MODELLING LAND-USE/COVER CHANGE AND WILDFIRE REGIMES IN A MEDITERRANEAN LANDSCAPE

James D.A. Millington

March 2007

Department of Geography

King's College, London

Submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK

This is to certify that:

- (i) the thesis comprises only my original work except where otherwise indicated,
- (ii) due acknowledgment has been made in the text to all other material used,
- (iii) the thesis is less than 100,000 words in length, exclusive of tables, figures, references and appendices

James D.A. Millington

ABSTRACT

This interdisciplinary thesis examines the potential impacts of human land-use/cover change upon wildfire regimes in a Mediterranean landscape using empirical and simulation models that consider both social and ecological processes and phenomena. Such an examination is pertinent given contemporary agricultural land-use decline in some areas of the northern Mediterranean Basin due to social and economic trends, and the ecological uncertainties in the consequent feedbacks between landscape-level patterns and processes of vegetation- and wildfire-dynamics.

The shortcomings of empirical modelling of these processes are highlighted, leading to the development of an integrated socio-ecological simulation model (SESM). A grid-based landscape fire succession model is integrated with an agent-based model of agricultural land-use decision-making. The agent-based component considers non-economic alongside economic influences on actors' land-use decision-making. The explicit representation of human influence on wildfire frequency and ignition in the model is a novel approach and highlights biases in the areas of land-covers burned according to ignition cause. Model results suggest if agricultural change (i.e. abandonment) continues as it has recently, the risk of large wildfires will increase and greater total area will be burned.

The epistemological problems of representation encountered when attempting to simulate 'open', middle numbered systems – as is the case for many 'real world' geographical and ecological systems – are discussed. Consequently, and in light of recent calls for increased engagement between science and the public, a shift in emphasis is suggested for SESMs away from establishing the truth of a model's structure via the mimetic accuracy of its results and toward ensuring trust in a model's results via practical adequacy. A 'stakeholder model evaluation' exercise is undertaken to examine this contention and to evaluate, with the intent of improving, the SESM developed in this thesis. A narrative approach is then adopted to reflect on what has been learnt.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the help, advice and support of many people, to all of whom I am most grateful and indebted. I must start with my original supervisor George Perry who encouraged me to apply for the ESRC/NERC Interdisciplinary Studentship that funded this research. Without George's enthusiastic and often ebullient supervision and example I would not have embarked along this most interesting and inspiring path. Thanks to George for making research and fieldwork fun and for his continuing support and advice after returning to New Zealand. This research and thesis would also not have been possible but for the support, goodwill and hard work of Raul Romero Calcerrada. I owe a large debt of gratitude to Raul for the generous access to his data and accumulated knowledge on SPA 56, his driving and translations skills as we toured the Spanish landscape making interviews, and his hospitality both at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos and in his home. Thanks to everyone else who aided my visits to Madrid, notably Javier. These trips to Spain were in part funded by a University of London Central Research Fund grant. More recently, my supervisors David Demeritt and John Wainwright have offered me invaluable advice, support and direction when I wasn't sure where my research was going or how to clarify my arguments. Thanks also for applying the lopping shears to my tortuous and verbose sentences, and to John for his hospitality in Sheffield.

I'm very grateful to everyone that welcomed me to SGES at the University of Auckland, and made my visit so interesting and enjoyable. Notably, thanks to David O'Sullivan for his advice and thoughts over coffee and to Nicky Perry for putting me up in her home when I needed shelter from the All Blacks fans. Closer to home, I must thank Bruce Malamud for the research opportunities he opened up for me outside, but most complementary to, my thesis and for offering his advice whenever it was requested. At King's thanks also go to Shatish Kundaiker for his technical support and the thesis-saving remote-desktop; to Margaret, Rob, Alison and Isobel for all their King's knowhow; and to the usual suspects for humouring my rants in the pub on Tuesday nights – Andreas, Ben, Chris, Gareth, Isobel, Helen, Nick, Pete, and others...

In the later stages of the thesis I moved out of London and returned to my family home. Thanks therefore to Chris, Mark, Laura, Jamie and Helen who put me up when I needed to be in London to work. Thanks to Olivia for all the Giraffes. Recently also to Erin for listening to my late-night rants on the phone and inspiring me to persevere when the pub, King's, London and everything else felt so far away. Last, but not least, thanks to Mum, Dad, Michael and Mark and for their love, support and for putting up with me over these last nine months at home when I needed to get it all done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|----------|
| | iii |
| | iv |
| Abstract Acknowledgements Table of Contents List of Figures List of Tables CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION 1.1 Introduction 1.2 Mediterranean Landscapes 1.3 Landscape Modelling 1.4 Thesis Aims 1.5 Thesis Structure CHAPTER TWO – SPANISH LANDSCAPES AND CHANGE 2.1 Introduction 2.2 Ecological Disturbance 2.3 Human Presence 2.3.1 Introduction 2.3.2 Traditional Land-Use in Spain 2.3.3 Traditional Spanish Land Tenure 2.3.4 Contemporary Spanish LUCC 2.3.5 European Agricultural Policy 2.3 6 Summary 2.4 Potential Consequences of LUCC in Spain 2.4.1 Introduction 2.4.2 Descrification 2.4.3 Biodiversity 2.3.4 Landscape Structure and Natural Hazard Risk 2.3.5 Summary 2.5 EU Special Protection Area 56 2.5.1 Introduction 2.5.2 Habitats 2.5.3 Endangered Species 2.5.4 Human Activity 2.5.5 Data Available for SPA 56 2.5.5.1 Introduction 2.5.2.2 Land-Cover Maps 2.5.5.3 Climatic Variables 2.5.5.4 Topographic Variables 2.5.5.5 Social Data Variables 2.5.5.5 Social Data Variables 2.5.5.5 Summary 2.6 Summary CHAPTER THREE – LUCC MODELLING 3.1 Introduction 3.2 Empirical Modelling | vi |
| | xi |
| List of Tables | xiii |
| CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION | |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Mediterranean Landscapes | 1 |
| 1.3 Landscape Modelling | 3 |
| | 5 |
| 1.5 Thesis Structure | 5 |
| CHAPTER TWO – SPANISH LANDSCAPES AND CHANGE | |
| | 8 |
| | 9 |
| | 11 |
| | 11 |
| <u> </u> | 12 |
| • | 14 |
| | 15 |
| | 16 |
| · | 18 |
| <u>-</u> | 18 |
| | 18 |
| | 18 |
| • | 19 |
| - | 20 |
| • | 22 |
| | 22 |
| | 22 |
| | 23 24 |
| | 25 |
| | 28 |
| | 28 |
| | 28 |
| <u>.</u> | 29 |
| 1 0 1 | 30 |
| | 31 32 |
| | 33 |
| | 33 |
| • | 33 |
| CHAPTED THREE _ LUCC MODELLING | |
| | 36 |
| | 37 |
| o.a mipiricai modening | 31 |

| | Page |
|--|------------------|
| 3.2.1 Transition-Based Models | 38 |
| 3.2.2 Regression-Based Models | 39 |
| 3.3 Empirical Modelling of SPA 56 | 40 |
| 3.3.1 Introduction | 40 |
| 3.3.2 Methodology | 40 |
| 3.3.3 Results | 44 |
| 3.3.4 Discussion | 45 |
| 3.3.5 Summary | 49 |
| 3.4 Simulation Modelling | 49 |
| 3.4.1 Introduction | 49 |
| 3.4.2 Integrated Ecological-Economic Simulation Models | 51 |
| 3.4.3 Summary | 54 |
| 3.5 Model Approach and Validation | 55 |
| 3.5.1 Introduction | 55 |
| 3.5.2 Model Approach | 55 |
| 3.5.3 Model Validation | 56 |
| 3.5.4 Summary | 57 |
| 3.6 Summary | 58 |
| | |
| CHAPTER FOUR – LANDSCAPE FIRE SUCCESSION MODEL | 50 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 59 |
| 4.2 Spatial Ecological Modelling of Vegetation-Dynamics | 59 |
| 4.2.1 Introduction | 59 |
| 4.2.2 Individual-Based Models | 60 |
| 4.2.3 Spatially-Explicit Landscape Models | 61 |
| 4.2.4 Modelling Tradeoffs in Mediterranean-type Ecosystems | 62 |
| 4.2.5 Summary | 63 |
| 4.3 Modelling Mediterranean Basin Vegetation-Dynamics | 64 |
| 4.3.1 Introduction | 64 |
| 4.3.2 Conceptual Models | 64 |
| 4.3.3 Spatial Simulation Models | 66 |
| 4.3.4 Summary | 68 |
| 4.4 Landscape Fire Succession Model I: Vegetation-Dynamics 4.4.1 Introduction | 69 |
| 4.4.1 Introduction 4.4.2 Environmental Conditions | 69 74 |
| 4.4.2. Elivironmental Conditions 4.4.2.1 Climatic Variability and Change | 74 74 |
| 4.4.2.2 Water Availability | 75 |
| 4.4.2.3 Light Availability | 76 |
| 4.4.3 Succession Attributes | 76 |
| 4.4.3.1 Successional Pathway | 76 |
| 4.4.3.2 Seed Sources | 78 - 2 |
| 4.4.4 Modelling State Transitions | 79 |
| 4.4.5 Summary | 82 |
| 4.5 Landscape Fire Succession Model II: Wildfire Regime | 84 |
| 4.5.1 Introduction | 84 |
| 4.5.2 Fire Ignition | 88 |
| 4.5.2.1 Frequency 4.5.2.2 Spatial Location | 88 91 |
| 4.5.3 Fire Spread | 92 |
| 4.5.4 Summary | 97 |
| 4.6 Sensitivity Analysis | 97 97 |
| 4.6.1 Introduction | 97 |
| | <i>,</i> , |

| | Page |
|---|-------------------|
| 4.6.2 Parameter Testing | 98 |
| 4.6.3 Summary | 101 |
| 4.7 Summary | 101 |
| CHAPTER FIVE – AGENT-BASED MODEL OF LAND-USE/COVE | CR C |
| CHANGE | |
| 5.1 Introduction | 103 |
| 5.2 Agricultural Location Theory | 104 |
| 5.3 Agent-Based Modelling | 107 |
| 5.3.1 Introduction | 107 |
| 5.3.2 Recent Agent-Based Modelling of Human-Environment | 108 |
| Interactions | |
| 5.3.3 Current ABM/MAS Issues | 110 |
| 5.3.3.1 Introduction 5.3.3.2 Model Data | 110 110 |
| 5.3.3.3 Agent Representation | 111 |
| 5.3.3.4 Model Validation | 113 |
| 5.3.3.5 Summary | 114 |
| 5.3.4 Implications for Modelling Mediterranean Human- | 114 |
| Environment Interactions | 116 |
| 5.3.5 Summary | 116 |
| 5.4 ABM/LUCC Structure 5.4.1 Introduction | 117 117 |
| 5.4.2 Rationale for Farmer Types | 117 |
| 5.4.3 Agent Attributes | 121 |
| 5.4.3.1 Commercial Agents | 121 |
| 5.4.3.1 Traditional Agents | 127 |
| 5.4.4 Integration with Landscape Fire Succession Model | 129 |
| 5.4.5 Summary | 130 |
| 5.5 Sensitivity Analysis and Testing | 131 |
| 5.5.1 Introduction | 131 |
| 5.5.2 Universal Parameters | 132 |
| 5.5.3 Land Tenure and Land-Cover | 133 |
| 5.5.4 Agent Properties | 138 |
| 5.5.5 Markets and Landscape Profitability | 141 |
| 5.5.6 Summary | 141 |
| 5.6 Summary | 142 |
| CHAPTER SIX – SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL SIMULATION MODEL: | |
| INTERACTION BETWEEN LUCC AND WILDFIRE | |
| 6.1 Introduction | 144 |
| 6.2 Characterising Wildfire Regimes | 146 |
| 6.3 Human Activity, LUCC and Wildfire Regimes | 148 |
| 6.3.1 Human-Activity Scenarios | 148 |
| 6.3.2 Human-Related Wildfire-Behaviour Parameters | 156 |
| 6.3.3 Ignition Cause | 157 |
| 6.4 Climate Change and Wildfire Regimes | 161 |
| 6.5 Landscape Fire Succession Model Dynamics | 163 |
| 6.5.1 Total Land-Cover Flammability | 163 165 |
| 6.5.2 Range of Land-Cover Flammability6.5.3 Land-Cover Configuration | 165 169 |
| 6.6 Discussion | 109 170 |
| OVO 2- AD-CHUDIOII | 1/0 |

| CC1 Harris Astinites and Wildfins | Page |
|---|------------|
| 6.6.1 Human Activity and Wildfire | 171 174 |
| 6.6.2 Wildfire Frequency-Area Scaling 6.7 Summary | 174 |
| 0.7 Summary | 170 |
| CHAPTER SEVEN – VALIDATING SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL | |
| SIMULATION MODELS | |
| 7.1 Introduction | 178 |
| 7.2 Validating Models of Open Systems | 179 |
| 7.2.1 The Nature of 'Open' Systems | 180 |
| 7.2.2 Epistemological Problems Presented by a Critical Realist Ontology | 181 |
| 7.2.3 A Potential Relativist Response | 184 |
| 7.3 Post-Normal Science and Public Engagement | 186 |
| 7.3.1 Evaluation Criteria for Simulation Modelling in the 'Risk | 188 |
| Society' | 101 |
| 7.3.2 Stakeholder Participation and Expertise | 191 |
| 7.4 Summary | 195 |
| CHAPTER EIGHT – STAKEHOLDER MODEL EVALUATION | |
| 8.1 Introduction | 197 |
| 8.2 Stakeholder Engagement in the Modelling Process | 197 |
| 8.3 Stakeholder Assessment of SPASIMv1 | 200 |
| 8.3.1 Introduction | 200 |
| 8.3.2 Drivers of Change | 201 |
| 8.3.3 Model Results | 205 |
| 8.3.4 Model Assumptions | 208 |
| 8.3.5 Model Modification | 212 |
| 8.3.6 Changes in Understanding | 215 |
| 8.3.7 Summary | 216 |
| 8.4 Discussion | 216 |
| 8.4.1 Model Validation Criteria | 216 |
| 8.4.2 Engaging Non-Modellers with Models | 219 |
| 8.5 Summary | 222 |
| CHAPTER NINE – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS | |
| 9.1 Introduction | 224 |
| 9.2 Narrative Approaches to Reflect on the Modelling Process | 224 |
| 9.3 SPASIMv1 Modelling Narrative | 226 |
| 9.3.1 Research Proposal | 226 |
| 9.3.2 Initial Exploratory Research | 227 |
| 9.3.3 Model Conceptualisation and Initial Construction | 230 |
| 9.3.4 Model Construction, Testing and Sensitivity Analysis | 232 |
| 9.3.5 Stakeholder Evaluation and Model Use | 236 |
| 9.3.6 Self-Reflection | 241 |
| 9.4 Summary | 242 |
| REFERENCES | 245 |
| | |

| | | Page |
|------|---|------|
| APPE | NDICES | |
| I | Look-up table of pixel physical attributes to define DD and | 260 |
| | TD in the rule-based community-level model of | |
| | Mediterranean vegetation-dynamics | |
| II | Curve numbers used in Equation 4.3 | 273 |
| III | Stakeholder Model Evaluation Interview Translations | 274 |
| IV | Enclosed Compact Disc | 277 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | Page |
|--------|---|------|
| Снарті | ER TWO | |
| 2.1 | Pinus with Quercus understory | 9 |
| 2.2 | Example <i>dehesa</i> found in SAP 56 | 13 |
| 2.3 | Land abandonment in SPA 56 | 16 |
| 2.4 | Vegetation species richness over time following fire | 20 |
| 2.5 | Recent trends in Spanish wildfire occurrence | 21 |
| 2.6 | Location of SPA 56 | 23 |
| 2.7 | Predominant vegetation in SPA 56 | 24 |
| 2.8 | \mathcal{E} | 26 |
| 2.9 | C | 27 |
| 2.10 | • | 29 |
| 2.11 | 1 | 30 |
| 2.12 | | 31 |
| 2.13 | 1 7 1 | 32 |
| 2.14 | Example SPA 56 maps of social variables | 33 |
| Снарті | ER THREE | |
| 3.1 | 1 1 | 46 |
| 3.2 | Example of the influence of municipality-aggregated data on model output | 47 |
| Снарті | ER FOUR | |
| 4.1 | Schematic diagram of the LSFM | 71 |
| 4.2 | Succession pathways used in the LFSM | 81 |
| 4.3 | Example of the traditional conceptualisation of succession in | 82 |
| | Mediterranean-type vegetation | |
| 4.4 | Spatial representation of landscape change from the LFSM | 83 |
| 4.5 | 1 1 | 84 |
| 4.6 | Illustration of the Forest Fire Cellular Automata Model | 88 |
| 4.7 | Schematic diagram of the cellular automata-based fire behaviour model | 93 |
| 4.8 | Schematic diagram of fire shells as used in the fire-behaviour model | 94 |
| 4.9 | Fire ignition weights as a function of wind speed and direction | 96 |
| Снарті | ER FIVE | |
| 5.1 | von Thünen's classical model of agricultural location | 105 |
| 5.2 | The fragmented and heterogeneous nature of SPA 56 | 115 |
| 5.3 | Procedure of the agent-based of land-use/cover change | 118 |
| 5.4 | Procedure of the integrated socio-ecological simulation model | 129 |
| 5.5 | Land-cover and use time-series for the baseline 'business as usual' model scenario | 130 |
| 5.6 | Examples of random maps generated with varying percolation probability parameter <i>p</i> | 134 |
| 5.7 | Landscape land-cover proportions and mean land-cover patch area for random land-tenure maps | 135 |
| 5.8 | Time-series of agent perspective and mean pixel profit | 140 |

| 5.9 | Relationship between threshold mean pixel profit values and ratio of farmer types | Page 140 |
|--------|---|--------------------|
| Снарті | ZD Siv | |
| 6.1 | Example LFSM wildfire frequency-area distribution | 147 |
| 6.2 | Relationship between mean total burned area and agricultural land-cover for scenarios of human activity | 149 |
| 6.3 | Mean land-cover landscape proportions for scenarios of human activity | 150 |
| 6.4 | Maps of landscape land-cover in the year 2026 for human-activity scenarios | 151 |
| 6.5 | Time-series of mean total landscape flammability for human- activity scenarios | 152 |
| 6.6 | Time-series of mean number of patches for human-activity scenarios | 153 |
| 6.7 | Time-series of mean number of patches by land-cover for scenario M2 | 154 |
| 6.8 | Time-series of landscape fractal dimension for human-activity scenarios | 154 |
| 6.9 | Time-series of landscape contagion for human-activity scenarios | 155 |
| 6.10 | Mean R_i for lightning, human-caused and randomly located fires | 160 |
| 6.11 | Mean R_b for lightning, human-caused and randomly located fires | 160 |
| 6.12 | Land-cover landscape proportions for scenarios of climate change | 162 |
| 6.13 | Relationship between β and total land-cover flammability | 164 |
| 6.14 | Land-cover landscape proportions for varying total land-cover flammability | 165 |
| 6.15 | Land-cover landscape proportions for varying range of land-cover flammability | 167 |
| 6.16 | Land-cover landscape proportions for varying initial land-cover configurations | 170 |
| Снарті | ER SEVEN | |
| 7.1 | Public participation in the scientific research process | 193 |
| | ER EIGHT | |
| 8.1 | Public participation in the socio-ecological modelling process | 198 |
| 8.2 | Sketch maps of two interviewees' expectations of LUCC in Villa del Prado by 2026 | 205 |
| 8.3 | Villa del Prado Land-cover for 2026 under scenario M1 | 206 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | Page |
|------------|--|------------|
| CHAP | TER ONE | |
| 1.1 | Structure of Thesis | 6 |
| Снарт | CER THREE | |
| 3.1 | Predictor variables (maps) used for empirical modelling | 43 |
| 3.2 | | 43 |
| 3.3 | Empirical models' prediction accuracy for individual pixel | 44 |
| | locations | |
| Снарт | ER FOUR | |
| | Land-cover classes represented in the model | 70 |
| 4.2 | <u> </u> | 76 |
| 4.3 | Maturity age for three main forest land-cover types | 78 |
| 4.4 | | 79 |
| 4.5 | e i | 92 |
| 4.6 | | 95 |
| 4.7 | ε | 96 |
| 4.8 | 5 5 | 99 |
| 4.9 | LFSM sensitivity analysis results for land-cover composition | 100 |
| Снарт | TER FIVE | |
| 5.1 | Summary comparison of 'traditional' and 'commercial' agents' | 120 |
| 5.2 | attributes Resometers for baseline model configuration | 123 |
| | Parameters for baseline model configuration Parameter values for ABM/LUCC testing | 132 |
| 5.4 | | 132 |
| 3.4 | composition | 133 |
| 5.5 | | 136 |
| 5.6 | maps | 127 |
| 5.6 | 1 | 137 138 |
| 5.7 5.8 | Spatial metrics of land-cover pattern for land-cover scenarios Agent types for <i>personal_choice</i> and agent perspective scenarios | 139 |
| 5.0 | Agent types for personal_choice and agent perspective scenarios | 139 |
| Снарт | TER SIX | |
| 6.1 | | 145 |
| | land-cover | |
| | Wildfire summary statistics for scenarios of human activity | 149 |
| 6.3 | ϵ | 152 |
| 6.1 | scenarios of human activity Wildfire statistics for yearing 'recent humand years' yelves | 156 |
| 6.4 | Wildfire statistics for varying 'recent burned years' values Wildfire statistics for 'maximum fire shell' scenarios | 156 157 |
| 6.6 | | 157 |
| 0.0 | scenarios | 130 |
| 6.7 | Wildfire statistics as a function of cause for human activity | 158 |
| | scenarios with modified fire ignition | |
| 6.8 | ϵ | 161 |
| 6.9 | Wildfire statistics for scenarios of climate change | 162 |

| | | Pag€ |
|-------|--|------|
| 6.10 | Land-cover flammability probabilities used to examine effect of | 163 |
| | total landscape flammability on model wildfire regime | |
| 6.11 | Wildfire statistics for varying total land-cover flammability | 164 |
| 6.12 | Land-cover flammability probabilities used to examine effect of | 166 |
| | range of flammability probabilities on model wildfire regime | |
| 6.13 | Wildfire statistics for varying range of land-cover flammability | 166 |
| 6.14 | Modified land-cover flammability probabilities used to examine the | 168 |
| | effect of maximum flammability probability on wildfire regime | |
| 6.15 | Wildfire statistics for modified land-cover flammability | 168 |
| | probabilities | |
| 6.16 | Wildfire statistics for varying initial landscape configuration | 169 |
| ∼нарт | TER SEVEN | |
| _ | Sources of relativistic operator dependencies | 185 |
| 7.1 | Sources of relativistic operator dependencies | 103 |
| Снарт | TER EIGHT | |
| 8.1 | Comparison of profitability and costs of land-use types | 208 |
| 8.2 | Model assumptions regarding agents' age | 208 |
| | | |