Potential climate impacts on water resources and ecosystems in the Red River

Thomas Neeson<sup>1</sup>, Rachel Fovargue<sup>1</sup>, Ken Gill<sup>1</sup>, Yang Hong<sup>2</sup>, Hernan Moreno<sup>1,2</sup>, Shabnam Rezapour<sup>3</sup>, Derek Rosendahl<sup>4</sup>, Sean Wineland<sup>1</sup>, Adrienne Wootten<sup>4</sup>, Xianwu Xue<sup>5</sup>, Hamed Zamani Sabzi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dept. of Geography and Environmental Sustainability, University of Oklahoma, Norman OK <sup>2</sup>School of Civil Engineering and Environmental Science, University of Oklahoma, Norman OK <sup>3</sup>The Dept. of Enterprise and Logistics Engineering, Florida International University, Miami FL <sup>4</sup>South Central Climate Adaptation Science Center, Norman OK <sup>5</sup>NOAA/NWS/NCEP/Environmental Modeling Center, College Park, MD



Red River. Photo credit: Henley Quadling

## Thank you!









Red River. Photo credit: Henley Quadling

#### <u>What might happen if</u> <u>streams get hotter and drier?</u>

"If warming 3-4°C occurs, a substantial number of species in this region could face extinction" Matthews and Zimmerman 1990

Dewatering and fragmentation interact as stressor for Great Plains fish communities – Perkin et al. 2015



FIGURE 5: Difference fields for mean daily minimum temperature (°C) between historical (1981–2005) and end-of-century (2075–2099) time frames for RCP 8.5. Columns represent the GCMs (CCSM4, MIROC5, and MPI-ESM-LR, from left to right respectively); rows represent downscaling methods, with CDFt on top and EDQM on bottom. Darker shades of red represent higher minimum temperature values. (a) Model: CCSM4, SD: CDFt. (b) Model: MIROC5, SD: CDFt. (c) Model: MPI-ESM-LR, SD: CDFt. (d) Model: CCSM4, SD: EDQM. (e) Model: MIROC5, SD: EDQM. (f) Model: MPI-ESM-LR, SD: CDFt. (d) Model: MIROC5, SD: EDQM.

#### Bertand and McPherson (2019) Advances in Meteorology

#### Here, we focus on two questions:

- 1) How might water resources and the distributions of stream fish in the Red River change in future climate scenarios?
  - Zamani Sabzi et al. (2019) J. Hydrology Regional Studies
  - Gill et al. *in review*

## 2) How might we mitigate these impacts?

- Zamani Zabzi et al. (2019) Ecological Engineering
- Fovargue et al. *in review*
- Wineland et al. *in review*

We build on regional climate downscaling (McPherson et al. 2016, Betrand and McPherson 2018, 2019) and hydrological modeling (Xue et al. 2016) for the Red River across climate scenarios.

We focus on three GCMs (CCSM4, MIROC5, MPI-ESM-LR) that span a range of wet/dry bias among climate models.



McPherson et al. (2016) SC-CASC final project report Xue et al. (2016) J. Hydrologic Engineering Bertrand and McPherson (2018) J. Applied Meteorology and Climatology Bertrand and McPherson (2019) Advances in Meteorology Projected surface water varies among climate scenarios, and spatially within each scenario.



Percent change in surface runoff (2040-2060 vs. recent historical) across nine climate scenarios.

Zamani Sabzi et al. (2019) Journal of Hydrology – Regional Studies

## How might species' distributions change across climate scenarios?

Gill et al. used a suite of climatic and biophysical covariates to drive MaxEnt species distribution models.

#### <u>Key results:</u>

- Changes in distribution for each species (historical vs. 2050) vary among climate scenarios.
- Uncertainty varies ~10x among species.



#### Gill et al. in review

Common species (i.e., historically widespread) show the greatest absolute changes in distribution across future climate scenarios.

However, we could not reject a null hypothesis that absolute changes were proportional to historical distributional extent.



#### Gill et al. in review

Aggregating species outcomes within each climate scenario reveals hotspots of potential species loss.

Despite climate uncertainty, hotspots of species loss tend to occur in same regions.



Expected change in the number of species within the Red River basin by the year 2050 across nine future climate scenarios, as projected by MaxEnt. The value for each raster 1/8° cell represents the difference in species' probability of occurrence between the historical period and the year 2050, summed across all species. Gill et al. *in review* 

#### **Spatial Planning Tools for Water Conservation**

Consider five water users on simple river network. When and where might we incentive users to consume less water? Downstream reaches differ in societal water needs and environmental water needs, and actions propagate downstream.

**Goal:** For a given budget, find the optimal reservoir releases and portfolio of water conservation projects that best balance societal and environmental water needs.





### Water rights & usage



# Spatial planning tools for water sustainability in the Red River

Hydrologic Data & models



**Optimization model**  
$$\max z = \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{g \in G} v_{jg} \alpha_{jg}$$



Ecological weightings



Zamani Sabzi et al. (2019) Ecological Engineering



 By manipulating the weights (relative importance) of meeting societal vs.
environmental water needs, we can find a tradeoff curve.

2) Even optimal allocation of water across network cannot simultaneously meet societal and ecosystem flow goals

Prioritize environmental water goals

Zamani Sabzi et al. (2019) Ecological Engineering

#### Results – Tradeoffs Under Conservation



 Small changes in water consumption (< 3%) can have big impacts.

2) Diminishing returns on water conservation: very large reductions in societal consumption might be needed to fully satisfy both goals. Feasibility?

Zamani Sabzi et al. (2019) Ecological Engineering

#### How might these tradeoffs shift under future climates?



**Figure 2.** Optimal trade-off curves balancing RRB-wide satisfaction of societal and environmental water targets. Trade-off curves are calculated for two time periods – early century (2010-2030; small circles) and near future (2031-2050; large circles).

Fovargue et al. *in review* 

## Planning for water sustainability under uncertainty

Water availability varies among climate scenarios. Can we identify locations where we are fairly certain of water scarcity, despite climate uncertainty?

Figure gives satisfaction of societal and environmental flow goals assuming basin-wide optimal reservoir management.

Fovargue et al. *in review* 



### Planning for water sustainability under climate uncertainty



Can joint consideration of water scarcity and climate uncertainty guide investments in water sustainability?

Fovargue et al. *in review* 

# How feasible might it be to meet environmental flow targets below each reservoir?



Assuming reservoir management that optimizes basin-wide water satisfaction, what is the highest possible societal satisfaction when environmental flow goals are fully met?

Wineland et al. in review

Both conservation feasibility and biodiversity value (i.e., species' presence) vary among climate scenarios.

Can we identify locations that remain feasible and high biodiversity value across climate scenarios?



Conceptual framework from Wineland et al. in review

Some river reaches do indeed have high conservation feasibility and high biodiversity value across all nine climate scenarios.

Can this type of analysis help to identify locations for considering instream flow targets?



Pie charts give number of climate scenarios (out of nine) in which river reaches downstream of reach reservoir fall into each feasibiligy/biodiversity category.

Wineland et al. in review

## Conclusions and future work

 Distributions of many fish species will contract, but outcomes vary among species and among climate scenarios

 Spatial planning tools can help to prioritize water conservation efforts in space and time

 <u>Central question</u>: How can we plan for water sustainability under climate uncertainty?

## Thank you!









Red River. Photo credit: Henley Quadling