

CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS FOR LOCAL ACTION

CHRISTINE J. KIRCHHOFF, JOSEPH J. BARSUGLI, GILLIAN L. GALFORD, AMBARISH V. KARMALKAR, KELLY LOMBARDO,
SCOTT R. STEPHENSON, MATHEW BARLOW, ANJI SETH, GUILING WANG, AND AUSTIN FRANK

This document is a supplement to “Climate Assessments for Local Action,” by Christine J. Kirchhoff, Joseph J. Barsugli, Gillian L. Galford, Ambarish V. Karmalkar, Kelly Lombardo, Scott R. Stephenson, Mathew Barlow, Anji Seth, Guiling Wang, and Austin Frank (*Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **100**, 2147–2152) • ©2019 American Meteorological Society • Corresponding author: Christine J. Kirchhoff, christine.kirchhoff@uconn.edu • DOI:10.1175/BAMS-D-18-0138.2

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL: CASE STUDIES OF STATE ASSESSMENTS.

We have divided the interview into two parts. Part I covers general questions about how you did your state assessment. Part II focuses on broader themes such as lessons learned as well as challenges you experienced in doing your state assessment and how you overcame those challenges. Since we are trying to assemble a body of knowledge about doing state assessments, we hope to not only understand how you did yours but what you learned in doing it. If at any point, time becomes short, we may skip some question areas to save time.

Part I.

A: Assessment broadly (charge and context)

- A-1. What motivated the state assessment?
- A-2. What was the scope of the assessment? *How was the scope determined?*
- A-3. How was the assessment funded? Do you anticipate there will be funding for another assessment in the future?
- A-4. Did you look to other state, national, or international assessments as a guide for how to do this assessment?

B. Climate data/modeling

- B-1. What climate information or thresholds did you focus on for the assessment? *How were those decided? Did stakeholders have a role in shaping them?*

- B-2. What were your primary data sources for historical and future climate analysis?

- B-3. Did you identify any challenges or limitations with the available climate data for your state assessment?

C. Review processes, stakeholder engagement, and outreach/communication

- C-1. Did you have an expert-/peer-review process for the assessment? *Was there a public review process for the assessment?*
- C-2. What was your engagement strategy for involving decision-makers or stakeholders in the assessment process?
- C-3. Did you develop an outreach or communication strategy for sharing assessment findings? Did you have trained communication experts to help develop the strategy or with developing and sharing results?
- C-4. Did you measure the usability/use of the state assessment? If so, how? Was there anything surprising or disappointing in what you found?

Part II.

D. Lessons/challenges/takeaways

- D-1. Thinking about lessons learned from doing the state assessment, what in your view worked really well and what might you do differently next time? (Probe: scope, funding, data, engagement, outreach, usability.)

- D-2. In the literature, assessments are evaluated in terms of how decision-makers or stakeholders perceive the credibility, the relevance, and the fairness of the assessment process and assessment products. In doing your assessment *did you worry* about how stakeholders or decision-makers would perceive the credibility, the relevance, and the fairness of the assessment? *Did decision-makers or stakeholders express* any concerns about the credibility, salience, or legitimacy of the assessment?
- D-3. How would you evaluate state climate assessments in general? (Probe: What would be the key factors you would use to measure the overall success of the process and products of a state assessment?)
- D-4. Looking back on your experience with the assessment, in your view what are the key strengths and limitations of doing assessments at the scale of an individual state? (Probe: scope, funding, climate data, engagement, outreach, usability, expertise availability.)
- D-5. Besides lacking a local context, are there any other reasons why state assessments may be more useful than the U.S. National Assessment? (Probe for specific examples; note: key strength may be something other than local context.)
- E. Wrap-up/final thoughts
- E-1. Is there anything else that you wish to share about the assessment process or product that we haven't yet discussed?

RESEARCH METHODS ADDITIONAL DETAILS. Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and then coded using both inductive and deductive qualitative methodologies (Creswell 2007). Coding was performed using qualitative data analysis software NVivo 11 (QSR International, Burlington, Massachusetts) (Galletta 2013; Saldaña 2016) to identify 1) how interviewees thought about and approached producing salient, credible, and legitimate SCAs; 2) interviewee perspectives on the strengths and limitations of SCAs; and 3) challenges faced by SCAs. In addition to coding transcripts, SCAs were categorized by whether or not they were ongoing, the motivation for the SCA (e.g., mandate or voluntary), and the intended audience for the SCA.

FOR FURTHER READING

- Creswell, J. W., 2007: *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. SAGE Publications, 296 pp.
- Galletta, A., 2013. *Mastering the Semi-Structured Interview and Beyond: From Research Design to Analysis and Publication*. New York University Press, 258 pp.
- Saldaña, J., 2016: *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. SAGE Publications, 328 pp

TABLE ESI. Most recent state climate assessments by state with publication year and web link. Interviewees included representatives from all SCAs listed except Maryland and Delaware.

Assessment title	Year Published	URL
Delaware Climate Change Impact Assessment	2014	http://bit.ly/2IOsQmI
California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment	2018	www.climateassessment.ca.gov/
Climate Change in Colorado	2014	https://www.colorado.edu/climate/co2014report/
Connecticut Physical Climate Science Assessment Report	—	Assessment under final review
Climate Change and Pacific Islands: Indicators and Impacts	2012	https://pirca.org/2012/12/04/2012-pirca-full-report/
Indiana's Past and Future Climate: A Report from the Indiana Climate Change Impacts Assessment	2018	https://ag.purdue.edu/indianaclimate/indiana-climate-report/
2018 Annual Report Maryland Commission on Climate Change	2018	http://bit.ly/2WehMBt
Massachusetts State Hazard Mitigation and Climate Adaptation Plan	2018	http://resilientma.org/resources/resource::2156
2017 Montana Climate Assessment	2017	http://montanaclimate.org/
Understanding and Assessing Climate Change Implications for Nebraska	2014	http://bit.ly/2GRtgNf
Potential Effects of Climate Change on New Mexico	2005	http://bit.ly/2XR1IG8
Responding to Climate Change in New York State	2011	https://on.ny.gov/2IPrAij
4th Oregon Climate Assessment Report	2019	http://bit.ly/2XZn30I
Pennsylvania Climate Impacts Assessment Update	2015	http://bit.ly/2UQ2Ckj
State Climate Summaries: Rhode Island ¹	2017	https://statesummaries.ncics.org/chapter/ri/
Vermont Climate Assessment	2014	http://vtclimate.org/publications/
Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation in Washington State: Technical Summaries for Decision Makers	2013	http://bit.ly/2ZLAK4D
Wisconsin's Changing Climate: Impacts and Adaptation	2011	www.wicci.wisc.edu/publications.php

¹ The Rhode Island state climate summary is one of 50 state summaries produced by NCICS.