For audio, please call:
866-737-4154
Passcode: 6437042#

California Landscape Conservation Cooperative

Webinar Series

CaliforniaLCC.org

Today's guest presenter – Dr. Kristin Byrd, US Geological Survey

Topic: "Climate Change and Land Use Scenarios for Habitat Threat Assessments on California Rangelands"

Webinar will begin shortly. Please mute your phone.

March 14, 2013

Climate change/land use change scenarios for assessing threats to ecosystem services on California rangelands

Kristin Byrd[1], Lorraine Flint[2], Frank Casey[3], and Pelayo Alvarez[4]



March 14, 2013

[1]USGS Western Geographic Science Center, Menlo Park, CA,
[2]USGS California Water Science Center, Sacramento, CA ,
[3]USGS Science and Decisions Center, Reston, VA,
[4]Defenders of Wildlife, Sacramento, CA,

USGS
science for a changing world

Ecosystem services provided by rangelands

- Food, fiber and fuel
- Wildlife habitat
- Water
- Carbon sequestration
- Adaptation to climate change
- Open space, cultural values

Integrated Threats to Rangelands

- In California 20,000 acres of rangelands are lost every year
- Privately owned
- Cattle ranching: low profits
- Low levels of protection



Land conversion and climate change lead to loss of grazing land, water availability, and altered species distribution



Rangeland Coalition Focus Area Map (TNC, 2007)

http://www.carangeland.org/focusarea.html

Dark blue: Critical Conservation Areas

(Privately-owned rangelands
that have high biodiversity value and require conservation action in the next 2-10 years.)

USGS
science for a changing world

Project Goals

- Six spatially-explicit climate change/land use change scenarios from years 2000 – 2100 consistent with three IPCC emission scenarios and two global climate models –

B1 (sustainability)	A1B (wealth and technology)	A2 (population pressures)
1. PCM (warm, wet future)	1. CSIRO Mark 3.5 GCM (warm, wet future)	1. PCM (warm, wet future)
2. GFDL CM 2.1 (hot, dry future)	2. MIROC 3.2 (medres) (hot, dry future)	2. GFDL CM 2.1 (hot, dry future)

- Assess potential threats to rangeland ecosystem services
  1. wildlife habitat
  2. water availability (Lorraine Flint and Alan Flint, USGS)
  3. carbon sequestration

USGS science for a changing world

Project Goals, continued

3. An economic analysis of scenarios to quantify economic costs and benefits (Frank Casey, USGS)
4. A web-based visualization tool, and
5. An outreach program that will target the Rangeland Coalition network to communicate how results can be applied to conservation and land management decisions. (Pelayo Alvarez, Defenders of Wildlife)

USGS
science for a changing world



Why IPCC emission scenarios?

- Climate scenarios and land use scenarios need to be logically consistent to form the basis for integrated assessments and long-term policies (Bierwagen et al. 2010).
- Existing land-use land-cover (LULC) change modeling and downscaled global climate models based on the same scenarios – **A1B, A2, B1**
  - USGS LULC change scenarios
  - USGS ensemble projections of climate and hydrology for California (Lorraine Flint and Alan Flint, USGS)

National Assessment of Ecosystem Carbon Sequestration and Greenhouse Gas Fluxes

http://www.usgs.gov/climate_landuse/land_carbon/

USGS National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD)



- Three LULC change scenarios for each EPA Level III ecoregion (Ben Sleeter, USGS)
- FORE-SCE model: maps of LULC change by scenario/year (Terry Sohl et al., USGS)
- GEMS biogeochemical model: annual total ecosystem carbon change per LULC class (S. Liu et al., USGS)

Driving Force Assumptions for the United States based on IPCC Emission Scenarios

(table adapted from Ben Sleeter, USGS)

	A1B – wealth and technology	A2 – population pressures	B1 - sustainability
DEMOGRAPHICS	Medium growth, sprawl	High growth, sprawl	Medium growth, densification
ECONOMICS	Very High Income	Medium Income	High Income
TECHNOLOGY	Very High rate of innovation	Low rate of innovation	High rate of innovation
ENERGY	Balanced between several sources	Fossil fuel intensive	Rapid diffusion of “green” energy resources
CLIMATE	Temperature change, best estimate and range: 2.8 °C; 1.7 – 4.4 °C	Temperature change, best estimate and range: 3.4 °C; 2.0 – 5.4°C	Temperature change, best estimate and range: 1.8 °C; 1.1 – 2.9°C
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	Mixed-use based conservation	Conservation lower priority	Conservation high priority

Scenario Narratives for CA Rangelands

Rancher's Focus Group, January 2012, Davis CA

<u>Key Concerns about ranching future:</u>

- Limited availability of grazing land for lease
- Fragmentation of grazing land
- Forage quality and quantity
- High start-up investment

USGS
science for a changing world

Scenario Narratives for CA Rangelands

– Alternative conservation plans

A1B (wealth and technology)	Development – low density Agriculture – high value perennial crops	Conservation – mixed-use emphasis	500,000 acres protected by 2100, near urban centers
A2 (population pressures)	Development – low density Agriculture – intensive, less innovation	Conservation – low priority	No active conservation planning
B1 (sustainability)	Development – high density Agriculture – moderate	Conservation – biodiversity high priority	1,000,000 acres protected by 2100, in high biodiversity areas

Integrated Scenarios



California Rangeland Conservation Coalition Focus Area

Three IPCC scenarios (A1B, A2, B1)
Two climate models (warm, wet or hot, dry)

↓

Land use/land cover change +

↓

Climate/hydrology decadal change

↓

Maps by scenario/year to 2100 at ~250 meter resolution



EPA Level III Eco-regions: Central Valley and Chaparral and Oak Woodlands

Land-use land-cover change 2006 to 2100; B1, A2, A1B



Present-Day



PCM B1 2100
GFDL B1 2100



PCM A2 2100
GFDL A2 2100



CSIRO A1B 2100
MIROC A1B 2100








Land use-land cover/ Climate/Hydrological Change
Precipitation
Minimum Winter Temp.
Maximum Summer Temp.
Climatic Water Deficit
Potential Evapotranspiration
Decadal averages 2010 – 2100, 250 meters
FORE-SCE LULC Change Model
Annual maps of land use change 2006-2100, 250 meters
Ecosystem Services Change (water, carbon, habitat)
Basin Characterization Model
Runoff, Recharge, Stream Discharge
2010, 2040, 2070, 2100
Change to Priority Conservation Areas (TNC, 2007)
Decadal change 2010 – 2100
GEMS biogeochemical model
Total Ecosystem Carbon 2006 – 2050



Landscape-level analysis

- Land use/climate change for conservation scenarios
- Water-wildlife hotspots

LULC change in B1 conservation areas



Summer maximum temperature by scenario, B1 conservation areas



LULC change in A1B conservation areas



Summer maximum temperature by scenario, A1B conservation areas



Water-wildlife hotspots for dry scenarios (draft)











Percent change in water availability (runoff+recharge) by basin from 1951-1980 to 2071-2100



Percent change in water availability in basins with >25% loss in critical habitat

Case Study of Six Watersheds:

North:
Upper Stony
Lower Butte

Central:
Lower Cosumnes
Alameda Creek

South:
Upper Tule
Estrella

Changes in:

- Wildlife habitat
- Carbon
- Runoff, recharge, streamflow

USGS
science for a changing world

Change in Total Ecosystem Carbon - Upper Stony Watershed





Habitat Change - Upper Stony Watershed



Change in Total Ecosystem Carbon – Consumnes Mokelumne Watershed





Habitat Change – Consumnes Mokelumne Watershed



Change in Total Ecosystem Carbon – Alameda Creek Watershed





Habitat Change – Alameda Creek Watershed





Soil storage affected by soil porosity and soil depth –
New soil thickness dataset – SSURGO county-level soil surveys (L. Flint, USGS)

Upper Stony Watershed

Recharge/Runoff



Streamflow



Alameda Creek Watershed





Consumnes Mokelumne Watershed





Summary

- Potential for C sequestration decreases with area and rate of grassland conversion
- The ratio of recharge to runoff decreases with increasing urbanization (Alameda, Cosumnes)
- Amount of change depends on current soil storage capacity, more change if urbanization on deep soils
- In non-urbanized watersheds, ratio of recharge to runoff can increase in dry years (Upper Stony)
- Has implications on water resource planning – water supply and habitat and need to plan for extreme events

Social value of carbon : avoided marginal damages from carbon emissions to a society as a whole

- Value: \$45/ton CO_2e (Kroeger 2012)
- Carbon: 47 t CO_2e/acre (Koteen et al. 2005, Silver et al. 2010)

Watershed	Grassland acreage lost from 2010 to 2050	Social value of carbon stocks (CO_2e)
Upper Stony		
A1B	14429	\$30,517,335.00
A2	8417	\$17,802,012.12
B1	12120	\$25,633,800.00
Alameda Creek		
A1B	66749	\$141,174,135.00
A2	45699	\$96,653,385.00
B1	48062	\$101,651,130.00
Consumnes-Mokelumne		
A1B	62765	\$132,747,975.00
A2	23768	\$50,269,320.00
B1	13328	\$28,188,720.00

Future Economic Analysis

- Link decreases in recharge to costs associated with less availability of water for consumptive and environmental uses
- Link increases in run-off to potential costs associated with mitigating increased sedimentation and other water quality issues
- Analyze changes in stream flow with respect to economic impacts on aquatic habitat
- Analyze land use changes with respect to potential economic impacts on wildlife habitats, including use and non-use values

Outreach

a) Key messages:

- Inform stakeholders of impacts of climate change and land use change to rangeland ecosystem services
- Decision-making tool for prioritization of climate change mitigation strategies (i.e restoration sites, conservation easements)
- Raise awareness about the importance of rangelands in providing ecosystem services

b) Targets

- Ranches and land managers
- Government agencies
- Non-profits: Ag and conservation organizations
- Others: researchers, planners, legislators, general public

Acknowledgments



Chris Soulard, Western Geographic Science Center, Menlo Park, CA
Adam McClure, Western Geographic Science Center, Menlo Park, CA

Zhiliang Zhu, LandCarbon Project Lead, Reston, VA
Shuguang Liu, EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD
Terry Sohl, EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD
Ben Sleeter, Western Geographic Science Center, Menlo Park, CA
The USGS LandCarbon Team

Funding by the California Landscape Conservation Cooperative

USGS
science for a changing world

California Landscape Conservation Cooperative

Webinar Series

CaliforniaLCC.org

Thank you for joining us. A recorded version of this webinar will be available on our website in about a week.

If you have questions about the webinar, contact Rebecca Fris at 916-278-9415.

March 14, 2013