

# Section 5: Habitats, Communities, Ecosystems



Reading: Ch 3 (coral bleaching, ocean acidification, polar bear habitat); Ch 5

## Learning outcomes

- understand definitions related to ecosystems
- explain how climate change affects biomes, and what the impacts are to ecosystem processes
- discuss examples of how climate change affects tropical, temperate, polar, freshwater, and marine ecosystems, and what the consequences of these changes are



# “Ecosystem consequences of wolf behavioural response to climate”

(a) Higher NAO -> deeper snow -> hunting in larger pack




(b) larger pack size -> inc. kill efficiency per pack and per wolf

(c) larger packs, inc. kill efficiency -> fewer moose




(d) fewer moose -> higher fir growth

# Climate defines biomes




[www.marietta.edu/~biol/biomes/biome\\_main.htm](http://www.marietta.edu/~biol/biomes/biome_main.htm)

# Climate defines biomes




[www.marietta.edu/~biol/biomes/biome\\_main.htm](http://www.marietta.edu/~biol/biomes/biome_main.htm)

# Cascading impacts of changes: Arid ecosystems




Higher than average winter precip during 1977-1992




# Cascading impacts of changes: Arid ecosystems


Increases, decreases, and no change in animal populations




rodents




rodents




ants



Increase in shrubs




# Evidence for biome shift: Tree expansion at northern treeline



*Beck et al., 2011*

# Evidence for biome shift: Tree expansion at northern treeline




Why does this figure provide evidence supporting tree expansion at northern treeline?

**Figure 4** (a) Tree cover (Hansen *et al.* 2003) compared to mean air temperature in May–August in 1982–2007 for non-anthropogenic vegetated areas of interior Alaska, i.e. the mainland north of the Alaska Range and south of the Brooks Range. Only areas where gross productivity (Prs) shows a deterministic trend from 1982 to 2008 and where there were no wildfires between 1982 and 2007 are shown. Histograms represent the distribution of (b) temperature and (c) tree cover and include areas where no trend was detected.




# Recent shrub expansion in the Arctic



*Figure 1. Increasing abundance of shrubs in arctic Alaska. The photographs were taken in 1948 and 2002 at identical locations on the Colville River (68° 57.9' north, 155° 47.4' west). Dark objects are individual shrubs 1 to 2 meters high and several meters in diameter. Similar changes have been detected at more than 200 other locations across arctic Alaska where comparative photographs are available. Photographs: (1948) US Navy, (2002) Ken Tape.*

*Sturm et al.,  
2005*

# Biomes 1961-1990




- Boreal Conifer Forest
- Desert
- Ice
- Temperate Broadleaf Forest
- Temperate Conifer Forest
- Temperate Grassland
- Temperate Mixed Forest
- Temperate Woodland
- Tropical Deciduous Broadleaf Forest
- Tropical Evergreen Broadleaf Forest
- Tropical Grassland
- Tropical Woodland
- Tundra and Alpine
- Water

Slide courtesy M. Jennings, TNC

Source: The Nature Conservancy Climate Change Initiative


# Biomes 2071 - 2100, A1B Emission Scenario



Slide courtesy M. Jennings, TNC

Source: The Nature Conservancy Climate Change Initiative

# Uncertainty in projected future shifts of biomes: LPJ model, two climate change scenarios



HADCM3 A2

ECHAM5 B1

IPCC, WG II, AR4

Figure 4.3. Projected appreciable changes in terrestrial ecosystems by 2100 relative to 2000 as simulated by DGVM LPJ (Sitch et al., 2003; Gerten et al., 2004) for two SRES emissions scenarios (Nakicenovic et al., 2000) forcing two climate models: (a) HadCM3 A2, (b) ECHAM5 B1 (Lucht et al., 2006; Schaphoff et al., 2006). Changes are considered appreciable and are only shown if they exceed 20% of the area of a simulated grid cell (see Figure 4.2 for further explanations).


# Impact of biome shift on ecosystem functioning: Arctic shrub expansion

*Table 2. Key differences in properties between shrubby and nonshrubby tundra.*

<b>Properties</b>	<b>Nonshrub tundra</b>	<b>Shrub tundra</b>
Snow depth/duration	Shallower/shorter	Deeper/longer; more snow runoff
Albedo	Higher	Lower
Summer active-layer depth	Deeper	Shallower (because of shading)
Summer active-layer temperature	Warmer	Cooler
Soil temperature	Higher in summer, lower in winter	Lower in summer, higher in winter
Nutrient (nitrogen) cycling	Faster	Slower
Carbon cycling	Faster	Slower
Caribou forage access and quality	Higher	Lower
Winter CO <sub>2</sub> flux	Lower	Higher
Summer CO <sub>2</sub> exchange	Lower	Higher

CO<sub>2</sub>, carbon dioxide.

# Impact of biome shift on ecosystem functioning: Arctic shrub expansion



*Sturm et al.,  
2005*

**Figure 9. The snow–shrub–soil–microbe feedback loop  
(based on Sturm et al. 2001b).**

# Impact of biome shift on ecosystem functioning: Arctic shrub expansion



Figure 5. A shrub patch that has created a snowdrift in and downwind of the patch. The snow on the tundra behind the patch was about one-fifth as deep as the drift. Photograph: Matthew Sturm.

more soil biological activity  
projected in future






Figure 7. The Kuparuk Basin, showing a proxy index (number of days of microbial activity) for subsurface winter biological activity (a) under present conditions and (b) with projected increases in shrub growth. The index was computed by summing the number of days of the winter that the soil surface temperature is at or above  $-6$  degrees Celsius (Taras et al. 2002). Note the strong latitudinal gradient in this index value. Snow depth increases as a function of vegetation growth, leading to significant increases in the index value, particularly in the middle and southern part of the basin.

# Impact of biome shift on ecosystem functioning

## New Mexico Environmental Gradient




Desert Grass; Desert Shrub; Juniper Savanna; Pinyon-Juniper; Ponderosa Pine; Subalpine Conifer






# Tropical ecosystems: cloud forests

Projected changes in clouds



Tropical cloud forests form where clouds intersect mountain slopes (top). Under climate change or lowland land clearing, lowered relative humidity at altitude means clouds will form higher (bottom), reducing the area of intersection with mountains and decreasing the extent of cloud forest, possibly causing loss of some of the many endemic species found there. In this schematic, increasing relative humidity and cloud condensation are indicated by shades of orange. Source: Lawton et al., 2001.

Effects of dry periods on animals in cloud forest




**FIGURE 5.4** Monteverde Population Fluctuations Synched to Dry Days.

Twenty species of frogs and toads disappeared from the Monteverde cloud forest in Costa Rica (first black bar) after an unusually long run of dry days (solid line). The golden toad (*Bufo periglenes*) was locally endemic, so its disappearance represented a global extinction, perhaps the first extinction linked to climate change. Subsequent long dry spells have caused other frog population crashes since 1987 (inset). Increasing frequency of dry spells in cloud forest is linked to climate change through the lifting cloud base effect. Dry periods appear to favor pathogenic growth of the fungus that is the ultimate cause of death in affected frogs. Reproduced with permission from Nature.

# Temperate forest ecosystems

## Shifts in range of ponderosa pine




**FIGURE 5.13** Map of Ponderosa Retreat in Sierras.

Ponderosa pine range has been reduced in the Sierra Nevada mountains of California since 1930. Upslope movement of montane hardwoods (dominated by *Quercus* sp.) has been replacing the lower range margin of ponderosa pine (left) while temperature has been increasing in the region (right). Upslope loss in ponderosa pine is detected by comparing vegetation surveys from the 1930s (Wieslander VTM survey) to modern vegetation maps. The area of retreat in freezeline (yellow, right) closely corresponds to the area of pine loss (red-purple, left). *Figure courtesy of Jim Thorne.*

Hannah, 2011

# Climate influences regional fire years





For roughly the past four centuries, regional fire years were ones of warm springs that were followed by dry summers (Figure 5).



*Morgan et al., 2008*

# Early snowmelt and longer, drier summers => more large fires


Change in Average Moisture Deficit  
1987–2003 versus 1970–1986



Large Forest Wildfires  
in Years with Early Spring



# Climate is a major driver of Canadian wildfires



Flannigan et al., 2005






Figure 5. Ratio of  $3 \times \text{CO}_2 / 1 \times \text{CO}_2$  area burned by Ecozone using the Canadian and Hadley GCMs, respectively. N/A, not applicable. The area burned model did not work for ecozone 14 with the Canadian GCM. (Continued on next page.)



# Wildfire: Projections based on future climate change




- A - Cascade Mixed Forest
- B - Northern Rocky Mt. Forest
- C - Middle Rocky Mt. Steppe-Forest
- D - Intermountain Semi-Desert
- E - Great Plains-Palouse Dry Steppe
- F - Sierran Steppe-Mixed Forest
- G - California Dry Steppe
- H - Intermountain Semi-Desert / Desert
- I - Nev.-Utah Mountains-Semi-Desert
- J - South. Rocky Mt. Steppe-Forest
- K - American Semi-Desert and Desert
- L - Colorado Plateau Semi-Desert
- M - Ariz.-New Mex. Mts. Semi-Desert
- N - Chihuahuan Semi-Desert


increase in burned area for 1° C increase in temperature

Littell et al., *Ecological Applications*, 2009;  
National Academies, *Climate Stabilization Targets*, 2010

# Projected future wildfire frequency



# Observed tree dieoff from climate change



*IPCC AR5, WG 2, 2013*



# Drought: Texas drought in 2011



*Dr. Ron Billings, Texas Forest Service*


# Drought: Pinyon pine dieoff in Southwest in 2000s



**Jemez Mts. near Los Alamos, October 2002**

**Photo: Craig D. Allen, USGS**

# Drought: Pinyon pine dieoff in Southwest in 2000s




*Breshears et al., 2011*

# Drought: Tree dieoff in Southwest

Warming:


- higher evapotranspiration
- bark beetles

West Climate



Breshears et al. PNAS, October 18, 2005, vol. 102, no. 42, 15144-15148, and graphic from Neil Cobb

# Drought: Tree dieoff in Southwest



evaporative demand by atmosphere

temperature

precipitation

Forest Drought Stress Index

Drought: Projections of forest stress given climate change in the Southwest


1572-1587 megadrought

Williams et al., Nature Climate Change, 2012

Prof. J. Hicke

# Drought: Tree dieoff in Southwest

Tree die-off effects on ecosystem processes and services



# Benson Glacier

(courtesy USDA)

Eagle Cap, Wallowa Mountains, OR

1920 (H. Richardson)



1992 (D. Jensen)



Andrew G. Fountain  
Portland State University

**a** 1978



**b** 2002




Tropical glacier melt

*Barnett et al.,  
Nature, 2005*

**Figure 3 | Changes in the Qori Kalis Glacier, Quelccaya Ice Cap, Peru, between 1978 (a) and 2002 (b). Glacier retreat during this time was 1,100 m (L. Thompson, personal communication). Photographs courtesy of L. Thompson.**




## Mountain Glacier Changes Since 1970



[en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Glacier\\_Mass\\_Balance\\_Map.png](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Glacier_Mass_Balance_Map.png)


# Glaciers in the American West

1 : 24,000




Andrew G. Fountain  
 Portland State University

# Fraction of Glacier Area Lost since 1900



Andrew G. Fountain  
Portland State University

# Precipitation Type - Rain vs. Snow 1965-2005 Reynolds Creek Experimental Watershed



Still Snow Dominated

Now Rain Dominated

Rarely Snows



Courtesy of  
 Dr. Danny Marks (ARS)  
 & Anurag Nayak (USU)

Slide courtesy  
 T. Link, UI

# Lower Spring Snowpack

Spring snowpack is projected to decline as more winter precipitation falls as rain rather than snow, *especially in warmer mid-elevation basins*

Snowpack will melt earlier with warmer spring temperatures




**April 1  
Snowpack**



# Shifts in Streamflow

- More winter rain → **higher winter streamflows**
- Warmer temperatures → **earlier snowmelt** and a **shift in the timing** of peak runoff
- Lower winter snowpack → **lower spring and summer flows**





**Sensitivity analysis for the Yakima River basin**

Source: Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington, [www.cses.washington.edu/cig](http://www.cses.washington.edu/cig)

# Increase in tree mortality rates in old-growth forests

**Fig. 1.** Locations of the 76 forest plots in the western United States and southwestern British Columbia. Red and blue symbols indicate, respectively, plots with increasing or decreasing mortality rates. Symbol size corresponds to annual fractional change in mortality rate (smallest symbol,  $<0.025 \text{ year}^{-1}$ ; largest symbol,  $>0.100 \text{ year}^{-1}$ ; the three inter-



van Mantgem et al., *Science*, 2009


**Fig. 2.** Modeled trends in tree mortality rates for (A) regions, (B) elevational class, (C) stem diameter class, (D) genus, and (E) historical fire return interval class.

# Increase in tree mortality rates in old-growth forests due to warming (stress, biotic causes)

observed mortality

likely cause

unlikely cause




van Mantgem and Stephenson,  
*Ecology Letters*, 2007

**Figure 1** Annual tree mortality rates from 1983 to 2004 for 21 permanent forest plots in the Sierra Nevada, California. The thin solid line represents the annual mortality rate averaged among plots, with the thick solid line showing the expected mortality rate ( $\pm 2$  SE, shaded area) from significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) models of the annual trend (Table 1). (a) Mean annual mortality rate for all causes of death increased at 3% per year (Table 1). (b) Mean annual mortality rate for stress and biotic causes increased at 3% per year (Table 1). Average water deficit (dashed line), an index of drought (see text for definition), predicted changes in the stress and biotic mortality rate (Table 2). (c) Mean annual mortality rate for mechanical causes did not show a significant trend (Table 1), although  $Precip_{max}$  (dotted line), an index of storm intensity (see text for definition), predicted annual variability in the mechanical mortality rate (Table 2).



# Warming leads to longer growing season but reduced plant growth



Hu et al., *Global Change Biology*, 2010

Shallower snowpack =>

longer growing season length but  
less water availability =>

less plant growth (dependence  
on snow melt water) =>

less carbon storage (lower Net  
Ecosystem Productivity)

Fig. 2 (a) Relationship between annual GSL and NEP for 9 years. A significant, negative relationship between GSL and NEP ( $P = 0.04$ ,  $R^2 = 0.47$ ,  $NEP = -2.66 \times GSL + 510.51$ ) demonstrate that longer growing seasons are correlated with lower annual rates of carbon sequestration by the forest. Vertical error bars correspond to 18% randomly generated NEP errors and horizontal error bars correspond to error in calculating the start and end of the growing season. (b) A significant, negative relationship between GSL and SWE ( $P = 0.01$ ,  $R^2 = 0.61$ ,  $SWE = -1.08 \times GSL + 223.87$ ) demonstrates that years with a longer growing season are correlated with less available snow melt water. Horizontal error bars correspond to 1% instrument error. NEP, net ecosystem productivity; GSL, growing season length; SWE, snow water equivalent.

# Reliance of trees on snow melt water, not summer precip in this area






Fig. 7 Gross primary productivity (GPP) modeled using SIPNET for 2005, 2006, and 2007. Gray areas represent snow contributed GPP and black areas represent rain contributed GPP. Annual net ecosystem productivity (NEP) for each year is as follows: 2005 ( $88 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ), 2006 ( $104 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ), and 2007 ( $98 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ).

*Hu et al., Global Change Biology, 2010*

# Salmon Impacted Across Full Life-Cycle




# Predicted response of bull trout to warming



*Rieman et al. 2007*

# Trout species respond differently to warming



Brook



Brown



Rainbow



Cutthroat




© Joseph Tomelleri

[fishandboat.com/trout.htm](http://fishandboat.com/trout.htm);  
[fieldguide.mt.gov](http://fieldguide.mt.gov)

JOSEPH TOMELLERI

*Wenger et al. 2011*


# Species responses to air temperature, streamflow



*Wenger et al. 2011*

# Predictions using future climate projections

Overall: 47% decrease by 2080




*Wenger et al. 2011*

**Rainbow: negative T offset by flow changes that are beneficial (spring, not winter, spawners)**



# Vulnerability to Climate Change



**Thermal Sensitivity**  
Black = fall spawner



# Cutthroat trout risk analysis that includes climate change

Factors influencing risk of losing cutthroat trout populations:  
Adding climate change





FIGURE 1.—Schematic showing how the current analysis of population persistence is influenced by climate change risk models to produce an overall description of population risk.

*Williams et al., NAJ Fish. Manag., 2009*

# Cutthroat trout risk analysis that includes climate change

Factor 1: Summer temperature




Risk of higher summer T: above 22° or 24°C (depending on population) after 3°C warming

*Williams et al., NAJ Fish. Manag., 2009*

Climate Change Ec FIGURE 3.—Risk of increased summer temperature within the historic ranges of Bonneville cutthroat trout and Colorado River cutthroat trout, by subwatershed.

# Cutthroat trout risk analysis that includes climate change

## Factor 2: Winter flooding



Winter precip-  
dominated watersheds


Change from snow- to  
rain-dominated with  
3°C winter warming

*Williams et al., NAJ Fish.  
Manag., 2009*

Climate Change Ec FIGURE 4.—Risk of increased winter floods within the historic ranges of Bonneville cutthroat trout and Colorado River cutthroat trout, by subwatershed.

# Cutthroat trout risk analysis that includes climate change

## Factor 3: Wildfire impacts



Intermediate elevations may be more susceptible to changes in fire regime (Westerling et al., 2006)

*Williams et al., NAJ Fish. Manag., 2009*

Climate Change Ecc **FIGURE 5.**—Risk of increased wildfire within the historic ranges of Bonneville cutthroat trout and Colorado River cutthroat trout, by subwatershed.

# Cutthroat trout risk analysis that includes climate change

Composite risk = max of three climate risks

Bonneville subspecies: 73% in high risk

Colorado subspecies: 29% in high risk

More change from flooding, fire than from summer warming

summer T




FIGURE 3.—Risk of increased summer temperature within the historic ranges of Bonneville cutthroat trout and Colorado River cutthroat trout, by subwatershed.

winter flooding




FIGURE 4.—Risk of increased winter floods within the historic ranges of Bonneville cutthroat trout and Colorado River cutthroat trout, by subwatershed.

wildfire




FIGURE 5.—Risk of increased wildfire within the historic ranges of Bonneville cutthroat trout and Colorado River cutthroat trout, by subwatershed.

Williams et al., NAJ Fish. Manag., 2009

# Cutthroat trout risk analysis that includes climate change

Westslope subspecies: 65% in high risk

More change from flooding, fire than from summer warming





FIGURE 6.—Composite climate change risk for subwatersheds within the historic range of westslope cutthroat trout.

*Williams et al., NAJ Fish. Manag., 2009*

# Wildfire effects on stream temperature



“Burned”: loss of shading from streamside vegetation

“Reorganized”: flooding, debris flows following fires that redistribute sediment and wood (and remove live vegetation)


Changes in T lasted for decades

Figure 4. Plot of predicted probability of exceeding 20°C as a function of stream elevation for sites in nine streams in the Boise River Basin (Figure 1) with differing wildfire and channel disturbance history (*closed circles* unburned streams, *open circles* burned streams, *gray triangles* burned and reorganized streams).


Dunham et al., *Ecosystems*, 2007

# Cascading effects of changes in climate through physical and biological systems

Warm water entering into Arctic -> changes in circulation  
 -> deflection of low-salinity water to west of Greenland...



...with resulting impacts to marine ecosystems



Greene and Pershing, Science, 2007




# Coral bleaching



*Hannah, 2011*

# Coral bleaching





**FIGURE 3.2** 1997 – 1998: A Deadly Year for Corals.

The right panel shows corals bleached in the El Ni ñ o event of 1997 – 1998. The left panels show a single coral head pre- and postbleaching: (a) prebleaching, (b) bleached coral head, (c) partially recovered coral head, and (d) fully recovered postbleaching. *Left Source: Manzello et al., 2007; Right Source: Courtesy U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.*

*Hannah, 2011*

# Coral bleaching



● No bleaching ● Low bleaching ● Moderate bleaching ● Severe bleaching ● Severity unknown

*Marshall, Schuttenberg, 2006*

# Ocean acidification





Figure 1.1 • Diagram of the pH scale, labeled with the average pH values for some common solutions, including seawater. pH is defined as the negative log of the hydrogen ion concentration in a solution. Neutral pH is 7.0, solutions that have pH values < 7.0 are acidic, and those that have pH values > 7.0 are basic. The term 'ocean acidification' refers to the direction of change toward more acidic conditions with increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. Like the Richter scale, the pH scale is *logarithmic*. This means that a pH of 7 is *10 times more acidic* than a pH of 8.


NOAA, *State of Washington Report on Ocean Acidification, 2012*

# Ocean acidification



<http://pmel.noaa.gov/co2/files/oareaction.jpg>

# Ocean acidification



Recent changes in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> in seawater, and pH

Figure 1.3 • Time series of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> at Mauna Loa (in ppm; mole fraction in dry air) and surface ocean pH and pCO<sub>2</sub> (μatm) at Ocean Station Aloha in the subtropical North Pacific Ocean. Note that the increase in oceanic CO<sub>2</sub> over the last 19 years is consistent with the atmospheric increase within the statistical limits of the measurements. Mauna Loa data: Dr. Pieter Tans, NOAA/ESRL (<http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends>); HOTS/ALOHA data: Dr. John Dore, University of Hawaii (<http://hahana.soest.hawaii.edu>).

NOAA, *State of Washington Report on Ocean Acidification, 2012*

# Ocean acidification

## History and future of OA at the ocean surface





Figure 1.4 • Schematic diagram of the changes in pH, CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>, and CO<sub>2</sub>(aqueous) of the surface oceans under a high CO<sub>2</sub> emission scenario out to 2100 (after Wolf-Gladrow et al., 1999). The pH has declined by about 0.1 (equivalent to a hydrogen ion concentration increase of about 30%) since the beginning of the industrial era.


NOAA, State of Washington Report on Ocean Acidification, 2012

# Arctic sea ice retreat



Extent during each year

## Change in extent during winter




[nsidc.org](http://nsidc.org)




# Arctic sea ice retreat

## Extent in fall (minimum)



[oceanoday.noaa.gov/welcome.html](http://oceanoday.noaa.gov/welcome.html)

# Arctic sea ice retreat



globalwarmingart.com

# Arctic sea ice retreat

Models do not predict retreat as fast as observed (worrying)





Figure 1. Arctic September sea ice extent ( $\times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$ ) from observations (thick red line) and 13 IPCC AR4 climate models, together with the multi-model ensemble mean (solid black line) and standard deviation (dotted black line). Models with more than one ensemble member are indicated with an asterisk. Inset shows 9-year running means.

Stroeve et al., GRL, 2007

# Climate change effects on Antarctic food webs



**FIGURE 5.17** Example of an Antarctic Food Web. Diatoms dependent on sea ice support a diverse food web, including great whales that feed directly on plankton and several food chains that have diatoms at their base.

Hannah, 2011