

Comments on Chapter 8

1 **Written Public Comments on the**
2 ***Strategic Plan for the U.S. Climate Change Science Program***
3 **Chapter 8: Land Use/Land Cover Change (pp 90-99)**
4 **Comments Submitted 11 November 2002 through 18 January 2003**
5 **Collation dated 21 January 2003**
6

7 Page 90, Chapter 8: First Overview Comment: The term uncertainty is utilized without
8 any clear definition of the term. As this is the main theme of much of the report, it
9 portrays an incorrect image of climate science that everything is uncertain and that no one
10 can or should act until the uncertainty levels are diminished. It then goes on to lay out a
11 high risk strategy of waiting until an unknown day for uncertainties to be reduced before
12 any action can be taken. The risks are high as the lifetime of greenhouse gases in the
13 atmosphere is long and mitigation efforts will not take immediate effect, unlike some
14 other pollutants. This also ignores decades of research by US institutions and others that
15 have reduced uncertainty levels on a wide range of climate issues. A guide to the
16 uncertainty levels is clearly included in the IPCC's Third Assessment Report.

17
18 We would therefore strongly recommend that the report and the research efforts around it
19 not revolve around reducing uncertainties per se, but rather provide new and useful
20 information for policymakers. Finally, to infer that policymakers must have 100%
21 certainty before taking any decisions is not consistent with the current situation. As the
22 report notes, there are many uncertainties surrounding terrorism, but the government is
23 not waiting for 100% certainty before taking preventative measures such as increasing
24 security in airports.

25 **JENNIFER MORGAN, WORLD WILDLIFE FUND**
26

27 Page 90, Chapter 8: #1) There is a need to emphasize the impact of land use/land cover
28 change on soil quality, soil resilience, elemental cycling and greenhouse gas fluxes.

29
30 #2) Which soil, hydrological, vegetational and microclimate processes influence local,
31 regional and global environment.

32 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**
33

34 Page 90, Chapter 8: The following comments are directed to issues relating to land-
35 atmosphere interactions. While these issues are relevant to many of the chapters in the
36 CCSP draft, they are particularly motivated by text in the Water Cycle (7) and Land Use
37 (8) chapters. Overview comments include:

- 38 • The CCSP draft correctly infers that the term "global change" incorporates a change in
39 the frequency distributions of important climate variables. This is more than a change in
40 the mean values. Changes in the frequencies of occurrence of relatively rare, but extreme
41 events, can have very large human implications.
- 42 • Consistent with frequency distribution concepts, the scientific output expected from
43 CCSP projects should be amenable to coupling with proven risk management techniques.
- 44 • The CCSP draft uses the term "watershed-scale" without sufficient background.
45 Watersheds can span scales from the hill slope to continental. This raises issues of scale
46 interaction models that are amenable to probabilistic modelling methods discussed

Comments on Chapter 8

1 elsewhere in these comments.

2 • A distinction between "observations" and "monitoring" should be made more clear in
3 the CCSP draft. The science of global change research requires long-term observations of
4 sufficient precision to permit discovery, quantify process, and support model building.

5 Monitoring comes about after relevant thresholds have been established based on
6 integrations of the science. The monitoring process is used to determine when thresholds
7 are exceeded and remediation is required.

8 • Regarding observations, the CCSP draft is commendable in recognizing the need for
9 "coordinated data sets" and datasets from "regional test beds". These data entities will
10 require substantial new support for infrastructure, personnel, and instrumentation.

11 • The interdisciplinary nature of the climate change problem is also recognized in the
12 CCSP draft. What is perhaps not specified is a need to educate differently, at the graduate
13 student level, to support CCSP needs. An educational goal is the development of a pool
14 of multi-disciplinary climate change scientists capable of providing syntheses of science
15 results necessary to interface with policy-makers. Also, the numbers of field scientists in
16 training should be examined. A significant fraction of the pool of experienced field
17 experimentalists is nearing retirement. Are their sufficient numbers of appropriately
18 trained young scientists to replace them?

19 • The balance between observational and modelling emphases in the CCSP seems correct.
20 We note a need for observational datasets sufficient to properly initialize and test
21 mesoscale boundary-layer models and/or boundary-layer components in large-scale
22 models. Such observations should span time periods commensurate with growing cycles
23 in major biomes of specific continents, and eventually the globe.

24 • CCSP should consider a coordinated network of natural laboratories (an enhancement
25 of the test bed concept in the CCSP draft). For water-cycle and land-atmosphere
26 interaction issues, this coordinated network could consist of nested watersheds of various
27 scales across the major biomes of the US, and eventually the globe. Land-atmosphere
28 interaction research in support of climate change science naturally begins at a minimum
29 resolved watershed scale. As a prototype example, we refer to the Cooperative
30 Atmosphere-Surface Exchanges Study (CASES) that documents land-atmosphere
31 interaction over a 5400 km² watershed in a grassland biome of the Midwest. In a larger-
32 scale context, we refer the CCSP authors to the Water, Earth, Biota (WEB) white paper
33 that emerged from the Geosciences 2000 effort at NSF.

34 • Natural laboratory creation and maintenance will require substantial resources in time
35 and dollars. The time horizons projected in the CCSP draft for many of the water cycle
36 and land use science deliverables (typically 2 to 4 years), are unrealistically short. Ten
37 year time horizons are more realistic. For example, the data-gathering component of a
38 hydrology program in the CASES study area is 3 to 5 years, with 3 to 5 additional years
39 (partly overlapping) planned for data analyses. The plans for CASES extensions also
40 provide examples of the dollar investments to be required. The effort to generate from the
41 CASES observations sufficient datasets for the initialization and validation of atmospheric
42 boundary-layer models will require long-term staffing of O(10) technician and field
43 scientist positions. A substantial instrument maintenance budget is also required over the
44 decade long time period. We note that the resource requirement bounds outlined here are
45 for a single natural laboratory.

46 • The CCSP draft correctly notes that there exists a geophysical component of waterborne

Comments on Chapter 8

1 (e.g. coastal inundation) and airborne (e.g. dust transport) disease processes.
2 Understanding the relevant geophysics for such processes should be given a higher
3 priority in CCSP.
4

5 *References*

6 for information regarding CASES see: <http://www.joss.ucar.edu/cases>.
7 for information regarding WEB see: <http://cires.colorado.edu/hydrology>
8 NorthWest Research Associates (NWRA), Dr. Robert Grossman
9 Page 90, Chapter 8: An additional question that should be posed here regards the impact of
10 climate variability on land use and cover change (especially in vulnerable regions of the
11 world, where changes have impacts that go beyond national borders). Climate variability
12 issues/opportunities can be further developed throughout this section, especially to
13 inform validation and valuation of land, land use, and land cover changes.

14 **IRI, ZEBIAK AND STAFF**

15
16 Page 90, Chapter 8: Overview Comment 1: More emphasis needs to be placed on the
17 need for understanding at the local and regional scale of land use and land management
18 and its impacts. The local and regional levels of land use and management are where the
19 greatest changes might occur. That scale of understanding should be the basis of
20 modeling efforts are well.
21

22 Overview Comment 2: Improved understanding is needed on the feedbacks between
23 ecological, social, economic, health and climate controls and constraints on changes to
24 the land. Feedbacks can have such important implications that they definitely need to be
25 called out.
26

27 Overview Comment 3: The challenges in modeling these systems have been set forth and
28 need to be included into this document (instead of just vague statements that the
29 questions needs to be set forth). The vagueness implies that the scientific community
30 knows little about how to model these processes.
31

32 Overview Comment 4: It is important that the topics of land use and land management
33 are given this high level of treatment in this document. The existing chapter is a major
34 step toward addressing these issues.
35

36 Overview Comment 5: I am concerned that urban land uses are given so much attention
37 when other land uses (and their management and changes) have important implications as
38 well.
39

39 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

40
41 Page 90, Chapter 8: It would be a missed opportunity to use existing databases on land
42 use that could be refined to aid in the climate science program. One obvious example is
43 the databases maintained by the USDA-NRCS that could be adapted to the climate
44 science program. The NRCS Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) could be refined to
45 document agricultural land use with soil carbon change. As a result the NRI would be a

Comments on Chapter 8

1 more valuable resource which would make better use of public dollars. This could be
2 done with partnerships with land-grant universities, NRCS and ARS.

3 **CHUCK RICE, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

4
5 Page 90, Chapter 8: OVC 1. How land use and cover interact spatially is a critical
6 consideration in defining the interaction with the climate system and to society. Explicit
7 consideration of the spatial patterning of land use and cover needs to be incorporated in
8 Chapter 8.

9
10 OVC 2: It is not often clear that settlement patterns (e.g., urban and ex-urban
11 developments) are being considered in the land use and cover considerations. Explicitly
12 stating what range of land use and cover are needed to evaluate land surface feedbacks to
13 the climate system. The role human-dominated land use and land cover types (e.g.,
14 urban, croplands, etc), as well as, more natural ecosystems (preserves, forests, etc) have a
15 differential impact on the feedback to the climate.

16
17 OVC 3: Question 2: Land use intensity is a critical characteristic in describing land use
18 and cover types. The feedbacks and interactions are often determined more by the
19 intensity land is used and the nature which natural resources and other inputs are
20 augmented by human activities related to a particular land use that affects the strength of
21 the feedback to climate and other environmental considerations.

22
23 OVC 4: Question 4: Land management practices and associated resource use needs to be
24 quantified explicitly to develop realistic and meaningful projections of land use and
25 cover. The exchange of energy, water, and other biogeochemical compounds are
26 responding to a particular land use management practice associated with water use,
27 nitrogen inputs, organic matter management, etc.

28 **DR. DENNIS OJIMA, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY**

29
30 Page 90, Chapter 8: Focus is on Land use/cover change (use of remote sensing) no clear
31 link is made to the need for resource maps of soils and geology and how soils maps can
32 be used to predict land use and land use change. The focus is on remote sensing and
33 below ground “stuff” soil is hard to look at with remote sensing yet the soil is often the
34 driving force in land use and land use change and even land cover if that term is used.

35 **SOIL SCIENCE, GLASENER**

36
37 Page 90, Chapter 8:

38 **POTENTIAL ROLE OF THE PARK SERVICE:** The NPS is a steward for some of the
39 most pristine land in United States territory, where anthropogenic influence (e.g., land-
40 use, Chapter 8) is minimal. Data (e.g., the IMPROVE [Interagency Monitoring of
41 Protected Visual Environments] and Inventory and Monitoring programs) is collected
42 routinely in these areas. With CCSP guidance and a minimum of funding (taking
43 advantage of infrastructure and personnel already in place), the NPS could provide a
44 standardized, national-scale database, developed from core monitoring procedures and a
45 core set of variables, that can answer the pressing climate change questions. Reviewer's

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Name, affiliation: Leland Tarnay, Ph.D., National Park Service-Center for Urban
2 Ecology

3
4 The plan places much emphasis on the need to develop data for the period of 10 to 50
5 years into the future. This should be scaled back. We doubt that projections that extend
6 to 50 years will have any accuracy, and they will have little value to decision makers.
7 Emphasis should be placed on a shorter timeframe such as 3 to 20 years. Three years is
8 suggested because it matches the federal budget cycle. Twenty years is suggested
9 because it exceeds the life of most land use management plans and many private
10 investments. We have a far greater need to know what will happen in five years than
11 what might happen in 50 years.

12
13 The authors dwell on using history as an indicator of the future, but fail to mention the
14 very specific situations where climate change caused land use changes. We should look
15 specifically at these situations. A prime example is the changes in agriculture in the short
16 to mid grass regions when the wet years early in the 20th century were followed by the
17 dry years of the Dust Bowl. Current changes in the Sahel (the southern margin of the
18 Sahara Desert) may provide another well documented example, although the cause and
19 effect relationships are not as clear in the Sahel as in the Dust Bowl.

20
21 Having said that, it seems that the historic relationship between climate and land use may
22 not be a good indicator of the future. As the nation and world move from an agricultural
23 economy to an industrial economy to an information economy, climate becomes less
24 important. When USA was a pioneering economy, population distribution was based on
25 resources and climate. Now that we are a mature economy, population distribution is
26 largely set in place by the investment in infrastructure.

27
28 In the face of climate change, forest and range-lands will remain relatively stable while
29 agricultural lands, and possibly wetlands, will change rapidly. Agriculture occupies a
30 huge land base and it is a huge industry, so it should be the major focus of studies of land
31 use change. Impacts on agriculture can be predicted on the basis of agronomic and
32 economic information, not historic relationships.

33
34 Major attention has been focused on sea level changes, and that is appropriate. We also
35 need to pay special attention to the other extreme, i.e., the mountaintops. In North
36 America, with mountain chains that run north and south, the southern mountains are
37 "islands in the sky" with Arctic and sub-Arctic environments. As the climate warms and
38 cools, low elevation species can redistribute themselves north and south, respectively.
39 Species confined to the mountaintops cannot do this, so they are especially vulnerable
40 and they should be given special attention.

41
42 Among most categories of species, there will be winners and losers as the climate
43 changes. Most will not require management attention; those at the extremes may require
44 management attention. Among the rare species, those that turn out to be losers may be
45 pushed to the brink of extinction. Among the pest species, those that are too numerous,
46 the ones that turn out to be winners will become even worse pests. An example might be

Comments on Chapter 8

1 mosquitoes and their associated diseases. Monitoring, research and management should
2 be focused at these extremes.

3
4 Maybe there is a principle here ? we need to focus on the extremes. Reviewer's Name,
5 affiliation: Dr. Terry Cacek, National Park Service-Biological Resource Management
6 Division

7 **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

8
9 Page 90, Chapter 8: This chapter benefits from a competent and well-positioned team of
10 experts long involved in land use and cover change research in the US and abroad (page
11 174). The topic (LUCC) calls for close linkages to all other chapters in the plan (what I
12 refer here as ‘integrated science’, still these linkages are not explored (beyond
13 mentioning chapter numbers) and explicitly articulated within each questions and
14 research needs.

15
16 -While well-written, the chapter seems to mirror the plan as a whole as it reiterates
17 research trends/questions already in place while missing the opportunity to stress the need
18 for more ‘integrated science’. More attention was also needed to ‘human dimension’
19 aspects of land use and cover change, such as on issues related to land use economics and
20 agricultural markets, land use decision-making, policy and institutions, and demographic
21 dynamics at various scales. These topics exemplify areas of great “uncertainty” in LUCC.
22 The sections on “State of Knowledge” (after each of the 5 questions) basically reinstate
23 points already mentioned during the introduction (plan and chapter) and are mostly too
24 general to provide specific directions for future research needs.

25 - Some of the important topics on land use and cover change research that could have
26 been incorporated or further explored while providing an “integrated science” approach
27 to the plan include:

28 -*Land use - Water interactions*: land use systems, nutrient dynamics, hydrological cycles,
29 Carbon cycle.

30 -*Land use - Atmosphere*: land cover change and rainfall patterns, farmers’ response (land
31 use decision making) to climate events, land use systems and greenhouse gases
32 emissions.

33 -*Market incentives and land use*: credit and subsidies influencing large scale land use
34 patterns, medium-term scenarios of land use in response to shifts in agricultural
35 subsidies; shifting in global market demands and land use change.

36 -*Urban-growth and rural land use change*: urban spawn and land cover fragmentation,
37 climate change -land value-agricultural change.

38 -*Land use – biodiversity*: patterns of land use change, habitat fragmentation; land
39 use systems and adaptation of crop varieties to climate change

40
41 -Other areas requiring advances in LUCC research, and mentioned in the chapter, refer to
42 methodological developments on the integration between social/economic/demographic
43 data (field surveys and census data) and regional land use and cover spatial data.

44 Examples a)Use of historical census data; b)Use of historical economic data (crop
45 markets, land price, etc.); c)Ethnographic data on agricultural decision making, farmer’s
46 perception of climate change, institutions and social organization.

Comments on Chapter 8

1 –The need for institutional cooperation and funding mechanisms to facilitate ‘integrated
2 approaches’ has been recognized by national and international programs involved in
3 global change research (NRC 1999, 2000, several IGBP-HDP science plans 1990-2002).
4 More attention to these issues in the current plan would help to diminish ‘uncertainties’
5 and foster scientific advances relevant to policies for a changing world.

6 **EDUARDO S. BRONDIZIO, INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

7
8 Page 90, Chapter 8: This chapter seems well conceived and organized. The importance
9 of land use and cover is suitably recognized and explained. However, this chapter seems
10 to weigh heavily the importance of understanding past land use change as a predictor for
11 future changes. A key missing component from this “equation” is “ecosystem function”
12 as a driver for future changes – something poorly understood and/or of limited
13 importance in the past. Past changes were largely influenced by resource proximity –
14 understanding “resource” in this statement could range from economic “resource” return
15 on investment to water availability for irrigation (and all possibilities in-between).
16 Existing large data bases, for example soils inventories and recognized best uses of
17 different soils, now allows land use decisions to be made based on function of this
18 resource as they interact with intended uses. As a society that recognizes potential
19 impacts of land use change, increased emphasis may be placed on “function” rather than
20 “proximity”.

21 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

22
23 Page 90, Chapter 8: The issues of land cover change (Chapter 8), the carbon cycle
24 (Chapter 9), and ecosystems (Chapter 10) overlap extensively. In order to closely link
25 the research strategies for these three areas, the three chapters should explicitly reference
26 each other at key overlapping points, as the IPCC authors did for the Third Assessment
27 Report.

28 **PATRICK GONZALEZ, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY**

29
30 Page 90, Chapter 8: This chapter successfully establishes the significance of land use as a
31 topic for research on climate change. However, this topic would be strengthened by
32 expanding to add a focus on transportation. This would consider the interrelationships
33 between land use and transportation, and the resultant impacts on GHG emissions. Land
34 use is determined by public and private sector decisions on how to distribute commercial
35 and residential activities, which influence travel patterns and the significant GHG
36 emissions from the transportation sector. And in turn, transportation systems influence
37 land use.

38
39 Research directed at better understanding these complex relationships would have a
40 significant promise for improving the ability to consider the critical climate change
41 implications of land use and transportation decisions.

42
43 Transportation, as much as any other factor, shapes development patterns and impacts the
44 natural environment either positively or negatively. Land use and transportation are
45 symbiotic: how development is spaced can greatly influence regional travel patterns, and,

Comments on Chapter 8

1 in turn, the degree of access provided by the transportation system influences land use
2 distribution.¹

3
4 The location of economic functions and housing greatly influences travel patterns,
5 distances traveled, transportation modes used, and congestion. This distribution of land
6 use and the impact that it has on the transportation system is often the cause of congestion
7 that contributes to air quality that is unacceptable for healthy living. Transportation is not
8 mentioned in this chapter even though it often acts as a guiding force for new
9 development.

10 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, LAWSON**

11
12 Page 90, Chapter 8: Overview Comments on Chapters 8, 9, and 10

13 **Integrate chapters:** These three chapters should be merged into a single chapter that
14 addresses land use/cover, ecosystems, and the terrestrial component of the carbon cycle.
15 The marine component of the carbon cycle and comprehensive carbon cycle modeling
16 could be addressed in a separate chapter or in the chapter on atmospheric composition.
17 Integrating the chapters focused on the terrestrial biosphere would reduce redundancy in
18 the exposition, and more importantly, reduce the risk of analytical inconsistencies. For
19 example, terrestrial carbon cycle models often project a terrestrial CO₂ sink without
20 considering changes in land use that could eliminate the forests assumed to be
21 sequestering carbon in response to higher CO₂ concentrations. Integration of the chapters
22 will also help to focus attention on the key interactions and feedbacks between climate
23 change and terrestrial ecosystems, including albedo as well as carbon cycle changes.
24

25 **Focus on overriding issues:** The draft plan lacks focus and fails to set priorities.
26 Priorities should be based on relevance to refining our understanding of what is required
27 to stabilize heat-trapping greenhouse gases in the atmosphere at a level that prevents
28 dangerous human interference with the climate system. Key issues to highlight are:

- 29 • What carbon budget is compatible with different stabilization levels given
30 feedbacks?
- 31 ○ Ocean CO₂ uptake
 - 32 ○ Climate change and CO₂ fertilization impact on NEP
 - 33 ○ Changes in forest cover impact on albedo
 - 34 ○ Climate change impacts on methane emissions
- 35 • How can inventory and inverse estimates of the North American sink be
36 reconciled?
- 37 • How can carbon stock changes due to management practices be distinguished
38 from changes due to other factors?
- 39 ○ CO₂ fertilization, nitrogen deposition
 - 40 ○ Climate variability, climate change
- 41 • How will ecosystem services be affected by global change?

42 **DANIEL LASHOF, NRDC**

43

¹ The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process: Key Issues, Nov. 2001

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 90, Chapter 8: I found this chapter to be weak relative to the other GCRP chapters.
2 The payoffs were exclusively maps, databases, and reports. There were few identified
3 improvements in science (i.e. what answers will be provided?) I recognize that that Land
4 Use is a complex topic, but this chapter does not make a compelling case for investment.

5 **MARK R. ABBOTT, OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**

6
7 Page 90, Chapter 8: While the chapter does a good job of covering issues dealing with
8 major changes in land use/land cover such as conversion of forests and agricultural land
9 to urban use, etc., it does not adequately address the effects of management decisions on
10 land use. For example, within agricultural lands, the balance between greenhouse gas
11 sources and sinks will be greatly influenced by such things as annual vs. perennial
12 cropping systems and conventional vs. no-till practices. In forests, the ability of young,
13 rapidly growing stands to sequester carbon could be quite different from that of mature,
14 old-growth stands which could actually be carbon sources. These subtle differences
15 within major land use groups needs to be more adequately addressed. Some of these
16 issues are covered in the carbon cycle chapter suggesting the better linkages among
17 chapters is warranted.

18 **R. HOWARD SKINNER, USDA-ARS**

19
20 Page 90, Chapter 8: The importance of this issue is underscored by the recent paper by
21 Pielke et al. (*Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.* Vol. 360, pp. 1705 – 1719, 2002). This deserves
22 priority attention.

23 **GEORGE WOLFF, PH.D., GENERAL MOTORS**

24
25 Page 90, Chapter 8: Shorelines

26 A large portion of the population now lives in coastal areas, and the rate of population
27 growth in these areas is higher than the average (Cohen et al., 1997). A change in sea-
28 level in these areas would have a huge impact on both the economy and wellbeing of the
29 region. The CCSP strategic plan would be deficient by not including activities to
30 measure and monitor shoreline change and their impacts.

31
32 The shore zones of the world are both potent indicators and potential controllers of global
33 climate change. Defined in name and geography by the shoreline, the interface between
34 land and water, these regions occupy one of the most dynamic, diverse, and productive
35 areas on the planet. These regions are densely populated, highly bioproductive, and
36 exquisitely sensitive to climate change. That sensitivity is manifested in both biophysical
37 impacts and socioeconomic impacts, primarily in terms of eustatic change in sea level,
38 but secondarily in terms of environmental and ecosystems shifts that accompany changes
39 in shoreline that may be amplified by isostatic responses or exacerbated by subsurface
40 fluid withdrawal. Shoreline is then a powerful agent in measuring, understanding, and
41 predicting climate change. Shoreline change will significantly alter regional albedo,
42 bioproductivity (consequently carbon fixation), and coastal circulation patterns. These
43 effects feed back into changing the climate.

44
45 Shoreline change likewise poses an immense impact on society, since the vast majority of
46 the nation's and world's population occupy the shore zones. Any change immediately and

Comments on Chapter 8

1 drastically effects population whether the shoreline advances, forcing people to retreat or
2 drown, or whether the shoreline retreats, offering up new, albeit low-lying and risk-prone
3 land for development. Current examples of shoreline-societal crises are New Orleans,
4 awaiting a killer hurricane, Long Beach, diking and abandoning land to petroleum
5 production, Venice, Italy continuing to fight a losing battle against a rising sea, or the
6 periodic tragedies of Bay of Bengal hurricanes striking the Bangladeshi coast with
7 horrific loss of life.

8
9 There have been several studies over the last decade (e.g. Timmerman et al., 1999;
10 Nicholls et al., 1999; and Dean, 1990) to document and predict the impacts of climate
11 change and sea-level rise on coastal systems. The implication of a change in sea-level
12 due to a change in climatic conditions (i.e. global warming) is that there will be
13 tendencies for eroding shorelines to erode further, stable shorelines to begin to erode, and
14 accreting shorelines to wane or stabilize (Bird, 1993). Such changes to the coastal
15 environment will result in increased loss of property and habitats, higher storm-surge
16 flooding, inhibition of primary production processes, and loss of tourism, recreation, and
17 transportation functions.

18
19 Shorelines and shoreline change are critical indicators and controllers of climate change.

20
21 Bird, E.C.F., 1993. *Submerging Coasts: The Effects of a Rising Sea Level on Coastal*
22 *Environments*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, United Kingdom, 184 pp.

23
24 Cohen, J.E., C. Small, A. Mellinger, J. Gallup, and J. Sachs, 1997. Estimates of coastal
25 populations. *Science*: 278, 1211-1212.

26
27 Dean, R.G., 1990. Beach response to sea level change. In: *The Sea* [le Méhauté, B. and
28 D.M. Hanes (eds.)]. John Wiley and Sons, New York, USA, 9: 869-887.

29
30 Nicholls, R.J., F.M.J. Hoozemans, and M. Marchand, 1999. Increasing flood risk and
31 wetland losses due to sea-level rise: regional and global analyses. *Global Environmental*
32 *Change*, 9: S69-S87.

33
34 Timmermann, A., J. Oberhuber, A. Bacher, M. Esch, M. Latif, and E. Roeckner, 1999.
35 Increased El Niño frequency in a climate model forced by future greenhouse warming.
36 *Nature*, 398: 694-696.

37 **NOAA-NESDIS – DIVINS**

38
39 Page 90, Chapter 8: Characterization and monitoring of the global land surface is crucial
40 to understanding climate change and the impacts of climate change on human and natural
41 systems. Changes in land cover can alter albedo, transpiration, carbon balance, and
42 surface temperature. When land cover change expands to regional scale the overall
43 effects on the local to regional climate can be significant.

44
45 The primary agent of land cover change is our species. The continued expansion of
46 human population numbers and living standards produces a persistent pressure for land

Comments on Chapter 8

1 cover changes, such as deforestation. Cumulatively this land cover change will have a
2 dramatic impact on biodiversity, air, food, and water supplies during the coming decades.
3 In many parts of the world rates of land cover change and land degradation are not
4 sustainable, raising questions on how to redesign the human enterprise.

5
6 The feedback processes between land cover change and global climate are not well
7 defined. To address this climate models would need to incorporate representations of the
8 biophysical characteristics of the land surface and to compare climate outcomes under
9 varying scenarios of land cover change.

10
11 The chapter outlines a research program designed to produce land surface products and
12 predicted land cover changes suitable for use in the study of land surface / climate
13 interactions, the carbon cycle, and ecosystems. Global mapping of human settlement and
14 monitoring of biomass burning could be used to build gridded carbon and aerosol
15 emission databases, which are called for in atmospheric composition studies (Chapter 5).

16
17 The satellite observations required for global mapping, characterization and monitoring
18 of the land surface during the next 10-20 years have been planned for and are under
19 development (e.g. EOS => NPP => NPOESS). Compared to the cost of planning,
20 building, launching and operating these systems, the level of investment to make and
21 provide access to the scientific products to support the CCSP is very modest. Chapters
22 like this point out the value of using operational satellite observations to address
23 important science and policy issues.

24 **NOAA-NESDIS, ELVIDGE**

25
26 Page 90, Chapter 8, There should be close linkage between the activities in Chapter 8
27 (which emphasizes data and mapping) and Chapter 11 (which could provide more insight
28 about the behavioral theories behind changes in land use and land cover). Question 4 in
29 Chapter 8 is crucial.

30 **ANN FISHER, PENN STATE UNIVERSITY**

31
32 Page 90, Chapter 8: The most disappointing thing about this chapter is its apparent lack
33 of a conceptual theory or even a unifying vision for approaching the topic. It calls for
34 extensive empirical observations and cataloging without providing a framework for
35 thinking about or organizing land use and land cover change knowledge. It offers no
36 reason even why land cover and land use (two different things) should be united as the
37 same activity or why investigating their change is a “science”. Unlike the chapters on
38 ecosystems, the carbon cycle, and human interactions, this chapter is peculiarly free of a
39 unifying vision other than the obvious fact that land covers and land uses are discrete
40 elements of landscapes reflecting physical, biological, and social processes.

41
42 Second Overview Comment: It would be disingenuous to criticize the authors for a lack
43 of vision without at least offering a possible candidate alternative. If there is a unifying
44 theory of land use/land cover change, I suspect it involves the relentless urbanization of
45 societies and landscapes over history and the ways that energy gets captured and
46 concentrated by urbanization processes. (The word “energy” is mentioned only twice in

Comments on Chapter 8

1 this chapter.) This vision sees rural landscapes as the suppliers of energy (food, fuel, and
2 fiber) and the urbanizing landscapes as consumers (and drivers of change). It would
3 chronicle the rapid growth and urbanization of the world's human population as a
4 function of energy technologies. This approach suggests landscape patterning and
5 organization – land use/land cover change – as an outcome of energy consuming
6 processes and a way to account for its potentially harmful byproducts (CO₂, methane,
7 etc.) in the environment.

8 **TOM WAGNER, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN**

9
10 Page 90, Chapter 8: Overview Comments

11 The focus on land use change as a dynamic (both contributor to and consequence of)
12 climate change factor is important and useful. However, the 5 Questions in Chapter 8
13 appear to overlook the reality that large-scale land cover changes driven by climate
14 change are already well under way, especially in Alaska where there is very little direct
15 human land modification. Some of these climate/land cover changes include tall shrub
16 expansion and invasion of tundra, deglaciation and revegetation of land surfaces,
17 shrinking lakes and wetlands, widespread loss of conifer cover from insect outbreaks, and
18 potential forest invasion of tundra. Most of these climate-related natural land cover
19 changes have considerable climate feedback effect. We suggest that climate sensitive
20 processes and effects of natural land cover change be recognized as an important research
21 need.

22 **WELLER, ET AL, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS**

23
24 Page 90, Chapter 8: In this context we feel that it will be useful to define whether the
25 research will look at purely US-impacts, or effects on other countries as well. As many
26 commodities are internationally traded, there could be secondary effects on US
27 agriculture and land-use, for example, as a result of changes in agricultural production
28 elsewhere in the world. This consideration applies to the topics in Chapter 8 but also to
29 the socio-economic scenarios in Chapter 4.

30 **WARRILOW, WILKINS – UK DEPARTMENT FOR ENVIRONMENT,
31 FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS**

32
33 Page 90, Chapter 8: First Overview Comment: The chapter in general does not appear to
34 recognize the current level of effort mounted by local and state governments, and
35 occasionally regional consortia. The major questions and many of the products and
36 payoffs listed under each question are well posed and welcome but the entire description
37 of the issue could be considerably enhanced through collaboration with states and
38 regions.

39 **CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

40
41 Second Overview Comment: This section emphasizes prospective research on future land
42 modification, but there is much to be learned from assessing the effects of past landscape-
43 scale land modification. This involves two basic research areas:

- 44 1) Past land cover reconstruction in populated areas. This is currently a “cottage
45 industry” within academic circles, but it needs far more support. Much of the
46 work done to date is anecdotal, and some is colored by methodological bias;

Comments on Chapter 8

1 interpretation of past changes (e.g. the deforestation of Europe and its subsequent
2 afforestation, the conversion of the central U.S. from grassland to farms) will be
3 most instructive when there is accurate data on what the past land cover was, and
4 how past ecosystems functioned.

- 5 2) Land cover change is not only a product of direct human disturbance and
6 modification, but may arise as a consequence of climate change. The effects of
7 changing seasonality of precipitation, temperature regimes, or disruption of
8 hydrologic processes (e.g. the loss of perched soil water when permafrost melts)
9 may have important effects on carbon uptake, biogenic emissions, dust, or other
10 direct effects on the atmosphere in addition to potential changes in surface
11 albedo.

12 **-CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD**

13
14 Page 90, Chapter 8: Prioritize Question 5 on the combined effects of and feedback
15 between climate and land use/cover change. Questions 1 through 4 address land
16 use/cover change without overt reference to the climate change context. Such models and
17 research to project future changes in land use and cover may be irrelevant if they do not
18 consider land usages undertaken for adaptation and mitigation purposes.

19
20 More particularly:

- 21 • Address in a more integrated manner the relation between land use/cover change,
22 ecosystems and potential mitigation/adaptation measures.
- 23 • Assess the effects of particular land use practices for climate change (e.g., urban
24 growth, agricultural expansion, conservation, sequestration efforts) considering
25 issues of population growth and increased demands on resources (e.g., ecosystem
26 services).
- 27 • Assess relevant mitigation and adaptation measures considering issues, such as
28 market/non-market costs, feasibility, unintended consequences, timeframes, and
29 efficacy for achieving stabilization and human/wildlife welfare goals.
- 30 • Build on pre-existing work, particularly the National Assessment of Climate
31 Change Impacts on the United States.

32 **BURGIEL, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE**

33
34 Page 90, Chapter 8: This the a good and timely chapter. As one panelist said, there is no
35 denying that land use/land cover has become a "stand-alone issue." One key problem I
36 perceive with the chapter is that it gives the impression that we know less about this topic
37 than we actually do. There is already some understanding related to some of the questions
38 being posed. Examples follow:

39
40 "What are the primary drivers of land use and land-cover change" (p.90). See McDaniel,
41 N., and D.N. Borton. 2002. Increased human energy use causes biological diversity loss
42 and undermines prospects for sustainability. BioScience 52(10): 929-936; Czech, B.,
43 P.R. Krausman, and P.N. Devers. 2000. Economic associations among causes of species
44 endangerment in the United States. BioScience 50 (7): 593-601; Sisk, T.D., A.E. Launer,
45 K.R. Switky, and P.R. Ehrlich. 1994. Identifying extinction threats. BioScience 44(9):
46 592-604.

Comments on Chapter 8

1
2 "What tools or methods are needed to allow for better characterization of historic and
3 current land use cover characteristics and dynamics" (p.90). See O' Neill, R.V., et al.
4 1997. Monitoring environmental quality at the landscape scale. BioScience 47 (8): 513-
5 519.

6
7 "What are the combined effects of climate and land use and land cover change and what
8 are the potential feedbacks" (p. 90).

9 See Dale, V., et al. 2001. Climate change and forest disturbances. BioScience 51 (9):
10 723-734; Aber, J., et al. 2001. Forest processes and global environmental change:
11 predicting the effects of individual and multiple stressors. BioScience 51(9): 753-754.

12 **SHAFFER, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

13
14 Page 90, Chapter 8: After reading the draft strategic plan, some readers might presume
15 that any potential mitigation action must await more precise knowledge. And there is no
16 denying the fact that more knowledge is needed and that predictions preferably need to be
17 available with better levels of confidence. But this argument can always be made at any
18 stage in the evolution of a field of knowledge. Knowledge is always imperfect;
19 confidence levels can always be improved, and on. As one panelist for Chapter 4 said,
20 "All decisions are made under uncertainty." And she stressed that we should ask "what is
21 the least amount of information needed to make a decision." If present knowledge is any
22 predictor, if our society waits another 20 years to refine a mitigation strategy, much loss
23 will be irreversible. If refining our knowledge through research becomes an unconscious
24 method of stasis, then science will benefit but society as a whole may not. So synthesis
25 of what we already know is a crucial need. This chapter might incorporate synthesis as a
26 major thrust, with a completion time line of "very soon." This point blends into
27 comments offered on another chapter.

28 **CRAIG SHAFER, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

29
30 Page 90, Chapter 8: 1. In this chapter specifically, and throughout the plan as the
31 individual chapters like the water cycle and the carbon cycle link and crosscut with this
32 chapter there is a need to establish a common framework for discussion of land use
33 change scenarios. I would propose that this Science Plan take on the ambitious objective
34 of developing a suite of land use change outcomes or conditions for 2100 AD. This
35 effort would obviously parallel the work of the IPCC on the identification of emission
36 scenarios. I envision a formal process whereby one of the critical products of this plan is
37 to develop scientifically defensible land use change scenarios based on the very best
38 estimates for the ranges in likely future population growth and economic development
39 and integrated with the very best estimates of ranges of climate change . . . taking into
40 account that warming without increases in precipitation will likely necessitate the
41 "extensification of agriculture" i.e. the conversion of more grassland, forest land and
42 shrub land into more intensive agricultural production. The adoption of a suite of land
43 use change scenarios would provide a framework for future analyses on how such
44 changes in land use would interact with the carbon and water cycles. This framework
45 would allow for more productive model intercomparisons. One of the criticisms of this
46 chapter that I have is that there is such an infinite set of possible outcomes for

Comments on Chapter 8

1 combinations of land use/water cycle and carbon cycle changes that it is difficult to
2 focus on any specific set of combinations that cover a range of tractable issues.

3 **THOMAS G. HUNTINGTON, U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

4
5 Page 90, Chapter 8: While the chapter does a good job of covering issues dealing with
6 major changes in land use/land cover such as conversion of forests and agricultural land
7 to urban use, etc., it does not adequately address the effects of management decisions on
8 land use. For example, within agricultural lands, the balance between greenhouse gas
9 sources and sinks will be greatly influenced by such things as annual vs. perennial
10 cropping systems and conventional vs. no-till practices. In forests, the ability of young,
11 rapidly growing stands to sequester carbon could be quite different from that of mature,
12 old-growth stands which could actually be carbon sources. These subtle differences
13 within major land use groups needs to be more adequately addressed. Some of these
14 issues are covered in the carbon cycle chapter suggesting the better linkages among
15 chapters is warranted.

16 **STEVEN R. SHAFER, USDA-ARS**

17
18 Page 90, Chapter 8: First Overview Comment: The plan addresses the interaction
19 between land use/land cover change, climate change, water cycle and carbon cycle.
20 Although the plan talks about coupled climate-land use change models, significant
21 understanding of this interaction could be gained by incorporating land use change data
22 into coupled climate and *carbon cycle* models.

23
24 Second Overview Comment: In order to improve our understanding of the interaction
25 between land use change and climate change on local, regional scales, significant effort
26 should be devoted to high-resolution modeling of climate. The projected land use change
27 data should be incorporated into these models to project the future impact of land
28 use/land use cover changes.

29
30 Third Overview Comment: Granted that the subject of the chapter is land use/land cover
31 change, a significant effort should be devoted to understanding the impact of the future
32 land use changes on the carbon budget of the Earth system. Focus on such interaction will
33 add value to the various methods of carbon sequestration projects.

34 **BALA GOVINDASAMY, LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL**
35 **LABORATORY**

36
37 Page 90 and 92, Question 2 – deals only with data (note that models are another type of
38 tool); so change question to be “What **data and methods of data collection and analysis**
39 are needed”

40 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

41
42 Page 90, line 3: One of the really important emerging issues that seems to be totally
43 neglected here is what effect past changes in land cover (going back hundreds to 1000
44 years or more) may have done to the climate. There have likely been regional and even
45 global influences, on temperature, precipitation, and, speculating a bit, sea level.
46 Provision needs to be added to cover this issue given this is a long-term plan.

Comments on Chapter 8

1 **MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)**

2
3 Page 90, Line 5: "Land use and land cover change is perhaps the most prominent form" -
4 How is this evaluated? What metric is used?

5 **RONALD STOUFFER, GFDL/NOAA**

6
7 Page 90, Line 8: While much of the activity of this chapter could shed light on the impact
8 of urban heat islands on the surface temperature record, this element of research should
9 be much more explicit, and a key focus of the chapter.

10 **KENNETH GREEN, FRASER INSTITUTE**

11
12 Page 90, line 8: Following the word "ways," please add the sentence "Predominant
13 effects are on soil quality and cycling of principal elements such as C, N and H₂O."

14 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

15
16 Page 90, line 14: Recommend adding transportation as an influence on land use patterns.

17 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, LAWSON**

18
19 Page 91-92: The history of the land use/land cover work is unfortunately illustrative of
20 the problems of trying to squeeze abstract comprehensiveness into a process that ends up
21 looking like a model but is really a large checklist. The grand statements are academic,
22 but the case specifics are the scene of the action and the source of real value. While the
23 Clark University group diligently pursued the grand synthesis, doing as well as possible,
24 the serious debate was over the soil fertility and carrying capacity arguments in Kenya
25 inspired by claims of "more people, less erosion" by Mortimore and Tiffen, countering
26 generalized statements to the contrary.

27
28 All of social science is relevant, but so what? For any given case and place, the question
29 is not how anyone would look at it, but can anyone from any discipline or perspective
30 persuade us that there is a policy prescription which works on points of leverage and
31 helps solve problems. This is where the grand synthesis is background which cannot be
32 applied without "marching right back" to the specifics of the case to see what happened
33 and what to do about here and now. Knowing some huge set of historic drivers is
34 marginal to acting usefully.

35 **WIENER, INDIVIDUAL COMMENTATOR**

36
37 Page 91, Line 1, remove "the geophysics of."

38 **BALA GOVINDASAMY, LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL**
39 **LABORATORY**

40
41 Page 91, line 5: The fact that LUCC may also of itself impact on climate variability and
42 change, particularly at the regional level also needs to be acknowledged.

43 **JULIA SLINGO, NCAS/CGAM, UK**

44
45 Page 91, Line 5: add: Developing this knowledge would entail instrumenting small
46 watersheds to obtain watershed process data

Comments on Chapter 8

1 **Bonta, USDA**

2
3 Page 91, line 12-19 -- I recognize that the goal is to provide two overarching research
4 questions (such as is done in the other chapters), but these questions are awkwardly
5 worded and are clearly more than two questions. How about rephrasing the questions to
6 be:

- 7 • **How can greater understanding of the influence of social, economic, and**
8 **ecological processes on the temporal and spatial distributions of land-cover**
9 **and land-use change improve projections of these changes?**
- 10 • **How may changes in land use, management, and cover affect environmental**
11 **and socioeconomic conditions, including economic welfare and human**
12 **health?**

13 I realize than some of the detail is not included in this phrasing, but it seems better to be
14 understandable than to have all of the details.

15 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

16
17 Page 91, second paragraph. Again this statement "...scientific underpinning for land use
18 decision making..." is unclear. Most land use decisions are made today by the private
19 sector, and without much understanding of long term repercussions to the environment or
20 other better uses of the land. Will this scientific underpinning be of value to
21 governmental bodies for policy on zoning? Will the better understanding be of value in
22 the design of better uses of the land? How will this work?

23 **SOIL SCIENCE, KISSEL**

24
25 Page 91, line 18: Please add the sentence "What soil, vegetation and hydrologic processes
26 influence the local, regional and global environment?"

27 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

28
29 Page 91, line 27 – "...the direct **and indirect** impacts of land use and land cover change"
30 should be considered.

31 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

32
33 Page 91, line 28: LUCC may also affect biogenic emissions and hence the atmospheric
34 chemistry and composition.

35 **Julia Slingo, NCAS/CGAM, UK**

36
37 Page 91, lines 32-33 – The ability to forecast land use and land cover change and,
38 ultimately, to predict the consequences of change, **depends** on ..." <Note: this should not
39 be future tense.>

40 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

41
42 Page 91, line 33: **(37-S)** The usage in this sentence of "forecast" and "predict" cry out for
43 "project", in the sense it's being used in this document.

44 **HP HANSON. LANL**

45

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 91, Lines 33-35: While it is important to understand the past, it is not always a good
2 guide to the future. Increased globalization is likely to drive land use change in ways not
3 easily predictable from past history. One could infer from language in several places in
4 this chapter that globalization is a key driver but it deserves more explicit recognition.

5 **California Resources Agency**

6
7 Page 91, line 33: Change “predict” to “project” as they consequences are conditional on a
8 lot of things.

9 **Michael MacCracken, LLNL (retired)**

10
11 Page 91, l 34 ...will depend partially on our ability...

12 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

13
14 Page 91, l 35 ...change. Future land use changes may increasingly be made based on
15 improved understanding of ecosystem function and the impact land use changes may
16 have on selected environmental component(s). Historical...

17 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

18
19 Page, 91, line 36 – should be “economic **development, transportation patterns,...**”

20 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

21
22 Page 91, line 37 – “environmental **forces** (..) and social **forces** (..)”

23 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

24
25 Page 91: Question 1, last paragraph on page 91. Patterns of human settlement in the US
26 were shaped by soils and access to water transportation more than anything. Both **soils**
27 **and water transportation** should be mentioned in this statement. Settlers were largely
28 agrarian at the time of settlement of the US, and prosperous communities developed
29 where crops grew well. Good soils promote high crop yields, which in turn promote
30 prosperity and related business development. It is no accident that Dallas, Waco, Austin,
31 Houston, and San Antonio in Texas are located on or just adjacent to deep prairie soils
32 and not on the poor clay pan soils of that state. Also note that Memphis, Evansville,
33 Louisville, Cincinnati, and St Louis are adjacent to highly productive agricultural areas
34 (excellent soils) with excellent water transportation. Although railroads later made water
35 transportation less important, at the time of settlement, good water transportation was
36 dominant.

37 **SOIL SCIENCE, KISSEL**

38
39 Page 92, l 2 ...factors, coupled with improved understanding of ecosystem function
40 resulting from these changes, will improve

41 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

42
43 Page 92, Line 7-17: Climate change due to past land use changes "may" be larger than the
44 ones listed here. See PP97-98.

45 **Ronald Stouffer, GFDL/NOAA**

46

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 92, line 8 – “...trends that shaped **human** expansion...” <Note the concept of “land
2 use expansion” makes no sense, even though certain types of land uses can expand.>

3 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

4
5 Page 92, line 9 – **Historically**, why and how have land use and land management systems
6 (e.g., agriculture) spread **and been constrained**?

7 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

8
9 Page 92, Line 12: new bullet: How does climate change impact agricultural decisions
10 such as crop/animal type, diseases, insects, etc. during a changing climate?

11 **BONTA, USDA**

12
13 Page 92, Line 16: Please add the sentence "How does the impact on soil quality and
14 elemental cycling influence the future land use/land cover?"

15 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

16
17 Page 92, line 19: Broad land cover classes do not provide enough vegetation species
18 information for understanding species-specific impacts or for properly calculating carbon
19 sequestration and losses. Therefore, a fundamental research need is for plant species
20 composition of land cover classes. This would require much more field work to ground-
21 truth remote sensing data.

22 **PATRICK GONZALEZ, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY**

23
24 Page 92, l 20 ...use, ecosystem function, and land cover...

25 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

26
27 Page 92, Line 22, wording is awkward. Remove “change detection”.

28 **BALA GOVINDASAMY, LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL**
29 **LABORATORY**

30
31 Page 92, line 23: Insert, “such as the impact that transportation systems have on land use”
32 after “...influences another”

33 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, LAWSON**

34
35 Page 92; line 28: ... variability. Development of appropriate methodologies to better
36 integrate information between the social and physical-environmental sciences will be
37 needed to adequately address the interaction of human and environmental factors
38 affecting agents of land use change. Consideration of how to integrate this information
39 across appropriate time and space scales will take joint research engagement between the
40 social and physical science community. ...

41 **DR. DENNIS OJIMA, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY**

42
43 Page 92, Line 28: add: Furthermore, studies are needed to evaluate how climate change
44 affects agricultural decisions and vice versa.

45 **BONTA, USDA**

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 92, lines 29-35: The timescales assigned to products and payoffs adds clarity.
2 Recommend using a similar template throughout the document.

3 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, LAWSON**

4

5 Page 92, lines 31-37: This all seems very ambitious—and will require a lot of resources.
6 Promising it without the commitment of resources would seem to be little more than
7 wishful thinking.

8 **MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)**

9

10 Page 92, line 31 – What does “<2 years” refer to? Is this the time period over which the
11 work is expected to produce a payoff?

12 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

13

14 Page 92, Line 38: Specific Comment [page 92, line 38]. Potential of hyper-spectral
15 imaging for the detection of "characterization of current land use and land cover
16 characteristics and dynamics"

17 **OSMOND, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY**

18

19 Page 93 et seq.: I urge funding a small series of symposia with groups such as the
20 American Society for Environmental History, which has a great deal to offer in providing
21 case-study insights into what has happened. It would be very interesting to see how well
22 their cases can be used as samples of different kinds or sequences of processes in land
23 use/land cover change. There is no point in arguing over historiography; lets just get help
24 in finding good work and using it.

25 **WIENER, INDIVIDUAL COMMENTATOR**

26

27 Page 93, line 2ff: This is really not a statement of the State of Knowledge, but of what the
28 research will cover. A baseline for information (like the IPCC reports fro climate) needs
29 to be given.

30 **MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)**

31

32 Page 93, Lines 7-14: The plan recognizes existing data sources (implicitly, state and
33 sectoral programs) for land cover and land use, but fails to recognize the considerable
34 problems in bring those irreplaceable (e.g. requiring hundreds of person years to
35 produce) data sets into the analysis. These data sets are frequently non-digital and often
36 use idiosyncratic classifications. The problems are large yet surmountable, but require
37 resources and a focused outreach program to regional and state data stewards.

38 **CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

39

40 Page 93, line 8ff: this will require a great deal of analysis (and again, a lot of resources).

41 **MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)**

42

43 Page 93; line 11: ... statistics, settlement patterns, resource use, and ...

44 **DR. DENNIS OJIMA, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY**

45

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 93, Line 17: "What are the current patterns and attributes of land use and land cover
2 at national to global scales..." (p.93). See Heilman, G.H., et al. 2002. Forest
3 fragmentation of the conterminous United States: assessing forest intactness through road
4 density and spatial characteristics. BioScience 52(5): 411-422; Olson, D.M. et al. 2001.
5 Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: a new map of life on earth. BioScience 51 (11): 933-
6 938; Sanderson, E.W., M. Jaiteh, M.A. Levy, K.H. Redford, A.V. Wannebo, and G.
7 Woolmer. 2002. The human footprint and the last of the wild. BioScience 52(10): 891-
8 904;

9 **SHAFER, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

10
11 Page 93, Line 17: new bullet: What is the best way to characterize and parameterize
12 various land uses in watershed models for simulation purposes?

13 **BONTA, USDA**

14
15 Page 93, Line 20: "What are the national and global rates, patterns, and characteristics of
16 contemporary land use and land cover change" (p. 93). The rates of change for some
17 areas in the United States, such as conversion of natural or agricultural land to
18 development, have been calculated. For example, see Wang, Y., and D.K. Moskovits.
19 2001. Tracking fragmentation of natural communities and changes in land cover:
20 applications of Landsat data for conservation in an urban landscape (Chicago
21 Wilderness). Conservation Biology 15 (4): 835-843.

22 **SHAFER, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

23
24 Page 93, line 22-23 – Insert question “**Under what ecological and socioeconomic**
25 **conditions are large charges most prevalent?”**

26 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

27
28 Page 93 lines 24-27, need to look at soils here

29 **SOIL SCIENCE, GLASNER**

30
31 Page 93, line 30, insert:

32 Statistics (e.g., census information), vegetation and materials reflectance and radiative
33 properties, and remotely sensed measurements?

34 **NIST, HRATCH SEMERJIAN**

35
36 Page 93, line 31 add:

37 What are the most important climate-driven processes of natural land cover change and
38 what are their feedback effects on climate change?

39 **WELLER, ET AL, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS**

40
41 Page 93, line 31: Please add the sentence "How can the data credibility and reliability be
42 verified?"

43 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

44
45 Page 93, Lines 38-40: As a user of USGS land use/land cover data, I assure CCSP that
46 we need continued and considerable effort focused on accurate attribution of landscape

Comments on Chapter 8

1 characteristics. While this effort might be characterized as research, it truthfully involves
2 more rigorous and regionally specific mapping, which once again can best be done via
3 consortia with regional and state agencies.

4 **CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

5
6 Page 93, line 38 – replace “begin” with “**progress.**”

7 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

8
9 Page 93, line 40 – replace “will require a considerable research effort.” with “**requires**
10 considerable research **efforts.**”

11 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

12
13 Page 93; line 41: ... needed. Development of land use management data associated with
14 various land use and land cover types is critical to quantify the feedback to environmental
15 and climatic changes.

16 **DR. DENNIS OJIMA, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY**

17
18 Page 94, l 1 ...information. Improved models addressing ecosystem function on large
19 scales will be critical. These models must be capable of integrating a broad range of site
20 information increasingly available, and must be able to identify the environmental impact
21 of changes brought about by land use alterations. Concurrently, these models should be
22 capable of identifying the potential for the existing ecosystem to appropriately support
23 proposed changes to the area under consideration. As...

24 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

25
26 Page 94, line 4: **(38-E)** A verb problem: “ A new suite...is needed.”

27 **HP HANSON, LANL**

28
29 Page 94, lines 4- 17 (Products and Payoffs), need to like these items to the soil and soil
30 maps.

31 **SOIL SCIENCE, GLASNER**

32
33 Page 94, line 5: **(39-S)** “Projections” is probably more appropriate here than
34 “predictions”.

35 **HP HANSON, LANL**

36
37 Page 94, Line 8: new bullet: Methods for characterizing and parameterizing land use,
38 such as urban and agricultural uses, for watershed models to evaluate the effects of
39 climate change.

40 **BONTA, USDA**

41
42 Page 94: between line 10-11: Quantification of land use management practices and
43 resource utilization relative to processes controlling feedback to the climate and other
44 environmental considerations.

45 **DR. DENNIS OJIMA, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY**

46

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 94, Lines 20-39 and Page 95, Lines 2-23: The issue of projecting land use and land
2 cover change is clearly central to the scenarioing capacity emphasized elsewhere, yet the
3 entire discussion of current capacity and future research in this area is overly general and
4 does not reflect the state of the science, at least in California. Several researchers have
5 been pursuing this topic for more than a decade, and have developed models of urban
6 development and rural settlement, as well as agriculture in the Central Valley. The lack of
7 specificity in the plan may result from a national perspective on what is fundamentally a
8 state or regional issue. The CCSP will accelerate research in this area far more quickly by
9 building partnerships with state and regional assessment and research efforts.
10 Specifically, the CCSP must ensure that any national and global projection models are
11 compared to state and regional models, lest they become too detached from reality.

12 CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY

13
14 Page 94, line 29 – replace “the regional” with “**local and regional.**” Delete “with this”
15 VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

16
17 Page 94, line 34-36 – Question is too vague; we need to list these questions arising from
18 modeling efforts instead of asking what they are. Some questions are:

19 **What spatial and temporal level of information and modeling are needed to project**
20 **land use and land management and its impacts at regional, national, and global**
21 **scales?**

22 **How and under what conditions are future responses to land use and land**
23 **management expected to differ from past responses?**

24 **What are the major feedbacks between socioeconomic and ecological influences on**
25 **changes in land use and land management?**

26 **What are the major patterns of changes in land use and land management**
27 **occurring today?**

28 VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

29
30 Page 94, lines 37-39: This is quite a challenging effort, and a need that the National
31 Assessment efforts pointed out was needed. How might it even be approached?

32 MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)

33
34 Page 94, line 37-39 --- This vague question can be reworded to read “**Given specific**
35 **climate, demographic, and socioeconomic projections, what are the key sources of**
36 **uncertainty and major sensitivities in projecting characteristics of land use and land**
37 **cover change into the future for five years to five decades?”**

38 VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

39
40 Page 95: Continuing, these sequences and real cases are a sound basis for scenario
41 construction and considerations, which should not be overlooked. The diversion of effort
42 into some giant model view is insufficiently productive; we should not waste the
43 humanities and history by disregarding their interpretations and methods.

44 WIENER, INDIVIDUAL COMMENTATOR

45
46 Page 95, line 3 – Delete “new”

Comments on Chapter 8

1 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

2

3 Page. 95, line 4 – “This **need** ...”

4 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

5

6 Page 95, Line 5: add after change: , characterization/parameterization of land use
7 elements,

8 **BONTA, USDA**

9

10 Page. 95, line 6 – “**annual** to decadal time scales

11 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

12

13 Page 95, Line 17: new bullet: Better parameterization methods for watershed models.
14 96:14 change rural to agricultural

15 **Bonta, USDA**

16

17 Page. 95, line 17 – Why is the focus only on urban growth models? Models are also
18 needed for change in all other land cover types (especially suburban, x-urban, agriculture
19 and forest lands

20 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

21

22 Page 95, Line 18, time frame missing for this task.

23 **BALA GOVINDASAMY, LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL**
24 **LABORATORY**

25

26 Page 95, line 20 – Replace “national” with “national, **regional and local**” for models are
27 needed at all levels-- especially, local and regional since land use change is largely a local
28 phenomenon.

29 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

30

31 Page. 95, line 21-22 – Refer to **models** instead of a single model.

32 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

33

34 Page 95, line 27: Following the word "local" please add "soil and"

35 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

36

37 Page 95, lines 31-33. Water cycle is greatly affected by the soils (all water moves through
38 or over the soil) unless it falls on a water body. Need to address land management here

39 **SOIL SCIENCE, GLASNER**

40

41 Page 95, line 32: Following the word "characteristics" please add "soil properties"

42 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

43

44 Page 96, Line 14: "How will changes in urban and rural land use and land cover influence
45 the spatial and temporal distribution of wildlife and what are the resulting economic,

Comments on Chapter 8

1 social, and ecological impacts" (p.96). See Hansen, A.J. et al. 2002. Ecological causes
2 and consequences of demographic change in the New West. BioScience 52(2): 151-162;
3 Irland, L.C. et al. 2002. Assessing socioeconomic impacts of climate change on US
4 forests, wood-product markets, and forest recreation. BioScience 51 (9): 753-764; Losos,
5 E. et al. 1995. Taxpayer-subsidized resource extraction harms species. BioScience 45(7):
6 446-455.

7 **SHAFFER, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

8
9 Page 96, Line 17: after public add land private

10 **BONTA, USDA**

11
12 Page 96, line 17 – What is the “form” of public lands?

13 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

14
15 Page 96, line 20: Add an additional illustrative research question asking, “How will land
16 use changes mitigate or aggravate transportation-related drivers of climate change?”

17 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, LAWSON**

18
19 Page 96, line 24: Following the word "carbon" please add "pool and fluxes,"

20 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

21
22 Page 96, line 32 – Why only focus on urbanization?

23 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

24
25 Page 96, line 39: Add an additional payoff, research on greenhouse gas reduction
26 through state and local transportation planning and decision making, 2 years.”

27 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, LAWSON**

28
29 Page 97: The timetable here is very fast; I would try it, if I were king, but I'd expect to
30 have to buy some time and talent away from other tasks or risk lowest-common-
31 denominator mush. We already know that poverty and lack of choice reduces the ability
32 to invest in long-term productivity maintenance and capital accumulation, for instance.
33 How hard do we want to relearn that, and how often?

34 **WIENER, INDIVIDUAL COMMENTATOR**

35
36 Page 97, Chapter 8: coupled climate-land use models would be very useful, and we
37 support the intention to accelerate their development.

38 **PHILIP MOTE ON BEHALF OF THE CLIMATE IMPACTS GROUP,**
39 **UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON**

40
41 Page 97 first paragraph. The statement on the “...outflow of soil nutrients...” is not true.
42 First of all, this is a very general statement that does not specify which nutrient. Does the
43 writer mean nitrate leaching in agriculture, or in the natural environment such as in forest
44 or rangeland? I am at a loss to think of an instance where this would be a true statement.
45 At what time scale is this statement intended? Does the writer mean an annual time scale
46 or shorter, or at a geologic time scale? I presume the shorter time scale. The writer is

Comments on Chapter 8

1 making a grandiose statement that is simply not true. Poor soils are poor largely because
2 they starve crops for water, either due to limited rooting profile due to physical
3 limitations or acid subsoils, and/or limited water storage capacity (sandy textures and low
4 organic matter) that is available to crops in a climate that does not provide sufficient rain
5 to overcome the soil water storage limitations. In today's world, fertilizers are cheap and
6 easily make up for any deficiencies in soil fertility for the production of marketable
7 crops.

8
9 I propose that there should be a question 6 related to design of communities that make
10 optimum use of land with the minimum effect on greenhouse gas production.. Where
11 should the crops be produced and where should the natural areas be located for optimum
12 ecological benefit and where should housing and business be laid out for optimum use of
13 land? How do you design optimum land use within a given climatic zone? This design
14 would minimize the production of greenhouse gases. This research would depend on
15 intricate linked models for a very complex set of issues. However, scientists should begin
16 to lead the way with research in these complex areas.

17 **SOIL SCIENCE, KISSEL**

18
19 Page 97, lines 4-13, and p. 98, lines 13-19 have the potential to ignore the historical and
20 dynamic effects of human decisions.

21 **ANN FISHER, PENN STATE UNIVERSITY**

22
23 Page 97, line 7: Following the word "nutrients" please add "and decline in soil structure"

24 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

25
26 Page 97, line 10: Following the words "climate change" please add "soil degradation"

27 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

28
29 Page 97, lines 10 -11 – Insert “ **and ecological systems sometimes have a more intense
30 reaction when exposed to two or more perturbations.**”

31 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

32
33 Page 97 l 10 ...affect natural resources through their effect on ecosystem function. The
34 research...

35 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

36
37 Page 97, line 13: Following the word "cycle" please add "and soil quality"

38 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

39
40 Page 97, lines 15 – 26. Changes in land cover change surface albedo, which, in turn, will
41 affect the climate system. This feedback should be mentioned under Illustrative Research
42 Questions and estimation of albedo effects incorporated into research needs.

43 **LEONARD S. BERNSTEIN, L.S. BERNSTEIN & ASSOCIATES**

44

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 97, line 16ff: This would be a good place to put in a question about the climatic
2 effects of past changes in land cover (and of past changes in climate—natural and human-
3 induced—on land cover) and how far we are now from equilibrium vegetation cover.

4 **MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)**

6 Page 97, Line 16: 16 after agriculture add (e.g. animal and plant production systems)†

7 **BONTA, USDA**

9 Page 97, line 24: Insert a bulleted sentence next to last "What is the impact of future
10 changes in land use and land cover on soil quality, and soil resilience?"

11 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

13 Page 97, line 25-26 – replace “in light of” with “**in order to mitigate the negative**
14 **impacts of.**”

15 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

17 Page 97 130 ...factors and ecosystem function, should be...

18 **SOIL SCIENCE, CRUSE**

20 Page 97, line 37: What is the strategy to do this?

21 **ANTONIO J. BUSALACCHI, EARTH SYSTEM SCIENCE**
22 **INTERDISCIPLINARY CENTER (ESSIC), U. MARYLAND**

24 Page 97, line 39: Replace the word "and" with a comma, and after the word "change"
25 please add "and soil degradation/desertification"

26 **RATTAN LAL, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

28 Page 98, line 6: This will likely take more than 10 years to do globally.

29 **MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)**

31 Page. 98, line 10 – too vague - national model of what?

32 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

34 Page 98, line 19 – replace “larger” with “interactive”

35 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

37 Page 99, references: Recommend reference be correlated to text (via numbers). Also –
38 was there really only one reference used to prepare this Chapter?

39 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, LAWSON**

41 Page 99, line 1: **(40-E)** Another nit-picking verb problem – I’d reword the first part of
42 this sentence to read:

43 “Several programs have identified...and have played...”

44 **HP HANSON, LANL**

Comments on Chapter 8

1 Page 99, line 7 --Transportation is only mentioned in the last paragraph, but it is a key
2 aspect of land-use change

3 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

4
5 Page 99, line 7 -- Why is the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) called out and not the
6 Department of Interior (the agency under which BLM falls)? Why are other agencies that
7 hold land not mentioned here (e.g., the Department of Defense)?

8 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

9
10 Page 99, line 10 – The importance of local land managers is noted in this last sentence but
11 not elsewhere in the chapter

12
13 Several editorial aspects of the writing need to be fixed.

14 “Land use” and “land cover” are hyphenated when used as adjectives.

15 There are several places where unnecessary commas are inserted, which inappropriately
16 separate the subject from the verb.

17 **VIRGINIA DALE, OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY**

18
19 Page 99, line 12: This single reference is really inadequate—what is the basis for all of
20 these points?

21 **MICHAEL MACCRACKEN, LLNL (RETIRED)**