptions about the timing of implementation of adaptation measures and the type of adaptation measures) such as hard protection, elevation, relocation, or protection through wetlands and dunes in front of the infrastructure in question) (for example, ^{18,38,41,42,44}). However, such studies can only test the sensitivity of conclusions to these assumptions; they do not allow statements about what is occurring on the ground.</p> <p>Additional uncertainties arise from the confluence of climate change impacts from the inland and ocean side, which have yet to be studied in an integrated fashion across different coastal regions of the United States.</p>
<p>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</p>	<p>Given the evidence base, the large quantity of infrastructure (water-related infrastructure, energy infrastructure and the 60,000 miles of coastal roads) in the U.S. coastal zone, and the directional trend at least of sea level rise and runoff associated with heavy precipitation events, we have very high confidence that these types of infrastructure in the coastal zone are increasingly vulnerable.</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

3

1 **Chapter 25: Coastal Zone, Development and Ecosystems**

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

<p>Key message #2/5</p>	<p>Nationally important assets, such as ports, tourism and fishing sites, in already-vulnerable coastal locations, are increasingly exposed to sea level rise and related hazards. This threatens to disrupt economic activity within coastal areas and the regions they serve and results in significant costs from protecting or moving these assets.</p>
<p>Description of evidence base</p>	<p>The key message and supporting text summarize extensive evidence documented in the coastal zone technical input report.⁷ Technical input reports (68) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input, as well as the extant scientific literature.</p> <p>The evidence base for increased exposure to assets is strong. Many publications have assessed at-risk areas (for example, ^{38,42,77,79}) Highly reliable economic activity information is available from recurring surveys conducted by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and others, and asset exposure is conclusively demonstrated by historical information (from storm and erosion damage), elevation data (in Geographic Information System (GIS)-based, LIDAR, and other forms), and numerous vulnerability and adaptation studies of the built environment. Further evidence is provided in technical input reports and other NCA chapters on infrastructure and urban systems (Ch. 11: Urban),⁴⁵ transportation (Ch. 5: Transportation),⁵² and energy (Ch. 4: Energy). A number of studies in addition to the ones cited in the text, using various economic assumptions, aim to assess the cost of protecting or relocating coastal assets and services. Many publications and reports explore the cost of replacing services offered by ports,^{52,89} though one study¹⁸⁵ notes that few ports are implementing adaptation practices to date. The economic consequences of climate change on tourism are supported by a number of recent studies.^{87,88,89,91} The threats of climate change on fishing have been explored in the coastal zone technical input report.⁷</p> <p>Additional evidence comes from empirical observation: public statements by private sector representatives and public officials indicate high awareness of economic asset exposure and a determination to see those assets protected against an encroaching sea, even at high cost (New York City, Miami Dade County, San Francisco airport, etc.). The economic value of exposed assets and activities is frequently invoked when they get damaged or interrupted during storm events (for example, ¹⁶⁸). Threats to economic activity are also consistently cited as important to local decision-making in the coastal context (for example, ¹⁰⁸).</p>
<p>New information and remaining uncertainties</p>	<p>The projected rate of sea level rise is fully accounted for through the use of common scenarios. We note, however, that there is currently limited impacts literature that uses the lowest or highest scenario for 2100, and no studies that specifically use the broader range of SLR (0.7 to 6.6 feet,) and NCA land use scenarios (60% to 164% increase in urban and suburban land area).¹⁸⁴</p> <p>The projected severity and frequency of storm damage in any given location cannot yet be fully accounted for due to uncertainties in projecting future extratropical and tropical storm frequency, intensity, and changes in storm tracks for different regions.⁷</p> <p>The timely implementation and efficacy of adaptation measures, including planned retreat, in mitigating damages are accounted for in the underlying literature (for example, by varying assumptions about the timing of implementation of adaptation measures, the type of adaptation measures, and other economic assumptions such as discount rates). However, such studies can only test the sensitivity of conclusions to</p>

	<p>these assumptions; they do not allow statements about what is occurring on the ground. Well-established post-hoc assessments¹⁵⁹ suggest that hazard mitigation action is highly cost-effective (for every dollar spent, four dollars in damages are avoided). A more recent study suggests an even greater cost-effectiveness.⁷⁷</p>
<p>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</p>	<p>Given the evidence base, the well-established accumulation of economic assets and activities in coastal areas, and the directional trend of sea level rise, we have very high confidence in the main conclusion that resources and assets that are nationally important to economic productivity are threatened by SLR and climate change.</p> <p>While there is currently no indication that the highest-value assets and economic activities are being abandoned in the face of sea level rise and storm impacts, we have very high confidence that the cost of protecting these assets in place will be high, and that the cost will be higher the faster sea level rises relative to land.</p> <p>We have very high confidence that adequate planning and arrangement for future financing mechanisms, timely implementation of hazard mitigation measures and effective disaster response will keep the economic impacts and adaptation costs lower than if these actions are not taken.</p> <p>We are not able to assess timing or total cost of protecting or relocating economic assets with any confidence at this time, due to uncertainties in asset-specific elevation above sea level, in the presence and efficacy of protective measures (at present and in the future), in the feasibility of relocation in any particular case, and uncertainties in future storm surge heights and storm frequencies.</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 25: Coastal Zone, Development and Ecosystems**

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

<p>Key message #3/5</p>	<p>Socioeconomic disparities create uneven exposures and sensitivities to growing coastal risks and limit adaptation options for some coastal communities, resulting in the displacement of the most vulnerable people from coastal areas.</p>
<p>Description of evidence base</p>	<p>The key message and supporting text summarize extensive evidence documented in the coastal zone technical input report.⁷ Technical input reports (68) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input, along with the extant literature.</p> <p>Evidence base is moderate: Assessment of the social vulnerability to coastal impacts of climate change is a comparatively new research focus in the U.S., and clearly an advance since the prior NCA.¹⁸⁶ There are currently multiple published, peer-reviewed studies, by different author teams, using different vulnerability metrics, which all reach the same conclusion: economically and socially vulnerable individuals and communities face significant coastal risks and have a lower adaptive capacity than less socially vulnerable populations. Studies have shown that the U.S. coastal population is growing⁹⁷ and have assessed the importance of this population for climate change exposure.^{39,99} The social factors that play key roles in coastal vulnerability are detailed in numerous publications.^{79,103}</p> <p>There is an additional body of evidence emerging in the literature that also supports this key message, namely the growing literature on “barriers to adaptation”, particularly from studies conducted here in the United States.^{7,79,104,144,187} This literature reports on the limitations poorer communities face at present in beginning adaptation planning, and on the challenges virtually all communities face in prioritizing adaptation and moving from planning to implementation of adaptation options.</p> <p>There is empirical evidence for how difficult it is for small, less wealthy communities (for example, the Native communities in Alaska or southern Louisiana) to obtain federal funds to relocate from eroding shorelines.^{106,107} Eligibility criteria (positive benefit-cost ratios) make it particularly difficult for low-income communities to obtain such funds; current federal budget constraints limit the available resources to support managed retreat and relocation.^{165,172} The recent economic hardship has placed constraints even on the richer coastal communities in the U.S. in developing and implementing adaptation strategies, for example in California.¹⁴⁴ While the economic situation, funding priorities, or institutional mechanisms to provide support to socially vulnerable communities will not remain static over time, there is no reliable scientific evidence for how these factors may change in the future.</p>
<p>New information and remaining uncertainties</p>	<p>The body of research on this topic is largely new since the prior NCA in 2009.¹⁸⁶ Each of the peer-reviewed studies discusses data gaps and methodological limitations, as well as the particular challenge of projecting demographic variables – a notoriously difficult undertaking – forward in time. While methods for population projections are well established (typically using housing projections), those, in turn, depend on more difficult to make assumptions about fertility, migration, household size and travel times to urban areas. The conclusion is limited by uneven coverage of in-depth vulnerability studies; although those that do exist are consistent with and confirm the conclusions of a national study.¹⁰² This latter study was extended by applying the same approach, data sources, and methodology to regions previously not yet covered, thus closing important informational gaps (Hawaii, Alaska, the Great Lakes region). Data gaps remain for most coastal locations in the</p>

	<p>Pacific islands, Puerto Rico, and other U.S. territories.</p> <p>The most important limit on understanding is the current inability to project social vulnerability forward in time. While some social variables are more easily predicted (for example, age and gender distribution) than others (for example, income distribution, ethnic composition and linguistic abilities), the predictive capability declines the further out projections aim (beyond 2030 or 2050). Further, it is particularly difficult to project these variables in specific places subject to coastal risks, as populations are mobile over time, and no existing model reliably predicts place-based demographics at the scale important to these analyses.</p>
Assessment of confidence based on evidence	<p>We have high confidence in this conclusion, as it is based on well-accepted techniques, replicated in several place-based case studies, and on a nationwide analysis, using reliable Census data. Consistency in insights and conclusions in these studies, and in others across regions, sectors, and nations, add to the confidence. The conclusion does involve significant projection uncertainties, however, concerning where socially vulnerable populations will be located several decades from now. Sensitivity analysis of this factor, and overall a wider research base is needed, before a higher confidence assessment can be assigned.</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

3

1 **Chapter 25: Coastal Zone, Development and Ecosystems**

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

<p>Key message #4/5</p>	<p>Coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change because many have already been dramatically altered by human stresses; climate change will result in further reduction or loss of the services that these ecosystems provide, including potentially irreversible impacts.</p>
<p>Description of evidence base</p>	<p>The key message and supporting text summarize extensive evidence documented in the coastal zone technical input report.⁷ Technical input reports (68) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input, along with the extant literature.</p> <p>Evidence base is strong for this part of the key message: "Coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change because they have already been dramatically altered by human activity;"</p> <p>The degradation and depletion of coastal systems due to human stresses (for example, pollution, habitat destruction, overharvesting) has been widely documented throughout the U.S. and the world.^{65,114,115,117,118} The degree of degradation varies based on location and level of human impact. However, evidence of degradation is available for all types of U.S. coastal ecosystems, from coral reefs, to seagrasses and rocky shores. Human stresses can be direct (for example, habitat destruction due to dredging of bays) or indirect (for example, food web disruption due to overfishing). There is also consistent evidence that ecosystems degraded by human activities are less resilient to changes in climatic factors, such as water temperature, precipitation, and sea level rise (for example, ^{127,128,129}).</p> <p>Evidence base is strong: "climate change will result in further reduction or loss of the services that these ecosystems provide."</p> <p>The impacts of changing coastal conditions (for example, changes associated with altered river inflows, higher temperatures, and the effects of high rates of relative sea level rise) on coastal ecosystems and their associated services have been extensively documented through observational and empirical studies, including recent publications.^{28,120,121,122,128,132} Many models of coastal ecosystem responses to climatic factors have been well-validated with field data. Given the existing knowledge of ecosystem responses, future climate projections, and the interactions with non-climatic stressors that further exacerbate climatic impacts, evidence is strong of the potential for further reduction and/or loss of ecosystem services.</p> <p>Evidence is suggestive: "including potentially irreversible impacts."</p> <p>Severe impacts (for example, mass coral bleaching events, rapid species invasions) have been extensively documented for U.S. coastal ecosystems. Many experts have suggested that some of these impacts may be irreversible¹³³ and never before seen conditions have been documented.^{135,136} Recovery may or may not be possible in different instances; this depends on factors that are not well-understood, such as the adaptive capacity of ecosystems, future projections of change that consider interactions among multiple climatic and non-climatic human alterations of systems, the dynamics and persistence of alternative states that are created after a regime shift has occurred, and whether or not the climatic and/or non-climatic stressors that lead to impacts will be ameliorated.^{32,33,137,138,139,140}</p>
<p>New information and remaining uncertainties</p>	<p>Since the prior NCA,¹⁸⁶ new studies have added weight to previously established conclusions. The major advance lies in the examination of tipping points for species and entire ecosystems (for example, ^{133,134,136,137}). Existing uncertainties and</p>

	<p>future research needs were identified through reviewing the NCA technical inputs and other peer-reviewed, published literature on these topics, as well as through our own identification and assessment of knowledge gaps.</p> <p>Key uncertainties in our understanding of ecosystem impacts of climate change in coastal areas are associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the interactive effects and relative contributions of multiple climatic and non-climatic stressors on coastal organisms and ecosystems; • how the consequences of multiple stressors for individual species combine to affect community- and ecosystem-level interactions and functions; • projected magnitude of coastal ecosystem change under different scenarios of temperature change, sea level rise, and land-use change, particularly given the potential for feedbacks and non-linearities in ecosystem responses • the potential adaptive capacity of coastal organisms and ecosystems to climate change; • trajectories, timeframes, and magnitudes of coastal ecosystem recovery; • the dynamics and persistence of alternative states that are created after ecosystem regime shifts have occurred; and • the potential and likelihood for irreversible climate-related coastal ecosystem change. <p>In general, relatively little work to date has been conducted to project future coastal ecosystem change under integrative scenarios of temperature change, sea level rise, and changes in human uses of, and impacts to, coastal ecosystems (for example, through land-use change). Advancing understanding and knowledge associated with this key uncertainty, as well as the others included in the above list, would be fostered by additional research.</p>
<p>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</p>	<p>We have very high confidence that coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change because they have already been dramatically altered by human stresses, as documented in extensive and conclusive evidence.</p> <p>We have very high confidence that climate change will result in further reduction or loss of the services that these ecosystems provide, as there is extensive and conclusive evidence related to this vulnerability.</p> <p>We have high confidence that climatic change will include “potentially irreversible impacts.” Site-specific evidence of potentially irreversible impacts exists in the literature. This vulnerability is frequently identified by studies of coastal ecosystems. However, methods, research, and models are still being developed for understanding, documenting, and predicting potentially irreversible impacts across all types of coastal ecosystems.</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

1 **Chapter 25: Coastal Zone, Development and Ecosystems**

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

<p>Key message #5/5</p>	<p>Leaders and residents of coastal regions are increasingly aware of the high vulnerability of coasts to climate change, and are developing plans to prepare for potential impacts on citizens, businesses, and environmental assets. Significant institutional, political, social, and economic obstacles to implementing adaptation actions remain.</p>
<p>Description of evidence base</p>	<p>The key message and supporting text summarize extensive evidence documented in the coastal zone technical input report.⁷ Technical input reports (68) on a wide range of topics were also received and reviewed as part of the Federal Register Notice solicitation for public input, along with the extant literature.</p> <p>Evidence base is moderate to strong: The results on which this key message relies are based on case studies, direct observation and “lessons learned” assessments from a wide range of efforts, surveys, and interview studies in ongoing adaptation efforts around the country.¹⁵³ There has been some planning for remediating climate change impacts, including recent publications^{143,152,162,163} and there are publications on the lower social acceptance of certain adaptation option (for example,^{143,157}) and on the many barriers that affect adaptation.^{144,180,181}</p> <p>In addition, there is confirming evidence of very similar findings from other locations outside the U.S. (some, from Canada, were also submitted as technical input reports to the NCA), such as the United Kingdom, continental Europe, Australia, and others.^{156,180}</p>
<p>New information and remaining uncertainties</p>	<p>Adaptation is a rapidly spreading policy and planning focus across coastal America. This was not previously captured or assessed in the prior NCA¹⁸⁶ and is thus a major advance in understanding, including what adaptation activities are underway, what impedes them, and how coastal stakeholders view and respond to these emerging adaptation activities.</p> <p>Given the local nature of adaptation (even though it frequently involves actors from all levels of government), it is difficult to systematically track, catalog, or assess progress being made on adaptation in coastal America. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of comprehensively tracking such progress has been previously acknowledged.²⁰ This conclusion is reiterated in the Adaptation Chapter of this report.</p> <p>While the findings and integrative key message stand on strong evidence, some uncertainties remain about U.S. coastal regions’ adaptive capacity, the level of adoption of hazard mitigation and other adaptation strategies, and the extent and importance of barriers to adaptation.</p> <p>Possibly the least well understood aspect about coastal adaptation is how and when to undertake large-scale, transformational adaptation. Aside from the mentioned examples of relocation, no other examples exist at the present time, and further research is required to better understand how major institutional, structural or social transformation might occur and what would be involved to realize such options.</p>
<p>Assessment of confidence based on evidence</p>	<p>We have very high confidence in this key message, as it is primarily based on studies using well-accepted social science research techniques (for example, surveys, interviews, participant observation), replicated in several place-based case</p>

studies, and on a nationwide compilation of adaptation case studies. Consistency in insights and conclusions in these studies, and in others across regions, sectors, and nations, add to the confidence.

As described above, a comprehensive catalogue of all adaptation efforts, and of related challenges and lessons learned, is difficult if not impossible to ever obtain. Nevertheless, the emerging insights and evidence from different regions of the country provide considerable confidence that the situation is reasonably well captured in the documents relied on here. The coastal stakeholders represented among the authors of the foundational technical input report⁷ confirmed the conclusions from their long-term experience in coastal management and direct involvement in adaptation efforts locally.

Moreover, evidence from other regions outside the U.S. adds weight to the conclusions drawn here.

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

3

References

1. NOAA, 2013: National Coastal Population Report: Population Trends from 1970 to 2020, 22 pp., National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Census Bureau
2. —, cited 2012: The U.S. Population Living in Coastal Watershed Counties. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. [Available online at <http://stateofthecoast.noaa.gov/population/welcome.html>];
3. —, 2012: NOAA's List of Coastal Counties for the Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract Series. [Available online at http://www.census.gov/geo/landview/lv6help/coastal_cty.pdf];
4. U.S. Census Bureau, cited 2010: 2010 Population Finder. U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. [Available online at <http://www.census.gov/popfinder/>]
5. NOAA, cited 2012: Spatial Trends in Coastal Socioeconomics Demographic Trends Database: 1970-2010. National Ocean Service. [Available online at <http://coastalsocioeconomics.noaa.gov/download/download2.html>]
6. Bookman, C. A., T. J. Culliton, and M. A. Warren, 1999: Trends in US coastal regions 1970-1998: addendum to the proceedings. Trends and future challenges for US national ocean and coastal policy, 31 pp., National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Special Projects Office, National Ocean Service, Silver Spring, MD. [Available online at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CZIC-gc1018-t736-add-1999/pdf/CZIC-gc1018-t736-add-1999.pdf>]
7. Houston, J. R., 2008: The economic value of beaches – a 2008 update. *Shore & Beach*, **76**, 22-26
8. OTTI, 2012: Overseas Visitation Estimates for U.S. States, Cities, and Census Regions: 2011, 6 pp., U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Commission, Office of Travel and Tourism Industries, Washington, D.C. [Available online at http://tinet.ita.doc.gov/outreachpages/download_data_table/2011_States_and_Cities.pdf]
9. Burkett, V., and M. Davidson, 2012: *Coastal Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerabilities: A Technical Input to the 2013 National Climate Assessment*. Island Press, 216 pp
10. NOAA, 1972: Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended through Pub. L. No. 109-58, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, 40 pp., National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, D.C. [Available online at http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/about/media/CZMA_10_11_06.pdf]
11. —, cited 2012: States and Territories Working on Ocean and Coastal Management. NOAA, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. [Available online at <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/welcome.html>.]
12. Moser, S. C., S. J. Williams, and D. F. Boesch, 2012: Wicked Challenges at Land's End: Managing Coastal Vulnerability under Climate Change. *Annual Review of Environment and Natural Resources*, **37**, 51-78, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-021611-135158. [Available online at http://susannemoser.com/documents/Moseretal_2012_AnnualReview_preformat.pdf]
13. Folke, C., 2006: Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, **16**, 253-267, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.04.002. [Available online at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378006000379>];
14. Walker, B., C. S. Holling, S. R. Carpenter, and A. P. Kinzig, 2004: Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-ecological Systems. *Ecology and Society*, **9**. [Available online at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss2/art5/print.pdf>]
15. Holling, C. S., 1996: Engineering Resilience Versus Ecological Resilience. *Engineering Within Ecological Constraints*, P. Schulze, Ed., National Academies Press, 31-44

- 1 13. Adger, W. N., 2003: Governing natural resources: institutional adaptation and resilience. *Negotiating*
2 *Environmental Change: New Perspectives from Social Science*, F. Berkhout, M. Leach, and I. Scoones, Eds.,
3 Edward Elgar Pub, 193-208
- 4 14. Trenberth, K. E., P. D. Jones, P. Ambenje, R. Bojariu, D. Easterling, A. K. Tank, D. Parker, F. Rahimzadeh, J. A.
5 Renwick, M. Rusticucci, B. Soden, and P. Zhai, 2007: Observations: Surface and Atmospheric Climate Change.
6 *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment*
7 *Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M.
8 Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller, Eds., Cambridge University Press. [Available online at
9 http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch3.html];
- 10 Xue, Y., Z. Hu, A. Kumar, V. Banzon, T. M. Smith, and N. A. Rayner, 2012: Sea surface temperatures. *Bulletin of*
11 *the American Meteorological Society*, **93**, S58-S62. [Available online at
12 <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/pdf/10.1175/2012BAMSStateoftheClimate.1>]
- 13 15. Howard, J., E. Babij, R. Griffis, B. Helmuth, A. Himes-Cornell, P. Niemier, M. Orbach, L. Petes, S. Allen, and G.
14 Auad, 2013: Oceans and Marine Resources in a Changing Climate. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: an*
15 *Annual Review*, R. N. Hughes, D. J. Hughes, and I. P. Smith, Eds., CRC Press, 71-192
- 16 16. Parris, A., P. Bromirski, V. Burkett, D. Cayan, M. Culver, J. Hall, R. Horton, K. Knuuti, R. Moss, J. Obeysekera, A.
17 Sallenger, and J. Weiss, 2012: Global Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States National Climate
18 Assessment. NOAA Tech Memo OAR CPO-1, 37 pp., National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver
19 Spring, MD. [Available online at http://scenarios.globalchange.gov/sites/default/files/NOAA_SLR_r3_0.pdf]
- 20 17. CCSP, 2009: Coastal Sensitivity to Sea-Level Rise: A Focus on the Mid-Atlantic Region. A report by the U.S.
21 Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research. J. G. Titus, (Coordinating
22 Lead Author), K. E. Anderson, D. R. Cahoon, D. B. Gesch, S. K. Gill, B. T. Gutierrez, E. R. Thieler, and S. J.
23 Williams, (Lead Authors), Eds. 978-0160830860, 320 pp., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington,
24 D.C. [Available online at <http://downloads.globalchange.gov/sap/sap4-1/sap4-1-final-report-all.pdf>];
- 25 IPCC, 2007: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth*
26 *Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z.
27 Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 996 pp. [Available
28 online at
29 http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_ipcc_fourth_assessment_report_wg1_report_the_p
30 [hysical_science_basis.htm](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_ipcc_fourth_assessment_report_wg1_report_the_p_hysical_science_basis.htm)]
- 31 18. Irish, J. L., A. E. Frey, J. D. Rosati, F. Olivera, L. M. Dunkin, J. M. Kaihatu, C. M. Ferreira, and B. L. Edge, 2010:
32 Potential implications of global warming and barrier island degradation on future hurricane inundation,
33 property damages, and population impacted. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **53**, 645-657,
34 doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2010.08.001
- 35 19. Rotzoll, K., and C. H. Fletcher, 2013: Assessment of groundwater inundation as a consequence of sea-level
36 rise. *Nature Clim. Change*, **3**, 477-481, doi:10.1038/nclimate1725
- 37 20. NRC, 2010: *Adapting to Impacts of Climate Change. America's Climate Choices: Report of the Panel on*
38 *Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change*. The National Academies Press, 292 pp
- 39 21. Sallenger, A. H., K. S. Doran, and P. A. Howd, 2012: Hotspot of accelerated sea-level rise on the Atlantic coast
40 of North America. *Nature Climate Change*, **2**, 884-888, doi:10.1038/nclimate1597. [Available online at
41 [http://www.cityofboston.gov/Images_Documents/Hotspot%20of%20accelerated%20sea-level%20rise%20-](http://www.cityofboston.gov/Images_Documents/Hotspot%20of%20accelerated%20sea-level%20rise%20-%20USGS%206-25-12_tcm3-33215.pdf)
42 [%20USGS%206-25-12_tcm3-33215.pdf](http://www.cityofboston.gov/Images_Documents/Hotspot%20of%20accelerated%20sea-level%20rise%20-%20USGS%206-25-12_tcm3-33215.pdf)];
- 43 Tamisiea, M. E., J. X. Mitrovica, J. L. Davis, and G. A. Milne, 2003: Ch. II: Solid Earth Physics: Long wavelength
44 sea level and solid surface perturbations driven by polar ice mass variations: fingerprinting Greenland and
45 Antarctic ice sheet flux. *Earth Gravity Field from Space - from Sensors to Earth Sciences*, G. Beutler, R.
46 Rummel, M. R. Drinkwater, and R. von Steiger, Eds., Kluwer Academic Publishers, 81-93;

- 1 Yin, J., M. E. Schlesinger, and R. J. Stouffer, 2009: Model projections of rapid sea-level rise on the northeast
2 coast of the United States. *Nature Geoscience*, **2**, 262-266, doi:10.1038/ngeo462 [Available online at
3 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ngeo462>]
- 4 22. Blum, M. D., and H. H. Roberts, 2009: Drowning of the Mississippi Delta due to insufficient sediment supply
5 and global sea-level rise. *Nature Geoscience*, **2**, 488-491, doi:10.1038/ngeo553;
- 6 Cazenave, A., and W. Llovel, 2010: Contemporary sea level rise. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, **2**, 145-173,
7 doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-120308-081105;
- 8 Komar, P. D., J. C. Allan, and P. Ruggiero, 2011: Sea Level Variations along the U.S. Pacific Northwest Coast:
9 Tectonic and Climate Controls. *Journal of Coastal Research*, **27**, 808-823, doi:10.2112/jcoastres-d-10-00116.1.
10 [Available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-10-00116.1>];
- 11 Mazzotti, S., A. Lambert, N. Courtier, L. Nykolaishen, and H. Dragert, 2007: Crustal uplift and sea level rise in
12 northern Cascadia from GPS, absolute gravity, and tide gauge data. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **34**, L15306,
13 doi:10.1029/2007GL030283. [Available online at
14 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2007GL030283/pdf>];
- 15 Nicholls, R. J., and A. Cazenave, 2010: Sea-level rise and its impact on coastal zones. *Science*, **328**, 1517-1520,
16 doi:10.1126/science.1185782
- 17 23. Tebaldi, C., B. H. Strauss, and C. E. Zervas, 2012: Modelling sea level rise impacts on storm surges along US
18 coasts. *Environmental Research Letters*, **7**, 014032, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/014032
- 19 24. Hayhoe, K., and D. Wuebbles, 2008: Climate Change and Chicago: Projections and Potential Impacts, 175 pp.,
20 City of Chicago, Chicago, IL. [Available online at <http://www.chicagoclimataction.org/>];
- 21 Uzarski, D. G., T. M. Burton, R. E. Kolar, and M. J. Cooper, 2009: The ecological impacts of fragmentation and
22 vegetation removal in Lake Huron's coastal wetlands. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management*, **12**, 45-62,
23 doi:10.1080/14634980802690881
- 24 25. Vose, R. S., S. Applequist, M. J. Menne, C. N. Williams, Jr., and P. Thorne, 2012: An intercomparison of
25 temperature trends in the US Historical Climatology Network and recent atmospheric reanalyses. *Geophysical*
26 *Research Letters*, **39**, 6, doi:10.1029/2012GL051387 [Available online at
27 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2012GL051387/pdf>]
- 28 26. Wang, M., and J. E. Overland, 2012: A sea ice free summer Arctic within 30 years: An update from CMIP5
29 models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **39**, L18501, doi:10.1029/2012GL052868. [Available online at
30 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2012GL052868/pdf>];
- 31 Wang, X. L., V. R. Swail, and F. W. Zwiers, 2006: Climatology and Changes of Extratropical Cyclone Activity:
32 Comparison of ERA-40 with NCEP–NCAR Reanalysis for 1958–2001. *Journal of Climate*, **19**, 3145-3166,
33 doi:10.1175/jcli3781.1. [Available online at <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/pdf/10.1175/JCLI3781.1>]
- 34 27. Seneviratne, S. I., N. Nicholls, D. Easterling, C. M. Goodess, S. Kanae, J. Kossin, Y. Luo, J. Marengo, K. McInnes,
35 M. Rahimi, M. Reichstein, A. Sorteberg, C. Vera, and X. Zhang, 2012: Ch. 3: Changes in climate extremes and
36 their impacts on the natural physical environment. *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to*
37 *Advance Climate Change Adaptation. A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental*
38 *Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)*, C. B. Field, V. Barros, T. F. Stocker, Q. Dahe, D. J. Dokken, K. L. Ebi, M. D.
39 Mastrandrea, K. J. Mach, G.-K. Plattner, S. K. Allen, M. Tignor, and P. M. Midgley, Eds., Cambridge University
40 Press, 109-230
- 41 28. Doney, S. C., M. Ruckelshaus, J. E. Duffy, J. P. Barry, F. Chan, C. A. English, H. M. Galindo, J. M. Grebmeier, A.
42 B. Hollowed, N. Knowlton, J. Polovina, N. N. Rabalais, W. J. Sydeman, and L. D. Talley, 2012: Climate change
43 impacts on marine ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, **4**, 11-37, doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-
44 041911-111611. [Available online at
45 <http://www.annualreviews.org/eprint/fzUZd7Z748TeHmB7p8cn/full/10.1146/annurev-marine-041911-111611>]
46

- 1 29. Feely, R. A., C. L. Sabine, R. H. Byrne, F. J. Millero, A. G. Dickson, R. Wanninkhof, A. Murata, L. A. Miller, and D.
2 Greeley, 2012: Decadal changes in the aragonite and calcite saturation state of the Pacific Ocean. *Global*
3 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, **26**, GB3001, doi:10.1029/2011gb004157. [Available online at
4 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2011GB004157/pdf>]
- 5 30. Hoegh-Guldberg, O., P. J. Mumby, A. J. Hooten, R. S. Steneck, P. Greenfield, E. Gomez, C. D. Harvell, P. F. Sale,
6 A. J. Edwards, K. Caldeira, N. Knowlton, C. M. Eakin, R. Iglesias-Prieto, N. Muthiga, R. H. Bradbury, A. Dubi, and
7 M. E. Hatziolos, 2007: Coral reefs under rapid climate change and ocean acidification. *Science*, **318**, 1737-
8 1742, doi:10.1126/science.1152509
- 9 31. Nye, J. A., J. S. Link, J. A. Hare, and W. J. Overholtz, 2009: Changing spatial distribution of fish stocks in
10 relation to climate and population size on the Northeast United States continental shelf. *Marine Ecology*
11 *Progress Series*, **393**, 111-129, doi:10.3354/meps08220
- 12 32. Chan, F., J. A. Barth, J. Lubchenco, A. Kirincich, H. Weeks, W. T. Peterson, and B. A. Menge, 2008: Emergence
13 of anoxia in the California current large marine ecosystem. *Science*, **319**, 920, doi:10.1126/science.1149016
- 14 33. Grantham, B. A., F. Chan, K. J. Nielsen, D. S. Fox, J. A. Barth, A. Huyer, J. Lubchenco, and B. A. Menge, 2004:
15 Upwelling-driven nearshore hypoxia signals ecosystem and oceanographic changes in the northeast Pacific.
16 *Nature*, **429**, 749-754, doi:10.1038/nature02605
- 17 34. NRC, 2012: *Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future*.
18 Committee on Sea Level Rise in California, Oregon, Washington. Board on Earth Sciences Resources Ocean
19 Studies Board Division on Earth Life Studies The National Academies Press, 201 pp.[Available online at
20 http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=13389]
- 21 35. Craft, C., J. Clough, J. Ehman, S. Joyce, R. Park, S. Pennings, H. Guo, and M. Machmuller, 2009: Forecasting the
22 effects of accelerated sea-level rise on tidal marsh ecosystem services. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
23 *Environment*, **7**, 73-78, doi:10.1890/07219
- 24 36. Neubauer, S. C., and C. B. Craft, 2009: Global change and tidal freshwater wetlands: Scenarios and impacts.
25 *Tidal freshwater wetlands*, A. Barendregt, D. F. Whigham, and A. H. Baldwin, Eds., Backhuys Publishers, 253-
26 266
- 27 37. Conner, W. H., T. W. Doyle, and K. W. Krauss, Eds., 2007: *Ecology of Tidal Freshwater Forested Wetlands of*
28 *the Southeastern United States*. Springer, 518 pp
- 29 38. Heberger, M., H. Cooley, P. Herrera, P. H. Gleick, and E. Moore, 2009: The impacts of sea-level rise on the
30 California coast. California Energy Commission Report CEC-500-2009-024-F, 115 pp., California Energy
31 Commission, Sacramento, CA. [Available online at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-500-2009-024/CEC-500-2009-024-F.PDF>]
- 32 39. Strauss, B. H., R. Ziemiński, J. L. Weiss, and J. T. Overpeck, 2012: Tidally adjusted estimates of topographic
33 vulnerability to sea level rise and flooding for the contiguous United States. *Environmental Research Letters*,
34 **7**, 014033, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/014033
- 35 40. Weiss, J. L., J. T. Overpeck, and B. Strauss, 2011: Implications of recent sea level rise science for low-elevation
36 areas in coastal cities of the conterminous U.S.A. A letter. *Climatic Change*, **105**, 635-645,
37 doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0024-x
- 38 41. Aerts, J. C. J. H., and W. J. W. Botzen, 2012: Managing exposure to flooding in New York City. *Nature Climate*
39 *Change*, **2**, 377-377, doi:10.1038/nclimate1487;
- 40 42. Bloetscher, F., B. N. Heimlich, and T. Romah, 2011: Counteracting the effects of sea level rise in Southeast
41 Florida. *Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering*, **5**, 121-139
- 42 43. Biging, G., J. Radke, and J. H. Lee, 2012: Vulnerability assessments of transportation infrastructure under
43 potential inundation due to sea-level rise and extreme storm events in the San Francisco Bay Region. *Paper*
44

- 1 *for the California Vulnerability and Adaptation Study. Public Interest Energy Research Program. California*
2 *Energy Commission report, in press*
- 3 43. DOT, 2011: A framework for considering climate change in transportation and land use scenario planning:
4 final report. Lessons Learned from an Interagency Pilot Project on Cape Cod., U.S. Department of
5 Transportation, John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Cambridge, MA. [Available online at
6 http://www.volpe.dot.gov/coi/ppoa/publiclands/projects/docs/cape_cod_pilot_finalreport.pdf]
- 7 44. Kirshen, P., R. Vogel, and K. Strzepek, 2011: Guidance Tools for Planning and Management of Urban Drainage
8 Under a Changing Climate. Final Report to NOAA SARP Program, Grant NA07OAR4310373, Silver Spring, MD
- 9 45. Wilbanks, T., S. Fernandez, G. Backus, P. Garcia, K. Jonietz, P. Kirshen, M. Savonis, B. Solecki, and L. Toole,
10 2012: Climate Change and Infrastructure, Urban Systems, and Vulnerabilities. Technical Report to the U.S.
11 Department of Energy in Support of the National Climate Assessment, 119 pp., Oak Ridge National
12 Laboratory. U.S Department of Energy, Office of Science, Oak Ridge, TN. [Available online at
13 <http://www.esd.ornl.gov/eess/Infrastructure.pdf>]
- 14 46. Zimmerman, R., and C. Faris, 2010: Infrastructure impacts and adaptation challenges. *Annals of the New York*
15 *Academy of Sciences*, **1196**, 63-86, doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05318.x
- 16 47. ASCE, cited 2012: Failure to Act Economic Studies. American Society of Civil Engineers. [Available online at
17 <http://www.asce.org/failuretoact>]
- 18 48. Kirshen, P., E. Douglas, M. Paolisso, and A. Enrici, 2012: Community Attitudes to Adaptation to Coastal
19 Flooding under Climate Change (in press)
- 20 49. Douglass, S. L., and J. Krolak, 2008: Highways in the Coastal Environment, Hydraulic Engineering Circular No.
21 25, Second Edition. Publication No. FHWA-NHI-07-096, 250 pp., U.S. Department of Transportation Federal
22 Highway Administration. [Available online at
23 <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/07096/07096.pdf>]
- 24 50. NOAA, 2012: State of the Coast: Sea Level Rise Impacts Transportation Infrastructure. *NOAA's State of the*
25 *Coast*.
- 26 51. U.S.A. Evacuation Routes, cited 2012: U.S.A. Evacuation Routes. University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Rape
27 Crisis Information. [Available online at <http://www.ibiblio.org/rcip/evacuationroutes.html>]
- 28 52. DOT, 2012: Climate Impacts and Transportation: Technical Input Report for the National Climate Assessment.
29 DOT OST/P-33 (Draft, February 2012).
- 30 53. Transportation Research Board, 2011: Annual report, 76 pp., Transportation Research Board of The National
31 Academies, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
32 http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/general/2011_TRB_Annual_Report.pdf]
- 33 54. FHWA, 2008: Highways in the Coastal Environment, Second Edition. Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 25.
34 FHWA-NHI-07-096, 250 pp., Federal Highway Administration. Department of Civil Engineering, University of
35 South Alabama, Mobile, AL. [Available online at
36 <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/07096/07096.pdf>];
- 37 FDEP, 2012: Critically Eroded Beaches in Florida, 76 pp., Florida Department of Environmental Protection,
38 Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems, Division of Water Resource Management. [Available online at
39 <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/beaches/publications/pdf/critical-erosion-report-2012.pdf>];
- 40 Texas General Land Office, cited 2012: Caring for the Coast: Coastal Management Program. State of Texas.
41 [Available online at [http://www.glo.texas.gov/what-we-do/caring-for-the-coast/grants-](http://www.glo.texas.gov/what-we-do/caring-for-the-coast/grants-funding/cmp/index.html)
42 [funding/cmp/index.html](http://www.glo.texas.gov/what-we-do/caring-for-the-coast/grants-funding/cmp/index.html)];
- 43 Wolshon, B., 2006: Evacuation planning and engineering for Hurricane Katrina. *The Bridge*, **36**, 27-34

- 1 55. California King Tides Initiative, cited 2012: California King Tides Initiative. [Available online at
2 <http://www.californiakingtides.org/aboutus/>];
- 3 State of Washington, cited 2012: Climate Change, King Tides in Washington State. Department of Ecology,
4 State of Washington. [Available online at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/ipa_hightide.htm];
- 5 Turner, S., 2011: Extreme High Tides Expected Along RI Coast; Grab Your Camera *East Greenwich Patch*;
- 6 Watson, S., 2011: Alignment of the Sun, moon and Earth will cause unusually high tides.
7 *pressofAtlanticCity.com*.
- 8 56. MDOT, cited 2003: Bridge Design Guide. Maine Department of Transportation, Prepared Guertin Elkerton &
9 Associates. [Available online at <http://www.maine.gov/mdot/technicalpubs/bdg.htm>]
- 10 57. Berry, L., M. Arockiasamy, F. Bloetscher, E. Kaiser, J. Rodriguez-Seda, P. Scarlatos, R. Teegavarapu, and N.
11 Hammer, 2012: Development of a Methodology for the Assessment of Sea Level Rise Impacts on Florida's
12 Transportation Modes and Infrastructure. Synthesis of Studies, Methodologies, Technologies, and Data
13 Sources Used for Predicting Sea Level Rise, Timing, and Affected Areas in Florida, 148 pp., Florida Department
14 of Transportation. [Available online at [http://www.dot.state.fl.us/research-](http://www.dot.state.fl.us/research-center/Completed_Proj/Summary_PL/FDOT_BDK79_977-01_rpt.pdf)
15 [center/Completed_Proj/Summary_PL/FDOT_BDK79_977-01_rpt.pdf](http://www.dot.state.fl.us/research-center/Completed_Proj/Summary_PL/FDOT_BDK79_977-01_rpt.pdf)]
- 16 58. Flood, J. F., and L. B. Cahoon, 2011: Risks to coastal wastewater collection systems from sea-level rise and
17 climate change. *Journal of Coastal Research*, **27**, 652-660, doi:10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-10-00129.1 [Available
18 online at <http://www.jcronline.org/doi/pdf/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-10-00129.1>];
- 19 Water Research Foundation, 2012: Water Utilities and Climate Change: A Research Workshop on Effective
20 System Adaptation. Web Report #4228. . Denver, CO, Water Research Foundation, 46 pp. [Available online at
21 www.waterrf.org/PublicReportLibrary/4228.pdf]
- 22 59. Mailhot, A., and S. Duchesne, 2010: Design criteria of urban drainage infrastructures under climate change.
23 *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, **136**, 201-208, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-
24 5452.0000023
- 25 60. Bierwagen, B. G., D. M. Theobald, C. R. Pyke, A. Choate, P. Groth, J. V. Thomas, and P. Morefield, 2010:
26 National housing and impervious surface scenarios for integrated climate impact assessments. *Proceedings of*
27 *the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **107**, 20887-20892,
28 doi:10.1073/pnas.1002096107 ;
- 29 Changnon, S. A., 2011: Temporal distribution of weather catastrophes in the USA. *Climatic Change*, **106**, 129-
30 140, doi:10.1007/s10584-010-9927-1;
- 31 Toll, D. G., cited 2012: The Impact of Changes in the Water Table and Soil Moisture on Structural Stability of
32 Buildings and Foundation Systems. Systematic review CEE10-005 (SR90). Collaboration for Environmental
33 Evidence. [Available online at
34 http://www.environmentalevidence.org/Documents/Draft_reviews/Draftreview10-005.pdf]
- 35 61. Bjerklie, D. M., J. R. Mullaney, J. R. Stone, B. J. Skinner, and M. A. Ramlow, 2012: Preliminary investigation of
36 the effects of sea-level rise on groundwater levels in New Haven, Connecticut. U.S. Geological Survey Open-
37 File Report 2012-1025, 56 pp., U.S. Department of the Interior and U.S. Geological Survey. [Available online
38 at http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2012/1025/pdf/ofr2012-1025_report_508.pdf]
- 39 62. Johnson, L., 2012: Rising Groundwater May Flood Underground Infrastructure of Coastal cities *Scientific*
40 *American*;
- 41 Peterson, T. C., P. A. Stott, and S. Herring, 2012: Explaining extreme events of 2011 from a climate
42 perspective. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, **93**, 1041-1067, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-12-
43 00021.1. [Available online at <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/pdf/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00021.1>]

- 1 63. Solecki, W., and C. Rosenzweig, 2012: U.S. Cities and Climate Change: Urban, Infrastructure, and Vulnerability
2 Issues, Technical Input Report Series, U.S. National Climate Assessment. S. W., and C. Rosenzweig, Eds., U.S.
3 Global Change Research Program, Washington, D.C;
- 4 Hilton, T. W., R. G. Najjar, L. Zhong, and M. Li, 2008: Is there a signal of sea-level rise in Chesapeake Bay
5 salinity? *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, **113**, C09002, doi:10.1029/2007jc004247. [Available online
6 at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2007JC004247/pdf>]
- 7 64. CCAP and EESI, 2012: Climate Adaptation & Transportation: Identifying Information and Assistance Needs, 66
8 pp., Center for Clean Air Policy and Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Washington, D.C. [Available
9 online at [http://cakex.org/virtual-library/climate-adaptation-transportation-identifying-information-and-
11 assistance-needs](http://cakex.org/virtual-library/climate-adaptation-transportation-identifying-information-and-
10 assistance-needs)]
- 12 65. EPA, 2008: A Screening Assessment of the Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Combined Sewer Overflow
13 (CSO) Mitigation in the Great Lakes and New England Regions. EPA/600/R-07/033F, 50 pp., U.S.
14 Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
http://ofmpub.epa.gov/eims/eimscomm.getfile?p_download_id=472009]
- 15 66. Kenward, A., D. Yawitz, and U. Raja, 2013: Sewage Overflows From Hurricane Sandy, 43 pp., Climate Central.
16 [Available online at <http://www.climatecentral.org/pdfs/Sewage.pdf>]
- 17 67. AMWA, 2009: Confronting Climate Change: An early Analysis of Water and Wastewater Adaptation Costs, 104
18 pp., Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies. [Available online at
19 <http://www.amwa.net/galleries/climate-change/ConfrontingClimateChangeOct09.pdf>]
- 20 68. Freas, K., L. van der Tak, J. Kepke, P. Pasteris, and P. Karney, 2011: Confronting climate change: An early
21 analysis of water and wastewater adaptation costs through 2050. *Proceedings of the Water Environment
22 Federation, Energy and Water 2011*, **27**, 871-897, doi:10.2175/193864711802836319;
- 23 WERF, 2009: Implications of Climate Change for Adaptation by Wastewater and Stormwater Agencies. Water
24 Environment Research Foundation, Alexandria, VA. [Available online at
25 www.climatestrategies.us/library/library/download/960]
- 26 69. Hayhoe, K., M. Robson, J. Rogula, M. Auffhammer, N. Miller, J. VanDorn, and D. Wuebbles, 2010: An
27 integrated framework for quantifying and valuing climate change impacts on urban energy and
28 infrastructure: a Chicago case study. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, **36**, 94-105,
29 doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2010.03.011;
- 30 Perez, P. R., 2009: *Potential Impacts of Climate Change on California's Energy Infrastructure and Identification
31 of Adaptation Measures: Staff Paper*. California Energy Commission, 23 pp;
- 32 Sathaye, J., L. Dale, P. Larsen, G. Fitts, K. Koy, S. Lewis, and A. Lucena, 2011: Estimating Risk to California
33 Energy Infrastructure from Projected Climate Change, 85 pp., Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National
34 Laboratory, California Energy Commission, Berkeley, CA. [Available online at
35 <http://www.osti.gov/bridge/servlets/purl/1026811/1026811.PDF>]
- 36 70. Francis, R. A., S. M. Falconi, R. Nateghi, and S. D. Guikema, 2011: Probabilistic life cycle analysis model for
37 evaluating electric power infrastructure risk mitigation investments. *Climatic Change*, **106**, 31-55,
38 doi:10.1007/s10584-010-0001-9;
- 39 Rosato, V., L. Issacharoff, F. Tiriticco, S. Meloni, S. Porcellinis, and R. Setola, 2008: Modelling interdependent
40 infrastructures using interacting dynamical models. *International Journal of Critical Infrastructures*, **4**, 63-79,
41 doi:10.1504/IJCIS.2008.016092;
- 42 Vugrin, E. D., and R. C. Camphouse, 2011: Infrastructure resilience assessment through control design.
43 *International Journal of Critical Infrastructures*, **7**, 243-260, doi:10.1504/IJCIS.2011.042994
- 44 71. Zimmerman, R., 2006: Ch. 34: Critical infrastructure and interdependency. *The McGraw-Hill Homeland
45 Security Handbook*, D. G. Kamien, Ed., McGraw-Hill, pp. 523-545;

- 1 Vugrin, E. D., D. E. Warren, M. A. Ehlen, and R. C. Camphouse, 2010: A framework for assessing the resilience
2 of infrastructure and economic systems. *Sustainable and Resilient Critical Infrastructure Systems*, K.
3 Gopalakrishnan, and S. Peeta, Eds., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 77-116
- 4 72. Hallegatte, S., 2008: Adaptation to climate change: do not count on climate scientists to do your work.
5 *Working paper*, 15. [Available online at [http://regulation2point0.org/wp-](http://regulation2point0.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/04/RP08-01_topost.pdf)
6 [content/uploads/downloads/2010/04/RP08-01_topost.pdf](http://regulation2point0.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/04/RP08-01_topost.pdf)];
- 7 U.S. Government, 2009: Executive Order 13514. Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic
8 Performance, 52117-52127 pp, Federal Register, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
9 <http://www1.eere.energy.gov/femp/pdfs/eo13514.pdf>]
- 10 73. SFRPC, cited 2012: Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Program. South Florida Regional Planning Council.
11 [Available online at <http://www.sfrpc.com/sresp.htm>];
- 12 —, 2012: Turkey Point Expansion – Draft Agency Report on the Power Plant and Non-Transmission
13 Associated Facilities. South Florida Regional Planning Council [Available online at
14 http://www.sfrpc.com/council/05-07-12/Agenda%20May12_IIIG.pdf];
- 15 SFRCCC, 2012: A Region Responds to a Changing Climate. Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change
16 Compact Counties. Regional Climate Action Plan, 80 pp., South Florida Regional Climate Change Compact
17 Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach Counties, FL. [Available online at
18 [http://southeastfloridaclimatecompact.org/pdf/Regional%20Climate%20Action%20Plan%20FINAL%20ADA%2](http://southeastfloridaclimatecompact.org/pdf/Regional%20Climate%20Action%20Plan%20FINAL%20ADA%20Compliant.pdf)
19 [0Compliant.pdf](http://southeastfloridaclimatecompact.org/pdf/Regional%20Climate%20Action%20Plan%20FINAL%20ADA%20Compliant.pdf)]
- 20 74. Davoudi, S., J. Crawford, and A. Mehmood, Eds., 2009: *Planning for climate change: strategies for mitigation*
21 *and adaptation for spatial planners*. Routledge, 344 pp;
- 22 Jones, H. P., D. G. Hole, and E. S. Zavaleta, 2012: Harnessing nature to help people adapt to climate change.
23 *Nature Climate Change*, **2**, 504-509, doi:10.1038/nclimate1463;
- 24 Nolon, J. R., and P. E. Salkin, 2011: Integrating Sustainable Development Planning and Climate Change
25 Management: A Challenge to Planners and Land Use Attorneys. *Planning & Environmental Law*, **63**, 3-10,
26 doi:10.1080/15480755.2011.560769. [Available online at
27 <http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1819&context=lawfaculty>];
- 28 Tzoulas, K., K. Korpela, S. Venn, V. Yli-Pelkonen, A. Kazmierczak, J. Niemela, and P. James, 2007: Promoting
29 ecosystem and human health in urban areas using Green Infrastructure: A literature review. *Landscape and*
30 *Urban Planning*, **81**, 167-178, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.02.001
- 31 75. Irish, J. L., and D. T. Resio, 2010: A hydrodynamics-based surge scale for hurricanes. *Ocean Engineering*, **37**,
32 69-81, doi:10.1016/j.oceaneng.2009.07.012;
- 33 Roseen, R., T. Janeski, J. Houle, M. Simpson, and J. Gunderson, 2011: Forging the Link: Linking the Economic
34 Benefits of Low Impact Development and Community Decisions, 14 pp., The UNH Stormwater Center,
35 University of New Hampshire. [Available online at
36 http://www.unh.edu/unhsc/sites/unh.edu.unhsc/files/docs/FTL_FactSheets%20ALL%20LR.pdf]
- 37 76. NOAA, cited 2012: NOAA's State of the Coast. Economy: Ports - Crucial Coastal Infrastructure. Department of
38 Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. [Available online at
39 <http://stateofthecoast.noaa.gov/ports/>]
- 40 77. Neumann, J., D. Hudgens, J. Herter, and J. Martinich, 2010: The economics of adaptation along developed
41 coastlines. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **2**, 89-98, doi:10.1002/wcc.90. [Available online at
42 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wcc.90/pdf>]
- 43 78. Neumann, J. E., D. E. Hudgens, J. Herter, and J. Martinich, 2010: Assessing sea-level rise impacts: a GIS-based
44 framework and application to coastal New Jersey. *Coastal Management*, **38**, 433-455,
45 doi:10.1080/08920753.2010.496105

- 1 79. Cooley, H., E. Moore, M. Heberger, and L. Allen, 2012: Social Vulnerability to Climate Change in California.
2 California Energy Commission. Publication Number: CEC-500-2012-013, 69 pp., Pacific Institute, Oakland, CA
- 3 80. AWF/AEC/Entergy, 2010: Building a Resilient Energy Gulf Coast: Executive Report, 11 pp., America's Wetland
4 Foundation, America's Energy Coast, and Entergy. [Available online at
5 [www.entropy.com/content/our_community/environment/GulfCoastAdaptation/Building_a_Resilient_Gulf_C](http://www.entropy.com/content/our_community/environment/GulfCoastAdaptation/Building_a_Resilient_Gulf_Coast.pdf)
6 [oast.pdf](http://www.entropy.com/content/our_community/environment/GulfCoastAdaptation/Building_a_Resilient_Gulf_Coast.pdf)]
- 7 81. State of Louisiana, 2012: Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast, draft Jan 2012,
8 State of Louisiana. Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, Baton Rouge, LA. [Available online at
9 <http://www.coastalmasterplan.louisiana.gov/2012-master-plan/final-master-plan/>]
- 10 82. Cordero, M., 2011: Commissioner Mario Cordero Federal Maritime Commission Remarks at the Global
11 Shippers Forum International Luncheon. *Global Shippers Forum International Luncheon*, Atlanta, GA, 4 pp.
12 [Available online at
13 http://www.fmc.gov/assets/1/News/Cordero_Remarks_NITLeague_GSF_%20Luncheon_11_16_2011.pdf];
- 14 IMO, 2012: IMO's Contribution to Sustainable Maritime Development: Capacity-building for safe, secure and
15 efficient shipping on clean oceans through the Integrated Technical Co-operation Programme, 12 pp.,
16 International Maritime organization, London, UK. [Available online at
17 <http://www.imo.org/OurWork/TechnicalCooperation/Documents/Brochure/English.pdf>];
- 18 USN, 2007: A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower, 20 pp., U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast
19 Guard, Kissimmee, FL. [Available online at <http://www.navy.mil/maritime/Maritimestrategy.pdf>]
- 20 83. IAPH, 2011: Seaports and Climate Change: An Analysis of Adaptation Measures. International Association of
21 Ports and Harbors
- 22 84. Becker, M., B. Meyssignac, C. Letetrel, W. Llovel, A. Cazenave, and T. Delcroix, 2012: Sea level variations at
23 Tropical Pacific Islands since 1950. *Global and Planetary Change*, **80-81**, 85-98,
24 doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2011.09.004
- 25 85. DOT, cited 2010: Freight Analysis Framework (Version 3) Data Tabulation Tool, Total Flows. U.S. Department
26 of Transportation. [Available online at <http://faf.ornl.gov/fafweb/Extraction1.aspx>]
- 27 86. NOAA, 1998: National Ocean Report. NOAA's Office of Public and Constituent Affairs. [Available online at
28 <http://www.publicaffairs.noaa.gov/oceanreport/tourism.html>];
- 29 U.S. Travel Association, cited 2012: U.S. Travel Forecasts. U.S Travel Association. [Available online at
30 <http://www.ustravel.org/sites/default/files/page/2009/09/ForecastSummary.pdf>]
- 31 87. Amelung, B., A. Moreno, and D. Scott, 2008: The place of tourism in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: A
32 review. *Tourism Review International*, **12**, 5-12, doi:10.3727/154427208785899984
- 33 88. Nordstrom, K. F., N. L. Jackson, N. C. Kraus, T. W. Kana, R. Bearce, L. M. Bocamazo, D. R. Young, and H. A. de
34 Butts, 2011: Enhancing geomorphic and biologic functions and values on backshores and dunes of developed
35 shores: a review of opportunities and constraints. *Environmental Conservation*, **38**, 288-302,
36 doi:10.1017/S0376892911000221;
- 37 Pendleton, L., P. King, C. Mohn, D. G. Webster, R. Vaughn, and P. N. Adams, 2011: Estimating the potential
38 economic impacts of climate change on Southern California beaches. *Climatic Change*, **109**, 278-298,
39 doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0309-0. [Available online at
40 http://geomorph.geology.ufl.edu/adamsp/Outgoing/Pubs/Pendleton_EtAl_2011_ClimChng.pdf]
- 41 89. Caldwell, M. R., E. Hartge, L. Ewing, G. Griggs, R. Kelly, S. Moser, S. Newkirk, R. Smyth, and B. Woodson, 2012:
42 Ch. 9: Coastal issues. *Assessment of Climate Change in the Southwest United States: A Technical Report*
43 *Prepared for the U.S. National Climate Assessment*, R. Lunde, G. Garfin, A. Jardine, R. Merideth, M. Black, and
44 J. Overpeck, Eds., Southwest Climate Alliance, 274-327

- 1 90. Kittinger, J. N., and A. L. Ayers, 2010: Shoreline Armoring, Risk Management, and Coastal Resilience Under
2 Rising Seas. *Coastal Management*, **38**, 634-653, doi:10.1080/08920753.2010.529038;
- 3 NRC, 1995: *Beach Nourishment and Protection*. National Research Council, Marine Board, Committee on
4 *Beach Nourishment and Protection*. National Research Council, The National Academies Press 352 pp
- 5 91. Marra, J. J., M. A. Merrifield, and W. V. Sweet, 2012: Ch. 3: Sea Level and Coastal Inundation on Pacific
6 Islands. *Climate Change and Pacific Islands: Indicators and Impacts. Report for the 2012 Pacific Islands*
7 *Regional Climate Assessment (PIRCA)*, V. Keener, J. J. Marra, M. L. Finucane, D. Spooner, and M. H. Smith,
8 Eds., 65-87
- 9 92. Barbier, E. B., S. D. Hacker, C. Kennedy, E. W. Koch, A. C. Stier, and B. R. Silliman, 2011: The value of estuarine
10 and coastal ecosystem services. *Ecological Monographs*, **81**, 169-193, doi:10.1890/10-1510.1. [Available
11 online at <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/10-1510.1>]
- 12 93. Ruckelshaus, M., S. C. Doney, H. M. Galindo, J. P. Barry, F. Chan, J. E. Duffy, C. A. English, S. D. Gaines, J. M.
13 Grebmeier, A. B. Hollowed, N. Knowlton, J. Polovina, N. N. Rabalais, W. J. Sydeman, and L. D. Talley, 2013:
14 Securing ocean benefits for society in the face of climate change. *Marine Policy*, **40**, 154-159,
15 doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2013.01.009
- 16 94. NMFS, 2010: Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2009. U.S. Dept. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo.
17 NOAA Fisheries-F/SPO-118, 179 pp., National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD. [Available online at
18 <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/econ/2009/FEUS%202009%20ALL.pdf>]
- 19 95. Crowell, M., K. Coulton, C. Johnson, J. Westcott, D. Bellomo, S. Edelman, and E. Hirsch, 2010: An estimate of
20 the U.S. population living in 100-Year coastal flood hazard areas. *Journal of Coastal Research*, **262**, 201-211,
21 doi:10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-09-00076.1
- 22 96. Crowell, M., J. Westcott, S. Phelps, T. Mahoney, K. Coulton, and D. Bellomo, 2013: Estimating the United
23 States Population at Risk from Coastal Flood-Related Hazards. *Coastal hazards*, C. W. Finkl, Ed., Springer, 151-
24 183. [Available online at <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/bfm%3A978-94-007-5234-4%2F1.pdf>]
- 25 97. EPA, 2010: Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments: A Review of Water Utility Practices. EPA 800-R-10-001,
26 32 pp., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
27 [http://water.epa.gov/scitech/climatechange/upload/Climate-Change-Vulnerability-Assessments-Sept-](http://water.epa.gov/scitech/climatechange/upload/Climate-Change-Vulnerability-Assessments-Sept-2010.pdf)
28 [2010.pdf](http://water.epa.gov/scitech/climatechange/upload/Climate-Change-Vulnerability-Assessments-Sept-2010.pdf)];
- 29 Nakicenovic, N., J. Alcamo, G. Davis, B. de Vries, J. Fenhann, S. Gaffin, K. Gregory, A. Grübler, T. Y. Jung, T.
30 Kram, E. L. L. Rovere, L. Michaelis, S. Mori, T. Morita, W. Pepper, H. Pitcher, L. Price, K. Riahi, A. Roehrl, H.-H.
31 Rogner, A. Sankovski, M. Schlesinger, P. Shukla, S. Smith, R. Swart, S. v. Rooijen, N. Victor, and Z. Dadi, 2000:
32 *Special report on emissions scenarios. A special report of Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on*
33 *Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, 612 pp.[Available online at
34 <http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/sres/emission/index.php?idp=0>]
- 35 98. Carson, S. T., and B. E. Montz, 2009: Planning for climate change: An analysis of vulnerability in Suffolk
36 County, New York. *Environmental Hazards*, **8**, 133-148, doi:10.3763/ehaz.2009.0009;
- 37 Kleinosky, L. R., B. Yarnal, and A. Fisher, 2007: Vulnerability of Hampton Roads, Virginia to Storm-Surge
38 Flooding and Sea-Level Rise. *Natural Hazards*, **40**, 43-70, doi:10.1007/s11069-006-0004-z
- 39 99. Pielke, R. A., Jr., 2007: Future economic damage from tropical cyclones: sensitivities to societal and climate
40 changes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*,
41 **365**, 2717-2729, doi:10.1098/rsta.2007.2086 [Available online at
42 <http://rsta.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/365/1860/2717.full.pdf+html>];
- 43 Zhang, K., and S. Leatherman, 2011: Barrier island population along the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. *Journal*
44 *of Coastal Research*, **27**, 356-363, doi:10.2112/jcoastres-d-10-00126.1

- 1 100. Davis, M. A., and M. G. Palumbo, 2008: The price of residential land in large US cities. *Journal of Urban*
2 *Economics*, **63**, 352-384, doi:10.1016/j.jue.2007.02.003;
- 3 Zabel, J. E., 2004: The demand for housing services. *Journal of Housing Economics*, **13**, 16-35,
4 doi:10.1016/j.jhe.2003.12.002
- 5 101. Burton, C., and S. Cutter, 2008: Levee failures and social vulnerability in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
6 area, California. *Natural Hazards Review*, **9**, 136, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)1527-6988(2008)9:3(136);
- 7 Cutter, S. L., and C. Finch, 2008: Temporal and spatial changes in social vulnerability to natural hazards.
8 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **105**, 2301-2306,
9 doi:10.1073/pnas.0710375105;
- 10 Emrich, C. T., and S. L. Cutter, 2011: Social vulnerability to climate-sensitive hazards in the southern United
11 States. *Weather, Climate, and Society*, **3**, 193-208, doi:10.1175/2011WCAS1092.1. [Available online at
12 <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/pdf/10.1175/2011WCAS1092.1>];
- 13 Oxfam America, 2009: Exposed: Social Vulnerability and Climate Change in the US Southeast, 24 pp., Oxfam
14 America Inc., Boston, MA. [Available online at
15 http://adapt.oxfamamerica.org/resources/Exposed_Report.pdf];
- 16 Rygel, L., D. O'Sullivan, and B. Yarnal, 2006: A method for constructing a Social Vulnerability Index: an
17 application to hurricane storm surges in a developed country. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global*
18 *Change*, **11**, 741-764, doi:10.1007/s11027-006-0265-6. [Available online at
19 http://www.cara.psu.edu/about/publications/Rygel_et_al_MASGC.pdf]
- 20 102. Martinich, J., J. Neumann, L. Ludwig, and L. Jantarasami, 2013: Risks of sea level rise to disadvantaged
21 communities in the United States. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **18**, 169-185,
22 doi:10.1007/s11027-011-9356-0. [Available online at
23 <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11027-011-9356-0>]
- 24 103. Bovbjerg, R. R., and J. Hadley, 2007: Why Health Insurance is Important. Report No. DC-SPG no. 1, 3 pp., The
25 Urban Institute. [Available online at
26 http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411569_importance_of_insurance.pdf];
- 27 Clark, G. E., S. C. Moser, S. J. Ratick, K. Dow, W. B. Meyer, S. Emani, W. Jin, J. X. Kasperson, R. E. Kasperson,
28 and H. E. Schwarz, 1998: Assessing the vulnerability of coastal communities to extreme storms: the case of
29 Revere, MA., USA. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **3**, 59-82,
30 doi:10.1023/A:1009609710795;
- 31 Cutter, S. L., B. J. Boruff, and W. L. Shirley, 2003: Social vulnerability to environmental hazards. *Social Science*
32 *Quarterly*, **84**, 242-261, doi:10.1111/1540-6237.8402002;
- 33 Moser, S. C., R. E. Kasperson, G. Yohe, and J. Agyeman, 2008: Adaptation to climate change in the Northeast
34 United States: opportunities, processes, constraints. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*,
35 **13**, 643-659, doi:10.1007/s11027-007-9132-3. [Available online at
36 http://www.northeastclimateimpacts.org/pdf/miti/moser_et_al.pdf];
- 37 Texas Health Institute, 2012: Climate Change, Environmental Challenges and Vulnerable Communities:
38 Assessing Legacies of the Past, Building Opportunities for the Future Joint Center for Political and Economic
39 Studies. The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Research Project, Washington, D.C.
- 40 104. Papiez, C., 2009: Climate Change Implications for the Quileute and Hoh Tribes of Washington: A
41 Multidisciplinary Approach to Assessing Climatic Disruptions to Coastal Indigenous Communities. Master's
42 Thesis, Environmental Studies, The Evergreen State College, 119 pp. [Available online at
43 http://academic.evergreen.edu/g/grossmaz/Papiez_MES_Thesis.pdf];
- 44 Tribal Climate Change Project, 2010: Tribal Climate Change Profile: Coquille Indian Tribe: Planning for the
45 effects of climate change and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Technical Input Report to the National

- 1 Climate Assessment 2013. U.S. Department of Agriculture,; U.S. Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research
2 Station,; University of Oregon,. [Available online at
3 tribalclimate.uoregon.edu/files/2010/11/tribes_Coquille_web1.pdf]
- 4 105. Cochran, P., O. H. Huntington, C. Pungowiyi, S. Tom, F. S. Chapin, III, H. P. Huntington, N. G. Maynard, and S.
5 F. Trainor, 2013: Indigenous frameworks for observing and responding to climate change in Alaska. *Climatic*
6 *Change*, **120**, 557-567, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0735-2;
- 7 Tribal Climate Change Project, 2008: Tribal Climate Change Profile: Biloxi-Chitimacha-Choctaw Indians: Rising
8 Tides. Technical Input Report to the National Climate Assessment 2013, 3 pp., Institute for Tribal
9 Environmental Professionals, Northern Arizona University, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. [Available
10 online at http://www4.nau.edu/tribalclimatechange/tribes/docs/tribes_RisingTides.pdf];
- 11 —, 2008: Tribal Climate Change Profile: Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point: Climate Change Impacts
12 and Strategies. Technical Input Report to the National Climate Assessment 2013. U.S. Department of
13 Agriculture,; U.S. Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station,; University of Oregon,. [Available online
14 at www.tribesandclimatechange.org/docs/tribes_378.pdf]
- 15 106. Bronen, R., 2011: Climate-induced community relocations: creating an adaptive governance framework based
16 in human rights doctrine. *NYU Review Law & Social Change*, **35**, 357-408. [Available online at
17 <http://socialchangenyu.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/climate-induced-migration-bronen-35-2.pdf>]
- 18 107. Maldonado, J. K., C. Shearer, R. Bronen, K. Peterson, and H. Lazrus, 2013: The impact of climate change on
19 tribal communities in the US: Displacement, relocation, and human rights. *Climatic Change*, **120**, 601-614,
20 doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0746-z
- 21 108. Titus, J. G., D. E. Hudgens, D. L. Trescott, M. Craghan, W. H. Nuckols, C. H. Hershner, J. M. Kassakian, C. J. Linn,
22 P. G. Merritt, T. M. McCue, J. F. O'Connell, J. Tanski, and J. Wang, 2009: State and local governments plan for
23 development of most land vulnerable to rising sea level along the US Atlantic coast. *Environmental Research*
24 *Letters*, **4**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/4/4/044008
- 25 109. Whyte, K. P., 2013: Justice forward: Tribes, climate adaptation and responsibility. *Climatic Change*, **120**, 517-
26 530, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0743-2
- 27 110. Coastal Louisiana Tribal Communities, 2012: Stories of Change: Coastal Louisiana Tribal Communities'
28 Experiences of a Transforming Environment (Grand Bayou, Grand Caillou/Dulac, Isle de Jean Charles, Pointe-
29 au-Chien). Workshop Report Input Into the National Climate Assessment. Pointe-aux-Chenes, Louisiana
- 30 111. Holzman, D. C., 2012: Accounting for nature's benefits: the dollar value of ecosystem services. *Environmental*
31 *Health Perspectives*, **120**, a152-a157, doi:10.1289/ehp.120-a152. [Available online at
32 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3339477/pdf/ehp.120-a152.pdf>];
- 33 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005: *Ecosystems and human well-being. Health Synthesis*. Island press
34 53 pp;
- 35 Costanza, R., O. Pérez-Maqueo, M. L. Martinez, P. Sutton, S. J. Anderson, and K. Mulder, 2008: The value of
36 coastal wetlands for hurricane protection. *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, **37**, 241-248,
37 doi:10.1579/0044-7447(2008)37[241:tvocwf]2.0.co;2. [Available online at
38 <http://www.bioone.org/doi/pdf/10.1579/0044-7447%282008%2937%5B241%3ATVOCWF%5D2.0.CO%3B2>]
- 39 112. Principe, P., P. Bradley, S. H. Yee, W. S. Fisher, E. D. Johnson, P. Allen, and D. E. Campbell, 2012: Quantifying
40 coral reef ecosystem services. EPA/600/R-11/206, 158 pp., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of
41 Research and Development, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
42 http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_report.cfm?dirEntryId=239984]
- 43 113. EPA, 2012: National Coastal Condition Report IV. EPA-842-R-10-003, 368 pp, U.S. Environmental Protection
44 Agency, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
45 <http://water.epa.gov/type/oceb/assessmonitor/nccr/upload/NCCR4-Report.pdf>]

- 1 114. Waddell, J., and A. D. Clarke, 2008: The state of coral reef ecosystems of the United States and Pacific Freely
2 Associated States: 2008. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 73. NOAA/NCCOS Center for Coastal
3 Monitoring and Assessment' s Biogeography Team, 569 pp., NOAA/NCCOS Center for Coastal Monitoring and
4 Assessment - Biogeography Team, Silver Spring, MD. [Available online at
5 <http://ccma.nos.noaa.gov/ecosystems/coralreef/coral2008/pdf/CoralReport2008.pdf>]
- 6 115. Burke, L., L. Reynter, M. Spalding, and A. Perry, 2011: *Reefs at Risk Revisited*. World Resources Institute, 130
7 pp.[Available online at http://pdf.wri.org/reefs_at_risk_revisited.pdf]
- 8 116. Crawford, T. W., D. J. Marcucci, and A. Bennett, 2013: Impacts of residential development on vegetation
9 cover for a remote coastal barrier in the Outer Banks of North Carolina, USA. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*,
10 **in press**, 1-13, doi:10.1007/s11852-013-0241-8;
- 11 Feagin, R. A., W. K. Smith, N. P. Psuty, D. R. Young, M. L. Martínez, G. A. Carter, K. L. Lucas, J. C. Gibeaut, J. N.
12 Gemma, and R. E. Koske, 2010: Barrier islands: coupling anthropogenic stability with ecological sustainability.
13 *Journal of Coastal Research*, **26**, 987-992, doi:10.2112/09-1185.1. [Available online at
14 <http://www.jcronline.org/doi/abs/10.2112/09-1185.1>]
- 15 117. Couvillion, B. R., J. A. Barras, G. D. Steyer, W. Sleavin, M. Fischer, H. Beck, N. Trahan, B. Griffin, and D.
16 Heckman, 2011: Land area change in coastal Louisiana from 1932 to 2010: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific
17 Investigations Map 3164. U.S. Geological Survey;
- 18 Yuill, B. L., D.; Reed, D.J., 2009: Understanding subsidence processes in coastal Louisiana. *Journal of Coastal*
19 *Research*, **54**, 23-36, doi:10.2112/SI54-012.1
- 20 118. Diaz, R. J., and R. Rosenberg, 2008: Spreading dead zones and consequences for marine ecosystems. *Science*,
21 **321**, 926-929, doi:10.1126/science.1156401 ;
- 22 CENR, 2010: Scientific assessment of hypoxia in U.S. coastal waters. Interagency Working Group on Harmful
23 Algal Blooms, Hypoxia, and Human Health of the Joint Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology, 154
24 pp., Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
25 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/hypoxia-report.pdf>]
- 26 119. State of Louisiana, 2012: Integrated Ecosystem Restoration and Hurricane Protection: Louisiana's
27 Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast, 190 pp., Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of
28 Louisiana, Baton Rouge, LA. [Available online at [http://www.coastalmasterplan.louisiana.gov/2012-master-](http://www.coastalmasterplan.louisiana.gov/2012-master-plan/final-master-plan/)
29 [plan/final-master-plan/](http://www.coastalmasterplan.louisiana.gov/2012-master-plan/final-master-plan/)]
- 30 120. Petes, L. E., A. J. Brown, and C. R. Knight, 2012: Impacts of upstream drought and water withdrawals on the
31 health and survival of downstream estuarine oyster populations. *Ecology and Evolution*, **2**, 1712-1724,
32 doi:10.1002/ece3.291. [Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ece3.291/pdf>]
- 33 121. Barton, A., B. Hales, G. G. Waldbusser, C. Langdon, and R. A. Feely, 2012: The Pacific oyster, *Crassostrea*
34 *gigas*, shows negative correlation to naturally elevated carbon dioxide levels: Implications for near-term
35 ocean acidification effects. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **57**, 698-710, doi:10.4319/lo.2012.57.3.0698
- 36 122. Dawson, T. P., S. T. Jackson, J. I. House, I. C. Prentice, and G. M. Mace, 2011: Beyond predictions: biodiversity
37 conservation in a changing climate. *Science*, **332**, 53-58, doi:10.1126/science.1200303
- 38 123. Feder, M. E., 2010: Physiology and global climate change. *Annual review of physiology*, **72**, 123-125,
39 doi:10.1146/annurev-physiol-091809-100229;
- 40 Foden, W., G. Mace, J.-C. Vié, A. Angulo, S. Butchart, L. DeVantier, H. Dublin, A. Gutsche, S. Stuart, and E.
41 Turak, 2008: Species susceptibility to climate change impacts. *The 2008 Review of The IUCN Red List of*
42 *Threatened Species*, J.-C. Vié, C. Hilton-Taylor, and S. N. Stuart, Eds., IUCN;
- 43 Hoegh-Guldberg, O., 1999: Climate change, coral bleaching and the future of the world's coral reefs. *Marine*
44 *and Freshwater Research*, **50**, 839-866, doi:10.1071/MF99078. [Available online at
45 <http://www.publish.csiro.au/paper/MF99078>];

- 1 Hofmann, G. E., and A. E. Todgham, 2010: Living in the now: physiological mechanisms to tolerate a rapidly
2 changing environment. *Annual review of physiology*, **72**, 127-145, doi:10.1146/annurev-physiol-021909-
3 135900;
- 4 Montoya, J. M., and D. Raffaelli, 2010: Climate change, biotic interactions and ecosystem services.
5 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **365**, 2013-2018,
6 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0114. [Available online at
7 <http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/365/1549/2013.full.pdf+html>]
- 8 124. Alongi, D. M., 2008: Mangrove forests: resilience, protection from tsunamis, and responses to global climate
9 change. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, **76**, 1-13, doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2007.08.024
- 10 125. Kirwan, M. L., G. R. Guntenspergen, A. D'Alpaos, J. T. Morris, S. M. Mudd, and S. Temmerman, 2010: Limits on
11 the adaptability of coastal marshes to rising sea level. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **37**, L23401,
12 doi:10.1029/2010gl045489. [Available online at <Go to ISI>://000285013600003]
- 13 126. Jones, S. J., N. Mieszkowska, and D. S. Wethey, 2009: Linking thermal tolerances and biogeography: *Mytilus*
14 *edulis* (L.) at its southern limit on the east coast of the United States. *The Biological Bulletin*, **217**, 73-85.
15 [Available online at <http://www.biobull.org/content/217/1/73.full.pdf+html>]
- 16 127. Gedan, K. B., B. R. Silliman, and M. D. Bertness, 2009: Centuries of human-driven change in salt marsh
17 ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, **1**, 117-141, doi:10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163930
- 18 128. Glick, P., B. A. Stein, and N. A. Edelson, 2011: *Scanning the conservation horizon: a guide to climate change*
19 *vulnerability assessment*. National Wildlife Federation 176 pp
- 20 129. Williams, S. L., and E. D. Grosholz, 2008: The invasive species challenge in estuarine and coastal
21 environments: Marrying management and science. *Estuaries and Coasts*, **31**, 3-20, doi:10.1007/s12237-007-
22 9031-6
- 23 130. Feagin, R. A., M. L. Martinez, G. Mendoza-Gonzalez, and R. Costanza, 2010: Salt marsh zonal migration and
24 ecosystem service change in response to global sea level rise: a case study from an urban region. *Ecology and*
25 *Society*, **15**, 14. [Available online at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/art14/>]
- 26 131. Phillips, J. D., and M. C. Slattery, 2006: Sediment storage, sea level, and sediment delivery to the ocean by
27 coastal plain rivers. *Progress in Physical Geography*, **30**, 513-530, doi:10.1191/0309133306pp494ra
- 28 132. Stralberg, D., M. Brennan, J. C. Callaway, J. K. Wood, L. M. Schile, D. Jongsomjit, M. Kelly, V. T. Parker, and S.
29 Crooks, 2011: Evaluating Tidal Marsh Sustainability in the Face of Sea-Level Rise: A Hybrid Modeling Approach
30 Applied to San Francisco Bay. *PLoS ONE*, **6**, e27388, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0027388. [Available online at
31 [http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0027388&r](http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0027388&representation=PDF)
32 [epresentation=PDF](http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0027388&representation=PDF)]
- 33 133. Hoegh-Guldberg, O., and J. F. Bruno, 2010: The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems.
34 *Science*, **328**, 1523-1528, doi:10.1126/science.1189930
- 35 134. Barnosky, A. D., E. A. Hadly, J. Bascompte, E. L. Berlow, J. H. Brown, M. Fortelius, W. M. Getz, J. Harte, A.
36 Hastings, P. A. Marquet, N. D. Martinez, A. Mooers, P. Roopnarine, G. Vermeij, J. W. Williams, R. Gillespie, J.
37 Kitzes, C. Marshall, N. Matske, D. P. Mindell, E. Revilla, and A. B. Smith, 2012: Approaching a state shift in
38 Earth's biosphere. *Nature*, **486**, 52-58, doi:10.1038/nature11018
- 39 135. Burkett, V. R., D. A. Wilcox, R. Stottlemeyer, W. Barrow, D. Fagre, J. Baron, J. Price, J. L. Nielsen, C. D. Allen, D.
40 L. Peterson, G. Ruggerone, and T. Doyle, 2005: Nonlinear dynamics in ecosystem response to climatic change:
41 case studies and policy implications. *Ecological Complexity*, **2**, 357-394, doi:DOI
42 10.1016/j.ecocom.2005.04.010. [Available online at
43 http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/cirmount/wkgrps/ecosys_resp/postings/pdf/Burkett2005EcoCom357.pdf];

- 1 CCSP, 2009: Thresholds of Climate Change in Ecosystems. A report by the U.S. Climate Change Science
2 Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research. U.S. Climate Change Science Program Synthesis
3 and Assessment Product 4.2. U.S. Geological Survey, 156;
- 4 Nicholls, R. J., P. P. Wong, V. R. Burkett, J. O. Codignotto, J. E. Hay, R. F. McLean, S. Ragoonaden, and C. D.
5 Woodroffe, 2007: Ch. 6: Coastal Systems and Low-lying Areas. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptations
6 and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental
7 Panel on Climate Change*, M. L. Parry, O. F. Canziani, J. P. Palutikof, P. J. Van der Linden, and C. E. Hanson,
8 Eds., Cambridge University Press, 316-356. [Available online at
9 <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1192&context=scipapers>]
- 10 136. Foti, R., M. del Jesus, A. Rinaldo, and I. Rodriguez-Iturbe, 2013: Signs of critical transition in the Everglades
11 wetlands in response to climate and anthropogenic changes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of
12 Sciences*, in press, doi:10.1073/pnas.1302558110
- 13 137. Folke, C., S. Carpenter, B. Walker, M. Scheffer, T. Elmqvist, L. Gunderson, and C. S. Holling, 2004: Regime
14 shifts, resilience, and biodiversity in ecosystem management. *Annual review of ecology, Evolution, and
15 Systematics*, **35**, 557-581, doi:10.2307/30034127. [Available online at
16 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/30034127>]
- 17 138. Moore, K. A., and J. C. Jarvis, 2008: Environmental factors affecting recent summertime eelgrass diebacks in
18 the lower Chesapeake Bay: Implications for long-term persistence. *Journal of Coastal Research*, **Special Issue
19 55**, 135-147, doi:10.2112/SI55-014. [Available online at
20 <http://www.chesapeake.org/OldStac/savrest/Moore%20and%20Jarvis%20JCR%202008.pdf>]
- 21 139. Jarvis, J. C., and K. A. Moore, 2010: The role of seedlings and seed bank viability in the recovery of
22 Chesapeake Bay, USA, *Zostera marina* populations following a large-scale decline. *Hydrobiologia*, **649**, 55-68,
23 doi:10.1007/s10750-010-0258-z
- 24 140. Barth, J. A., B. A. Menge, J. Lubchenco, F. Chan, J. M. Bane, A. R. Kirincich, M. A. McManus, K. J. Nielsen, S. D.
25 Pierce, and L. Washburn, 2007: Delayed upwelling alters nearshore coastal ocean ecosystems in the northern
26 California current. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **104**,
27 3719-3724, doi:10.1073/pnas.0700462104. [Available online at
28 <http://www.pnas.org/content/104/10/3719.full.pdf+html>]
- 29 141. Biggs, R., S. R. Carpenter, and W. A. Brock, 2009: Turning back from the brink: Detecting an impending regime
30 shift in time to avert it. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **106**,
31 826-831, doi:10.1073/pnas.0811729106;
- 32 Hsieh, C., C. S. Reiss, R. P. Hewitt, and G. Sugihara, 2008: Spatial analysis shows that fishing enhances the
33 climatic sensitivity of marine fishes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **65**, 947-961,
34 doi:10.1139/F08-017;
- 35 Kelly, R. P., M. M. Foley, W. S. Fisher, R. A. Feely, B. S. Halpern, G. G. Waldbusser, and M. R. Caldwell, 2011:
36 Mitigating local causes of ocean acidification with existing laws. *Science*, **332**, 1036-1037,
37 doi:10.1126/science.1203815;
- 38 Lubchenco, J., and L. E. Petes, 2010: The interconnected Biosphere: Science at the ocean's tipping Points.
39 *Oceanography*, **23**, 115-129, doi:10.5670/oceanog.2010.55;
- 40 Sumaila, U. R., W. W. L. Cheung, V. W. Y. Lam, D. Pauly, and S. Herrick, 2011: Climate change impacts on the
41 biophysics and economics of world fisheries. *Nature Climate Change*, **1**, 449-456. [Available online at
42 <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/nclimate1301>]
- 43 142. Blakely, E. J., and A. Carbonell, Eds., 2012: *Resilient Coastal City Regions: Planning for Climate Change in the
44 United States and Australia*. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy;
- 45 ICLEI, 2011: Financing the Resilient City: a demand driven approach to development, disaster risk reduction
46 and climate adaptation - An ICLEI White Paper, *ICLEI Global Report*, 47 pp., The Next Practice, Ltd., ICLEI -

- 1 Local Governments for Sustainability. [Available online at [http://resilient-](http://resilient-cities.iclei.org/fileadmin/sites/resilient-cities/files/Frontend_user/Report-Financing_Resilient_City-Final.pdf)
2 [cities.iclei.org/fileadmin/sites/resilient-cities/files/Frontend_user/Report-Financing_Resilient_City-Final.pdf](http://resilient-cities.iclei.org/fileadmin/sites/resilient-cities/files/Frontend_user/Report-Financing_Resilient_City-Final.pdf)];
- 3 Brugmann, J., 2012: Financing the resilient city. *Environment and Urbanization*, **24**, 215-232,
4 doi:10.1177/0956247812437130. [Available online at
5 <http://eau.sagepub.com/content/24/1/215.full.pdf+html>];
- 6 Carmin, J., N. Nadkarni, and C. Rhie, 2012: Progress and Challenges in Urban Climate Adaptation Planning:
7 Results of a Global Survey, 30 pp., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, ICLEI Local Governments for
8 Sustainability, Cambridge, MA. [Available online at
9 <http://web.mit.edu/jcarmin/www/urbanadapt/Urban%20Adaptation%20Report%20FINAL.pdf>];
- 10 Gregg, R. M., L. J. Hansen, K. M. Feifel, J. L. Hitt, J. M. Kershner, A. Score, and J. R. Hoffman, 2011: The State of
11 Marine and Coastal Adaptation in North America: A Synthesis of Emerging Ideas. A report for the Gordon and
12 Betty Moore Foundation: Bainbridge Island, WA, EcoAdapt., 145 pp. [Available online at
13 <http://ecoadapt.org/documents/marine-adaptation-report.pdf>]
- 14 143. Finzi Hart, J. A., P. M. Grifman, S. C. Moser, A. Abeles, M. R. Myers, S. C. Schlosser, and J. A. Ekstrom, 2012:
15 Rising to the challenge: results of the 2011 Coastal California Adaptation Needs Assessment. USCSG-TR-01-
16 2012, 76 pp., University of Southern California Sea Grant. [Available online at [http://ca-](http://ca-sgep.ucsd.edu/sites/ca-sgep.ucsd.edu/files/advisors/mrmyers/files/CCSurveyReportOnline.pdf)
17 [sgep.ucsd.edu/sites/ca-sgep.ucsd.edu/files/advisors/mrmyers/files/CCSurveyReportOnline.pdf](http://ca-sgep.ucsd.edu/sites/ca-sgep.ucsd.edu/files/advisors/mrmyers/files/CCSurveyReportOnline.pdf)]
- 18 144. Moser, S. C., and J. A. Ekstrom, 2012: Identifying and Overcoming Barriers to Climate Change Adaptation in
19 San Francisco Bay: Results from Case Studies. Publication number: CEC-500-2012-034 186 pp., California
20 Energy Commission, Sacramento, CA. [Available online at [http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-](http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-500-2012-034/CEC-500-2012-034.pdf)
21 [500-2012-034/CEC-500-2012-034.pdf](http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-500-2012-034/CEC-500-2012-034.pdf)]
- 22 145. Carrier, S. D., G. L. Bruland, L. J. Cox, and C. A. Lepczyk, 2012: The perceptions of coastal resource managers in
23 Hawai'i: The current situation and outlook for the future. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **69**, 291-298,
24 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2012.07.028>;
- 25 Moser, S. C., 2009: Good Morning America, 39 pp., California Energy Commission, NOAA-Coastal Services
26 Center, Sacramento, CA and Charleston, SC. [Available online at [http://www.csc.noaa.gov/publications/need-](http://www.csc.noaa.gov/publications/need-for-adaptation.pdf)
27 [for-adaptation.pdf](http://www.csc.noaa.gov/publications/need-for-adaptation.pdf)]
- 28 146. Poulter, B., R. L. Feldman, M. M. Brinson, B. P. Horton, M. K. Orbach, S. H. Pearsall, E. Reyes, S. R. Riggs, and J.
29 C. Whitehead, 2009: Sea-level rise research and dialogue in North Carolina: Creating windows for policy
30 change. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **52**, 147-153, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2008.09.010. [Available online
31 at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S096456910800118X>]
- 32 147. Grannis, J., 2011: Adaptation Tool Kit: Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Land Use. How Governments can Use Land-
33 Use Practices to Adapt to Sea-Level Rise, 100 pp., Georgetown Climate Center, Washington, D.C. [Available
34 online at http://www.georgetownclimate.org/sites/default/files/Adaptation_Tool_Kit_SLR.pdf];
- 35 Morris, R. K. A., 2012: Managed realignment: A sediment management perspective. *Ocean & Coastal*
36 *Management*, **65**, 59-66, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2012.04.019;
- 37 Titus, J. G., 2011: Rolling Easements. EPA 430R11001, 179 pp., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
38 [Available online at <http://water.epa.gov/type/oceb/cre/upload/rollingeasementsprimer.pdf>]
- 39 148. Dolan, G., and D. J. Wallace, 2012: Policy and management hazards along the Upper Texas coast. *Ocean &*
40 *Coastal Management*, **59**, 77-82, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2011.12.021;
- 41 Salvesen, D., 2005: The Coastal Barrier Resources Act: Has It Discouraged Coastal Development? *Coastal*
42 *Management*, **33**, 181-195, doi:10.1080/08920750590917585
- 43 149. Kates, R. W., W. R. Travis, and T. J. Wilbanks, 2012: Transformational adaptation when incremental
44 adaptations to climate change are insufficient. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **109**, 7156-
45 7161, doi:10.1073/pnas.1115521109. [Available online at www.pnas.org/content/109/19/7156.full.pdf+html]

- 1 150. Marino, E., 2012: The long history of environmental migration: Assessing vulnerability construction and
2 obstacles to successful relocation in Shishmaref, Alaska. *Global Environmental Change*, **22**, 374-381,
3 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.09.016
- 4 151. Dow, K., F. Berkhout, B. L. Preston, R. J. T. Klein, G. Midgley, and M. R. Shaw, 2013: Limits to adaptation.
5 *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 305-307
- 6 152. Goidel, K., C. Kenny, M. Climek, M. Means, L. Swann, T. Sempier, and M. Schneider, 2012: 2012 Gulf Coast
7 Climate Change Survey Executive Summary MASGP-12-017, 36 pp, National Oceanic and Atmospheric
8 Administration, Texas Sea Grant, Louisiana Sea Grant, Florida Sea Grant, Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant
9 Consortium. [Available online at
10 http://www.southernclimate.org/documents/resources/Climate_change_perception_survey_summary_NOA
11 [A_Sea_Grant_2012.pdf](http://www.southernclimate.org/documents/resources/Climate_change_perception_survey_summary_NOA_A_Sea_Grant_2012.pdf)]
- 12 153. Responsive Management, 2010: Responsive Management: Delaware Residents' Opinions on Climate Change
13 and Sea Level Rise, 351 pp., Responsive Management, Harrisonburg, VA. [Available online at
14 <http://www.dnrec.delaware.gov/coastal/Documents/SeaLevelRise/SLRSurveyReport.pdf>]
- 15 154. Krosnik, J., 2013: Stanford University Climate Adaptation National Poll, 20 pp., Stanford Woods Institute for
16 the Environment. [Available online at [http://woods.stanford.edu/research/public-opinion-research/2013-](http://woods.stanford.edu/research/public-opinion-research/2013-Stanford-Poll-Climate-Adaptation)
17 [Stanford-Poll-Climate-Adaptation](http://woods.stanford.edu/research/public-opinion-research/2013-Stanford-Poll-Climate-Adaptation)]
- 18 155. Abbott, T., 2013: Shifting shorelines and political winds – The complexities of implementing the simple idea of
19 shoreline setbacks for oceanfront developments in Maui, Hawaii. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **73**, 13-21,
20 doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2012.12.010. [Available online at
21 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0964569112003353>];
- 22 Kick, E. L., J. C. Fraser, G. M. Fulkerson, L. A. McKinney, and D. H. De Vries, 2011: Repetitive flood victims and
23 acceptance of FEMA mitigation offers: an analysis with community–system policy implications. *Disasters*, **35**,
24 510-539, doi:10.1111/j.1467-7717.2011.01226.x
- 25 156. Agyeman, J., P. Devine-Wright, and J. Prange, 2009: Close to the edge, down by the river? Joining up managed
26 retreat and place attachment in a climate changed world. *Environment and Planning A*, **41**, 509-513
- 27 157. Peach, S., 2012: Sea Level Rise, One More Frontier For Climate Dialogue Controversy. *Yale Forum on Climate*
28 *Change and the Media*.
- 29 158. Schrope, M., 2010: Unarrested development. *Nature Reports Climate Change*, **4**, 36-38,
30 doi:10.1038/climate.2010.27. [Available online at
31 <http://www.nature.com/climate/2010/1004/pdf/climate.2010.27.pdf>];
- 32 Kyler, D., 2010: Coastal Georgia Development Rates, Patterns, and Impacts, Presentation, 25 pp., Center for a
33 Sustainable Coast. [Available online at <http://www.sustainablecoast.org/coastalgrowth2010.pdf>]
- 34 159. Multihazard Mitigation Council, 2005: Natural hazard mitigation saves: An independent study to assess the
35 future savings from mitigation activities. Volume 2 - Study Documentation, 150 pp., National Institute of
36 Building Sciences, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
37 [http://www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/MMC/hms_vol2_ch1-](http://www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/MMC/hms_vol2_ch1-7.pdf?hhSearchTerms=Natural+and+hazard+and+mitigation)
38 [7.pdf?hhSearchTerms=Natural+and+hazard+and+mitigation](http://www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/MMC/hms_vol2_ch1-7.pdf?hhSearchTerms=Natural+and+hazard+and+mitigation)]
- 39 160. USACE, 2012: Mississippi Coastal Improvement Plan: Voluntary Buy-out Program. U.S. Army Corps of
40 Engineers, Mobile, AL. [Available online at
41 <http://www.sam.usace.army.mil/Missions/ProgramandProjectManagement/MsCIPProgram.aspx>]
- 42 161. Rosenzweig, C., W. D. Solecki, R. Blake, M. Bowman, C. Faris, V. Gornitz, R. Horton, K. Jacob, A. LeBlanc, R.
43 Leichenko, M. Linkin, D. Major, M. O'Grady, L. Patrick, E. Sussman, G. Yohe, and R. Zimmerman, 2011:
44 Developing coastal adaptation to climate change in the New York City infrastructure-shed: process, approach,
45 tools, and strategies. *Climatic Change*, **106**, 93-127. [Available online at
46 http://www.ccrun.org/sites/ccrun/files/attached_files/2011_Rosenzweig_etal.pdf]

- 1 162. Hudson, B., 2012: Coastal Land Loss and the Mitigation – Adaptation Dilemma: Between Scylla and Charybdis.
2 *Louisiana Law Review*, **73**. [Available online at <http://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/lalrev/vol73/iss1/3>]
- 3 163. IPCC, 2012: *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. A*
4 *Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. C. B. Field, V.
5 Barros, T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, D. J. Dokken, K. L. Ebi, M. D. Mastrandrea, K. J. Mach, G.-K. Plattner, S.K. Allen, M.
6 Tignor, and P. M. Midgley, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 582 pp.[Available online at [http://ipcc-](http://ipcc-wg2.gov/SREX/images/uploads/SREX-All_FINAL.pdf)
7 [wg2.gov/SREX/images/uploads/SREX-All_FINAL.pdf](http://ipcc-wg2.gov/SREX/images/uploads/SREX-All_FINAL.pdf)]
- 8 164. FEMA, 2013: Personal communication;
- 9 King, R. O., 2005: Federal Flood Insurance: The Repetitive Loss Problem, 45 pp., Library of Congress
10 Congressional Research Service, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
11 http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metacrs7693/m1/1/high_res_d/RL32972_2005Jun30.pdf]
- 12 165. GAO, 2004: National Flood Insurance Program: Actions to Address Repetitive Loss Properties. GAO-04-401T,
13 22 pp, U.S. Government Accountability Office, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
14 <http://www.gao.gov/assets/120/110626.pdf>]
- 15 166. Cropper, M. L., and P. R. Portney, 1990: Discounting and the evaluation of life-saving programs. *Journal of*
16 *Risk and Uncertainty*, **3**, 369-379, doi:10.1007/BF00353347
- 17 167. Franck, T., 2009: Coastal adaptation and economic tipping points. *Management of Environmental Quality: An*
18 *International Journal*, **20**, 434-450, doi:10.1108/14777830910963762;
- 19 H. John Heinz III Center for Science Energy and the Environment, 2000: *The Hidden Costs of Coastal Hazards:*
20 *Implications for Risk Assessment and Mitigation*. A multisector collaborative project of the H. John Heinz
21 Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment. Island Press, 252 pp
- 22 168. Hallegatte, S., 2012: A framework to investigate the economic growth impact of sea level rise. *Environmental*
23 *Research Letters*, **7**, 015604
- 24 169. Abel, J. R., J. Bram, R. Deitz, and J. Orr: What Are the Costs of Superstorm Sandy? Federal Reserve Bank of
25 New York. [Available online at [http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2012/12/what-are-the-costs-of-](http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2012/12/what-are-the-costs-of-superstorm-sandy.html)
26 [superstorm-sandy.html](http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2012/12/what-are-the-costs-of-superstorm-sandy.html)];
- 27 AON Benfield, 2012: Annual Global Climate and Catastrophe Report. Impact Forecasting - 2012., 95 pp., AON
28 Benfield: Impact Forecasting. [Available online at
29 [http://thoughtleadership.aonbenfield.com/Documents/20130124_if_annual_global_climate_catastrophe_re](http://thoughtleadership.aonbenfield.com/Documents/20130124_if_annual_global_climate_catastrophe_report.pdf)
30 [port.pdf](http://thoughtleadership.aonbenfield.com/Documents/20130124_if_annual_global_climate_catastrophe_report.pdf)]
- 31 170. Greening, H., P. Doering, and C. Corbett, 2006: Hurricane impacts on coastal ecosystems. *Estuaries and*
32 *Coasts*, **29**, 877-879, doi:10.1007/BF02798646;
- 33 Miao, S. L., C. B. Zou, and D. D. Breshears, 2009: Vegetation responses to extreme hydrological events:
34 sequence matters. *The American Naturalist*, **173**, 113-118, doi:10.1086/593307;
- 35 Paerl, H. W., J. D. Bales, L. W. Ausley, C. P. Buzzelli, L. B. Crowder, L. A. Eby, J. M. Fear, M. Go, B. L. Peierls, T. L.
36 Richardson, and J. S. Rasmus, 2001: Ecosystem impacts of three sequential hurricanes (Dennis, Floyd, and
37 Irene) on the United States' largest lagoonal estuary, Pamlico Sound, NC. *Proceedings of the National*
38 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **98**, 5655-5660. [Available online at
39 <http://www.pnas.org/content/98/10/5655.full.pdf+html>];
- 40 Peterson, T. C., A. D.M., S. J. Cohen, M. Cortez-Vázquez, R. J. Murnane, C. Parmesan, D. Phillips, R. S. Pulwarty,
41 and J. M. R. Stone, 2008: Ch. 1: Why Weather and Climate Extremes Matter. *CCSP: Weather and Climate*
42 *Extremes in a Changing Climate. Regions of Focus: North America, Hawaii, Caribbean, and U.S. Pacific Islands.*
43 *A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research*, T. R.
44 Karl, G. A. Meehl, C. D. Miller, S. J. Hassol, A. M. Waple, and W. L. Murray, Eds., Department of Commerce,

- 1 NOAA's National Climatic Data Center, 164. [Available online at
2 <http://library.globalchange.gov/downloads/download.php?id=22>]
- 3 171. Barthel, F., and E. Neumayer, 2010: A trend analysis of normalized insured damage from natural disasters.
4 *Climatic Change*, **113**, 215-237, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0331-2
- 5 172. GAO, 2010: National Flood Insurance Program: Continued Actions Needed to Address Financial and
6 Operational Issues. U.S. Government Accountability Office, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
7 <http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/124468.pdf>]
- 8 173. Ntelekos, A. A., M. Oppenheimer, J. A. Smith, and A. J. Miller, 2010: Urbanization, climate change and flood
9 policy in the United States. *Climatic Change*, **103**, 597-616, doi:10.1007/s10584-009-9789-6
- 10 174. FEMA, cited 2013: Total Coverage by Calendar Year. U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency. [Available
11 online at <http://www.fema.gov/policy-claim-statistics-flood-insurance/policy-claim-statistics-flood->
12 [insurance/policy-claim-13-12](http://www.fema.gov/policy-claim-statistics-flood-insurance/policy-claim-13-12)]
- 13 175. GAO, 2013: High-Risk Series: An Update. GAO-13-283. U.S. Government Accountability Office, Washington
14 D.C. [Available online at <http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/652133.pdf>]
- 15 176. Mills, E., R. J. Roth, Jr., and E. Lecomte, 2005: Availability and Affordability of Insurance Under Climate
16 Change: A Growing Challenge for the U.S., 43 pp., Ceres, Boston, MA. [Available online at
17 http://energy.lbl.gov/ea/mills/EMills/PUBS/PDF/ceres-insur_report.pdf];
- 18 Thomas, A., and R. Leichenko, 2011: Adaptation through insurance: lessons from the NFIP. *International*
19 *Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, **3**, 250-263, doi:10.1108/17568691111153401
- 20 177. H. John Heinz III Center for Science Energy and the Environment, 2000: Evaluation of erosion hazards. H. John
21 Heinz III Center, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC, USA;
- 22 Czajkowski, J., H. Kunreuther, and E. Michel-Kerjan, 2011: A Methodological Approach for Pricing Flood
23 Insurance and Evaluating Loss Reduction Measures: Application to Texas, Wharton Risk Management Center
24 and CoreLogic, Philadelphia, PA and Santa Ana, CA, 87 pp;
- 25 Kunreuther, H. C., and E. O. Michel-Kerjan, 2009: *At war with the weather: Managing large-scale risks in a*
26 *new era of catastrophes*. The MIT Press, 416 pp;
- 27 Michel-Kerjan, E., and H. Kunreuther, 2011: Redesigning flood insurance. *Science*, **333**, 408-409,
28 doi:10.1126/science.1202616. [Available online at [http://erwannmichelkerjan.com/wp-](http://erwannmichelkerjan.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/RedesigningFloodIns_ScienceMag_20110722-1.pdf)
29 [content/uploads/2011/07/RedesigningFloodIns_ScienceMag_20110722-1.pdf](http://erwannmichelkerjan.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/RedesigningFloodIns_ScienceMag_20110722-1.pdf)];
- 30 Michel-Kerjan, E. O., 2010: Catastrophe Economics: The National Flood Insurance Program. *The Journal of*
31 *Economic Perspectives*, **24**, 165-186, doi:10.1257/jep.24.4.165. [Available online at
32 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/20799178.pdf>];
- 33 King, R. O., 2011: National Flood Insurance Program: Background, Challenges, and Financial Status. R40650,
34 33 pp., Congressional Research Service, Washington, D.C. [Available online at
35 <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40650.pdf>]
- 36 178. Colls, A., N. Ash, and N. Ikkala, 2009: *Ecosystem-based Adaptation: A Natural Response to Climate Change*.
37 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, 16 pp.[Available online at
38 <http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/2009-049.pdf>];
- 39 Danielsen, F., M. K. Sørensen, M. F. Olwig, V. Selvam, F. Parish, N. D. Burgess, T. Hiraishi, V. M. Karunakaran,
40 M. S. Rasmussen, L. B. Hansen, A. Quarto, and N. Suryadiputra, 2005: The Asian tsunami: a protective role for
41 coastal vegetation. *Science*, **310**, 643, doi:10.1126/science.1118387;
- 42 Swann, L. D., 2008: The use of living shorelines to mitigate the effects of storm events on Dauphin Island,
43 Alabama, USA, 12 pp., Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquaculture, Auburn University, Ocean Springs,
44 MS;

- 1 The World Bank, 2009: *Convenient Solutions for an Inconvenient Truth: Ecosystem-based Approaches to*
2 *Climate Change*. The World Bank, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 91 pp;
- 3 Tobey, J., P. Rubinoff, D. Robadue Jr, G. Ricci, R. Volk, J. Furlow, and G. Anderson, 2010: Practicing coastal
4 adaptation to climate change: Lessons from integrated coastal management. *Coastal Management*, **38**, 317-
5 335, doi:10.1080/08920753.2010.483169;
- 6 UNEP-WCMC, 2006: *In the front line: Shoreline protection and other ecosystem services from mangroves and*
7 *coral reefs*. UNEP-WCMC, 33 pp.[Available online at http://www.unep.org/pdf/infrontline_06.pdf];
- 8 Villanoy, C., L. David, O. Cabrera, M. Atrigenio, F. Siringan, P. Aliño, and M. Villaluz, 2012: Coral reef
9 ecosystems protect shore from high-energy waves under climate change scenarios. *Climatic Change*, **112**, 1-
10 13, doi:DOI 10.1007/s10584-012-0399-3
- 11 179. Daily, G. C., S. Polasky, J. Goldstein, P. M. Kareiva, H. A. Mooney, L. Pejchar, T. H. Ricketts, J. Salzman, and R.
12 Shallenberger, 2009: Ecosystem services in decision making: time to deliver. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
13 *Environment*, **7**, 21-28, doi:10.1890/080025;
- 14 Koch, E. W., E. B. Barbier, B. R. Silliman, D. J. Reed, G. M. E. Perillo, S. D. Hacker, E. F. Granek, J. H. Primavera,
15 N. Muthiga, S. Polasky, B. S. Halpern, C. J. Kennedy, C. V. Kappel, and E. Wolanski, 2009: Non-linearity in
16 ecosystem services: temporal and spatial variability in coastal protection. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
17 *Environment*, **7**, 29-37, doi:10.1890/080126. [Available online at
18 <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/080126>]
- 19 180. Amundsen, H., F. Berglund, and H. Westskog, 2010: Overcoming barriers to climate change adaptation - a
20 question of multilevel governance? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, **28**, 276-289;
- 21 Burch, S., 2010: Transforming barriers into enablers of action on climate change: insights from three
22 municipal case studies in British Columbia, Canada. *Global Environmental Change*, **20**, 287-297,
23 doi:10.106/j.gloenvcha.2009.11.009;
- 24 Measham, T. G., B. L. Preston, T. F. Smith, C. Brooke, R. Gorddard, G. Withycombe, and C. Morrison, 2011:
25 Adapting to climate change through local municipal planning: barriers and challenges. *Mitigation and*
26 *Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **16**, 889-909, doi:10.1007/s11027-011-9301-2. [Available online at
27 <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11027-011-9301-2>]
- 28 181. McNeeley, S. M., 2012: Examining barriers and opportunities for sustainable adaptation to climate change in
29 Interior Alaska. *Climate Change*, **111**, 835-857, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0158-x. [Available online at
30 <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10584-011-0158-x>];
- 31 Moser, S. C., and J. A. Ekstrom, 2010: Developing adaptation strategies for San Luis Obispo County:
32 preliminary climate change vulnerability assessment for social systems. Technical Report, 73 pp., Susanne
33 Moser Research & Consulting, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Santa Cruz, CA. [Available online at
34 http://www.lgc.org/adaptation/slo/docs/SLO_TechnicalReport_5-7-10_final.pdf];
- 35 Hanemann, M., D. Lambe, and D. Farber, 2012: Climate Vulnerability and Adaptation Study for California:
36 Legal Analysis of Barriers to Adaptation for California's Water Sector. Research paper CEC 500-2012-019.
37 California Energy Commission PIER Program, Sacramento, CEC. [Available online at
38 <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-500-2012-019/CEC-500-2012-019.pdf>];
- 39 Rudd, M. A., and R. N. Lawton, 2013: Scientists' prioritization of global coastal research questions. *Marine*
40 *Policy*, **39**, 101-111, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2012.09.004
- 41 182. Georgetown Climate Center, cited 2012: Helping Communities Adapt to Climate Change. [Available online at
42 <http://www.georgetownclimate.org/adaptation>]
- 43 183. NPCC, 2010: *Climate Change Adaptation in New York City: Building a Risk Management Response: New York*
44 *City Panel on Climate Change 2009 Report*. Vol. 1196, C. Rosenzweig, and W. Solecki, Eds. Blackwell
45 Publishing Inc, 328 pp;

- 1 —, 2009: Climate Risk Information, 74 pp., New York City Panel on Climate Change, New York, New York.
2 [Available online at http://www.nyc.gov/html/om/pdf/2009/NPCC_CRI.pdf]
- 3 184. EPA, 2009: Land-Use Scenarios: National-Scale Housing-Density Scenarios Consistent with Climate Change
4 Storylines (Final Report). EPA/600/R-08/076F, 137 pp., Global Change Research Program, National Center for
5 Environmental Assessment, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Washington D.C. [Available online at
6 <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=203458>]
- 7 185. Becker, A., S. Inoue, M. Fischer, and B. Schwegler, 2012: Climate change impacts on international seaports:
8 knowledge, perceptions, and planning efforts among port administrators. *Climatic Change*, **110**, 5-29,
9 doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0043-7
- 10 186. 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>]
- 13 187. Standen, A., 2012: Threatened by Rising Seas, Alaskans Ponder Where to Move. *Climate Watch*, KQED: Public
14 Media for Northern California.
15