



Integrating Ecosystem Services into Adaptive Rangeland Management



Mark Lubell, UC Davis
 Bethany Cutts, University of Illinois
 Justin Derner, ARS
 Matt Hamilton, UC Davis
 Leslie Roche, UC Davis
 Kenneth Tate, UC Davis

Study Goals

- Understand decision-making process of ranchers
- Identify variables linked to integration of ecosystem services into rangeland management goals and practices
- Develop theoretical framework for adaptive rangeland management



Survey Process

- Partner with California Cattleman's Association to send out surveys
- Semi-structured qualitative interviews of 10 ranchers
- Mail survey using Dillman process sent out to 1725 CCA Regular Members
- Promoted through CCA and Farm Bureau newsletters, communication with County Specialists, and attending rangeland conferences

Rangeland Decision-Making Survey
 University of California, Davis
 Winter 2010-2011

Research project directors:
 Eric Teare, Assistant Professor, Agricultural & Natural Resources
 University of California, Davis, California 95616


Research Project Sponsors:
 UCCE, NARS, etc.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:
 Dr. Eric Teare
 Department of Plant and Soil Sciences
 The Middle Campus
 University of California, Davis
 Davis, CA 95616

Response Rates

Table 3. Rangeland decision-making response frequencies and response rates

Aggregated response category	Frequency	Percent
I Complete survey (code 1.1)	475	
P Partial survey (code 1.2)	24	
R Known respondent-level refusal (code 2.112)	61	
NC n/a	n/a	
U Unknown Eligibility, "non-interview" (code 3.0-3.99)	1086	
NE Selected respondent screened out of sample (4.0-4.91)	93	
Volunteered survey response (not included in response rate - code 4.9)	20	
<i>n</i>	0.86	
<i>Response Rate 1 (RR1)</i>		30.0
<i>Response Rate 4 (RR4)</i>		23.4




Role of Rancher Demographics and Operation Characteristics

- Personal background of rancher affects values and knowledge
- Structure of operation affects costs and benefits of different management goals and practices

Rancher Demographics

Age (mean)	61.42 (±12.1 sd)
Female	16.2%
with 4 year degree or higher	51.1%
Grew up in a rural area or small town	34%
First rancher in family	18.7%
Modal household income	50-99K
Modal portion of off-ranch income	51-75%




Operation Characteristics

	Private owned	Private leased	Public leased	Hired to manage grazing
total acres managed for grazing				
Respondents with this land type	422	299	101	13
min	3	9	10	1
max	40000	100000	600000	5000000
sum	1290204	1580017	3545620	5029921





	Yes
Does your ranching operation include...	
Other agricultural production	152
Non-extractive recreation (hiking, birding, horseback riding)	59
Conventional energy development (e.g. oil, coal, natural gas)	13
Extractive recreation (hunting, fishing)	104
Alternative energy development (e.g. solar, wind, biofuel)	25
Other	50


Type of Livestock

	dairy	sheep	cow/calf	stocker
Mean	364	251	301	812
Median	150	60	150	200
Mode	0	100	300	200
Minimum	1	3	2	2
Maximum	1000	3000	8000	15000






- ### Linking Goals and Practices
- Link between intentions and behavior a central issue in decision-making
 - Match between scope of goals and practices; e.g.; managing for riparian health leads to practices designed to meet that goal
 - Potential tradeoffs and synergies between different goals





Social Values and Conservation Program Participation

- Reshape incentives and provide information
- Build social network connections with conservation managers and other ranchers
- Attitudes about private property rights and government often portrayed as barriers to participation



Conclusions and Next Steps

- Rangeland management must adapt to spatial and temporal variability in environment, economy, and policy
- Economic viability is central goal, and reflected in practices
- Management practices and grazing strategies mixed in complex ways
- Relatively infrequent use of available incentive programs, with the exception of Williamson Act and EQIP
- Next steps are to explore correlations between different predictor variables and goals, strategies, practices