

Valuation of Water-Quality Ecosystem Services Available From Farms

Noel Gollehon Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA ACES Conference December 8, 2016 Jacksonville, FL



Natural Resources Conservation Service

s.usda.gov

Project Team

- Lisa Wainger, University of Maryland
- Robert Johnston, Clark University
- LeRoy Hansen, Economic Research Service, USDA
- John Loomis, Colorado State University,
- Lisa Duriancik, Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA
- Marc Ribaudo, Economic Research Service, USDA
- Doug Lawrence, Blackwoods Group LLC
- Travis Warziniak, Forest Service, USDA
- Dave Ervin, Portland State University
- · Chris Hartley, Office of Environmental Markets, USDA, and
- Caron Gala, Council on Food, Agricultural & Resource Economics.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

nrcs usda.go

Project Objectives

- To assess the replicability of the process for identifying and estimating the values of public ecosystem service benefits realized from implementation of conservation plans carried out under USDA Farm-Bill programs
- To apply the process, and develop ecosystem service benefit estimates for a landscape-scaled application
- To assess the process and application for improvement
 opportunities



Natural Resources Conservation Service

nrcs usda.go



First step – Identification

- Interdisciplinary team developed a Conceptual Model to map potential Ecosystem Services from the implementation of conservation practices
- Focus on benefits from water quality improvements
- Other models could be developed for water quantity, soil, habitat, and air quality management

Natural Resources Conservation Service

nrcs usda.go

Water Quality Based Ecosystem Service Benefits From Conservation Practices



Second step – Framing

- Identified more Ecosystem Services than resources for evaluation
 - Focus on four key benefits that may be overlapping
 - Enhanced property values
 - Improved sportfishing
 - Improved aquatic community condition (non-use value)
 - Avoided costs in drinking water & navigation systems
- Benefit values are location-specific, need a location to site the valuation procedures
 - Western Lake Erie Basin





Western Lake Erie Basin



Natural Resources Conservation Service

cs.usda.go



Third step – Baseline & Estimating Change

- Element of project objective was to examine effects from implementing USDA working lands programs to improve water quality
- Specify the change from a baseline
- Determine how to measure the change in benefits
 - Models used to estimate the change in water quality from applying conservation practices
 - Applied APEX and HUMUS/SWAT from CEAP
- Applied the valuation methodology
 - Identify available data and methods
 - Note missing data and linkages
 - Develop illustrative ecosystem service values

Natural Resources Conservation Service

nrcs.usda.go



Benefit: Residential property values

• 26,000 private residences near Maumee River

Literature

linkages

Start

- Hedonic model to relate \downarrow nutrients to \uparrow in property values (Liu, et al 2014)
- Benefit transfer model
 - Conservation practices on 8% of acres
- Reduces nutrients by 7-8% (Keitzer, et al, 2016)

Apply

Value

• \$27 million in improved property values (river only)



Benefit: Improved sportfishing

- Participation day values
- Current catch rates

Literature linkages

Start

- Benefit transfer model for catch value per fish, adjusted for income and location (Johnson & Wainger, 2015)
- Conservation practices on 48% of acres
- Apply

Value

- Increase fish abundance 42% (Keitzer, et al, 2016)
- \$22 million increase in annual value of fishing

0



Start

Literature linkages

Apply

Value

Benefit: Improved aquatic community condition

- Accept the use of an index as an acceptable indicator
- Determine appropriate population
- Benefit transfer model for Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) (Johnson, et. al 2011) adjusted for income
- Conservation practices on 48% of acres
- Increase IBI by 6% (Keitzer, et al, 2016)
 - \$9 million increase in annual WTP for watershed population



Benefit: Avoided costs from reduced Sedimentation

 CEAP study estimates of soil loss that becomes sediment Start • Sediment to reduced reservoir capacity model (Hansen & Hellerstein, 2007) Sediment to reduced dredging cost model (Hansen, 2002) Literature linkages • Conservation practices adaptation continues in watershed at the same rate as past 8 years Apply • \$220K in annual increased reservoir storage capacity benefits \$120K in annual reduced dredging costs Value



Summary of Water Quality Findings

- "Case-study" framework to demonstrate
 - Replicable process
 - Identifying & valuing several ecosystem service changes
 - Application based on working-lands conservation
- Sited in relatively data-rich Western Lake Erie Basin
 - Location of a recent CEAP (Conservation Effects Assessment Project) Study and additional studies
- Four types of ecosystem services from increased conservation were valued
- Limited the set of ecosystem services to those that could be valued (others possible)



LISD/

Many Future Challenges

- Reducing the number of major assumptions required to connect components from actions to benefits.
- Valued several ecosystem service changes to illustrate the process, but assumptions to fill data gaps limit use.
- Isolating conservation practice effects from other trends requires a strong baseline (CEAP study)
- Without study like CEAP, data limitations will further limit physical to final ecosystem services analysis.
- Lack common variables to link ecological and economic models.
- Improving the precision of the ecological and economic estimates will involve substantial cost.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

nrcs.usda.go

Requirements

Thoughts and opinions presented today are those of the author and do not represent those of USDA or the Natural Resources Conservation Service

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination against its customers, employees, and applicants for employment on the bases of race, color, national origin, age, disability, sex, gender identity, religion, reprisal, and where applicable, political beliefs, marital status, familial or parental status, sexual orientation, or all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program, or protected genetic information in employment or in any program or activity conducted or funded by the Department. (Not all prohibited bases will apply to all programs and/or employment activities.)



LISD/



Thank you!



Noel Gollehon 301-504-1763 Noel.Gollehon@wdc.usda.gov





Natural Resources Conservation Service

nrcs.usda.gov/