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Motivation for an evaluation of ecosystem services and biodiversity

• Ecosystems and biodiversity provide a wide array of goods and services of value to people
• Provision of ecosystem services often is not factored into important decisions that affect ecosystems
• Distortions in decision-making damage the provision of ecosystem services making human society and the environment poorer
Motivation for an evaluation of ecosystem services and biodiversity

• Individuals and firms are not rewarded for protecting environmental quality necessary for sustained provision of ecosystem services and conserving biodiversity

• Unless society fixes this imbalance and begins to properly account for the value of nature we are unlikely to see fundamental change necessary to sustain ecosystem services and conserve biodiversity
The MA: ecosystems and human well-being are linked

Ecosystem services: ecosystems provide vital goods and services of value to people
Linkage of ecosystems and human welfare

1. Human actions cause changes in ecosystems and biodiversity

2. Changes in ecosystems and biodiversity lead to changes in human well-being

• The MA
  – Lots of information on (1)
  – Did not provide conclusive evidence on (2)
The MA gap

• Relative lack of credible quantitative evidence on the link from ecosystem structure and function to human well-being

• Research agenda:
• Demonstrate this link and show the value of nature
• Policy/institutions: incentives to conserve nature in order to maximize net benefits
Tasks to mainstream the value of nature in everyday decisions

1. Improve understanding of the likely consequences of human actions on ecosystems
2. Improve understanding of the impacts of ecosystem change on ecosystem services and biodiversity
3. Improve understanding of the value of these impacts on human welfare
4. Tie understanding of impacts and values to incentives
   - Everyday decisions of individuals and firms
   - Societal policy choices
Figure 1: Integrating ecology and economics: A research agenda for ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation

1. Incentives
2. Actions
3. Non-anthropocentric approaches
4. Ecological production functions
5. Biophysical tradeoffs
6. Valuation
7. Economic efficiency
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Ecosystem services

Benefits and costs
The Natural Capital Project: Mainstreaming ecosystem services
“InVEST”

Integrated Valuation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs

http://www.naturalcapitalproject.org/InVEST.html
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Outline of rest of talk

• Provide three examples of integrated ecological and economic models in the analysis of ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation
  1. Where to put things? Spatial land management with biological and economic objectives
  2. Modeling multiple ecosystem services and tradeoffs at landscape scales
  3. The efficiency of voluntary incentive policies for preventing biodiversity loss
Where to put things? Spatial land management with biological and economic objectives
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Willamette Basin
Current Land Cover
- Floating Vegetation
- Riparian Forest
- Low Structure Agriculture
- Meadow
- Deciduous, Mixed Close Forest
- Deciduous, Mixed Open Forest
- Oak Hardwood
- Scrub-Shrub
- Shrub-Riparian
- Conifer, 21-40 Years
- Conifer, 41-80 Years
- Conifer, 81-200 Years
- Conifer, 200 Plus Years
- Water
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Biological model: effect of land use/land cover of species persistence

- Predict a land use pattern’s ability to support viable populations of a large set of species.
- Each species’ appraisal of a land use pattern depends on three species-specific traits:
  - habitat compatibility (which includes geographic range, habitat type and special features like whether there is water access)
  - the amount of habitat required for a breeding pair
  - dispersal ability between suitable patches of habitat
Economic model: effect of land use on value of commodities produced

- Predict the present value of rents for a parcel generated by a land use of the parcel and the characteristics of the parcel.
- The economic return for a land use pattern is the sum of the present value of rents over all of the parcels patches of habitat.
Polasky et al.
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Modeling multiple ecosystem services and tradeoffs at landscape scales
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Projected land use change in 2050 under the three scenarios
Modeling multiple services under alternative scenarios

- Model outputs: service provision and biodiversity
  - Water quality (reduced phosphorus loadings)
  - Storm peak mitigation (flooding reduction)
  - Soil conservation (sediment retention)
  - Climate stabilization (carbon sequestration)
  - Biodiversity (species conservation)
  - Market returns to landowners (agricultural crop production, timber harvest and housing values)
Outputs through time

Nelson et al. Frontiers 2009
Maps of change in service provision

Nelson et al. Frontiers 2009
The efficiency of voluntary incentive policies for preventing biodiversity loss
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Conservation and private land

• Voluntary incentives for species conservation on private lands
  – Conservation Reserve Program
  – Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)
  – Conservation easements
  – Conservation banking under the Endangered Species Act

• Basic question: can voluntary incentives achieve efficient spatial allocations of private land use?
The spatial problem

Initial landscape

Landscape with conservation land

Coordinated

Uncoordinated

Landscape with conservation land
This paper

- Two outstanding questions
  - On actual landscapes, how efficient are voluntary incentive-based policies?
  - How important is biological and economic information for improving the efficiency of policies?
This paper

• Integrating earlier work
  – Econometric land-use models
    • Lubowski, Plantinga, and Stavins JEEM 2006
  – Spatially-explicit landscape simulations of incentive-based policies
    • Lewis and Plantinga Land Econ 2007
  – Spatial management
    • Polasky, Nelson et al. Ecol Applications 2005
  – Preliminary examination of incentive-based policies
    • Nelson, Polasky, Lewis, Plantinga, Lonsdorf, White, Bael, and Lawler PNAS 2008
Steps in the analysis

1) Simulate responses to voluntary incentives
   - Econometric model of land-use change
   - Use the econometric results to estimate parcel-level willingness-to-accept
   - Simulating the spatial pattern of conservation lands

2) Score the landscape for species conservation

3) Derive the optimal spatial arrangement of conservation lands

4) Application to the Willamette Basin
   - Species of “conservation concern” are modeled
   - A range of alternative voluntary incentive policies are considered
   - Comparison to the optimal planner’s solution
Econometric model of land-use change

- Random parameters logit model is estimated with data for Oregon and Washington west of the Cascade Crest
- Repeated plot-level data from the National Resources Inventory (15,356 plots at four points in time; 1982, 1987, 1992, 1997)
- Four major land uses (crops, pasture, forest, urban) are modeled, representing most of the privately owned land in the region
- Data on county average net revenues for all uses from Lubowski (2002) and plot-level land quality measures from the NRI
- Observed land-use changes are modeled in terms of annualized net returns from alternative uses
Estimation

• Separate models estimated for parcels starting in crops (3,504 pooled observations) and pasture (4,637 pooled observations)

• Four ending uses are crops, pasture, forest, urban

• Models are not estimated for parcels starting in forest and urban because few or no parcels change out of these uses
Specification of net returns

• For parcel i beginning in use j, the net return to choosing use k by the end of time period t is:

\[
R_{ikt} - rC_{ijkt} = \begin{cases} 
\text{alternative-specific constant} & \alpha_{jk} \\
\text{county error component} & \sigma_{1jk} \omega_{1c(i)jk} \\
\text{parcel error component} & \sigma_{2jk} \omega_{2ijk} \\
\text{county average net revenue adjusted for parcel land quality} & \beta_{0jk} R_{c(i)kt} + \beta_{1jk} LCC_i R_{c(i)kt} \end{cases} + \varepsilon_{ijkt}
\]
Transition probabilities

• The probability that parcel i changes from use j to k during time period t is given by:

\[ P_{ijkt} = F(R_{c(i)t}, LCC_i, \varpi_{1c(i)j}, \varpi_{2ij}, \alpha_j, \beta_j, \sigma_j) \]

• As with the WTA values, sets of transition probabilities are differentiated by starting use, county, and LCC
Maximum net return to a parcel

\[ R_{ijt}^* = \frac{1}{\xi_j} \left( \ln \left[ \sum_k \exp(\alpha_{jk} + \sigma_{1jk} \omega_{1c(i)jk} + \sigma_{2jk} \omega_{2ijk} + \beta_{0jk} R_{c(i)kt} + \beta_{1jk} LCC_i R_{c(i)kt}) \right] - \gamma \right) + \nu_{ijt} \]

- where \( \nu_{ijt} \) is distributed type I extreme value with scale parameter \( \xi_j \) and \( \gamma \) is Euler’s constant
- The maximum net return on a parcel is a random variable with known distribution
Willingness to accept

• We assume that landowners are willing to accept the maximum net return from their parcel in exchange for returning their land to its native (pre-Euro-American settlement) cover

• WTA values are random and differentiated by starting use, county, and LCC values

Native covers include prairie, emergent marsh, scrub/shrub, oak and other hardwoods, old-growth conifer, or riparian forest
Simulating the spatial pattern of conservation

- Landowners are offered an annual per-acre payment $Z$
- For parcel $n$, we compute $WTA_n$ by drawing values of all random variables.

If $WTA_n < Z$, the parcel is conserved

If $WTA_n > Z$, the parcel is not conserved and may remain in the same use or convert to an alternative use according to the transition probabilities.

$r$ is drawn from a $U(0,1)$. Its value determines the use of parcel $n$, as in the following example:
WTA distribution for crop parcels
WTA distribution for pasture parcels
Simulating the spatial pattern of conservation lands

- We consider a range of different policies and different budget levels.
- The regulator is assumed to know the distribution of WTA but not the WTA on any specific parcel.
- For each policy/budget combination, the response to the conservation payment is simulated for each parcel.
- Each round of the simulation produces a landscape consistent with the underlying WTA values and transition rules.
- 500 landscapes are produced for each policy/budget level to characterize the range of potential spatial patterns.
- The budget is the opportunity cost of the policy (not the cost to the government) computed as the sum of WTA for all conserved parcels. We consider budgets of $1, $5, $10, $20, and $30 million per year.
Scoring the landscapes for species conservation

- Use the same biological model as in “Where to put things”
- Input land use pattern from policy simulations into biological model to get biological score for each simulation
Species modeled

- Information is available on 267 terrestrial vertebrate species in the Willamette Basin. We focus on 24 species that are 1) expected to decline in the baseline or 2) have small initial populations that can increased by land-use change.
- These species include: American Bittern, Canada Goose, Green-Winged Teal, Cinnamon Teal, Ruddy Duck, White-Tailed Kite, Bald Eagle, Osprey, Northern Goshawk, Red-Shouldered Hawk, Marbled Murrelet, Spotted Owl, Belted Kingfisher, Short-Eared Owl, Grasshopper Sparrow, Common Musk Rat, Wolverine, White-Tailed Deer, Painted Turtle, Western Pond Turtle, Northern Harrier, Acorn Woodpecker, Western Meadowlark, and Fisher.
The optimal landscape

• Objective: maximize the biological score for a given level of opportunity costs (measured by sum of WTA across conserved parcels)

• Assume that WTA for all parcels is known (full information)

• Spatial processes determining the biological score make explicit solution of this problem intractable

• We use heuristic methods to approximate the optimal solution
Policies considered:
least-cost conservation policies

- **Uniform**: all parcels are eligible
- **Large**: only parcels greater in size than 800 acres
- **Rare Habitat**: only parcels whose natural state is prairie, oak savanna, wetland, or late-succession conifer forest
- **Agglomeration**: only parcels whose immediate neighbor accepts a conservation payment
- **Agglomeration-Rare Habitat**: combines eligibility for the Rare Habitat and Agglomeration policies
- **WHIP**: only parcels that score at least 100 points according to Oregon WHIP criteria
- **Rare Habitat-Large-Range**: only parcels with three or more of the following: i) satisfy the Rare Habitat eligibility, ii) greater than 400 acres, iii) greater than 800 acres, and iv) within the range of fourteen or more of our group of species
Policies considered: benefit-cost conservation policies

- **Lot Size**: Parcels targeted according to ratio of lot size to expected cost
- **Lot Size-Rare Habitat**: same as Lot Size but eligibility limited to rare habitat parcels
- **Lot size-Agglomeration**: benefit index is the size of two adjacent conserved parcels
- **WHIP**: benefit index is Oregon WHIP points
- **Rare Habitat-Large-Range**: Benefit index computed by awarding one point for each of the following: i) satisfy the Rare Habitat eligibility, ii) greater than 400 acres, iii) greater than 800 acres, and iv) within the range of fourteen or more of our group of species.
Table 4 – Estimated Mean Change in Biodiversity Score Relative to Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$5m</th>
<th>$10m</th>
<th>$20m</th>
<th>$30m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Optimal Policy</strong></td>
<td>0.0840</td>
<td>0.2377</td>
<td>0.3289</td>
<td>0.3493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniform Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Uniform</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0224</td>
<td>0.0603</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11.92%)</td>
<td>(9.43%)</td>
<td>(18.35%)</td>
<td>(30.37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
<td>0.0267</td>
<td>0.0759</td>
<td>0.1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.29%)</td>
<td>(11.23%)</td>
<td>(23.08%)</td>
<td>(35.57%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Habitat</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>0.0781</td>
<td>0.1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.33%)</td>
<td>(11.40%)</td>
<td>(23.75%)</td>
<td>(37.22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agglomeration</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>0.1091</td>
<td>0.1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19.65%)</td>
<td>(18.32%)</td>
<td>(33.17%)</td>
<td>(47.23%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agglomeration - Rare Habitat</td>
<td><strong>0.0203</strong></td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>0.1314</td>
<td>0.1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24.22%)</td>
<td>(22.94%)</td>
<td>(39.95%)</td>
<td>(54.36%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHIP</td>
<td>0.0113</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
<td>0.0732</td>
<td>0.1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.52%)</td>
<td>(11.12%)</td>
<td>(22.26%)</td>
<td>(35.15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Habitat – Large – Range</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
<td>0.0323</td>
<td>0.0900</td>
<td>0.1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.81%)</td>
<td>(13.59%)</td>
<td>(27.38%)</td>
<td>(41.51%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 – Estimated Mean Change in Biodiversity Score Relative to Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$5m</th>
<th>$10m</th>
<th>$20m</th>
<th>$30m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Optimal Policy</strong></td>
<td>0.0840</td>
<td>0.2377</td>
<td>0.3289</td>
<td>0.3493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit-Cost Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
<td>0.0644</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.29%)</td>
<td>(3.43%)</td>
<td>(19.59%)</td>
<td>(33.82%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size - Rare Habitat</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.0822</td>
<td>0.1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.22%)</td>
<td>(4.42%)</td>
<td>(24.99%)</td>
<td>(36.48%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size Agglomeration</td>
<td>0.0060</td>
<td><strong>0.0686</strong></td>
<td>0.1278</td>
<td>0.2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.14%)</td>
<td>(28.86%)</td>
<td>(38.85%)</td>
<td>(64.52%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHIP</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.76%)</td>
<td>(2.12%)</td>
<td>(3.54%)</td>
<td>(8.34%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Habitat - Large - Range</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>0.0309</td>
<td><strong>0.2112</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3046</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.94%)</td>
<td>(13.00%)</td>
<td><strong>(64.23%)</strong></td>
<td>(87.20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relative efficiency of least-cost conservation policies
Relative efficiency of benefit-cost conservation policies
Fig. 3 - Frequency distributions of performance of alternative voluntary policies

a. Least-cost policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Description</th>
<th>$5 M</th>
<th>$10 M</th>
<th>$20 M</th>
<th>$30 M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple uniform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agglomeration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agglomeration-rare habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife habitat incentive program (WHIP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare habitat - large - range (RHLR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Biology score
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Fig. 3 - Frequency distributions of performance of alternative voluntary policies

b Benefit-cost policies
Discussion of results

• Large differences in the efficiency of alternative incentive-based policies

• At low budget levels:
  – No incentive-based policy performs particularly well compared to the estimated efficient solution
  – The simpler least-cost policies perform better than the benefit-cost policies
  – Premium for getting low cost land enrolled

• At high budget levels:
  – All incentive-based policies improve their performance vis-à-vis the estimated efficient solution
  – Some of the highly targeted benefit-cost policies perform extremely well (Lot-size – Agglomeration; Rare Habitat – Large – Range)
Discussion of results

• Economies of scale
  – Increasing returns to scale for all incentive-based policies at low to mid-budget levels
  – Increasing returns to scale throughout for some policies
  – Increased conservation decreasing fragmentation
  – Increased conservation allows species to attain critical thresholds of population that give large marginal benefit in terms of survival probabilities
Discussion of results

- Policies that target large parcels are relatively inefficient
- Agglomeration policies that create contiguous habitat do much better
- Targeting rare habitat does not do well on its own, but can be combined with other targeting criteria
- Adding more biological criteria does not necessarily improve the policy’s performance, as seen with the WHIP policy
- Incorporating information on expected WTA can have a significant effect. Mechanisms that can elicit private information on WTA are worth exploring further.
Summary

• How efficient are voluntary incentive-based policies?
• Significant differences between outcomes on efficiency frontier and the incentive-based policy outcomes
• Incorporation of biological and economic information can significantly improve outcome
  – Economic information on WTA
  – Biological information on marginal benefit of conservation on parcel
  – Note: marginal benefit depends on spatial pattern of conservation
Summary: issues for future work

- Exploration of auctions and other mechanisms that reveal landowner WTA
- Exploration of mechanisms that tie acceptance into conservation program more closely to benefits per unit cost expended (where spatial pattern influences benefits)
- Studies of different regions with different benefit and cost patterns: do general patterns emerge?
Thank you