



University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

International Grassland Congress Proceedings

21st International Grassland Congress / 8th
International Rangeland Congress

Rangeland Monitoring and Adaptive Management

T. J. Bai
MDSM Data Analysis Services, LLC

Y. Q. Liang
MDSM Data Analysis Services, LLC

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc>



Part of the [Plant Sciences Commons](#), and the [Soil Science Commons](#)

This document is available at <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc/21/5-1/39>

The 21st International Grassland Congress / 8th International Rangeland Congress took place in Hohhot, China from June 29 through July 5, 2008.

Proceedings edited by Organizing Committee of 2008 IGC/IRC Conference

Published by Guangdong People's Publishing House

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the Plant and Soil Sciences at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Grassland Congress Proceedings by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

Rangeland monitoring and adaptive management

T. J. BAI, Y. Q. LIANG

MDSM Data Analysis Services, Llc., 615 Joanne St. Fort Collins, CO 80524-3684, USA. E-mail: jay@mdsm.us

Key words: trend analysis, m -Vectors, Multi-Dimensional Sphere Model (MDSM), time series

Introduction Rangeland monitoring data are expressed as three subscripts data, $D_{i,j,k}$, where $i=1, 2, \dots, m$, indicates species, $j=1, 2, \dots, n$, indicates samples, and $k=1, 2, \dots, o$, indicates times (Legendre & Legendre, 1998). Multi-Dimensional Sphere Model, MDSM (Bai, et al., 1997) is designed to discover the changing trends in these data. Model uses m -vectors, instead of matrix, to express rangeland: uses magnitude of the vector to express the total biomass, and uses direction of the vectors to express the composition of rangelands. In vector space, it is direction, instead of distances, that makes differences, but in rangeland science, it is the composition, instead of production, that makes differences. For example, three position vectors in shrub-grass 2-space, $A=(1, 0)$, $B=(0, 1)$, and $C=(3, 0)$. A is closer to B than to C , but A has same direction with C , but orthogonal to B . Model clusters A and C as shrubland, but B as grassland. In other words, vector space is a projective space, where $nA=A$ (Bai, et al., 2001).

Methods As collinear vectors have the same composition, rangeland vectors have to be standardized (normalized):

$$Y' = Y / |Y|, \quad (1)$$

Where Y' are the state vectors of the rangelands, or the projection of the rangelands on the unit hyper-sphere, Y are the rangeland vectors, or a point in m -space, and $|Y|$ is the vector length, the square root of the sum of the squares. Then, model uses time series to express the rangeland dynamics. It defines changing trends as present state over previous,

$$T_k = Y_k / Y_{k-1} = (Y_k / |Y_k|) / (Y_{k-1} / |Y_{k-1}|), \quad (2)$$

Where, T_k are trends, Y_k are state vectors of rangelands, subscript k indicate times. The rangeland growth based on cell duplication is expressed as exponential growth, and trends can be used to project the next year state (Zhao, et al., 1982),

$$P_{k+1} = Y_k * T_k. \quad (3)$$

Where P_{k+1} are the projection of the next year based on given year's information, Y_k are the state of given year, T_k are the trends of given year. The projection can be modified by next year's actual samples to generate expectation of the next year, and this is so called Kalman filter (Jameson, 1989):

$$E_{k+1} = \alpha * P_{k+1} + (1-\alpha) * D_{k+1}, \quad (4)$$

where E_{k+1} are expectation, P_{k+1} are projection based on previous year, D_{k+1} are new samples, and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ is the weighing factor given to P_{k+1} . Thus, E have two resources: projection based on history and new actual samples.

Conclusions and discussions vector space and rangeland are (one-one) related: vector magnitude vs. rangeland production, direction vs. composition, addition vs. combination, minus vs. differences, division vs. trends, multiply vs. projection. It has been proven that E are closer to the true values than either P or D , and projection error,

$$R = (1-\alpha) * (D-P) \quad (5)$$

are smaller than either using P or D alone. Furthermore, if we use $P+D$ to replace E , and use $T \times E$ to replace P , then,

$$\begin{aligned} E_k &= D_k + P_k, \\ &= D_k + T_{k-1} * E_{k-1} = D_k + T_{k-1} * (D_{k-1} + P_{k-1}) \dots \\ &= D_k + T_{k-1} * (D_{k-1} + T_{k-2} * (D_{k-2} + T_{k-3} * (D_{k-3} + \dots + T_0 * D_0))) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Rangeland expectation are linked to whole monitoring time series, and the trends calculated from expectations have used all information from the monitoring history, even looks like only two points be used (Bai, et al., 2007).

References

- Bai, T. J., Liang, Y. Q., (2007). Changing vegetation and trend analysis. Journal of Plant Ecology. Science press, Beijing (accepted).
- Bai, T. J., (2006). Trend Analysis and Its Applications in Ecology and Stock Market. Ethnic Publishing House, Beijing.
- Bai, T. J., Cottrell, T., Hao, D. Y., Te, T. L., Brozka, R. J., (1997). Multi-dimensional sphere model and instantaneous rangeland trend analysis. Ecological Modelling, 97, 75-86.
- Legendre P., Legendre L., (1998). Numerical Ecology. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 247-258.
- Zhao, S. L., et al., (1982). Linear and Non-Linear of Plant Community Succession and Numerical Prediction. Acta Ecologica Sinica.