Because most global warming emissions remain in the atmosphere for decades or centuries, the choices we make today greatly influence the climate our children and grandchildren inherit. The quality of life they experience will depend on if and how rapidly California and the rest of the world reduce these emissions.

In California and throughout western North America, signs of a changing climate are evident. During the last 50 years, winter and spring temperatures have been warmer, spring snow levels in lower- and mid-elevation mountains have dropped, snowpack has been melting one to four weeks earlier, and flowers are blooming one to two weeks earlier.

These regional changes are consistent with global trends. During the past 100 years, average temperatures have risen more than one degree Fahrenheit worldwide. Research indicates that much of this warming is due to human activities, primarily burning fossil fuels and clearing forests, that release carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other gases into the atmosphere, trapping in heat that would otherwise escape into space. Once in the atmosphere, these heat-trapping emissions remain there for many years—CO₂, for example, lasts about 100 years. As a result, atmospheric concentration of CO₂ has increased more than 30 percent above pre-industrial levels. If left unchecked, by the end of the century CO₂ concentrations could reach levels three times higher than pre-industrial times, leading to dangerous global warming that threatens our public health, economy, and environment.

The latest projections, based on state-of-the-art climate models, indicate that if global heat-trapping emissions proceed at a medium to high rate, temperatures in California are expected to rise 4.7 to 10.5°F by the end of the century. In contrast, a lower emissions rate would keep the projected warming to 3 to 5.6°F. These temperature increases would have widespread consequences including substantial loss of snowpack, increased risk of large wildfires, and reductions in the quality and quantity of certain agricultural products.

The state’s vital resources and natural landscapes are already under increasing stress due to California’s rapidly growing population, which is expected to grow from 35 million today to 55 million by 2050.

This document summarizes the recent findings of the California Climate Change Center’s “Climate Scenarios” project, which analyzed a range of impacts that projected rising temperatures would likely have on California. The growing severity of the consequences as temperature rises underscores the importance of reducing emissions to minimize further warming. At the same time, it is essential to identify those consequences that may be unavoidable, for which we will need to develop coping and adaptation strategies.

In 2003, the California Energy Commission’s Public Interest Energy Research (PIER) program established the California Climate Change Center to conduct climate change research relevant to the state. This Center is a virtual organization with core research activities at Scripps Institution of Oceanography and the University of California, Berkeley, complemented by efforts at other research institutions. Priority research areas defined in PIER’s five-year Climate Change Research Plan are: monitoring, analysis, and modeling of climate; analysis of options to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; assessment of physical impacts and of adaptation strategies; and analysis of the economic consequences of both climate change impacts as well as the efforts designed to reduce emissions.

Executive Order #S-3-05, signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on June 1, 2005, called for the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) to prepare biennial science reports on the potential impact of continued global warming on certain sectors of the California economy. CalEPA entrusted PIER and its California Climate Change Center to lead this effort. The “Climate Scenarios” analysis summarized here is the first of these biennial science reports, and is the product of a multi-institution collaboration among the California Air Resources Board, California Department of Water Resources, California Energy Commission, CalEPA, and the Union of Concerned Scientists.
California’s Future Climate

California’s climate is expected to become considerably warmer during this century. How much warmer depends on the rate at which human activities, such as the burning of fossil fuels, continue. The projections presented here illustrate the climatic changes that are likely from three different heat-trapping emissions scenarios (see figure below).

Projected Warming
Temperatures are expected to rise substantially in all three emissions scenarios. During the next few decades, the three scenarios project average temperatures to rise between 1 and 2.3°F; however, the projected temperature increases begin to diverge at mid-century so that, by the end of the century, the temperature increases projected in the higher emissions scenario are approximately twice as high as those projected in the lower emissions scenario. Some climate models indicate that warming would be greater in summer than in winter, which would have widespread effects on ecosystem health, agricultural production, water use and availability, and energy demand.

Toward the end of the century, depending on future heat-trapping emissions, statewide average temperatures are expected to rise between 3 and 10.5°F. The analysis presented here examines the future climate under three projected warming ranges:

- **Lower warming range**: projected temperature rises between 3 and 5.5°F
- **Medium warming range**: projected temperature rises between 5.5 and 8°F
- **Higher warming range**: projected temperature rises between 8 and 10.5°F

Precipitation
On average, the projections show little change in total annual precipitation in California. Furthermore, among several models, precipitation projections do not show a consistent trend during the next century. The Mediterranean seasonal precipitation pattern is expected to continue, with most precipitation falling during winter from North Pacific storms. One of the three climate models projects slightly wetter winters, and another projects slightly drier winters with a 10 to 20 percent decrease in total annual precipitation. However, even modest changes would have a significant impact because California ecosystems are conditioned to historical precipitation levels and water resources are nearly fully utilized.

---

1 These warming ranges are for illustrative purposes only. These ranges were defined in the original Climate Scenarios analysis to capture the full range of projected temperature rise. The exact values for the warming ranges as presented in the original summary report are: lower warming range (3 to 5.4°F); medium warming range (5.5 to 7.9°F); and higher warming range (8 to 10.4°F).
How much temperatures rise depends in large part on how much and how quickly heat-trapping emissions accumulate in the atmosphere and how the climate responds to these emissions. The projections presented in this report are based on three different heat-trapping emissions scenarios and three climate models.

**Emissions Scenarios**

The three global emissions scenarios used in this analysis were selected from a set of scenarios developed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Special Report on Emissions Scenarios, based on different assumptions about population growth and economic development (measured in gross domestic product).

- The **lower emissions scenario** (B1) characterizes a world with high economic growth and a global population that peaks by mid-century and then declines. There is a rapid shift toward less fossil fuel-intensive industries and introduction of clean and resource-efficient technologies. Heat-trapping emissions peak about mid-century and then decline; CO$_2$ concentration approximately doubles, relative to pre-industrial levels, by 2100.

- The **medium-high emissions scenario** (A2) projects continuous population growth and uneven economic and technological growth. The income gap between now-industrialized and developing parts of the world does not narrow. Heat-trapping emissions increase through the 21st century; atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration approximately triples, relative to pre-industrial levels, by 2100.

- The **higher emissions scenario** (A1fi) represents a world with high fossil fuel-intensive economic growth, and a global population that peaks mid-century then declines. New and more efficient technologies are introduced toward the end of the century. Heat-trapping emissions increase through the 21st century; CO$_2$ concentration more than triples, relative to pre-industrial levels, by 2100.

**Climate Sensitivity**

The three models used in this analysis represent different climate sensitivities, or the extent to which temperatures will rise as a result of increasing atmospheric concentrations of heat-trapping gases. Climate sensitivity depends on Earth’s response to certain physical processes, including a number of “feedbacks” that might amplify or lessen warming. For example, as heat-trapping emissions cause temperatures to rise, the atmosphere can hold more water vapor, which traps heat and raises temperatures further—a positive feedback. Clouds created by this water vapor could absorb and re-radiate outgoing infrared radiation from Earth’s surface (another positive feedback) or reflect more incoming shortwave radiation from the sun before it reaches Earth’s surface (a negative feedback).

Because many of these processes and their feedbacks are not yet fully understood, they are represented somewhat differently in different global climate models. The three global climate models used in this analysis are:

- **National Center for Atmospheric Research Parallel Climate Model (PCM1):** low climate sensitivity
- **Geophysical Fluids Dynamic Laboratory (GFDL) CM2.1:** medium climate sensitivity
- **United Kingdom Met Office Hadley Centre Climate Model, version 3 (HadCM3):** medium-high climate sensitivity

As this figure shows, CO$_2$ emissions from human activities (such as the burning of fossil fuels) were negligible until around the so-called industrial age starting in the 1850s.
Continued global warming will affect Californians’ health by exacerbating air pollution, intensifying heat waves, and expanding the range of infectious diseases. The primary concern is not so much the change in average climate but the projected increase in extreme conditions, which pose the most serious health risks.

Poor Air Quality Made Worse
Californians currently experience the worst air quality in the nation, with more than 90 percent of the population living in areas that violate the state’s air quality standard for either ground-level ozone or airborne particulate matter. These pollutants can cause or aggravate a wide range of health problems including asthma and other acute respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, and can decrease lung function in children. Combined, ozone and particulate matter contribute to 8,800 deaths and $71 billion in healthcare costs every year. If global background ozone levels increase as projected in some scenarios, it may become impossible to meet local air quality standards.

Higher temperatures are expected to increase the frequency, duration, and intensity of conditions conducive to air pollution formation. For example, if temperatures rise to the medium warming range, there will be 75 to 85 percent more days with weather conducive to ozone formation in Los Angeles and the San Joaquin Valley, relative to today’s conditions. This is more than twice the increase expected if temperature rises are kept in the lower warming range.

Air quality could be further compromised by increases in wildfires, which emit fine particulate matter that can travel long distances depending on wind conditions. The most recent analysis suggests that if heat-trapping gas emissions are not significantly reduced, large wildfires could become up to 55 percent more frequent toward the end of the century.

More Severe Heat
By 2100, if temperatures rise to the higher warming range, there could be up to 100 more days per year with temperatures above 90°F in Los Angeles and above 95°F in Sacramento. This is a striking increase over historical patterns (see chart on p. 6), and almost twice the increase projected if temperatures remain within or below the lower warming range.

As temperatures rise, Californians will face greater risk of death from dehydration, heat stroke/exhaustion, heart attack, stroke, and respiratory distress caused by extreme heat. By mid century, extreme heat events in urban centers such as Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino could cause two to three times more heat-related deaths than occur today. The members of the population most vulnerable to the effects of extreme heat include people who are already ill; children; the elderly;

As temperatures rise, Californians will face greater risk of death from dehydration, heat stroke, heart attack, and other heat-related illnesses.

Cars and power plants emit pollutants that contribute to global warming and poor air quality. As temperatures increase, it will be increasingly difficult to meet air quality standards throughout the state.
and the poor, who may lack access to air conditioning and medical assistance.

More research is needed to better understand the potential effects of higher temperatures and the role that adaptation can play in minimizing these effects. For example, expanding air conditioner use can help people cope with extreme heat; however, it also increases energy consumption, which, using today’s fossil fuel-heavy energy sources, would contribute to further global warming and air pollution.

![Increase in Extreme Heat, 2070–2099](image1)

If global warming emissions continue unabated, Sierra Nevada snowpack could decline 70 to 90 percent, with cascading effects on winter recreation, water supply, and natural ecosystems.

Most of California’s precipitation falls in the northern part of the state during the winter while the greatest demand for water comes from users in the southern part of the state during the spring and summer. A vast network of man-made reservoirs and aqueducts capture and transport water throughout the state from northern California rivers and the Colorado River. The current distribution system relies on Sierra Nevada mountain snowpack to supply water during the dry spring and summer months. Rising temperatures, potentially compounded by decreases in precipitation, could severely reduce spring snowpack, increasing the risk of summer water shortages.

**Decreasing Sierra Nevada Snowpack**

If heat-trapping emissions continue unabated, more precipitation will fall as rain instead of snow, and the snow that does fall will melt earlier, reducing the Sierra Nevada spring snowpack by as much as 70 to 90 percent. How much snowpack will be lost depends in part on future precipitation patterns, the projections for which remain uncertain. However, even under wetter climate projections, the loss of snowpack would pose challenges to water managers, hamper hydropower generation, and nearly eliminate skiing and other snow-related recreational activities. If global warming emissions are significantly curbed and temperature increases are kept in the lower warming range, snowpack losses are expected to be only half as large as those expected if temperatures were to rise to the higher warming range.

**Challenges in Securing Adequate Water Supplies**

Continued global warming will increase pressure on California’s water resources, which are already over-stretched by the demands of a growing...
Our Changing Climate

Economy and population. Decreasing snowmelt and spring stream flows coupled with increasing demand for water resulting from both a growing population and hotter climate could lead to increasing water shortages. By the end of the century, if temperatures rise to the medium warming range and precipitation decreases, late spring stream flow could decline by up to 30 percent. Agricultural areas could be hard hit, with California farmers losing as much as 25 percent of the water supply they need.

Water supplies are also at risk from rising sea levels. An influx of saltwater would degrade California’s estuaries, wetlands, and groundwater aquifers. In particular, saltwater intrusion would threaten the quality and reliability of the major state fresh water supply that is pumped from the southern edge of the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Delta.

Coping with the most severe consequences of global warming would require major changes in water management and allocation systems. As more winter precipitation falls as rain instead of snow, water managers will have to balance the need to fill constructed reservoirs for water supply and the need to maintain reservoir space for winter flood control. Some additional storage could be developed; however, the economic and environmental costs would be high.

Potential Reduction in Hydropower

Higher temperatures will likely increase electricity demand due to higher air conditioning use. Even if the population remained unchanged, toward the end of the century annual electricity demand could increase by as much as 20 percent if temperatures rise into the higher warming range. (Implementing aggressive efficiency measures could lower this estimate.)

At the same time, diminished snow melt flowing through dams will decrease the potential for hydropower production, which now comprises about 15 percent of California’s in-state electricity production. If temperatures rise to the medium warming range and precipitation decreases by 10 to 20 percent, hydropower production may be reduced by up to 30 percent. However, future precipitation projections are quite uncertain so it is possible that precipitation may increase and expand hydropower generation.

Loss of Winter Recreation

Continued global warming will have widespread implications for winter tourism. Declines in Sierra Nevada snowpack would lead to later starting and earlier closing dates of the ski season. Toward the end of the century, if temperatures rise to the lower warming range, the ski season at lower and middle elevations could shorten by as much as a month. If temperatures reach the higher warming range and precipitation declines, there might be many years with insufficient snow for skiing and snowboarding.
California is home to a $30 billion agriculture industry that employs more than one million workers. It is the largest and most diverse agriculture industry in the nation, producing more than 300 commodities including half the country’s fruits and vegetables. Increased heat-trapping emissions are expected to cause widespread changes to this industry, reducing the quantity and quality of agricultural products statewide.

Although higher carbon dioxide levels can stimulate plant production and increase plant water-use efficiency, California farmers will face greater water demand for crops and a less reliable water supply as temperatures rise. Crop growth and development will change, as will the intensity and frequency of pest and disease outbreaks. Rising temperatures will likely aggravate ozone pollution, which makes plants more susceptible to disease and pests and interferes with plant growth.

To prepare for these changes, and to adapt to changes already under way, major efforts will be needed to move crops to new locations, respond to climate variability, and develop new cultivars and agricultural technologies. With adequate research and advance preparation, some of the consequences could be reduced.

**Increasing Temperature**

Plant growth tends to be slow at low temperatures, increasing with rising temperatures up to a threshold. However, faster growth can result in less-than-optimal development for many crops, so rising temperatures are likely to worsen the quantity and quality of yield for a number of California’s agricultural products. Crops that are likely to be hard hit include:

**Wine Grapes**

California is the nation’s largest wine producer and the fourth-largest wine producer worldwide. High-quality wines produced throughout the Napa and Sonoma Valleys and along the northern and central coasts generate $3.2 billion in revenue each year. High temperatures during the growing season can cause premature ripening and reduce grape quality. Temperature increases are expected to have only modest effect on grape quality in most regions over the next few decades. However, toward the end of the century, wine grapes could ripen as much as one to two months earlier, which will affect grape quality in all but the coolest coastal locations (Mendocino and Monterey Counties).

**Fruits and Nuts**

Many fruit and nut trees are particularly sensitive to temperature changes because of heat-accumulation limits and chill-hour requirements. Heat accumulation, which refers to the total hours during which temperatures reach between 45 and 95°F, is critical for fruit development. Rising temperatures could increase fruit development rates and decrease fruit size.

For example, peaches and nectarines developed and were harvested early in 2004 because of warm spring temperatures. The fruits were smaller than normal, which placed them in a lower quality category.

A minimum number of chill hours (hours during which temperatures drop below 45°F) is required for proper bud setting; too few hours can cause late or irregular bloom, decreasing fruit quality and subsequent marketable yield. California is currently classified as a moderate to high chill-hour region, but chill hours are diminishing in many areas of the state. If temperatures rise to the medium warming range, the number of chill hours in the entire Central Valley is expected to approach a critical threshold for some fruit trees.

**Milk**

California’s $3 billion dairy industry supplies nearly one-fifth of the nation’s milk products. High temperatures can stress dairy cows, reducing milk production. Production begins to decline at temperatures as low as 77°F and can drop substantially as temperatures climb above 90°F. Toward the end of the century, if temperatures rise to the higher warming range, milk production is expected to decrease by up to 20 percent. This is more
than twice the reduction expected if temperatures stay within or below the lower warming range.

Expanding Ranges of Agricultural Weeds
Noxious and invasive weeds currently infest more than 20 million acres of California farmland, costing hundreds of millions of dollars annually in control measures and lost productivity. Continued climate change will likely shift the ranges of existing invasive plants and weeds and alter competition patterns with native plants. Range expansion is expected in many species while range contractions are less likely in rapidly evolving species with significant populations already established. Should range contractions occur, it is likely that new or different weed species will fill the emerging gaps.

Increasing Threats from Pests and Pathogens
California farmers contend with a wide range of crop-damaging pests and pathogens. Continued climate change is likely to alter the abundance and types of many pests, lengthen pests’ breeding season, and increase pathogen growth rates. For example, the pink bollworm, a common pest of cotton crops, is currently a problem only in southern desert valleys because it cannot survive winter frosts elsewhere in the state. However, if winter temperatures rise 3 to 4.5°F, the pink bollworm’s range would likely expand northward, which could lead to substantial economic and ecological consequences for the state.

Temperature is not the only climatic influence on pests. For example, some insects are unable to cope in extreme drought, while others cannot survive in extremely wet conditions. Furthermore, while warming speeds up the lifecycles of many insects, suggesting that pest problems could increase, some insects may grow more slowly as elevated CO₂ levels decrease the protein content of the leaves on which they feed.

Multiple and Interacting Stresses
Although the effects on specific crops of individual factors (e.g., temperatures, pests, water supply) are increasingly well understood, trying to quantify interactions among these and other environmental factors is challenging. For example, the quality of certain grape varieties is expected to decline as temperatures rise. But the wine-grape industry also faces increasing risks from pests such as the glassy-winged sharpshooter, which transmits Pierce’s disease. In 2002, this bacterial disease caused damage worth $13 million in Riverside County alone. The optimum temperature for growth of Pierce’s disease is 82°F, so this disease is currently uncommon in the cooler northern and coastal regions of the state. However, with continued warming, these regions may face increased risk of the glassy-winged sharpshooter feeding on leaves and transmitting Pierce’s disease.
California is one of the most climatically and biologically diverse areas in the world, supporting thousands of plant and animal species. The state’s burgeoning population and consequent impact on local landscapes is threatening much of this biological wealth. Global warming is expected to intensify this threat by increasing the risk of wildfire and altering the distribution and character of natural vegetation.

**Increasing Wildfires**

Fire is an important ecosystem disturbance. It promotes vegetation and wildlife diversity, releases nutrients into the soil, and eliminates heavy accumulation of underbrush that can fuel catastrophic fires. However, if temperatures rise into the medium warming range, the risk of large wildfires in California could increase by as much as 55 percent, which is almost twice the increase expected if temperatures stay in the lower warming range.

Because wildfire risk is determined by a combination of factors including precipitation, winds, temperature, and landscape and vegetation conditions, future risks will not be uniform throughout the state. In many regions, wildfire activity will depend critically on future precipitation patterns. For...
Vegetation cover over the 21st century will depend on both temperature and precipitation. The lower and medium warming range bars reflect vegetation cover under a wetter climate (blue) and a drier climate (brown) projected in the different climate models. For the higher warming range, only a drier climate was considered.

example, if precipitation increases as temperatures rise, wildfires in the grasslands and chaparral ecosystems of southern California are expected to increase by approximately 30 percent toward the end of the century because more winter rain will stimulate the growth of more plant “fuel” available to burn in the fall. In contrast, a hotter, drier climate could promote up to 90 percent more northern California fires by the end of the century by drying out and increasing the flammability of forest vegetation.

Shifting Vegetation
Land use and other changes resulting from economic development are altering natural habitats throughout the state. Continued global warming will intensify these pressures on the state’s natural ecosystems and biological diversity. For example, in northern California, warmer temperatures are expected to shift dominant forest species from Douglas and White Fir to madrone and oaks. In inland regions, increases in fire frequency are expected to promote expansion of grasslands into current shrub and woodland areas. Alpine and subalpine ecosystems are among the most threatened in the state; plants suited to these regions have limited opportunity to migrate “up slope” and are expected to decline by as much as 60 to 80 percent by the end of the century as a result of increasing temperatures.

Declining Forest Productivity
Forestlands cover 45 percent of the state; 35 percent of this is commercial forests such as pine plantations. Recent projections suggest that continued global warming could adversely affect the health and productivity of California’s forests. If average statewide temperatures rise to the medium warming range, the productivity of mixed conifer forests is expected to diminish by as much as 18 percent by the end of the century. Yield reductions from pine plantations are expected to be even more severe, with up to a 30 percent decrease by the end of the century.

The risk of large wildfires in California could increase by as much as 55 percent.
California’s 1,100 miles of coastline are a major attraction for tourism, recreation, and other economic activity. The coast is also home to unique ecosystems that are among the world’s most imperiled. As global warming continues, California’s coastal regions will be increasingly threatened by rising sea levels, more intense coastal storms, and warmer water temperatures.

During the past century, sea levels along California’s coast have risen about seven inches. If heat-trapping emissions continue unabated and temperatures rise into the higher warming range, sea level is expected to rise an additional 22 to 35 inches by the end of the century. Elevations of this magnitude would inundate coastal areas with salt water, accelerate coastal erosion, threaten vital levees and inland water systems, and disrupt wetlands and natural habitats.

**Increasing Coastal Floods**

The combination of increasingly severe winter storms, rising mean sea levels, and high tides is expected to cause more frequent and severe flooding, erosion, and damage to coastal structures. Many California coastal areas are at significant risk for flood damage. For example, the city of Santa Cruz is built on the 100-year floodplain and is only 20 feet above sea level. Although levees have been built to contain the 100-year flood, a 12-inch increase in sea levels (projected for the medium warming range of temperatures) would mean storm-surge-induced flood events at the 100-year level would likely occur once every 10 years.

Flooding can create significant damage and enormous financial losses. Despite extensive engineering efforts, major floods have repeatedly breached levees that protect freshwater supplies and islands in the San Francisco Bay Delta as well as fragile marine estuaries and wetlands throughout the

---

**Sea levels could rise up to three feet by the end of the century, accelerating coastal erosion, threatening vital levees, and disrupting wetlands.**

---

Rising sea levels and more intense storm surges could increase the risk for coastal flooding.
Many California beaches are threatened from rising sea levels and increased erosion, an expected consequence of continued global warming. Continued sea level rise will further increase vulnerability to levee failures. Some of the most extreme flooding during the past few decades has occurred during El Niño winters, when warmer waters fuel more intense storms. During the winters of 1982–1983 and 1997–1998, for example, abnormally high seas and storm surges caused millions of dollars’ worth of damage in the San Francisco Bay area. Highways were flooded as six-foot waves crashed over waterfront bulkheads, and valuable coastal real estate was destroyed.

Continued global warming will require major changes in flood management. In many regions such as the Central Valley, where urbanization and limited river channel capacity already exacerbate rising flood risks, flood damage and flood control costs could amount to several billion dollars.

**Shrinking Beaches**

Many of California’s beaches may shrink in the future because of rising seas and increased erosion from winter storms. Currently, many beaches are protected from erosion through manmade sand replenishment (or “nourishment”) programs, which bring in sand from outside sources to replace the diminishing supply of natural sand. In fact, many of the wide sandy beaches in southern California around Santa Monica, Venice, and Newport Beach were created and are maintained entirely by sand nourishment programs. As sea levels rise, increasing volumes of replacement sand will be needed to maintain current beach width and quality. California beach nourishment programs currently cost millions of dollars each year. As global warming continues, the costs of beach nourishment programs will rise, and in some regions beach replenishment may no longer be viable.

**Multiple Causes of Coastal Flooding**

Several factors play a role in sea level and coastal flooding, including tides, waves temperature, and storm activity. Sea levels fluctuate daily, monthly, and seasonally; the highest tides occur in winter and in summer, during new and full moons. Sea levels often rise even higher during El Niño winters, when the Eastern Pacific Ocean is warmer than usual and westerly wind patterns are strengthened.

Coastal flooding usually occurs during winter storms, which bring strong winds and high waves. Storm winds tend to raise water levels along the coast and produce high waves at the same time, compounding the risk of damaging waves—a doubling of wave height is equivalent to a four-fold increase in wave energy. When these factors coincide with high tides, the chances for coastal damage are greatly heightened.

As sea levels rise, flood stages in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta of the San Francisco Bay estuary may also rise, putting increasing pressure on Delta levees. This threat may be particularly significant because recent estimates indicate the additional force exerted upon the levees is equivalent to the square of the water level rise. Estimates using historical observations and climate model projections suggest that extreme high water levels in the Bay and Delta will increase markedly if sea level rises above its historical rate. These extremes are most likely to occur during storm events, leading to more severe damage from waves and floods.
Continued global warming will have widespread and significant impacts on the Golden State. Solutions are available today to reduce emissions and minimize these impacts.

The projections presented in this analysis suggest that many of the most severe consequences that are expected from the medium and higher warming ranges could be avoided if heat-trapping emissions can be reduced to levels that will hold temperature increases at or below the lower warming range (i.e., an increase of no more than 5.5°F). However, even if emissions are substantially reduced, research indicates that some climatic changes are unavoidable. Although not the solution to global warming, plans to cope with these changes are essential.

Reducing Heat-Trapping Emissions
Reducing heat-trapping emissions is the most important way to slow the rate of global warming. On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed an executive order (#S-3-05) that sets goals for significantly lowering the state’s share of global warming pollution. The executive order calls for a reduction in heat-trapping emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and for an 80 percent emissions reduction below 1990 levels by 2050. These emission reduction targets will help stimulate technological innovation needed to help transition to more efficient and renewable transportation and energy systems.

California’s actions can drive global progress to address global warming.

Coping with Unavoidable Climatic Changes
Because global warming is already upon us, and some amount of additional warming is inevitable, we must prepare for the changes that are already under way.
Preparing for these unavoidable changes will require minimizing further stresses on sensitive ecosystems and implementing management practices that integrate climate risks into long-term planning strategies.

**California’s Leadership**

California has been a leader in both the science of climate change and in identifying solutions. The California Climate Change Center is one of the first—and perhaps the only—state-sponsored research institution in the nation dedicated to climate change research, and other state agencies such as the Air Resources Board support similar research. Continuing this strong research agenda is critical for developing effective strategies for addressing global warming in California.

The state has also been at the forefront of efforts to reduce heat-trapping emissions, passing precedent-setting policies such as aggressive standards for tailpipe emissions, renewable energy, and energy efficiency. However, existing policies are not likely to be sufficient to meet the ambitious emission reduction goals set by the governor. To meet these ambitious goals California will need to build on its legacy of environmental leadership and develop new strategies and technologies to reduce emissions.

By reducing heat-trapping emissions, severe consequences can be avoided.

California alone cannot stabilize the climate. However, the state’s actions can drive global progress. If the industrialized world were to follow the emission reduction targets established in California’s executive order, and industrializing nations reduced emissions according to the lower emissions path (B1) presented in this analysis, we would be on track to keep temperatures from rising to the medium or higher (and possibly even the lower) warming ranges and thus avoid the most severe consequences of global warming.
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