Using scenario predictions of climate, chemical and physical stressors for probabilistic effects assessment of nearshore coral reefs



Norwegian institute for water research

<u>S. Mentzel^{1*}, R. Nathan², P. Noyes³, K. Brix^{4,5}, S. J. Moe¹, J. Carriger⁶, J. R. Rohr⁷, J. Verheyen⁸, P. J. Van den Brink⁹ and J. Stauber^{10*}</u>

INTRODUCTION

METHOD

- The Great Barrier Reef (GBR) is facing increasing risk from multiple stressors, with climate change being a primary [1,2].
- This work is part of a Great Barrier Reef case study from the SETAC Pellston workshop on integrating climate change into environmental risk assessment (ERA) [3].
- Adverse Outcome Pathways (AOP) and Bayesian networks (BN) have been explored to improve the incorporation of future climate change scenarios into probabilistic ERA frameworks.
- This study focuses on the climate and environmental modelling efforts undertaken to establish prior probabilities and causal relationships for parameterizing the BN model.



Figure 1. Example of climate and catchment stressors included in this case study. The figure is adapted from Integrating Expertise on Climate Modeling and environmental risk assessment: A SETAC Pellston Workshop in the Oslo fjord. Poster at SETAC Europe 2023.

Statistical

downscaling



Figure 3. Projections of average annual (a) air temperature and (b) rainfall in Blacks Creek catchment derived from a 16member ensemble based on four climate models and four downscaling methods (GCM: ACCESS1-0, CNRM-CM5, GFDL-ESM2M and MIROC5 Downscaling: ISIMIP2b, MRNBC, QME, CCAM). Historical projections are provided for the period 1976 to 2005, and those for future scenarios extend from 2006 to 2100 (RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 scenarios are each for a 30 year period).









Figure 6. Projections of average annual (c) runoff (see additional info fig. 3) using Australian Water Resource Assessment Landscape modelling system (AWRA-L). The method was a semi-distributed hydrological model representing water stores at the surface, shallow, and deep soil layers

Figure 7. Projected distributions of Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen (DIN), ecology fine inorganics (EFI) and total nitrogen (TN) for adopted historical and future climate scenarios using eReefs model with the GBR4 BGC q3b method.

References

[1] Ban et al. (2014). Evidence for multiple stressor interactions and effects on coral reefs.

INTEGRATION OF MODELLING RESULTS INTO A BAYESIAN NETWORK

Our study integrated information from several sources into a BN: global climate models (Fig. 3), regional downscaling (Fig. 4), literature on coral ecology (Fig. 5), hydrological modeling (Fig. 6), and catchment modeling (Fig. 7). The temporal variability in environmental model projections within different scenarios (e.g. sea temperature, Fig. 4) was quantified as conditional probability distributions in the BN. Stressor-response relationship of corals (e.g., coral bleaching, Fig. 5) was expressed as equations in the BN. The resulting BN aims to quantify probabilistic risk to coral communities by multiple assessment endpoints: coral recruitment, coral mortality and coral cover. It is a promising approach for conceptualizing and integrating climate information into ERA [5].





Global Change Biology 20, 681-697.

[2] Hughes et al. (2018). Global warming transforms coral reef assemblages. Nature 556, 492– 496.

[3] Stahl et al.. (2024), Incorporating climate change model projections into ecological risk assessments to help inform risk management and adaptation strategies: Synthesis of a SETAC Pellston Workshop[®]. Integr Environ Assess Manag, 20: 359-366.

[4] Moe et al. (2024), Integrating climate model projections into environmental risk assessment: A probabilistic modeling approach. IEAM 20: 367-383.

[5] Mentzel et al. (2023), Evaluating the Effects of Climate Change and Chemical, Physical and Biological Stressors on Nearshore Coral Reefs: A Case Study in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia, IEAM 20:401-418.

Acknowledgement

The workshop was supported by: BHP, Chevron, Corteva Agrisciences, CSIRO, International Copper Association, NiPERA, NIVA's Computational Toxicology Program, Research Council of Norway, Rio Tinto, SETAC, Shell, Teck Resources, US EPA.

The views expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. EPA.

Affiliations: ¹ Norwegian Institute for Water Research (NIVA), Oslo, Norway, ² Department of Infrastructure Engineering, University of Melbourne, Vic, Australia, ³ Integrated Climate Sciences Division, Center for Public Health and Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC, ⁴ EcoTox, Miami, Florida, USA, ⁵ University of Miami, RSMAES, Miami, Florida, USA, ⁶ Land Remediation and Technology Division, Center for Environmental Solutions and Emergency Response, Office of Research and Development, U.S. EPA, Cincinnati, OH, ⁷ Department of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA, ⁸ Laboratory of Evolutionary Stress Ecology and Ecotoxicology, KU Leuven, Belgium, ⁸ Aquatic Ecology and Water Quality Management Group, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands, ⁹ Wageningen Environmental Research, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands, ¹⁰ La Trobe University, Wodonga, Victoria, Australia