GLOBAL CONSEQUENCES OF LAND USE

A.N. Jumanov - "Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Agricultural Mechanization Engineers" National Research University

Abstract

Geographic information systems serve as an essential integration component of precision farming solutions. Land use has generally been considered a local environmental issue, but it is becoming a force of global importance. Worldwide changes to forests, farmlands, waterways, and air are being driven by the need to provide food, fiber, water, and shelter to more than six billion people. Global croplands, pastures, plantations, and urban areas have expanded in recent decades, accompanied by large increases in energy, water, and fertilizer consumption, along with considerable losses of biodiversity. Such changes in land use have enabled humans to appropriate an increasing share of the planet's resources, but they also potentially undermine the capacity of ecosystems to sustain food production, maintain freshwater and forest resources, regulate climate and air quality, and ameliorate infectious diseases. We face the challenge of managing trade-offs between immediate human needs and maintaining the capacity of the biosphere to provide goods and services in the long term.

Keywords: Land, Remote Sensing, Yield mapping, Fertilizer, Precision Agriculture; agricultural land; ArcGIS.

Introduction: Land-use activities-whether converting natural landscapes for human use or changing management practices on human-dominated lands-have transformed a large proportion of the planet's land surface. By clearing forests, practicing subsistence agriculture, intensifying farmland production, or expanding urban centers, human actions are changing the world's landscapes in pervasive ways (1, 2) (Fig. 1). Although land-use practices vary greatly across the world, their ultimate outcome is generally the same: the acquisition of natural resources for immediate human needs, often at the expense of degrading environmental conditions. Several decades of research have revealed the environmental impacts of land use throughout the globe, ranging from changes in atmospheric composition to the extensive modification of Earth's ecosystems (3-6). For example, land-use practices have played a role in changing the global carbon cycle and, possibly, the global climate: Since 1850, roughly 35% of anthropogenic CO_2 emissions resulted directly from land use (7). Land-cover changes also affect regional climates through changes in surface energy and water balance (8, 9). Humans have also transformed the hydrologic cycle to provide freshwater for irrigation, industry, and domestic consumption (10, 11). Furthermore, anthropogenic nutrient inputs to the biosphere from fertilizers and atmospheric pollutants now exceed natural sources and have widespread effects on water quality and coastal and freshwater ecosystems (4, 12). Land use has also caused declines in biodiversity through the loss, modification, and fragmentation of habitats; degradation of soil and water; and overexploitation of native species (13). Ironically, just as our collective land-use practices are degrading ecological conditions across the globe, humanity has become dependent on an ever-increasing share of the biosphere's resources. Human activities now appropriate nearly one-third to one-half of global ecosystem production (14), and as development and population pressures continue to mount, so could the pressures on the biosphere. As a result, the scientific community is increasingly concerned about the condition of global ecosystems and "ecosystem services"(15, 16).

Land use thus presents us with a dilemma. On one hand, many land-use practices are absolutely essential for humanity, because they provide critical natural resources and ecosystem services, such as food, fiber, shelter, and freshwater. On the other hand, some forms of land use are degrading the ecosystems and services upon which we depend, so a natural question arises: Are land-use activities degrading the global environment in ways that may ultimately undermine ecosystem services, human welfare, and the long-term sustainability of human societies? Here, we examine this question and focus on a subset of global ecosystem conditions we consider most affected by land use. We also consider the challenge of reducing the negative environmental impacts of land use while maintaining economic and social benefits.

Background of this study: Together, croplands and pastures have become one of the largest terrestrial biomes on the planet, rivaling forest cover in extent and occupying 40% of the land surface (17, 18) (Fig. 3). Changing land-use practices have enabled world grain harvests to double in the past four decades, so they now exceed 2 billion tons per year (19). Some of this increase can be attributed to a 12% increase in world cropland area, but most of these production gains resulted from ''Green Revolution'' technologies, including high-yielding cultivars, chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and mechanization and irrigation (4, 20). During the past 40 years, there has been a 700% increase in global fertilizer use (4, 5) and a 70% increase in irrigated cropland area (21, 22). Although modern agriculture has been successful in increasing food production, it has also caused extensive environmental damage. For example, increasing fertilizer use has led to the degradation of water quality in many regions (4, 12, 13). In addition, some irrigated lands have become heavily salinized, causing the worldwide loss of 1.5 million hectares of arable land per year, along with an estimated $11 billion in lost production (20). Up to 40% of global croplands may also be experiencing some degree of soil erosion, reduced fertility, or overgrazing (20). The loss of native habitats also affects agricultural production by degrading the services of pollinators, especially bees (23, 24). In short, modern agricultural land use practices may be trading short-term increases in food production for long-term losses in ecosystem services, including many that are important to agriculture.

Purpose of the study: Land use can disrupt the surface water balance and the partitioning of precipitation into evapotranspiration, runoff, and groundwater flow. Surface runoff and river discharge generally increase when natural vegetation (especially forest) is cleared (25, 26). As a result, many large rivers, especially in semiarid regions, have greatly reduced flows, and some routinely dry up (21, 28). In addition, the extraction of groundwater reserves is almost universally unsustainable and has resulted in declining water tables in many regions (21, 28). Water quality is often degraded by land use. Intensive agriculture increases erosion and sediment load, and leaches nutrients and agricultural chemicals to groundwater, streams, and rivers. In fact, agriculture has become the largest source of excess nitrogen and phosphorus to waterways and coastal zones (12, 29). Urbanization also substantially degrades water quality, especially where wastewater treatment is absent. The resulting degradation of inland and coastal waters impairs water supplies, causes oxygen depletion and fish kills, increases blooms of cyanobacteria (including toxic varieties), and contributes to waterborne disease (12, 30).



Fig. 1. Land-use transitions.

Transitions in land-use activities that may be experienced within a given region over time. As with demographic and economic transitions, societies appear also to follow a sequence of different land-use regimes: from presettlement natural vegetation to frontier clearing, then to subsistence agriculture and small-scale farms, and finally to intensive agriculture, urban areas, and protected recreational lands. Different parts of the world are in different transition stages, depending on their history, social and economic conditions, and ecological context. Furthermore, not all parts of the world move linearly through these transitions. Rather, some places remain in one stage for a long period of time, while others move rapidly between stages.

Confronting the Effects of Land Use: Current trends in land use allow humans to appropriate an ever-larger fraction of the biosphere's goods and services while simultaneously diminishing the capacity of global ecosystems to sustain food production, maintain freshwater and forest resources, regulate climate and air quality, and mediate infectious diseases. This assertion is supported across a broad range of environmental conditions worldwide, although some (e.g., alpine and marine areas) were not considered here. Nevertheless, the conclusion is clear: Modern land use practices, while increasing the short-term supplies of material goods, may undermine many ecosystem services in the long run, even on regional and global scales. Confronting the global environmental challenges of land use will require assessing and managing inherent trade-offs between meeting immediate human needs and maintaining the capacity of ecosystems to provide goods and services in the future (Fig. 4) (2, 16). Assessments of trade-offs must recognize that land use provides crucial social and economic benefits, even while leading to possible longterm declines in human welfare through altered ecosystem functioning (2). Sustainable land-use policies must also assess and enhance the resilience of different land-use practices. Managed ecosystems, and the services they provide, are often vulnerable to diseases, climatic extremes, invasive species, toxic releases, and the like (21–23). Increasing the resilience of managed landscapes requires practices that are more robust to disturbance and can recover from unanticipated ‘‘surprises”. There is an increasing need for decision-making and policy actions across multiple geographic scales and multiple ecological dimensions. The very nature of the issue requires it: Land use occurs in local places, with real-world social and economic benefits, while potentially causing ecological degradation across local, regional, and global scales. Society faces the challenge of developing strategies that reduce the negative environmental impacts of land use across multiple services and scales while maintaining social and economic benefits. What strategies can ameliorate the detrimental effects of land use? Examples of land-management strategies with environmental, social, and economic benefits include increasing agricultural production per unit land area, per unit fertilizer input, and per unit water consumed (19, 21, 24, 25); maintaining and increasing soil organic matter in croplands, which is a key to waterholding capacity, nutrient availability, and carbon sequestration (20–23); increasing green space in urban areas, thereby reducing runoff and ‘‘heat island’’ effects; employing agroforestry practices that provide food and fiber yet maintain habitats for threatened species; and maintaining local biodiversity and associated ecosystem services such as pollination and pest control.

Methods. The normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) is one of the most widely used vegetation indexes and its utility in satellite assessment and monitoring of global vegetation cover has been well demonstrated over the past two decades. [7] It is defined

NDVI=((NIR-VIS))/((NIR+VIS))

as where NIR and RED represent surface reflectances averaged over visible (☒ ~ 0,6 μm) and near infrared (NIR) (☒ ~ 0,8 μm) regions of the spectrum, respectively. The NDVI is correlated with certain biophysical properties of the vegetation canopy, such as leafarea index (LAI), fractional vegetation cover, vegetation condition, and biomass. NDVI increases near-linearly with increasing LAI and then enters an asymptotic phase in which NDVI increases very slowly with increasing LAI.

Data collection. To evaluate (locate) the current situation in the field in the best possible way, the field was recorded during visit to the main local farms and their owners. Shorter surveys can be carried out in the process with farm owners. In addition to obtaining important technical data, this also provides an insight into the main issues in production. Also, each farm owner is required to submit a map showing the current situation and the location. These mostly include sketches or old plans that were either copied by hand or photocopied and thus diminished from the original cadastral maps. Maps very often include a legend on the field boundaries showing the types of crops grown, and each field has its own identification number. Preparation of the thematic GIS layers in the process of preparing GIS layers, several raster resolutions are used: (21) Basic resolution for calculation of suitability, 100 m; (22) LANDSAT image at 30 and 15m resolution; (23) A detailed topographic map 1:100 K, also at 15 m resolution. Boundaries of the area are set to Xmin = 6490027; Ymin = 5005476; Xmax = 6587527; Ymax = 5088076 (GaussKrueger system, zone 6), which means that the total area is 97 × 83km. Panchromatic image is at 15 m resolution (5508 × 6501 pixels). According to this methodology, the following thematic layers are made. The methodology of preparing thematic layers follows. For raster data we can use open source from internet source www.remotepixel. ca, for NDVI analyze we need download two raster images red (B4) and near infrared (B5).[27]

Nevertheless, you should keep in mind that high NDVI values can indicate that plants wintered at a late phenological stage. If the satellite image was taken before the resuming of vegetation, then it is necessary to analyze the zone after the resuming of the vegetation also. Above



Figure 2 Structure of IAG's Global Geodetic Observing System (GGOS).



Figure 3. NDVI analyzing by ArcGIS



Figure 4. Fertilizer Speading map.

0.5 is an abnormal value for the post-wintering period. It is better to check this field zone yourself. To sum up, if you see abnormal NDVI values (those that are very different from the average values for the field), you need to check this field area. You can see the NDVI index for your fields, monitor when the weather is cloudless, images are updated every 3–5 days. In results we get the maps identified in the traditional way and using NDVI analysis. In the traditional method, an equal amount of fertilizer is applied to all contours. Using a map identified and created using NDVI analysis, the exact coordinate fertilizer is applied and the crop is fertilized with as much fertilizer as needed. This increases economic efficiency and increases soil fertility as well.

Regional Climate and Air Quality: Land conversion can alter regional climates through its effects on net radiation, the division of energy into sensible and latent heat, and the partitioning of precipitation into soil water, evapotranspiration, and runoff. Modeling studies demonstrate that land-cover changes in the tropics affect climate largely through water-balance changes, but changes in temperate and boreal vegetation influence climate primarily through changes in the surface radiation balance (18). Large-scale clearing of forests may create a warmer, drier climate (19), whereas clearing temperate and forest is generally thought to cool the climate, primarily through increased (20). Urban ''heat islands'' are an extreme case of how land use modifies regional climate. The reduced vegetation cover, impervious surface area, and morphology of buildings in cityscapes combine to lower evaporative cooling, store heat, and warm the surface air (21).



Fig. 5. Worldwide extent of human land-use and land-cover change.

A recent analysis of climate records in the Uzbekistan suggests that a major portion of the temperature increase during the last several decades resulted from urbanization and other land-use changes (9). Landcover change has also been implicated in changing the regional climate in Kashkadaryo; recent analyses suggest that the daily diurnal temperature range has decreased as a result of urbanization (22). Land-use practices also change air quality by altering emissions and changing the atmospheric conditions that affect reaction rates, transport, and deposition. For example, tropospheric ozone (O3) is particularly sensitive to changes in vegetation cover and biogenic emissions.

Land-use practices often determine dust sources, biomass burning, vehicle emission patterns, and other air pollution sources. Furthermore, the effects of land use on local meteorological conditions, primarily in urban heat islands, also affect air quality: Higher urban temperatures generally cause O3 to increase (24).

These maps illustrate the geographic distribution of ''potential vegetation'' (top), vegetation that would most likely exist in the absence of human land use, and the extent of agricultural land cover (including croplands and pastures) across the world during the 1990s. [Adapted from (17) and (18)]

The provisioning of multiple ecosystem services under different land-use regimes can be illustrated with these simple ''flower'' diagrams, in which the condition of each ecosystem service is indicated along each axis.

Fig. 6. Conceptual framework for comparing land use and trade-offs of ecosystem services.

(In this qualitative illustration, the axes are not labeled or normalized with common units.) For purposes of illustration, we compare three hypothetical landscapes: a natural ecosystem (left), an intensively managed cropland (middle), and a cropland with restored ecosystem services (right). The natural ecosystems are able to support many ecosystem services at high levels, but not food production. The intensively managed cropland, however, is able to produce food in abundance (at least in the short run), at the cost of diminishing other ecosystem services. However, a middle ground-a cropland that is explicitly managed to maintain other ecosystem services-may be able to support a broader portfolio of ecosystem services.

Many of these strategies involve management of landscape structure through the strategic placement of managed and natural ecosystems, so the services of natural ecosystems (e.g., pest control by natural predators, pollination by wild bees, reduced erosion with hedgerows, or filtration of runoff by buffer strips) are available across the landscape mosaic. Local-scale case studies, drawn from a set of worldwide examples, illustrate how landuse practices can offer ''win-win-win'' environmental, social, and economic benefits:

Developing and implementing regional land-use strategies that recognize both shortand long-term needs, balance a full portfolio of ecosystem services, and increase the resilience of managed landscapes will require much more cross-disciplinary research on human-dominated ecosystems (16). However, it will also benefit from closer collaboration between scientists and practitionerslinking, for example, ecologists and land-use planners, hydrologists and farmers, climatologists and architects, and entomologists and physicians. A wide array of skills will be needed to better manage our planet's landscapes and balance human needs, the integrity of ecological infrastructure, the continued flow of ecosystem services, and the long-term health of people and the biosphere.

References:

1. R. DeFries, G. Asner, R. Houghton, Eds., Ecosystems and Land Use Change. (American Geophysical Union, Geophysical Monograph Series, Vol. 153, Washington, DC, 2004).
2. R. S. DeFries, J. A. Foley, G. P. Asner, Front. Ecol. Environ. 2, 249 (2004).
3. P. M. Vitousek, H. A. Mooney, J. Lubchenco, J. M. Melillo, Science 277, 494 (1997).
4. P. A. Matson, W. J. Parton, A. G. Power, M. J. Swift, Science 277, 504 (1997).
5. D. Tilman et al., Science 292, 281 (2001).
6. M. Wackernagel et al., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 99, 9266 (2002).
7. R. A. Houghton, J. L. Hackler, ORNL/CDIAC-131, NDP-050/R1 (Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, 2001).
8. R. A. Pielke Sr. et al., Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London Ser. B 360, 1705 (2002).
9. E. Kalnay, M. Cai, Nature 423, 528 (2003).
10. S. L. Postel, G. C. Daily, P. R. Ehrlich, Science 271, 785 (1996).
11. C. J. Vo¨ro¨smarty, P. Green, J. Salisbury, R. B. Lammers, Science 289, 284 (2000).
12. E. M. Bennett, S. R. Carpenter, N. F. Caraco, Bioscience 51, 227 (2001).
13. S. L. Pimm, P. Raven, Nature 403, 843 (2000).
14. P. M. Vitousek, P. R. Ehrlich, A. H. Ehrlich, P. A. Matson, Bioscience 36, 368 (1986).
15. G. C. Daily, Nature’s Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems (Island Press, Washington, DC, 1997).
16. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Ecosystems and Human Wellbeing: A Framework for Assessment (Island Press, Washington, DC, 2003).
17. N. Ramankutty, J. A. Foley, Global Biogeochem. Cycles 13, 997 (1999).
18. G. P. Asner et al., Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 29 (2004).
19. C. C. Mann, Science 283, 310 (1999).
20. S. Wood, K. Sebastian, S. J. Scherr, Pilot Analysis of Global Ecosystems: Agroecosystems (International Food Policy Research Institute and World Resources Institute, Washington, DC, 2000)
21. Abbas A. and Khan S., “Using remote sensing techniques for appraisal of irrigated soil salinity,” in Proceedings of the
22. Abo-Shetaia, A.M., Ashoub, M.A., Ismail, M., Al-Khaled, E.A., 2005a. Estimation of some summer crops area and yield prediction using remote sensing techniques. Ann. Agric. Sci. 50, 481–498.
23. Clay D.E., Shanahan J.F. 2011 GIS Applications in Agriculture. CRC Press 462p.
24. Dehni A. and Lounis M., “Remote sensing techniques for salt affected soil mapping: application to the Oran Region of Algeria,” Procedia Engineering, vol. 33, pp. 188–198, 2012.
25. International Congress on Modelling and Simulation (MODSIM ’07), L. Oxley and D. Kulasiri, Eds., pp. 2632–2638, Modelling and Simulation Society of Australia and New Zealand, Brighton, UK, December 2007
26. Runquist, S., Zhang, N., Taylor, R.K., 2001. Development of a field-level geographic information system. Comput. Electron Agric. 31, 201–209.
27. Aslanov I.M. Jumanov A.N “Using remote sensing for creating fertilizer spreading map on Precision” Agriculture. Journal "Sustainable Agriculture" №8(4) 2020 13-16pp.