



Climate Change Hazards Summary Report for Facility Investment Planning

Minute Man National Historical Park December 2020

Prepared By
NPS Climate Change Response Program
NPS Sustainable Operations and Maintenance Branch

Introduction

Parks are required to complete a PARK Project Narrative Template for each proposed Great American Outdoors Act Facility Investment Plan (GFIP) project for Legacy Restoration Funding in fiscal years 2023-2025. Information provided in this report is intended to help parks consider climate change related hazards when addressing Question 16 of the narrative template.

Specifically: What risks or hazards (current and projected, e.g. effects of climate change) are likely to affect this project? If applicable, what adaptation strategies and/or resiliency measures have been identified for scenarios that pose high risks to project assets?

How to Use this Information for your GFIP Projects

Parks can use information in this report to answer Question 16 as well as to inform other related GFIP questions. The steps to incorporate this information are as follows:

1. Review Section 1.0, Table 1: *Climate-related Hazards Checklist* to identify potential hazards for your project. The checklist is a “coarse filter” screening tool to help identify potential climate-related hazards that need to be addressed at an early stage in facility and asset planning. NPS Climate Change Response Program (CCRP) staff made an initial attempt to identify potential hazards for the park broadly (see ‘Best Professional Judgement’ column); however, park staff and project planners have more information about hazards that are likely to be applicable to a specific project. Additional detail describing ‘known’ or ‘potential’ hazards for the park is provided in Appendix 1.
2. Review Section 2.0, which defines adaptation and resiliency strategies and provides an example answer to Question 16 of the GFIP Project Narrative Template.
3. Develop an answer to Question 16 for your specific project and location, as well as strategies to address each hazard. Language can be adapted from Section 2.0 and Appendix 1 to assist with formulating your answer.
4. If additional assistance is desired, see Section 3.0 for contact information.
5. Appendix 2 provides a map to visualize how climate is changing for the park. The map portrays the present-day location that has a climate similar to that expected by the 2080s for (or near) **Minute Man National Historical Park**.

Section 1.0 Using the Climate-Related Hazard Checklist

This report provides an initial evaluation of climate hazards for **Minute Man National Historical Park** according to the hazard ratings identified below. The information used to identify hazards in the checklist is mostly from regional assessments. Park and project specific information was generally not available when assessing these hazards. Park and planning staff **must use their knowledge of specific projects, locations, and local conditions** to determine the actual risk posed by a particular hazard, and whether/when to consult subject matter experts to conduct a more detailed assessment.

Explanation of Hazard Ratings

Known hazard: Conditions that cause the hazard are well documented in the area where the park occurs. If applicable to the project site, these hazards should always be addressed in the project plan.

Potential hazard: Conditions that cause or underlie the hazard are known to occur nearby or are likely to occur based on studies with conditions similar to the park. If applicable to the project site, these hazards should be considered for inclusion in the project plan.


Not applicable: No evidence *was identified* showing this hazard is relevant to the park. Note this is a coarse filter evaluation; local knowledge of a hazard(s) should be used, when available.

Table 1. Climate-related Hazards Checklist

Potential Climate Hazard*	Best Professional Judgment	Examples of risk or secondary hazard	Sources of General Non-site specific Data	Sources for Site Specific Data
1. Hotter average days and more very hot days	Known Hazard ☒ Potential Hazard ☐ Not applicable ☐	• Inadequate HVAC • Road surface degradation • Lack of water due to increased water for irrigation • Increased humidity • Danger to staff	• National Climate Assessment • State climate summary	• National Climatic Data Center • DAYMet gridded climate data • National park historical and projected climate change
2. Melting permafrost/ declining sea and lake ice	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☐ Not applicable ☒	• Road and building foundations unstable • Landslides and unstable hillsides • Shoreline erosion	 • Global Permafrost Zonation Index Map	• Alaska CASC

Potential Climate Hazard*	Best Professional Judgment	Examples of risk or secondary hazard	Sources of General Non-site specific Data	Sources for Site Specific Data
3. Increased drought frequency, intensity, magnitude, and duration	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☒ Not applicable ☐	- Limited water supply for cooling, landscaping, other equipment - Increased competition for available water and water rights conflicts - Crack/heave damage in drier soils - Increased vulnerability to wildfire (below)	Drought Monitor National Integrated Drought Information Center National Climate Assessment State Climate Summaries	Drought Monitor National Integrated Drought Information Center
4. Increased wildfire frequency, intensity, magnitude, and duration	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☐ Not applicable ☒	- Damage to facilities and contents - Smoke damage - Air quality dangerous to staff and visitors - Increased runoff - Increased erosion - Damage to water treatment plants	Barbero et al. 2015 International Journal of Wildland Fire	NIFC International Wildland-Urban Interface Code
5. Altered precipitation patterns and changing humidity	Known Hazard ☒ Potential Hazard ☐ Not applicable ☐	- Local flooding - Mold growth - Wood decay - Drought - Fire - Groundwater change	National Climate Assessment State climate summary	National Climatic Data Center DAYMet gridded climate data National Park historical and projected climate change

Potential Climate Hazard*	Best Professional Judgment	Examples of risk or secondary hazard	Sources of General Non-site specific Data	Sources for Site Specific Data
6. Increased extreme precipitation	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☒ Not applicable ☐	• Surface erosion • Floods (see below) • Water damage to structures from driven rain • Unstable saturated soils	• National Climate Assessment • State climate summary	• Evaluations are mostly at regional scales
7. Riverine flood/Flash Flood	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☒ Not applicable ☐	• Damage or destruction of infrastructure • Stream channel migration • Stream bank erosion/extreme erosion • Safety • Water quality diminished • Damage to water source and delivery infrastructure • Changing requirements for culvert flow capacity	 • FEMA Flood map service	• FEMA Map Service Center • Floodplain maps for HUD projects • Van Dusen et al. 2020 (for select parks) • May require a special flood study
8. Sea/lake level change and coastal storm surge	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☐ Not applicable ☒	• Rising sea and lake levels • Rising water – wind driven (e.g. hurricane, nor'easter) • Saltwater intrusion • Vegetation damage	• NOAA SLR viewer • NOAA - Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory	• IRMA – Coastal reports • GRD SLR viewer • Specific Hazard Assessment: Coastal Storm Surge with Climate Change Effects • SLR reports • Great Lakes Dashboard Project

Potential Climate Hazard*	Best Professional Judgment	Examples of risk or secondary hazard	Sources of General Non-site specific Data	Sources for Site Specific Data
9. Hurricanes and tornados	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☒ Not applicable ☐	• Building destruction • Flying debris • Storm Surge • Tree fall (see other categories for associated intense rainfall and floods)		• Wind Speed data – from local codes • International Building Code • FEMA Map Service Center • NPS Technical Support
10. Pest infestation	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☒ Not applicable ☐	• Historic/ Facility Fabric Loss • Vegetation loss • Disease vectors may increase • Termites and other woodboring pests expanding range with warming and increased humidity	• USFS Forest Health Program	• Integrated Pest Management • Fisichelli et al. forest pests • USFS maps
11. Invasive species	Known Hazard ☐ Potential Hazard ☒ Not applicable ☐	• Aquatic mussels – water intakes clogged • Vegetation (kudzu, vines) – damage buildings, kill trees, obstruct waterways	• National Invasive Species Council	• Early Detection and Distribution Mapping System (current distribution) • Early Detection and Distribution Mapping System (projected distribution)

Section 2.0 Adaptation and Resiliency Strategies

Question 16 requires a screening for climate hazards followed by a review of adaptation and resiliency strategies that would be put in place to respond to these hazards. For the purposes of this report and investment planning, resilience is a property of a system or asset and generally refers to the ability of the system or asset to maintain its intended purpose following a temporary disturbance.

Adaptation strategies, in the context of built infrastructure, refers to the intentional management decision to identify, prepare for, and respond to observed or expected sustained changes in hazards, including climate change, e.g., to adjust to a sustained change in conditions.

Section 2.1 Example Answer to the PARK Project Narrative Template Question

A hypothetical response to Question 16 is provided below for a project at **Minute Man National Historical Park** that includes building assets.

Question 16: What risks or hazards (current and projected, e.g. effects of climate change) are likely to affect this project? If applicable, what adaptation strategies and/or resiliency measures have been identified for scenarios that pose high risks to project assets?

Several climate change hazards have been identified that may affect this project, including hotter average days, more extreme heat days, increased hurricane impacts from wind and flooding, altered precipitation patterns, and increased extreme precipitation. Adaptation and resiliency strategies for the expected hazards are described below:

- Hotter average days and more extreme heat days will increase demand and requirements for appropriately sized air conditioning systems.
- Extreme heat and humidity can stress the building envelope and will require significant humidity control alterations for structures.
- Hurricane force wind and wind-blown rain as well as damage from wind-blown debris or treefall will require wind resistant fortification of the structure. Addressing hazardous trees and retrofitting roof structures to be more wind resistant may also be required.
- Flooding from increased hurricane events, increased extreme precipitation, or in conjunction with altered precipitation patterns may require modifications to building infrastructure location and landscape drainage systems.
- Post-flooding effects may include increased rot, mold and mildew, and physical deterioration of wood, brick and stone building materials. Adaptation actions will include identifying appropriate dehumidification and air handling systems and coordinating with the NPS Historic Architecture, Conservation and Engineering Center or Historic Preservation Training Center regarding alternatives and maintenance for historic structures.

Section 3.0 Additional Assistance

The hypothetical response to Question 16 in Section 2.1 is provided as an example; the park response should be as project-specific as possible. The NPS Climate Change Response Program (CCRP) and Sustainable Operations and Maintenance Branch (SOMB) are available for assistance in evaluation of climate change hazards and resiliency strategies as they relate to specific infrastructure projects.

Questions can be sent to the NPS [GFIP Hazards and Risk Assistance](#) email account and a member of that team will reply with support.

Additional resources can be found at the [NPS Facility Planning Branch Strategic Facility Investment Planning SharePoint site](#). This folder includes an Excel workbook labeled [T75 Parks GFIP NRSS Supporting Materials](#) that provides links to information for natural resources to be considered during project design and construction.

Appendix 1. Summary Information for Known or Potential Hazards Identified for Minute Man National Historical Park

Most park specific details related to hazards were directly extracted from Gonzalez (2018); hyperlink [here](#). Numbering relates to Potential Climate Hazard* presented in Table 1.

1. Hotter average days and more very hot days

Climate change is already driving observable increases in average and extreme temperatures, and this trend is projected to continue, with record setting years becoming more common in the future (USGCRP 2017). The annual average temperature in the United States is expected to increase by 2.3 to 11°F by the end of the century depending on greenhouse gas emissions, relative to 1986-2015 (USGCRP 2018). Extreme temperatures can increase weathering of structures, threaten park staff and visitor safety, and increase stresses for HVAC systems. Demand for complex air conditioning systems can add stress to building envelopes and often requires significant alterations to a structure.

For eastern Massachusetts, models project an increase of 20 to 30 more days per year with a maximum temperature >90°F, an increase of 4-6°F in the hottest temperature of the year, and a decrease of 20 to 40 fewer days per year below freezing (32°F), from 1990 to 2050 under the highest greenhouse gas emissions scenario (Vose et al. 2017).

3. Increased drought frequency, intensity, magnitude, and duration

Rising air temperatures and changing precipitation patterns are exacerbating drought risk in many parts of the United States (Wehner et al. 2017). Changing drought conditions (frequency, severity, duration) can challenge a variety of infrastructure and operations (Department of Homeland Security, 2015) in the NPS (e.g., water supply and wastewater systems), impair water quality (Mosley 2015), affect soil heaves and shrinkages (Fernandes et al. 2015), and will enhance other related risks such as wildfire (Halofsky et al. 2020).

The Northeast U.S. is a wet region that historically experiences damaging droughts, despite simultaneous increasing precipitation (Dupigny-Giroux et al. 2018). Climate models suggest that, despite projected increasing precipitation, increased temperatures and precipitation variability will likely lead to more frequent short, but intense drought conditions (Krakauer et al. 2019, Pendergrass et al. 2020). These "flash droughts" are characterized by short, intense sudden onset droughts and rapid intensification of conditions with severe impacts (Pendergrass et al. 2020). In 2016, the Northeast

experienced an abnormally warm, dry summer, preceded by low winter snowfall causing a flash drought that challenged water resource managers throughout the region (Sweet et al. 2017).

5. Altered precipitation patterns and changing humidity

Changing precipitation patterns have been observed in many regions of the United States as result of climate change and changes are expected to continue. Depending on the region in the United States, increases or decreases in precipitation have been experienced (USGCRP 2018). Changing precipitation and humidity conditions can result in local flooding, encourage mold growth, wood decay, increase fire risk, and intensify drought conditions, depending on the pattern of change.

Total annual precipitation in Minute Man National Historical Park increases $16 \pm 7\%$ per century by 2100 under the highest greenhouse gas emissions scenario, but $7 \pm 6\%$ under a scenario of emissions reductions (IPCC 2013, Gonzalez et al. 2018). From 1895 to 2010, precipitation shifted from a relatively even distribution to an annual cycle with pronounced peaks in March and November, a trend projected to continue.

In eastern Massachusetts, the fraction of precipitation falling as snow in February could decrease from $\sim 70\%$ (1981–2000) to $\sim 10\text{--}30\%$ (2081–2100), depending on emissions scenario (Ning and Bradley 2015). In eastern Massachusetts, the number of days with snowfall >1 cm could decrease by two-thirds from 2000 to 2100 under a high emissions scenario (Notaro et al. 2014).

6. Increased extreme precipitation

Increased frequency and intensity of extreme precipitation events has been attributed to climate change within some regions of the United States and such increases are projected to continue over the next century (USGCRP 2018). Furthermore, the intensity of extreme precipitation events increase with increasing temperatures (Easterling et al. 2017). Extreme precipitation events present a variety of threats to infrastructure and operations including flooding of sites, sewage backup, accelerated decay of masonry, overcoming drainage systems, road wash out, cracks in building infrastructure, destabilization of buildings and pipes, erosion of supporting ground around structures, among many other effects.

For the northeastern U.S. as a whole, five year storms (a two-day period with more precipitation than any other two-day period in five years) are projected to increase to once every two years or every year (Easterling et al. 2017). In addition, precipitation in 20-year storms (a storm with more precipitation than any other storm in 20 years) is projected to increase 22% under a high greenhouse gas emissions scenario (Easterling et al. 2017).

7. Riverine flood/Flash Flood

Extreme precipitation events and the risk of flooding are expected to regionally intensify with a changing climate (Tabari 2020). Floods threaten infrastructure and operations through a variety of mechanisms, including inundation of structures, enhanced erosional forces, road wash out, structural collapse from

force of floodwaters, sewage backup, and damage to utilities, generators, and electrical systems. Post-flooding effects include increased rot, fungal/insect attack, mold and mildew, and physical deterioration of wood, brick and stone building materials.

In eastern Massachusetts, river runoff could increase 5 to 15% in autumn and winter by 2050 (Naz et al. 2016), with the increase in winter due to earlier snow melt under climate change (Demaria et al. 2016, Dudley et al. 2017). In New England, flood frequency showed a statistically significant increase from 1940 to 2013 (Archfield et al. 2016), although climate is just one factor leading to flooding (Peterson et al. 2013), with urbanization and other land cover changes exerting a strong influence (Yang et al. 2015).

9. Hurricanes and tornados

Hurricanes are projected to increase in intensity and precipitation rate in a warmer world (USGCRP 2017). Hurricanes threaten structures via damage from wind, wind-blown rain and debris; their large temperature swings stress buildings through sudden thermal expansion and can crack pipes; they also can cause flooding and road wash outs.

North Atlantic hurricane intensity and rainfall rates are projected to increase under continued climate change, although projections of the total number of North Atlantic hurricanes under climate change vary (IPCC 2013, USGCRP 2017). Under a low greenhouse gas emissions scenario, the maximum intensity during the course of individual North Atlantic hurricanes could increase 4% and rainfall rates could increase 15% to 20% by 2100 (Knutson et al. 2015).

With continued climate change, the potential for severe thunderstorms that provide conditions for tornadoes may increase substantially (Abell et al. 2007, Diffenbaugh et al. 2013, Gensini and Mote 2015). Tornadoes can result in catastrophic damage to infrastructure from high winds, and associated debris, hail, and flash flooding.

The number of days in spring in the eastern U.S. with severe thunderstorms that could produce tornadoes could increase 40% from 2000 to 2100 under the highest greenhouse gas emissions scenario (Diffenbaugh et al. 2013).

10. Pest infestation

Increased temperatures will result in redistribution of pests and intensification of pest outbreaks (Logan et al. 2003). Because temperature and other environmental conditions influence forest insect populations and outbreaks, climate change has and will continue to impact pest infestations (Pureswaran et al. 2018). This directly threatens the integrity of infrastructure (e.g., termite effects on wood structures) and indirectly affects structures through other mechanisms such as increased tree mortality leading to increased hazard trees or treefall.

U.S. Department of Agriculture monitoring has found over 50 forest pests and pathogens in the general region of the park (Fisichelli et al. 2014). The emerald ash borer, an exotic and invasive insect that has killed ash trees (*Fraxinus spp.*) across the eastern US, has been found as close to the park as Waltham, Massachusetts, but not yet in the park <<https://www.mass.gov/guides/emerald-ash-borer-in-massachusetts>>. Moving infected firewood and other material remains the main cause of the spread of the insect. The Concord area is in the currently suitable climate of emerald ash borer and could remain in its potential range under a range of climate change emissions scenarios (Liang and Fei 2014). Because warm and moist conditions favor many termite species, eastern Massachusetts is vulnerable to northward expansion of populations of up to four more termite species under a low greenhouse gas emission scenario by 2050 (Buczowski and Bertelsmeier 2017).


11. Invasive species

Many invasive species spread into new areas or become more abundant where they are currently established as a result of changing climate conditions (Essl et al. 2019). Invasive species can have direct and indirect effects on infrastructure and may require parks to develop updated integrated pest management plans to account for newly arriving species. The use of pesticides to combat expanding invasive species may also threaten structures.

Warmer summers and wetter spring seasons projected under a low greenhouse gas emissions scenario would continue to provide suitable habitat in eastern Massachusetts for the invasive Japanese barberry (*Berberis thunbergii*) (Merow et al. 2017), currently present in the park. Under a high greenhouse gas emissions scenario, hotter and moister conditions would make eastern Massachusetts more favorable to the invasive plants kudzu (*Pueraria lobata*) and privet (*Ligustrum sinense*) by 2100 (Bradley et al. 2010), currently not present in the park.

Appendix 2. What Will the Park Climate Feel Like in 60 Years?

The map below is intended to help visualize how the present-day climate in the region of **Minute Man National Historical Park** is projected to change as a result of climate change (Fitzpatrick and Dunn 2019). Under a high greenhouse gas emission scenario, Boston's climate in 2080 may feel like today's climate near Rosedale, Maryland. The typical summer in Rosedale, Maryland is 7.3°F (4.1°C) warmer and 17.1% wetter than summer in Boston. The red line shows the average of the 27 climate models; the black lines show the 27 individual projections assuming continued high emissions, providing a sense of the plausible range of future climates. Circle size gives a sense of how good of a match that location is, with larger circles indicating poorer matches; all circles (red or purple) denote cities used in the analysis. The analysis is based on twelve climate metrics, including minimum and maximum temperature and precipitation by season (spring, summer, fall, winter). More details are available in the reference cited above and the website <https://fitzlab.shinyapps.io/cityapp/>.



References

- Abell, R., J. D. Allan, and B. Lehner. 2007. Unlocking the potential of protected areas for freshwaters. *Biological Conservation* **134**:48-63.
- Archfield, S. A., R. M. Hirsch, A. Viglione, and G. Blöschl. 2016. Fragmented patterns of flood change across the United States. *Geophysical Research Letters* **43**:10,232-210,239.
- Bradley, B. A., D. S. Wilcove, and M. Oppenheimer. 2010. Climate change increases risk of plant invasion in the Eastern United States. *Biological Invasions* **12**:1855-1872.
- Buczowski, G., and C. Bertelsmeier. 2017. Invasive termites in a changing climate: A global perspective. *Ecol Evol* **7**:974-985.
- Demaria, E. M. C., R. N. Palmer, and J. K. Roundy. 2016. Regional climate change projections of streamflow characteristics in the Northeast and Midwest U.S. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies* **5**:309-323.
- Diffenbaugh, N. S., M. Scherer, and R. J. Trapp. 2013. Robust increases in severe thunderstorm environments in response to greenhouse forcing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**:16361-16366.
- Dudley, R. W., G. A. Hodgkins, M. R. McHale, M. J. Kolan, and B. Renard. 2017. Trends in snowmelt-related streamflow timing in the conterminous United States. *Journal of Hydrology* **547**:208-221.
- Dupigny-Giroux, L. A., E. L. Mecray, M. D. Lemcke-Stampone, G. A. Hodgkins, E. E. Lentz, K. E. Mills, E. D. Lane, R. Miller, D. Y. Hollinger, W. D. Solecki, G. A. Wellenius, P. E. Sheffield, A. B. MacDonald, and C. Caldwell. 2018. Northeast. In *Impacts, Risks, and Adaptation in the United States: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume II* [Reidmiller, D.R., C.W. Avery, D.R. Easterling, K.E. Kunkel, K.L.M. Lewis, T.K. Maycock, and B.C. Stewart (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, pp. 669–742.
- Easterling, D. R., K. E. Kunkel, J. R. Arnold, T. Knutson, A. N. LeGrande, L. R. Leung, R. S. Vose, D. E. Waliser, and M. F. Wehner. 2017. Precipitation change in the United States. In *U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGRP). Climate Science Special Report. Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I*. [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)] USGCRP, Washington, DC.
- Essl, F., S. Dullinger, P. Genovesi, P. E. Hulme, J. M. Jeschke, S. Katsanevakis, I. Kühn, B. Lenzner, A. Pauchard, P. Pyšek, W. Rabitsch, D. M. Richardson, H. Seebens, M. van Kleunen, W. H. van der Putten, M. Vilà, and S.

- Bacher. 2019. A Conceptual Framework for Range-Expanding Species that Track Human-Induced Environmental Change. *Bioscience* **69**:908-919.
- Fernandes, M., A. Denis, R. Fabre, J.-F. Lataste, and M. Chrétien. 2015. In situ study of the shrinkage-swelling of a clay soil over several cycles of drought-rewetting. *Engineering Geology* **192**:63-75.
- Fisichelli, N. A., S. R. Abella, M. Peters, and F. J. Krist. 2014. Climate, trees, pests, and weeds: Change, uncertainty, and biotic stressors in eastern U.S. national park forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* **327**:31-39.
- Fitzpatrick, M. C., and R. R. Dunn. 2019. Contemporary climatic analogs for 540 North American urban areas in the late 21st century. *Nature Communications* **10**:614. <https://fitzlab.shinyapps.io/cityapp/>.
- Gensini, V. A., and T. L. Mote. 2015. Downscaled estimates of late 21st century severe weather from CCSM3. *Climatic Change* **129**:307-321.
- Gonzalez, P. 2018. Anthropogenic Climate Change in Minute Man National Historical Park, Massachusetts Natural Resource Stewardship and Science, U.S. National Park Service, Berkeley, California.
- Gonzalez, P., F. Wang, M. Notaro, D. J. Vimont, and J. W. Williams. 2018. Disproportionate magnitude of climate change in United States national parks. *Environmental Research Letters* **13**:104001.
- Halofsky, J. E., D. L. Peterson, and B. J. Harvey. 2020. Changing wildfire, changing forests: the effects of climate change on fire regimes and vegetation in the Pacific Northwest, USA. *Fire Ecology* **16**:4.
- IPCC. 2013. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Knutson, T. R., J. J. Sirutis, M. Zhao, R. E. Tuleya, M. Bender, G. A. Vecchi, G. Villarini, and D. Chavas. 2015. Global Projections of Intense Tropical Cyclone Activity for the Late Twenty-First Century from Dynamical Downscaling of CMIP5/RCP4.5 Scenarios. *Journal of Climate* **28**:7203-7224.
- Krakauer, N. Y., T. Lakhankar, and D. Hudson. 2019. Trends in Drought over the Northeast United States. *Water* **11**:1834.
- Liang, L., and S. Fei. 2014. Divergence of the potential invasion range of emerald ash borer and its host distribution in North America under climate change. *Climatic Change* **122**:735-746.
- Logan, J. A., J. Régnière, and J. A. Powell. 2003. Assessing the impacts of global warming on forest pest dynamics. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **1**:130-137.
- Merow, C., S. T. Bois, J. M. Allen, Y. Xie, and J. A. Silander. 2017. Climate change both facilitates and inhibits invasive plant ranges in New England. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**:E3276-E3284.
- Mosley, L. M. 2015. Drought impacts on the water quality of freshwater systems; review and integration. *Earth-Science Reviews* **140**:203-214.
- Naz, B. S., S.-C. Kao, M. Ashfaq, D. Rastogi, R. Mei, and L. C. Bowling. 2016. Regional hydrologic response to climate change in the conterminous United States using high-resolution hydroclimate simulations. *Global and Planetary Change* **143**:100-117.
- Ning, L., and R. S. Bradley. 2015. Snow occurrence changes over the central and eastern United States under future warming scenarios. *Scientific Reports* **5**:17073.
- Notaro, M., D. Lorenz, C. Hoving, and M. Schummer. 2014. Twenty-First-Century Projections of Snowfall and Winter Severity across Central-Eastern North America*,+. *Journal of Climate* **27**:6526-6550.
- Pendergrass, A. G., G. A. Meehl, R. Pulwarty, M. Hobbins, A. Hoell, A. AghaKouchak, C. J. W. Bonfils, A. J. E. Gallant, M. Hoerling, D. Hoffmann, L. Kaatz, F. Lehner, D. Llewellyn, P. Mote, R. B. Neale, J. T. Overpeck, A. Sheffield, K. Stahl, M. Svoboda, M. C. Wheeler, A. W. Wood, and C. A. Woodhouse. 2020. Flash droughts present a new challenge for subseasonal-to-seasonal prediction. *Nature Climate Change* **10**:191-199.
- Peterson, T. C., R. R. Heim, R. Hirsch, D. P. Kaiser, H. Brooks, N. S. Diffenbaugh, R. M. Dole, J. P. Giovannettone, K. Guirguis, T. R. Karl, R. W. Katz, K. Kunkel, D. Lettenmaier, G. J. McCabe, C. J. Paciorek, K. R. Ryberg, S. Schubert, V. B. S. Silva, B. C. Stewart, A. V. Vecchia, G. Villarini, R. S. Vose, J. Walsh, M. Wehner, D. Wolock, K. Wolter, C. A. Woodhouse, and D. Wuebbles. 2013. Monitoring and understanding changes in heat waves, cold waves, floods, and droughts in the United States: State of knowledge. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **94**:821-834.
- Pureswaran, D. S., A. Roques, and A. Battisti. 2018. Forest Insects and Climate Change. *Current Forestry Reports* **4**:35-50.
- Sweet, S. K., D. W. Wolfe, A. DeGaetano, and R. Benner. 2017. Anatomy of the 2016 drought in the Northeastern United States: Implications for agriculture and water resources in humid climates. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **247**:571-581.

- Tabari, H. 2020. Climate change impact on flood and extreme precipitation increases with water availability. *Scientific Reports* **10**:13768.
- USGCRP. 2017. Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, 470 pp., doi: 10.7930/J0J964J6.
- USGCRP. 2018. Impacts, risks, and adaptation in the United States: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume II. Reidmiller, DR, Avery CW, Easterling DR, Kunkel KE, Lewis KLM, Maycock TK, Stewart BC (eds), US Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, 1515 pp. doi: 10.7930/NCA4.2018.
- Vose, R. S., D. R. Easterling, K. E. Kunkel, A. N. LeGrande, and M. F. Wehner. 2017. Temperature changes in the United States. In U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGRP). Climate Science Special Report. Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I. [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)] USGCRP, Washington, DC.
- Wehner, M. F., J. R. Arnold, T. Knutson, K. E. Kunkel, and A. N. LeGrande. 2017. Droughts, floods, and wildfires. In: Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, pp. 231-256
- Yang, Q., H. Tian, M. A. M. Friedrichs, M. Liu, X. Li, and J. Yang. 2015. Hydrological Responses to Climate and Land-Use Changes along the North American East Coast: A 110-Year Historical Reconstruction. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association* **51**:47-67.

Disclaimer

Report Purpose and Scope:

Parks identified for Legacy Restoration Funding in fiscal years 2023-2025 are required to develop a Great American Outdoors Act Facility Investment Plan (GFIP). The intended use of this series of park-specific reports is to help parks address Question 16 of the narrative template: *What risks or hazards (current and projected, e.g. effects of climate change) are likely to affect this project? If applicable, what adaptation strategies and/or resiliency measures have been identified for scenarios that pose high risks to project assets?*

Each report compiled and summarized published information on a suite of climate change hazards. Each report included an analysis of each hazard, for which the report author assigned a 'hazard rating' as follows:

Known hazard: Conditions that cause the hazard are well documented in the area where the park occurs. If applicable to the project site, these hazards should always be addressed in the project plan.

Potential hazard: Conditions that cause or underlie the hazard are known to occur nearby or are likely to occur based on studies with conditions similar to the park. If applicable to the project site, these hazards should be considered for inclusion in the project plan.

Not applicable: No evidence was identified showing this hazard is relevant to the park. Note this is a coarse filter evaluation; local knowledge of a hazard(s) should be used, when available.

As articulated within the report (in an appendix of the hazard ratings) those ratings constitute the author's 'best professional judgement' about the relevance of the hazard for that park based on the reviewed literature (cited in the narrative text for the hazard & provided in the report bibliography).

The intended use of each report is to inform decisions for facility investment planning related to (i) potential hazards that a suggested facility investment concept would need to appropriately consider and avoid or mitigate and (ii) identifying facilities possibly at greater relative vulnerability due to the identified hazards. The level of information quality in the report was calibrated to those purposes, i.e. to inform development of questions for a facility investment scoping process to further explore.

Peer Review Process:

Each report was based on a template, which heavily relied on boilerplate text for the non-park specific elements. The boilerplate text underwent multiple rounds of informal peer review by assorted CCRP staff, including members of the Climate Science and Adaptation Team, the Communications Team, the Regional Climate Change Liaisons, and the Climate Change Liaison to Facilities and Planning. Each report was peer-reviewed by a member of CCRP to check interpretation, consistency in hazard ratings, improve narrative coherence, and flag priority additions/modifications. In situations where revisions were required, the peer reviewer then re-reviewed the final revised report to assure adequate resolution of the identified issues.