Washington Connected Landscapes Project: Climate-Gradient Corridor Analysis

Meade Krosby, Tristan Nuñez, Lynn Helbrecht, Darren Kavanagh, Joshua Lawler, Brad McRae, John Pierce, Peter Singleton, Joshua Tewksbury

## Talk Outline

Climate Gradient Corridor analysis and products

II. Utility of the analysis for NCAP

- III. Potential future analyses for synthesis
  - and interpretation

.







# Species are already moving....

 Upward (~6m / decade) and poleward (~6km / decade)

(Parmesan & Yohe 2003)



....and will need to move farther and faster as climate change accelerates









# <section-header><section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item>



# A pathway through a changing climate

-Connect warm areas to cool -Avoid areas of heavy land use



# A pathway through a changing climate

<text>

# Link large, natural patches of land

- Patches in "natural" land cover
- Patches larger than 10,000 acres in size



# Link patches that differ in temperature

- Patches that differ by more than >1°C
- Temperature data:
  - 30-year average of Mean Annual Temperature (1971-2000)





# Link patches that are relatively nearby

• Patches that are < 50 km apart from each other





# <section-header><section-header><section-header><figure>

## Climate Gradient Corridor Network











### It is best to think of Climate Gradient Corridors as representing "Connectivity Zones"



### Take-home points:

- Connectivity will be critical for range shifts, but where & how individual species will move is highly uncertain
- Gradient approach requires relatively few assumptions
- Gradients can work in either direction (and can be modeled for precip, moisture deficit, other variables)





### Take-home points:

- Connectivity will be critical for range shifts, but where & how individual species will move is highly uncertain
- Gradient approach requires relatively few assumptions
- Gradients can work in either direction (and can be modeled for precip, moisture deficit, other variables)
- Best used for coarse-scale, landscape-level planning
- Automated GIS tools on the way



# Implications for species distributions

- New species moving in
- Alpine species moving out















### Potential Additional Analyses for Synthesis and Interpretation

- Re-running the model
  - With finer scale LI layers
  - Within large cores
- Overlaying with focal species layers
  - Guilds
  - Single species
- Overlaying with other relevant map layers
  - Land ownership/conservation status
  - Riparian or other landcover layers

### Acknowledgements

### Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group

Climate Change Subgroup:

 Tristan Nuñez, Lynn Helbrecht, Joshua Lawler, Brad McRae, John Pierce, Peter Singleton, Joshua Tewksbury, Darren Kavanagh

### Funding

- Wilburforce Foundation
- DOI Great Northern and North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperatives
- Wildlife Conservation Society's Wildlife Action Opportunities Fund

### Check out:

- Online tools, reports, and thesis at www.waconnected.org
- Online maps at Databasin.org