

NATURAL ASSET FARMING

PROFESSOR DAVID LINDENMAYER AO





www.sustainablefarms.org.au





Farm Context...



Farms cover 61% of the Australian continent

...therefore crucial for right balance between production & environment.

Many challenges

the second second

- Increased food demand
- Farm productivity vs degradation
- Farm profitability
- Farmer mental health
- Carbon emissions & climate change
- Biodiversity loss
- Animal welfare
- **Urbanizing human population**

Many ways to improve the natural assets on farms

- Regenerative agriculture
- Natural Sequence Farming
- Etc
- All approaches focus on natural assets (or subsets thereof)
- This is PRECISELY what LANDCARE does !!

Sustainable Farms Projects to Improve Natural Assets on Farms



Farm Dam Enhancements



Revegetation for Biodiversity



Native Shelterbelts







Rocky Outcrops

Scattered Paddock Trees

Riparian Restoration

Natural asset approach

- All farms have natural assets
- Way to engage with change – generally agnostic approach
- Can start small
- Some assets overlooked – e.g. rocky outcrops



Engagement process in Sustainable Farms Partner with (not replace) Landcare, LLS; CM. **Demonstration** Farm Days Target key assets – farm dams or shelterbelts Farmer-led, ANU with backup science Attendance at multiple days = confidence to begin to make changes LANDCARE = environmental AND social





23 years – 745 sites, varying in condition & management



Growth types



Biodiversity data

Vegetation:

- Plant species richness
- Vegetation structure
- Tree inventory Animals:
- Birds
- Reptiles
- Mammals

Habitat attributes:

- Hollow trees
- Bare ground
- Rocky outcrops
- Course woody debris
- Litter layer
- Area of woody vegetation









Example: Farm Dams

- 1.765m dams in Australia
- > 650K farm dams in MDB
- > 97% in poor condition in last drought
- Poor quality water → ~23% reduction in stock weight
- ~ 2m tonnes of GHG emissions
- \$\$ billions on breeding, pasture improvement — ?? water quality

Better management of farm dams



Results in water persistence, drought resilience, improved biodiversity profitability and mental health outcomes

Westgate et al. 2021 in review







- Vegetation around dams = improved water quality + lower temp
- Less sediment (less cleaning)
- Up to 23% weight gain of livestock (water temp effects for Nth breeds)
- Better biodiversity birds/frogs microhotspots for biodiversity
- Picnic tables etc = mental health

Cost Benefit Analysis

- Significant financial gain thru better productivity
- Average per farm Benefit-Cost Ratio = 1.5 (NSW), 3.0 (Vic) @ > 600mm/year
- Weight gain needed for clean water switch = 1.8% per annum
- Prob. Benefit > cost = 70%





Paddock trees

- Largest
- Oldest
- Most vertically structured countryside elements in agricultural landscapes

Paddock trees

- Most flowers
- Most seeds
- Support other structures = mistletoe
- Most, largest and most diverse range of hollows
- Most carbon

Where are large old (paddock) trees found? (Ikin et al. 2015; *Landscape Ecol*)



Landscape Ecol (2015) 30:1387–1403 DOI 10.1007/s10980-015-0193-5

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Woodland habitat structures are affected by both agricultural land management and abiotic conditions

Karen Ikin · Alessio Mortelliti · John Stein · Damian Michael · Mason Crane · Sachiko Okada · Jeff Wood · David Lindenmayer



Management prescription

To increase average canopy depth, managers should conserve south-facing remnants with fertile soils in low-lying areas of the landscape.

To manage for current and future large trees, managers should preserve large tree abundance by retaining existing trees and conserving old growth remnants, especially in highly fragmented landscapes.

To preserve hollow-bearing tree abundance, managers should conserve north-facing old growth and regrowth woodland. They also should limit removal of trees in later stages of senescence.

Re-creating paddock tree landscapes

- Microplantings limits productive land lost
- Existing paddock trees as nodal points for restoration
- Strategic plantings in key areas









Plantings, biodiversity and grazing

- Grazed vs ungrazing plantings over time
- As plantings age = loss of fences/or removed
- Grazing alters leaf litter & midstorey cover
- Path analysis shows –ve impacts on birds and reptiles

Lindenmayer et al. (2018) (Restoration Ecol) doi: 10.1111/rec.12676







Climate, weather, plantings and resilience



Plantings are critical refugia for bird biodiversity

Small bird species (+ species of conservation concern) = plantings

Migratory bird species associated with

plantings .

 Plantings = drought refuges; but +ve effects not seen in mesic periods DOL 10.1111/gdb.14524

PRIMARY RESEARCH ARTICLE

WILEY Global Change Biology

Weather effects on birds of different size are mediated by long-term climate and vegetation type in endangered temperate woodlands

David B. Lindenmayer^{1,2,3} [] Peter Lane¹ | Mason Crane^{1,3} | Daniel Florance^{1,3} | Claire N. Foster¹ | Karen Ikin¹ | Damian Michael¹ | Chloe F. Sato¹ | Ben C. Scheele^{1,2} | Martin J. Westgate¹

¹Fenner School of Environment & Society, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia ²Threatened Species Recovery Hub,

National Environmental Science Program, Fenner School of Environment & Society, The Australian National University, Carberra, ACT, Australia

³Sustainable Farms, Fenner School of Environment & Society, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

Correspondence

David B. Lindenmayer, Fenner School of Erwironment & Society, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia. Email: david.lindenmayer@anu.edu.au

Funding information

National Environmental Science Program, Threatened Species Recovery Hub, Grant/ Award Number: Threatened Species Recovery Hub; The Australian Research Cound); The Ian Potter Foundation; The Vincent Fairfax Family Foundation; Murray Local Land Services; Riverina Local Land Services; John Mitchell

Abstract

Species occurrence is influenced by a range of factors including habitat attributes, climate, weather, and human landscape modification. These drivers are likely to interact, but their effects are frequently quantified independently. Here, we report the results of a 13-year study of temperate woodland birds in south-eastern Australia to quantify how different-sized birds respond to the interacting effects of: (a) short-term weather (rainfall and temperature in the 12 months preceding our surveys), (b) long-term climate (average rainfall and maximum and minimum temperatures over the period 1970-2014), and (c) broad structural forms of vegetation (oldgrowth woodland, regrowth woodland, and restoration plantings). We uncovered significant interactions between bird body size, vegetation type, climate, and weather. High short-term rainfall was associated with decreased occurrence of large birds in old-growth and regrowth woodland, but not in restoration plantings. Conversely, small bird occurrence peaked in wet years, but this effect was most pronounced in locations with a history of high rainfall, and was actually reversed (peak occurrence in dry years) in restoration plantings in dry climates. The occurrence of small birds was depressed-and large birds elevated-in hot years, except in restoration plantings which supported few large birds under these circumstances. Our investigation suggests that different mechanisms may underpin contrasting responses of small and large birds to the interacting effects of climate, weather, and vegetation type. A diversity of vegetation cover is needed across a landscape to promote the occurrence of different-sized bird species in agriculture-dominated landscapes, particularly under variable weather conditions. Climate change is predicted to lead to widespread drying of our study region, and restoration plantingsespecially currently dimatically wet areas-may become critically important for conserving bird species, particularly small-bodied taxa.

KEYWORDS

birds, climate change, rainfall and temperature effects on biodiversity, revegetation, southeastern Australia, weather

Plantings & key threatening processes

 Noisy Miner
 Hyper-aggressive native species
 Listed as a KTP in woodlands
 Leng term data - replantings with
 OYOTAUNDERSTORY = few miners
 Understorey interventions = drives down Miners over time - takes > 8 years

Lindenmayer et al. 2010 (Biol Cons); Lindenmayer et al. 2018 (Rest. Ecol)

Woodland enhancement = less Miners



Lindenmayer et al. 2010, Biol. Cons, Lindenmayer et al. 2018 Austral Ecology, 43, 798-806

Tackling despots – using trees not guns

The Noisy Miner does not act alone

- Species co-occurrence patterns
- Noisy Miner has negative effects
- Grey and Pied Butcherbirds have no effects
 in isolation
- Strong synergistic effects when together
- Combined effects strongest on small birds
- Effects reduced when high midstorey cover



DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.13838

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Synergistic impacts of aggressive species on small birds in a fragmented landscape

David B. Lindenmayer^{1,2,3}

Martin J. Westgate^{1,2,3} | Mason Crane^{1,2,3} | Daniel Florance^{1,2,3}

¹Fenner School of Environment and Society, Australian National University, Acton, ACT, Australia

²Sustainable Farms Initiative, Australian National University, Acton, ACT, Australia

³National Environmental Science Program Threatened Species Hub, Australian National University, Acton, ACT, Australia

Correspondence Martin J. Westgate Email: martin.westgate@anu.edu.au

Funding information Australian Government National Environmental Science Program; Australian Research Council; Murray and Riverina Local Land Services

Handling Editor: Cristina Banks-Leite

Abstract

- 1. Attempts to conserve threatened species in fragmented landscapes are often challenging because factors such as habitat loss, habitat degradation and dominant species interact to reduce threatened species' capacity to survive and reproduce. Understanding how threatening and mitigating processes interact is critical if conservation measures are to be effective.
- 2. We used data from long-term monitoring of bird populations and multivariate latent variable models to quantify how Australian woodland birds respond to the presence of the Noisy Miner, a despotic species known to exclude other bird species. We then investigated the extent to which the presence of other aggressive species exacerbates the impacts of the Noisy Miner, and to what extent these impacts can be mitigated by dense midstorey plantings.
- 3. We found strong synergies between the Noisy Miner and two other aggressive species (Grey Butcherbird and Pied Butcherbird), despite weak effects of butcherbirds in isolation.



Attributes of a good planting ...

- -Location (gullies) 3.2 bird species increase cf midslopes & ridges
- -Size increased richness but not as important as context
- -Shape (block/strip) important for some species
- -**Contains** logs, large old trees, dams, understorey, mistletoe

–Fenced and **not** grazed



Summary points

- Riparian restoration = critical for biodiversity responses
- Maximizes species gains but only when replantings not grazed
- Biomass is greater (carbon implications) + animal breeding is greater
- Plantings in wetter climates do better especially during droughts
- Only know this thru proper monitoring!!!

Why on-farm Landcare efforts matter

- New trading platforms
- Carbon and biodiversity incentive schemes at State and Federal levels
- ANU-DAWE partnerships to develop methods and schemes



Carbon + Biodiversity Pilot

- Component of the Australian Government's Agriculture Stewardship Package
- 6 Natural Resource Management (NRM) Regions chosen (one in each state)
- Environmental planting projects eligible to receive:
 - Cash payments for biodiversity benefits they provide (also reduces establishment costs for farmers)
 - Carbon credits for CO2 sequestration (free to trade via the Emissions Reduction Fund)

Carbon + Biodiversity Pilot

- Key features to reduce application difficulties for farmers:
 - Initial contract is an options contract (option to initiate project within 6 months)
 - Application via a web portal = quick calculations of planting area size, and CO2 sequestered per annum (to allow financial planning)



Biodiversity scores

Projects ranked and awarded based on biodiversity benefit, higher scores for projects that:

- plant larger areas;
- are located in areas important for threatened species and ecosystems;
- involve local vegetation community plantings (vs simple native plantings);
- retain and protect mature native trees;
- are closer to, or incorporate to fresh water (rivers, streams);
- set 100-year permanence periods (vs 25 years)



In summary

- Whatever its name improving the condition of natural assets on farms is key
- LANDCARE has been doing just this for several decades
- Still much to learn –evidence is critical monitoring and knowledge exchange
- Scientist-practitioner partnerships crucial need to be long-term (change takes time)





www.sustainablefarms.org.au



