



Climate change threatens the sustainability of current timber harvesting practices across a latitudinal gradient in Siberia

Eric J. Gustafson¹ · Melissa S. Lucash² · Anatoly Z. Shvidenko^{3,4} · Brian R. Sturtevant¹ · Dmitry Schepaschenko³ · Colin Mast² · Neil Williams²

Received: 11 October 2024 / Revised: 15 March 2025 / Accepted: 26 March 2025

This is a U.S. Government work and not under copyright protection in the US; foreign copyright protection may apply 2025

Abstract

The boreal forests of Eurasia form the largest contiguous terrestrial biome in the world, providing numerous ecosystem functions and services for human societies. Temperatures are increasing most rapidly in high northern latitudes, altering tree growth and competition dynamics, and modifying disturbance regimes. The effect of these cumulative changes on the ecosystem functions provided by boreal forests is difficult to predict. We used the process-based LANDIS-II forest landscape model to evaluate how climate change and timber harvesting will interact to alter the production of ecosystem functions and services in boreal forests on three study areas across a large latitudinal gradient (11°) in central Siberia. We found that the relative importance of wood harvesting as a disturbance type varied depending on latitude and its impact was always far less than that of fire. Moderate climate change increased the availability of wood for harvest in the northern landscape, but wood availability declined in the southern landscapes under any amount of climate change likely because of an increase in the frequency of fire that kept forests too young for harvest. Modest climate change (RCP6.0) increased productivity and the storage of carbon in all landscapes but severe climate change (RCP8.5) reduced both in the southernmost landscape. Harvesting as a specific driver of change in these boreal forests is likely to be relatively minor except as a forest fragmentation process. Our results provide compelling evidence that *status quo* forest management in these landscapes is likely not sustainable, suggesting that climate-smart forestry will be needed.

Keywords Boreal forests · Climate change · LANDIS-II · Ecosystem functions · Siberia

Introduction

The boreal forests of Eurasia form the largest contiguous terrestrial biome in the world, and they contain 30–50% of the world's forest carbon stocks (Pan et al. 2011). Boreal

forests provide a large and critical carbon sink, with Russian forests alone sequestering $0.21 \pm 0.09 \text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$ in the form of new woody biomass (Shvidenko et al. in review). Russia's boreal forests, with their ~68 billion m³ of growing stock volume (Schepaschenko et al. 2021; Filipchuck et al. 2022) represent the largest potential source of commercial wood products in the world. These vast forests also provide other critical ecosystem functions (sensu Manning et al. 2018) in the form of biotic diversity of both plants and animals, above- and below-ground carbon storage, water quality and quantity, and many others.

At a global scale, 60% of boreal forests are designated as managed, ranging from 35% in Canada (Burton et al. 2010; Vernier et al. 2014) to 58% in Russia (Federal Agency of Forest Service 2009) and 90% in Fennoscandia (Burton et al. 2010). Forestry in Fennoscandian forests is generally intense and efficient, and large areas of Canada and western Russian boreal are actively managed, while other boreal regions (northwestern Canada, Alaska, Siberia) have limited

Communicated by Ruediger Grote.

✉ Eric J. Gustafson
eric.gustafson@usda.gov

¹ USDA Forest Service Northern Research Station, Institute for Applied Ecosystem Studies, 5985 Highway K, Rhinelander, WI 54501, USA

² Department of Geography, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, USA

³ International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria

⁴ Center for Ecology and Productivity of Forest, Russian Academy of Science, Moscow, Russia

commercial harvesting (Hayes et al. 2022). Managed forests are an important source of wood for commercial purposes because of their abundance and quality, and also for heating fuel because of their proximity to dispersed demand centers. In boreal Russia, both harvesting and forest protection have dropped substantially since the collapse of the Soviet Union (FAO 2012; State Program of the Russian Federation 2020). Also, despite existing laws and regulations, up to 20% of current logging is carried out illegally (FAO 2012), often with overharvesting of high-value (large) stems in the most accessible stands (Newell and Simeone 2014). More recently, the socio-economic pressure to harvest forests is growing in currently unharvested areas throughout Eurasia (Shvidenko et al. 2007), which could compromise forest sustainability, alter successional dynamics and forest composition, and interact with climate change and other disturbances in ways that are not fully understood (Gustafson et al. 2011).

Temperatures are increasing especially rapidly in high northern latitudes (Leskinen 2020; IPCC 2021), resulting in modified disturbance regimes (Gauthier et al. 2015) and greater thawing of permafrost in summer (Chapin et al. 2010). Between 1976 and 2021, Russia experienced warming ($+0.49$ °C/decade) that was more than twice that of the global average, with even higher rates recorded in central Siberia in spring ($+0.84$ °C/decade) (Roshydromet 2022). Precipitation also increased modestly ($+84$ mm/month/decade), but perhaps insufficiently to meet increased water demand by plants. Elevated temperatures result in increases in active layer thickness in permafrost areas, lengthening of growing seasons, and favorable temperatures for photosynthesis are becoming more likely in late June/early July when daylength is the longest. However, weather extremes are becoming more pronounced and destructive, and may result not only in more heat waves, but perhaps in more cold-killing events, at least in the next few decades (Gustafson et al. 2020). In the recent past, heat waves producing catastrophic fires and increasing pest disturbances are the most common modification of historical disturbance regimes in Siberian forests (Shvidenko and Schepaschenko 2013; Ponomarev et al. 2021).

Tree species will be differentially stressed or favored by altered temperature, precipitation, permafrost hydrology, and CO₂ fertilization, depending on their physiological traits, thus altering competitive interactions and biotic equilibria. Current species will be better able to survive in locations to the north and perhaps less able to compete in locations near the southern edge of their current range. The movement of climate isotherms (climate velocity) is likely to far outpace the ability of tree species to disperse as needed to maintain populations (biotic velocity), especially at high latitudes (Dial et al. 2016). Past attempts to predict how climate change will affect boreal forests have not adequately captured interactions among multiple disturbances (i.e., wind,

insects, fire, climate extremes and harvest), seed dispersal and climate change. Additionally, disturbances may become more frequent and more intense, altering forest composition to favor better adapted species, and potentially shifting age class distributions (Shvidenko and Schepaschenko 2013; de Groot et al. 2013). Shifts in forest composition and age class structure may threaten the supply of merchantable timber given current utilization standards, milling infrastructure and product markets, as well as changes in productivity and carbon storage.

These integrated effects of changing climate, harvesting and natural disturbances may also have repercussions for landscape structure, including patchiness and wildlife habitat. Fragmentation could be increased by changes in harvesting in response to increased productivity or by more prevalent natural disturbances and climate-induced dieback events. These changes may have complex effects on ecosystem functioning, including feedbacks to productivity (e.g., by edge effects and microclimatic buffering), resilience to future disturbances, and wildlife habitat suitability for species such as caribou (Mallory and Boyce 2018) and Siberian flying squirrels (Hof et al. 2012).

Most published studies predicting the response of boreal ecosystems to climate change used dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs), bioclimatic envelope models, or data assimilation systems (e.g., Tchebakova et al. 2016; Bloom et al. 2016; López-Blanco et al. 2019). These models typically have a coarse spatial resolution (e.g., 0.5° lat/long) and represent vegetation as proportional occupancy by plant functional types (not species). The strength of DGVMs is their use of highly mechanistic plant growth algorithms based on physical and physiological first principles, which produce robust predictions of growth and competition under the novel conditions of the future. Their weakness is their extremely limited spatial specificity, which makes it difficult to specifically account for important regional ecological processes with an important spatial component, such as harvesting, most natural disturbances, and seed dispersal and establishment. It has been shown that most studies conducted for Russian territories using DGVMs substantially overestimated heterotrophic respiration, therefore underestimating net carbon storage in forested ecosystems (Shvidenko and Schepaschenko 2014). Our study explored how models with finer resolution may generate results (e.g., timber harvest impacts on ecosystem goods and services) not available from coarse resolution models.

Process-based forest landscape models (FLMs) are a powerful tool to predict future landscape dynamics under novel conditions without historical analog. They feature a spatially interactive representation of landscapes as a grid of cells with a resolution that typically falls in the range of 10–250 m. Their primary strength is simulation of spatially contagious disturbances that interact with abiotic and

vegetation characteristics of the landscape, the dispersal of propagules from sexually mature cohorts, and the establishment of new cohorts as a function of their tolerance of the conditions on the grid cell. Their weakness is a (relatively) limited spatial extent (typically $< 10^7$ ha) and somewhat less mechanistic simulation of tree growth and competition, both required by their spatial resolution and the spatially explicit nature of their algorithms. However, one of their strengths is the ability to simulate a wide range of forest management activities targeted to specific species on specific parts of the landscape, a capability that is quite limited in DGVMs.

In this study we used the LANDIS-II FLM to evaluate how climate change and disturbances may alter timber harvesting in boreal forests across a large latitudinal gradient in central Siberia. This location is relatively under-studied and such a large latitudinal gradient is not forested (without mountains) on other continents. We tested three specific hypotheses. H1: climate change will increase the amount of tree biomass, achieved primarily by the northward expansion of productive forests and enhanced growth resulting from CO₂ fertilization. H2: Total annual net primary productivity will increase because both climate change (including CO₂ fertilization and lengthened growing seasons) and the general reduction of forest age by harvesting will increase growth rates. H3: climate change will increase the amount of timber available to harvest (i.e., more rapid growth) and therefore allow an increase in the amount of harvesting, increasing fragmentation.

Methods

We used the LANDIS-II FLM to conduct a factorial simulation experiment that varied latitude (three landscapes), climate (three climate scenarios) and harvesting (two contrasting regimes) to project landscape responses of ecosystem functions.

The latitude factor was implemented using three study landscapes along a broad latitudinal gradient in Siberia (Fig. 1) located within 96–102° East and 57–67° North, each 1 million ha in size. The northernmost site (Northern taiga, 67° N) is currently mostly unharvested, and is composed primarily of light coniferous forests (larch, Scots pine) and arctic shrubs and grasses on continuous permafrost (i.e., entire area has permafrost). The middle site (Middle taiga 59° N) is currently moderately harvested, and composed primarily of dark coniferous forests (spruce, Siberian pine, fir) on discontinuous permafrost. The southernmost study site (Southern taiga, 57° N) is currently heavily harvested and is composed of a mix of deciduous and conifer species in a zone at risk of loss of forests to grasslands at a biome ecotone (forest-steppe). The location of this site was chosen to


avoid the confounding climatic effects of the high-elevation Sayan Mountain range to the southeast.

Initial tree communities for each cell of each study area were created using Siberian plot and tree data from an Integrated Land Information System (Schepaschenko et al. 2017, 2018). Species composition within plots was estimated from growing stock volume of each species, and ages of those species were assigned by randomly imputing from the trees in the tree database sharing site characteristics (bioclimatic zone, ecoregion, site index, stand age, dominant species) of the plot. Specific species cohorts and ages were then imputed to each 2.25 ha-cell by randomly sampling from plots with similar characteristics (bioclimatic zone, ecoregion, site index, stand age, dominant species). We initialized non-arboreal species (i.e., shrubs, mosses, and grasses) based on a suite of ecologically relevant rules (e.g., riparian species, species associations) using expert judgement and published information (e.g., Krivobokov et al. 2020; Mukhortova et al. 2020; Gudilin 1987). The abiotic conditions of each cell were assigned based on a map of bioclimatic zones (Stolbovoi and McCallum 2002), and a map of ecoregions (Schepaschenko et al. 2011; Shvidenko and Schepaschenko 2014).

The simulation experiment was conducted using LANDIS-II v7 (Scheller et al. 2007), which simulates growth, mortality (including by disturbance), and reproduction of tree species-age cohorts (i.e., not individuals) on grid cells that interact spatially through seed dispersal and contagious disturbances. LANDIS-II represents vegetation as species-age cohorts, and their growth, competitive behavior, reproduction, and response to disturbance is driven by life history traits (Table 1). LANDIS-II has previously been used in Siberia to study the relative effects of climate change, timber harvesting, and insect outbreaks on forest composition, biomass and landscape pattern in central Siberia (Gustafson et al. 2010, 2011, 2024).

We used a relatively mechanistic LANDIS-II succession extension (PnET-Succession v.5.1) that operates at a monthly time step and relies heavily on physiological first principles (De Bruijn et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2023a). PnET-Succession is based on the “big leaf” PnET-II model (Aber et al. 1995), and simulates monthly photosynthesis for each cohort using physiological first principles (Gustafson 2013). It tracks soil water at the grid-cell level using a bulk-hydrology model based on precipitation, loss to foliage interception, evaporation, soil texture, runoff, and percolation out of the rooting zone, and consumption by species cohorts (transpiration). Depth to permafrost, (computed in summer months) is a function of temperature, snow cover, vegetation and soil thermal conductivity (Abels 1892; Sitch et al. 2003; Beer et al. 2007; Jonas et al. 2009), which determines maximum rooting depth and leaching (see Gustafson et al. (2020) for modeling details). Cohort biomass is a proxy for relative

Fig. 1 Location of the three study sites across a large latitudinal gradient in central Siberia, showing permafrost and bioclimate zones (Stolbovoi and McCallum 2002). Inset map shows the study context within the Russian Federation



access to light, and the effect of soil moisture depends on each species' waterlogging and drought tolerance (parameters H1-H4). When water is not limiting, the amount of photosynthesis for a given species cohort increases with available light (dependent on canopy position, leaf area and shade tolerance (half-saturation point)), atmospheric CO_2 concentration and foliar N, and decreases with age and departure from optimal temperature for photosynthesis. Photosynthates are allocated to pools of foliage, wood, roots and reserves. PnET-Succession accounts for respiration such that growth respiration depends on temperature and moisture stress, while maintenance respiration depends on temperature and biomass. Shrub species can compete with trees,

mimicking observed dynamics at all sites. We also simulated grasses, lichens, and mosses. Given the arrival of seeds by dispersal, establishment probability in PnET-Succession is proportional to photosynthetic rates calculated for that species at ground level and can vary dynamically through time as a function of light and water availability. PnET-Succession can output maps and tables of many cohort state variables for each landscape grid cell through time (Gustafson et al. 2024). Calibration of PnET-Succession parameters is described in Williams et al. (2023), and selected parameter values are given in Table 2. All LANDIS-II parameters are available in the Supplement.

Table 1 Selected LANDIS-II parameters for the species simulated. Parameters represent typical cohort life-history traits, derived from many Russian sources (e.g., Chertovsky et al. 1983; Osawa et al. 2010)

Species common name	Scientific name	Longevity (years) ^a	Sexual maturity (years)	Prob. of re-sprouting ^b	Post-fire reproduction
Larch	<i>Larix</i> spp.	300	12	0.0	Seed
Siberian spruce	<i>Picea obovata</i>	220	25	0.0	Seed
Stone pine	<i>Pinus sibirica</i>	280	35	0.0	Seed
Siberian fir	<i>Abies sibirica</i>	180	40	0.0	Seed
Scots pine	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	220	15	0.0	Serotiny
Silver birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	120	10	0.5	Resprout
Eurasian aspen	<i>Populus tremula</i>	100	7	0.9	Resprout
Alder*	<i>Alnus fruticosa</i>	70	10	0.9	Resprout
Willow*	<i>Salix</i> spp.	65	10	0.9	Resprout
Dwarf birch*	<i>Betula nana</i>	120	30	0.9	Resprout
Sphagnum*	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.	220	20	0.8	Seed
Arctic grass* ^c	Pseudo-species	500	5	0.95	Resprout
Steppe grass* ^d	Pseudo-species	500	2	0.95	Resprout

Non-tree species are indicated by *

^aTypical longevity of cohorts of the species (not unusually long-lived individuals)

^bProbability of sprouting after disturbance

^cArctic grass was parameterized as a pseudo-species representing typical tundra ground cover vegetation composed of a mixture of grasses, lichens and mosses

^dSteppe grass was parameterized as a pseudo-species representing ground cover typically found in steppe ecosystems

Table 2 Selected PnET-Succession parameters for each species, synthesized from many Russian sources (e.g., Chertovsky et al. 1983; Osawa et al. 2010)

Species	FolN (% by mass)	SLW Max (g/m ²) ^a	HalfSat ^b (μmol/m ² /s)	H1 ^c (m)	H2 ^c (m)	H3 & H4 ^c (m)	LeafOn-MinT (°C) ^d	PsnTMin (°C) ^e	PsnTOpt (°C) ^e	ColdTol (°C) ^f
Larch	2.3	70	275	−2.4	1	149	1.3	0	24	−65.2
Spruce	1.2	125	150	−1.5	1	144	1.4	0.4	26	−64
Dwarf birch*	2.2	70	265	−4	1	144	1.2	−0.4	17	−67
Stone pine	1.35	185	245	−3	2	151	1.5	1.0	26	−63
Fir	1.15	110	134	−3	2	144	1.6	0.7	26	−61
Scots pine	1.35	215	260	−2.3	1.5	157	1.4	0.7	26	−63
Birch	2.8	65	245	−1	1.2	146	1.7	1.5	28	−61
Aspen	2.7	68	234	−1	1.2	149	1.7	1.5	28	−57.5
Alder*	2.3	60	220	−4	1	3.4, 5	1.4	1.0	26	−66.3
Willow*	2.3	60	220	−4	1	3.4, 5	1.7	1.5	27	−67
Sphagnum*	2.1	120	130	−50	0	3.4, 15	1.4	0.4	24	−65
Arctic grass*	2.1	105	222	−1	0	151	1.2	−0.4	17	−68
Steppe grass*	2.3	90	275	−3	1	170	2.6	2.0	30	−50

Non-tree species (indicated by *) were parameterized as pseudo-species calibrated to appropriately burn and consume water and light

^aMaximum specific leaf weight determines leaf thickness and is used to compute cohort LAI

^bHalf saturation point; lower values represent greater shade tolerance

^cH1 = soil water potential (absolute values of meters pressurehead) above which photosynthesis stops due to waterlogging (negative values allow some photosynthesis in standing water); H2 = water potential above which photosynthesis slows due to waterlogging; H3 = water potential below which photosynthesis slows due to drought; H4 = water potential below which photosynthesis stops due to drought. H3 is usually equal to H4, resulting in instantaneous water starvation when soil water potential drops below H3. Exceptions to this show two values (H3, H4) in the table

^dMean monthly temperature above which leaves and photosynthesis are active. Dynamically determines growing season length

^ePhotosynthesis temperatures are given in terms of mean monthly daytime temperature ((Tmax + Tavg)/2)

^fColdest temperature the species can survive

The climate factor had three levels (Historical, Intermediate, Shared Socioeconomic Pathway 585 (SSP585)). Because an intermediate SSP climate scenario was not available for our study areas at the time of simulation, we generated one as described below. For the Historical climate treatment, we used the GSWP3 climate product for the years 1980–2014 (Compo et al. 2011). The extreme climate treatment (IPCC 2021) was derived from the CESM2-WACCM SSP585 product (Rodgers et al. 2021) for the years 2015–2300. These two climate scenarios were bias-corrected (downscaling bias) to produce a smooth transition in temperature and precipitation between past weather streams (1901–2015) used for spinup and future weather streams. Given that specific humidity was only available until 2100, the future humidity projections were extended beyond the year 2100 by altering the daily value into the future by the slope (through time) of that variable during the last 30 years of the projection. Wind data from CESM2 produced wind speeds that there unrealistically high so we used the GSWP3 wind data for all historical and future simulations. The purpose of the Intermediate climate treatment was to allow evaluation of the response variables under a climate that was midway between the extremes, and a hypothetical Intermediate climate stream was generated by computing the average of each climate variable (through time) between the Historical and SSP585 scenarios (see Figs. S1 and S2). We used the LANDIS-II climate library (v.4.2, Lucash and Scheller 2021) to ensure that each LANDIS-II extension received its required weather inputs from the same source at the same time.

The Harvesting experimental factor had two levels (current Harvest regime, No Harvest). Timber harvesting was simulated using the Biomass Harvest extension v.4.5.1 (Gustafson et al. 2000). This extension simulates removal of cohort biomass (including partial removal of individual cohorts) caused by timber harvest activities and links to the fuel extension to account for logging slash. Harvesting of each forest type was simulated using a unique prescription informed by the Forest Code of the Russian Federation (see <https://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/74983487>) and expert knowledge of local practice. The Harvest extension regulates cutting rates by rotation length rather than Annual Allowable Cut or wood demand, and rotation lengths were estimated from expert knowledge of current cutting practices. Illegal harvest of each type was simulated as clearcuts, at a rate varying between 5 and 20% of legal harvest (Table 3). The northern study area is comprised of sparse forests that are expected to become more productive and dominant with climate change. They are managed by a “Protective” silvicultural strategy specified in the Russian Forest Code, which generally uses longer rotations, avoids clearcuts and leaves more residual (uncut) forest after harvesting (Table 3). The southern two (more productive) study areas are managed by an “Exploitative” silvicultural strategy,

with shorter rotations and clearcutting methods, leaving less residual forest behind. Most harvest prescriptions involve two stand entries; the first entry applies a thinning cut, followed some decades later by a mature tree removal cut (either single-tree selection cutting or clearcut) (Table 3). Initial harvest rates were set to achieve the desired rotation length for each type based on the areal abundance of each harvested species in the initial condition maps. After the first rotation, harvest rates responded to the availability of each species through time. The Harvest extension applies prescriptions to spatial units (stands), but no technique to generate stand boundaries on imputed initial conditions maps is yet available, so a grid of arbitrary stand boundaries was imposed on each landscape. Stands in the northern landscape (Protective harvest rules) were 18 ha in size (600×300 m) and in the southern two landscapes (Exploitative rules) stands were 45 ha in size (750×600 m). Harvests were not simulated in the parts of each landscape that are officially set aside from harvesting, although the total amount of such areas was quite small. The Harvest extension estimates a forest type at each time step for each stand based on the composition of the cells in the stand.

Because seed dispersal was not possible from outside each landscape, we used the Harvest extension to introduce more southerly species (not initially extant in the landscape) along the southern border of each landscape once each decade to simulate colonization. These cohorts survived only when climate conditions (cold extremes) permitted and their ability to then colonize the landscape was determined by seed dispersal and competitiveness with existing vegetation, mediated by disturbances. This mimics the outcome of colonization processes that our model was unable to simulate.

Natural disturbances (fire, insects, and wind) were considered chronic background disturbances (parameterized the same for all treatment combinations), although fire and insects nevertheless responded to their climate and vegetation drivers. This is not a confounding of the climate treatment effect, but rather a complete accounting of the climate effect because some of these disturbances are partially driven by climate and they are a powerful driver of forest succession (Liang et al. 2023) in this biome. Fire was simulated by the BFOLDS (Boreal Forest Landscape Dynamics Simulator) Fire Regime extension (v2.2, Ouellette et al. 2022) because a BFOLDS wildfire regime is an emergent property of climate and fuel (live and dead vegetation), desirable because future functioning of these ecosystems is not anticipated to have the historical analog needed to parameterize other extensions. Parameters were adjusted under historical climate to match empirical observations of fire rotation intervals, fire size and area burned (Schepaschenko et al. 2011; Shvidenko and Schepaschenko 2014) as described by Williams et al. (2023). Fuel type for each cell (needed by BFOLDS) was estimated using the Dynamic Fuels extension (v3.0, Sturtevant et al.

Table 3 Harvest regimes (prescriptions) for each forest type (as specified for the Harvest extension) by Russian management system (Exploitative or Protective)

Forest type	Harvest method	Min. age (years)	Min. time between entries (years)	Nominal rotation length (years)	Residual (uncut stand area) (%)	Adjacency limit (years) ^a	Stand ranking method ^b
<i>Exploitative management system^c</i>							
Larch	Thin/clearcut	60	60	120	10	5	Oldest
Spruce	Thin/clearcut	60	60	120	10	5	Oldest
Fir	Thin/clearcut	60	60	120	10	5	Oldest
Scots pine	Thin/clearcut	60	60	120	10	5	Oldest
Stone pine	Selection	60	38	NA	0	0	Oldest
Aspen/birch	Clearcut	70	70	70	10	2	Oldest
<i>Protective management system^d</i>							
Larch	Thin/select	80	80	160	12.5	5	Oldest
Spruce	Thin/select	70	70	140	12.5	5	Oldest
Fir	Thin/select	70	70	140	12.5	5	Oldest
Scots pine	Thin/select	80	80	160	12.5	5	Oldest
Stone pine	Selection	60	38	NA	0	0	Oldest
Aspen/birch	Clearcut	70	70	70	10	2	Oldest
<i>Illegal^e</i>							
Stone pine	High-grade	100	0	NA	0	0	Value
All others	Clearcut	90	0	NA	0	0	Value

Some harvest methods use two entries per rotation (each with a different cutting strategy, denoted by a “/”)

^aAll adjacent stands must be at least this old for the focal stand to be eligible for harvest

^bDetermines the order in which eligible stands for the forest type prescription are harvested. “Value” ranks stands by economic value

^cExploitative: More aggressive harvest system applied in the two southern-most study areas

^dProtective: Less aggressive harvest system applied in the northernmost study area

^eIllegal: Not officially sanctioned or conducted according to Russian Forest Code. Harvest rules generated from expert knowledge. Implemented at a rate of 5% of legal harvest in the northern study area and 20% in the southern two study areas

2009). Defoliation disturbance by the major insect defoliator (Siberian silk moth) was simulated with the Biological Disturbance Agent extension (v4.1.0, Sturtevant et al. 2004). This extension simulates the mortality of tree cohorts caused by insect defoliators using relationships between insect tree species host abundance and temperature and drought to simulate defoliation outbreaks and was calibrated as described in the Online Appendix. Wind disturbance was simulated using the Base Wind v3.0 extension (microbursts, Mladenoff and He 1999) and the Linear Wind v1.0 extension (derechos and tornadoes, Gustafson et al 2016), using parameters from other studies in Siberia (Gustafson et al. 2010) and N. America (Lucash et al. 2017). Because we had no robust way to estimate future wind regimes under climate change, they were held constant.

The experimental landscapes were represented with a grid cell resolution of 150 m. We generated four replicates of each factorial combination, where each replicate varied the stochasticity of the model (via random number seed); climate and initial conditions did not vary among replicates. We simulated 280 years for each replicate to ensure at least one complete rotation for each forest type and allow

sufficient time for forests to respond to the experimental treatments. To quantify the effect of the experimental treatments on ecosystem functions and services, we extracted relevant state (response) variables from model outputs every 10 simulated years (Table 4). Maps of species composition were produced by the Output Species Biomass Extension (Scheller and Mladenoff 2004). Maps of area harvested and biomass harvested were generated by the Biomass Harvest extension. Maps of carbon storage and annual productivity were produced by the PnET extension. Outputs were reclassified using the Biomass Reclassification Output extension (v3.2, (Scheller 2019) to create maps of forest type (Table 5). Landscape metrics package (R) was used to calculate core area and forest patchiness of the forest type maps (Hesselbarth et al. 2019).

To evaluate our hypotheses, we relied primarily on graphical depictions of trends (with 1 STD uncertainty envelopes) in response variables by treatment through time, interpreting treatment effects as significant when uncertainty envelopes did not overlap after 100 years. This approach is generally superior to statistical tests for simulation modeling studies because models can readily generate many observations

Table 4 Response variables used to quantify the effect of the experimental treatments on ecosystem multifunctions

Response variable	Description	Units
Area occupied by each tree species	Species composition	km ²
Area harvested by species	Areal extent of all harvested cells	ha
Biomass harvested	Live wood biomass killed by harvest activities	Mg/m ²
% contemporary harvest rate	Ability to sustain harvest rates	percent
Mean carbon storage	Mean live above-ground biomass	g/m ²
Annual net primary productivity	Mean productivity of all species	Mg/ha/yr
Core area	Area of forest > 300 m from an opening	ha
Forest patchiness	Mean size of forested patches	Ha

Most variables were computed as a mean value per cell every 10 years

Table 5 Forest type classification as typically used by Eurasian forest managers

Forest type	Dominant species	Reclassification for fragmentation	Notes
Dark conifer	<i>Abies sibirica</i> <i>Picea obovata</i> <i>Pinus sibirica</i>	Forest	Generally shade tolerant
Light conifer	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i> <i>Larix</i> spp.	Forest	Shade intolerant
Deciduous	<i>Populus tremula</i> <i>Betula pendula</i>	Forest	Limited cold tolerance
Wetland forest	<i>Alnus fruticosa</i> <i>Salix</i> spp. <i>Sphagnum</i> spp.	Open	Limited to supersaturated soil
Shrub	<i>Betula nana</i>	Open	Very cold tolerant
Arctic ground vegetation	Arctic grass/lichen	Open	Extremely cold tolerant
Steppe grass	Steppe grass	Open	Limited cold tolerance
Inactive cell	None (Inactive, typically water)	Open	Cell not simulated

that may not include all sources of uncertainty (White et al. 2014). Accordingly, we limited replicates ($N = 4$).

Results

Timber harvest

The extraction of wood (timber harvest) was quantified in terms of area harvested and biomass harvested (reported as biomass of living cohorts killed; includes slash and waste). The area harvested was generally less than the area burned and was much less under climate change (Fig. 2).

In general, harvest rates generally decreased as latitude increased and as climate warmed (Fig. 3). Relatively short-term (decades) ups and downs in harvest rates were usually caused by demographic (age) availability; long term (century) shifts in harvest rates were caused by compositional availability (presence/absence of cohorts eligible for harvest) related to climate or disturbance effects on forest composition, age, and abundance. Notably, the spike in harvested area under historical climate in the NTaiga landscape resulted from the colonization of senescing shrub-dominated sites by trees and their maturation. In NTaiga and MTaiga, intermediate climate resulted in more (compared to Historical) area harvested (availability increased) until about 2200

and then area harvested dropped below Historical levels (availability decreased). In STaiga, intermediate climate produced the same area harvested as SSP585 climate, which was considerably lower than under Historical climate after 100 years. The SSP585 climate drove the availability of eligible cohorts (for harvest) to very low levels by 2200 in all landscapes because most cohorts were kept below minimum age constraints (Fig. 4; Table 3), driven by shortened rotation intervals for disturbances. In terms of the amount of wood (total biomass) removed, the general trends were very similar, but the biomass removed was much less as latitude increased because of less productivity, longer harvest rotation lengths, and more unforested sites to the north (Fig. S3, shown after Online Appendix).

The species most likely to be harvested varied by latitude (Fig. 5) because availability varied by latitude. Aspen and birch were initially very prevalent in the STaiga landscape (perhaps inaccurately high in the initial conditions map) but were gradually replaced by larch and Scots pine under Historical climate because fire intensity (as simulated by the model) lessened through time. Mature trees (of all species) eventually became scarce under both climate change scenarios on all landscapes because increased disturbance caused most cohorts to remain too young, resulting in very low harvest rates. Aspen and birch modestly increased late in the simulations in the southern two landscapes under




Fig. 2 Total area disturbed by disturbance type through time for each landscape and climate combination

climate change because of an increase of fire that favored their regeneration.

Forest composition

Our simulations showed that two of the experimental factors (latitude and climate) produced interacting effects on species abundance (Fig. 6), but the Harvest factor had little effect (not shown). Latitude generally determined the species present and increasingly severe climate change increasingly caused a substantial change of winners and losers.

Carbon dynamics


Forest productivity was quantified as the total (all simulated species) mean (all active landscape cells) annual net primary productivity. Productivity generally decreased with increasing latitude and increased with climate change, although in the southern two landscapes, the SSP585 climate resulted in declining productivity after 2200, especially in the STaiga (Fig. 7) mostly due to heat-related stress (in mid-summer) and increased disturbances. Harvesting did not noticeably alter productivity (harvest/no harvest curves overlap), likely because harvesting affected a relatively small proportion of the landscapes in each decade.

Carbon storage was quantified as mean aboveground live woody biomass (Fig. 8). Generally, carbon storage decreased with latitude and was slightly higher without harvest. In the MTaiga landscape there is a pronounced spike and decline of carbon in the first 100 years that is a consequence of initial condition demographics. In the first century, many younger cohorts of about the same age responded to an increasingly optimal climate (initially) to produce large amounts of live woody biomass (driven primarily by larch and Scots pine, Fig. S4). This was followed by a widespread demographic die-off of senescing cohorts (seen in all climates) and the subsequent slow (and sometimes incomplete) recovery reflects the effects of each climate on productivity in later years. In the northern landscape, the intermediate climate initially produced greater carbon storage, but ultimately the severe climate change scenario produced more by the end of the simulation period.

Landscape fragmentation

The area of core forest and the number of forest patches are indicators of fragmentation. The NTaiga landscape was initially mostly open, with trees found primarily in riparian corridors, and about 10% of that landscape consisted of core forest at the start of simulation, but core area rapidly declined near the end of the twenty-first century (Fig. 9).

Fig. 3 Area harvested through time by Climate and Harvest scenario. Envelopes show one standard deviation of four replicates. Note that y-axis scaling varies




In the southern two landscapes climate change eventually reduced the area of core forest below Historical climate levels, while the no-harvest treatment was less fragmenting, as expected. When core area approached zero, the difference between the Harvest and No Harvest scenarios became negligible.

The northern landscape initially had fairly large contiguous patches of trees in riparian corridors, but the invasion of trees into open areas generally resulted in large increases in forest patch number because most invaded cells formed a new patch (Fig. 10). The southern two landscapes had a matrix of forest initially, thus forming a low number of forest patches. Harvesting generally increased the number of forest patches under all climate scenarios although the difference was rarely significant (overlapping envelopes).

Discussion

Our results showed several things quite clearly. (1) The current harvesting regime does not have much of an impact on Siberian ecosystem functions and landscape patterns compared to the dominant effect of fire, and (2) *status quo* forest management strategies were sustainable until the end of the century (~2100), but will be unable to sustain most current forest ecosystem functions and services after 2150 under climate change, suggesting that adaptive management will be necessary. Specifically, climate change generally reduced the amount of timber available for harvest, and severe climate change nearly eliminated harvest activity by the year 2200 in all landscapes (Fig. 3, Fig. S3). Additionally, (3) productivity and carbon storage

Fig. 4 Mean (across active cells) maximum cohort age by harvest activities through time by Climate and Harvest scenario. Envelopes show one standard deviation of four replicates



were generally increased by moderate climate change, but severe climate change tended to produce less of an increase in the southern landscapes. Harvesting had a minor effect on productivity and carbon storage primarily because current stand age constraints limited harvest rates. (4) Harvesting also had a minor effect on forest composition and age, while climate change produced a gradual shift in composition and an increase in the frequency of fire disturbance, which reduced the average age of the forest. (5) Multiple functions of all landscapes were generally reduced by climate change, and some functions were almost completely degraded. Declining harvest rates induced by climate effects on timber availability suggest that “climate-smart” management strategies (to produce future forests that sustain critical ecosystem goods and services, *sensu* Millar et al. 2007) are indicated and further

research is needed to determine what an effective strategy might look like.

Our first hypothesis (H1) was that climate change would increase the amount of tree biomass as both stored carbon and wood available for harvest. We found that carbon storage was generally highest under Intermediate climate, but lowest under severe climate change (Fig. 8). There is evidence that plants will acclimate to elevated CO_2 such that extremely elevated CO_2 will not have an extreme fertilizing effect (Franks et al. 2013), while elevated temperatures will elevate heat stress and water demand (Allen et al. 2015). Our model includes these effects, and our results show how they will play out over 280 years in these biomes. Harvest generally reduced carbon storage, but the effect was quite small compared to climate effects and the interacting factors simulated by the model. Climate change




Fig. 5 Biomass (by species) removed by harvest through time by Climate and Harvest scenario. Envelopes show one standard deviation of four replicates

clearly altered the tree species in which carbon was stored (Fig. S4). Current age constraints on harvest will almost certainly be relaxed in the future in response to increasing tree productivity and shorter fire return intervals, which should make current harvest rates more likely to be sustained but also reducing carbon storage even more than seen in our results. Taken together, this suggests that the carbon storage function of these landscapes is at great risk

from climate change. Our hypothesis (H1) was supported for Intermediate climate change but not for severe climate change, and it was better supported in terms of carbon storage than for wood harvested.

We hypothesized (H2) that total annual net primary productivity (forest productivity) will increase because both climate change (CO_2 fertilization and lengthened growing seasons) and the general reduction of forest age by harvesting will increase growth rates. Forest productivity was very responsive to climate, with almost no response to harvest specifically (Fig. 7). The climate effect likely also reflected an alteration of species composition apart from harvest activities (Fig. 5). Thus, our hypothesis (H2) was supported, but only for one of the reasons posited. As noted earlier, the current harvest regime (specified in the Russian Forest Code) was quite generic and rotation lengths did not vary through time in response to changing productivity. It is conceivable that silvicultural treatments designed to maximize the productivity of specific stands would have a more detectable effect. We did not simulate planting of better adapted species as part of the harvest prescriptions (sensu Gustafson et al. 2023b), a practice that may have produced a greater response to harvesting. Intermediate climate change usually produced the greatest productivity, although the specific effect depended on the species found on (or invading) each landscape (see Fig. S4).





Fig. 6 Mean live biomass density of each species through time across all active cells with all disturbances (including harvest) by Climate scenario. Bars are stacked in the order shown in the legend

Fig. 7 Mean total annual net primary productivity (annual sum of monthly net photosynthesis of all species averaged across all active cells) through time by Climate and Harvest scenario. Envelopes show one standard deviation of four replicates, and are generally less than line width




Our third hypothesis (H3) stated that harvesting and climate change would interact to increase the fragmentation of forests (less core habitat and higher edge density). We found that harvesting increased the fragmentation of core habitat (as expected), although climate change decreased core habitat to such an extent by the year 2100 (likely through increased fire) that the effect of harvest was not detectable (Fig. 9). Climate change did not increase the fragmenting effect of harvesting as we expected from our hypothesis, and in fact the harvest fragmenting effect essentially disappeared after 200 years of climate change.

Our simulation of timber harvest allowed harvest rates to respond to timber availability after the first rotation (Table 3), although the rotation lengths (minimum age constraints) did not change. Climate change generally reduced the amount of timber available for harvest, and severe climate change almost nearly eliminated harvest activity by

the year 2200 in all landscapes (Fig. 3, Fig. S3), mostly caused by fires that kept the forests quite young. Intermediate climate change increased the biomass (proxy for volume) removed by harvest of some species on some landscapes (Fig. 5), but severe climate change reduced harvesting of all species. Fire impacts harvest rates by destroying stands nearing harvestable age and by creating many stands of similar age that all reach maturity at the same time. Climate change can change the fire regime, which in turn alters the supply of timber for harvest.

The LANDIS-II Harvest extension is not able to control harvest levels by available volume or biomass, only by area harvested and/or age. We simulated harvest using generic silvicultural prescriptions that reflect current harvest rotation lengths (minimum age for harvest) on each landscape. Because the minimum age parameters became very constraining as disturbance intervals shortened, the amount of

Fig. 8 Mean (across all active cells) total aboveground live woody biomass (all species) through time by Climate and Harvest scenario. Envelopes show one standard deviation of four replicates




harvest was not sustained. However, it is almost certain that real forest managers will find ways (i.e., adaptive management) to harvest some of the biomass that is present on all landscapes in all decades (Fig. 8). For example, the increased productivity under climate change (especially moderate climate change) that our simulations revealed in some or all study landscapes should reduce the time required for timber species to reach merchantable sizes, thereby allowing managers to reduce rotation lengths to reduce exposure to disturbances.

Other adaptations might include assisted migration of tree species expected to thrive under the conditions of the future, or hastening conversion to other endemic types (e.g., hardwoods). Our results show some clear shifts of forest types, especially under extreme climate change. Climate smart management might embrace these shifts along with the productivity gains associated with CO₂ fertilization and

longer growing season, allowing shorter rotations. This will likely have socio-economic implications in terms of wood processing infrastructure and the markets for the forest products that can be produced.

Our study is novel in that it was conducted using a landscape-scale model featuring process-based simulations of seed dispersal, establishment, growth and competition (both responding to abiotic drivers including permafrost thawing) combined with spatially explicit simulation of several major disturbances. Our approach allowed current harvest regimes to respond to the dynamic forest composition produced by the other simulated processes, so that all response variables represent emergent properties of the interacting drivers of the ecosystem. Our study is also one of a just a few to attempt to assess climate impacts on forest resources in high latitude ecosystems. Other studies were conducted using panels of experts (Jansson et al. 2015) or were aspirational

Fig. 9 Mean total area of core habitat on each landscape by Climate and Harvest scenario. Core habitat was defined as forested cells > 300 m from an “Open” cell (defined in Table 5). Envelopes show one standard deviation of four replicates. Decline in the first 10 years is an artifact of initial conditions that inadequately represented prior disturbances



in nature (Bastian et al. 2015; Bukvareva et al. 2015), so our study provides a process-based complement to those studies.

Caveats


It is important to note a few caveats related to our methods. First, we did not simulate the building of access roads (or processing mills) that facilitate the harvest of trees. We assumed that if timber is there, infrastructure will be built to extract it. Second, we did not simulate any tree planting activities, including assisted migration, because that is not part of current practice in these landscapes. Third, we did not simulate any land use change, such as land clearing for settlements or other permanent uses such as roads and natural resource extraction. Fourth, we did not include stochasticity in climate, initial landscape conditions, or species and abiotic model parameters. Thus, our variability envelopes

reflect only the variability in the stochastic processes simulated within the model (e.g., disturbances, cohort establishment, some site-level growth and competition processes). Finally, our forest productivity estimates include non-commercial species (shrubs, grasses), and therefore reflect the general effect of the treatments on plant productivity.

Future research

Our study suggests interesting options for future research. We did not simulate any “climate-smart” forest management practices (such as adapting to altered forest composition and growth rates, assisted migration strategies, or adopting new indicators of ecosystem sustainability) that will almost certainly be needed in the future to maintain ecosystem functions and services in arctic and boreal ecosystems. The primary reason we did not simulate any

Fig. 10 Mean number of forest (Table 5) patches (rook's case) on each landscape by Climate and Harvest scenario. Envelopes show one standard deviation of four replicates. Note that y-axis scaling varies



generic climate-smart forest management scenarios is that we found no specific options for Siberia (neither adaptive or transition strategies) published in the literature. The standard climate-smart strategies of planting more southerly tree species are a challenge in Siberia because areas to the south of Russia are often shrub and not tree-dominated. Conceptual research is needed to develop some climate-smart strategies for Siberia and then some applied research to assess the efficacy of such strategies in the boreal forests of Eurasia. Such research might include the development of a new doctrine for forest fire protection and importance of infrastructure to support it; adaptation of forest taiga landscapes to the future climate in terms of forest cover, composition and structure of tree stands; development of a system of assistance of natural migration of tree species

in response to climate change; development of new forest protective legislation and institutional structures of forest management; and the benefits of international cooperation.

Our modeling approach shows promise for investigating one facet of such an assessment by including many interacting drivers of forest dynamics at landscape scale, such as seed dispersal, disturbance and climate (e.g., Gustafson et al. 2023b). Research into the ability of adaptive forest management to respond to altered disturbance regimes and mitigate the negative consequences of climate change for forests and forest products is also needed. Another potential avenue for future research is to use LANDIS outputs to estimate habitat quality for representative animal species under alternative climate and management futures (e.g., Lucash et al. 2022).

Conclusions

We were able to draw three main conclusions from our study. (1) Climate change has the potential to greatly alter ecosystem functioning in the vast boreal forests of Eurasia, especially in the far north. Some impacts are positive (productivity), especially under Intermediate climate change, but some are negative (increasing mortality from natural disturbances, fragmentation), especially under severe climate change. (2) Harvesting as a specific driver of change in these boreal forests is likely to be relatively minor except as a forest fragmentation process. All disturbances combined had a much greater effect (Gustafson et al. 2024) on ecosystem processes. (3) Our results provide compelling evidence that *status quo* forest management is not sustainable in these ecosystems beyond this century, but they do highlight the potential for adaptive management, facilitated by increasing productivity and improved conditions for certain species. Although our study did not investigate what management strategies might be necessary to generate sustainable ecosystem functions and services, our modeling approach is well-suited for such studies.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-025-01782-5>.

Acknowledgements This research was supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant #2054713), the USDA Forest Service-Northern Research Station (in kind) and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (in kind), none of which had any role in the design, implementation or reporting of the study. Marc Ouellette (Ontario Forest Research Institute) modified the BFOLDS Fire Regime extension to create v2.2. We thank Tom Brussel, Jeffrey Suvada, Shelby Weiss, Hana Matsumoto, and Wesley Rancher for critical technical assistance. Thanks to María Suárez Muñoz, Matthew Hurteau, Ian McCallum, and three anonymous reviewers for critique that helped us improve the manuscript.

Author contributions Eric Gustafson: Conceptualization (equal), Funding Acquisition (supporting), Investigation (lead), Methodology (equal), Software (supporting), Writing—Original Draft Preparation (lead), Writing—Review & Editing (lead). Melissa Lucash: Conceptualization (equal), Funding Acquisition (lead), Data Curation (lead), Formal Analysis (lead), Methodology (equal), Project Administration (lead), Visualization (lead), Writing—Review & Editing (supporting). Brian Sturtevant: Conceptualization (equal), Funding Acquisition (supporting), Methodology (equal), Software (supporting), Writing—Review & Editing (supporting). Anatoly Shvidenko: Conceptualization (equal), Data Curation (equal), Writing—Review & Editing (supporting). Dmitry Schepaschenko: Data Curation (equal), Writing—Review & Editing (supporting). Colin Mast: Formal Analysis (supporting), Visualization (supporting), Writing—Review & Editing (supporting). Neil Williams: Methodology (equal), Writing—Review & Editing (supporting).

Funding US National Science Foundation (Grant #2054713).

Data availability Data inputs for this study are available at https://github.com/LANDIS-II-Foundation/Project-Siberia/tree/main/Gustafson_et_al_Harvest.

fson_et_al_Harvest. All data used to generate model output are freely available on github.

Code availability LANDIS-II is open-source and available at www.landis-ii.org.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

- Abels HF (1892) Beobachtungen der täglichen Periode der Temperatur im Schnee und Bestimmung des Wärmeleistungsvermögens des Schnees als Function seiner Dichtigkeit. Rep Meteorol 16:1–53
- Aber JD, Ollinger SV, Federer CA, Reich PB, Goulden ML, Kicklighter DW, Melillo JM, Lathrop RG Jr (1995) Predicting the effects of climate change on water yield and forest production in the north-eastern United States. Climate Res 5:207–222
- Allen CD, Breshears DD, McDowell NG (2015) On underestimation of global vulnerability to tree mortality and forest die-off from hotter drought in the Anthropocene. Ecosphere 6:1–55
- Bastian O, Grunewald K, Khoroshev AV (2015) The significance of geosystem and landscape concepts for the assessment of ecosystem services: exemplified in a case study in Russia. Landscape Ecol 30:1145–1164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0200-x>
- Beer C, Lucht W, Gerten D, Thonicke K, Schimmlius C (2007) Effects of soil freezing and thawing on vegetation carbon density in Siberia: a modeling analysis with the Lund-Potsdam-Jena Dynamic Global Vegetation Model (LPJ-DGVM). Global Biogeochem Cycles. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GB002760>
- Bloom AA, Exbrayat J-F, van der Welde IR, Feng L, Williams M (2016) The decadal state of the terrestrial carbon cycle: global retrievals of terrestrial carbon allocation, pools, and residence times. PNAS 113:1285–1290. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1515160113>
- Bukvareva EN, Grunewald K, Bobylev SN et al (2015) The current state of knowledge of ecosystems and ecosystem services in Russia: a status report. Ambio 44:491–507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-015-0674-4>
- Burton PJ, Bergeron Y, Bogdanski BEC, Juday GP, Kuuluvainen T, McAfee BJ, Ogden A, Teplyakov VK, Alfaro RI, Francis DA, Gauthier S, and Hantula (2010) In: Forests and Society—Responding to Global Drivers of Change, Mery G, Katila P, Galloway G, Alfaro RI, Kanninen M, Lobovikov M, and Varjo J (Eds.). International Union of Forest Research Organizations, Vienna, Austria, pp 249–282
- Chapin FS, McGuire AD, Ruess RW, Hollingsworth TN, Mack MC, Johnstone JF, Kasichke ES, Euskirchen ES, Jones JB, Jorgenson MT, Kielland K, Kofinas GP, Turetsky MR, Yarie J, Lloyd AH, Taylor DL (2010) Resilience of Alaska's boreal forest to climatic change. Can J for Res 40:1360–1370
- Chertovsky VG et al. (Eds.) (1983) Problems of pre-tundra forestry of European Part of USSR. Arkangelsk Inst. Of Forest and Forest Chemistry, Arkhangelsk, p 123
- Compo GP, Whitaker JS, Sardeshmukh PD, Matsui N, Allan RJ, Yin X, Gleason BE, Vose RS, Rutledge G, Bessemoulin P, Brönnimann S, Brunet M, Crouthamel RI, Grant AN, Groisman PY, Jones PD, Kruk MC, Kruger AC, Marshall GJ, Maugeri M, Mok HY, Nordli Ø, Ross TF, Trigo RM, Wang XL, Woodruff SD, Worley SJ (2011) The twentieth century reanalysis project. Q J Roy Meteor Soc 137:1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.776>

- De Bruijn A, Gustafson EJ, Sturtevant BR, Foster JR, Miranda BR, Lichti NI, Jacobs DF (2014) Toward more robust projections of forest landscape dynamics under novel environmental conditions: embedding PnET within LANDIS-II. *Ecol Model* 287:44–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.05.004>
- de Groot WJ, Flannigan MD, Cantin AS (2013) Climate change impacts on future boreal fire regimes. *For Ecol Manage* 294:35–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.09.027>
- Dial RJ, Smeltz TS, Sullivan PF, Rinas CL, Timm K, Geck JE, Tobin SC, Golden TS, Berg EC (2016) Shrubline but not tree-line advance matches climate velocity in montane ecosystems of south-central Alaska. *Glob Chang Biol* 22(5):1841–1856. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13207>
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) (2012) The Russian Federation forest sector. Outlook study to 2030. (FAO, Rome). Retrieved from www.fao.org/docrep/016/i3020e/i3020e00.pdf
- Federal Agency of Forest Service (2009) Forest Fund of the Russian Federation. Federal Agency of Forest Service, Moscow
- Filipchuk AN, Malysheva NV, Zolina TA, Berdov AM, Kosytsyn VN, Yugov AN (2022) Analytical review of quantitative and qualitative characteristics of forests in the Russian Federation: results of the first cycle of state forest inventory. *Forest Manag Inf*. <https://doi.org/10.24419/LHI.2304-3083.2022.1.01>
- Franks PJ, Adams MA, Amthor JS, Barbour MM, Berry JA, Ellsworth DS, Farquhar GD, Ghannoum O, Lloyd J, McDowell N, Norby RJ, Tissue DT, von Caemmerer S et al (2013) Sensitivity of plants to changing atmospheric CO₂ concentration: from the geological past to the next century. *New Phytol* 197:1077–1094
- Gauthier S, Bernier P, Kuuluvainen T, Shvidenko A, Schepaschenko D (2015) Boreal forest health and global change. *Science* 349:819–822
- Gudilin IS (1987) Landscape map of the USSR. Scale, 1, p 2500000
- Gustafson EJ (2013) When relationships estimated in the past cannot be used to predict the future: using mechanistic models to predict landscape ecological dynamics in a changing world. *Landscape Ecol* 28:1429–1437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-013-9927-4>
- Gustafson EJ, Shifley SR, Mladenoff DJ, He HS, Nimerfro KK (2000) Spatial simulation of forest succession and timber harvesting using LANDIS. *Can J for Res* 30:32–43
- Gustafson EJ, Shvidenko AZ, Sturtevant BR, Scheller RM (2010) Predicting global change effects on forest biomass and composition in south-central Siberia. *Ecol Appl* 20:700–715. <https://doi.org/10.1890/08-1693.1>
- Gustafson EJ, Shvidenko AZ, Scheller RM (2011) Effectiveness of forest management strategies to mitigate effects of global change in south central Siberia. *Can J for Res* 41:1405–1415
- Gustafson EJ, Miranda BR, Shvidenko AZ (2020) Simulating growth and competition on wet and waterlogged soils in a forest landscape model. *Front Ecol Evol* 8:598775. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2020.598775>
- Gustafson EJ, Kern CC, Kabrick JM (2023b) Can assisted tree migration today sustain forest ecosystem goods and services for the future? *For Ecol Manage*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2022.120723>
- Gustafson EJ, Sturtevant BR, Miranda BR, Duveneck M (2024) Overcoming conceptual hurdles to represent trees as cohorts in forest landscape models. *Ecol Model* 490:110657. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2024.110657>
- Gustafson EJ, Miranda BR, Lucash M, Sturtevant BR, Shvidenko AZ, Schepaschenko D (2024) Climate change and disturbance interact to alter landscape reflectivity (albedo) in boreal forests across a large latitudinal gradient in Eurasia. *Sci Total Environ* 956:177043
- Gustafson EJ, Miranda BR, and Sturtevant BR (2016) Linear wind disturbance v1.0 Extension user guide. Published on the Internet by the LANDIS-II Foundation. URL: <http://www.landis-ii.org/extensions/linear-wind>
- Gustafson EJ, Sturtevant BR, Miranda BR, and Zhou Z (2023a) PnET-Succession v 5.1: comprehensive description of an eco-physiological succession extension within the LANDIS-II forest landscape model. Published on the Internet by the LANDIS-II Foundation. URL: <https://github.com/LANDIS-II-Foundation/Foundation-Publications/blob/main/Description%20of%20PnET-Succession%20v5.1.pdf>
- Hayes DJ, Butman DE, Domke GM, Fisher JB, Neigh CSR, Welp LR (2022) Boreal forests. In: Poulter B, Canadell JG, Hayes DJ, Thompson RL (eds) *Balancing greenhouse gas budgets*. Elsevier, Cambridge, MA, pp 203–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814952-2.00025-3>
- Hesselbarth MHK, Sciaini M, With KA, Wiegand K, Nowosad J (2019) landscapemetrics: an open-source R tool to calculate landscape metrics. *Ecography* 42:1648–1657
- Hof AR, Jansson R, Nilsson C (2012) Future climate change will favour non-specialist mammals in the (sub)arctics. *PLoS One* 7(12):e52574. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0052574>
- IPCC (2021) Summary for policymakers. In: (Masson-Delmotte VP, Zhai A, Pirani SL, Connors C, Péan S, Berger N, Caud Y, Chen L, Goldfarb MI, Gomis M, Huang K, Leitzell E, Lonnoy JBR, Matthews TK, Maycock T, Waterfield O, Yelekçi R, Zhou Y, and Zhou B (eds.) *Climate Change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp 3–32. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.001>
- Jansson R, Nilsson C, Keskitalo ECH, Vlasova T, Sutinen M-L, Moen J, Chapin FS, Bråthen KA, Cabeza M, Callaghan TV, van Oort B, Dannevig H, Bay-larsen IA, Ims RA, Aspholm PE (2015) Future changes in the supply of goods and services from natural ecosystems: prospects for the European north. *Ecol Soc* 20(3):32. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-07607-200332>
- Jonas T, Marty C, Magnusson J (2009) Estimating the snow water equivalent from snow depth measurements in the Swiss Alps. *J Hydrol* 378:161–167
- Krivobokov L, Zverev A, Mukhortova L, Sergeeva O, Rosbakh S (2020) Typological diversity and ecological features of the middle taiga forests of Central Siberia. In *BIO Web of Conferences*. EDP Sciences, vol 24, p 00044
- Leskinen P, Lindner M, Verkerk PJ, Nabuurs GJ, Van Brusselen J, Kulikova E, Hassegawa M, and Lerink B (eds.) (2020) *Russian forests and climate change. What Science Can Tell Us 11*. European Forest Institute. <https://doi.org/10.36333/wscu11>
- Liang Y, Thompson JR, Duveneck MJ, Gustafson EJ, Serra-Diaz JM, He HS (2023) What is the role of disturbance in catalyzing changes in tree species abundance and range shifts under climate change? *Glob Chang Biol* 29:1160–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16517>
- López-Blanco E, Expbrayat J-F, Lund M, Christensen TR, Tamstorf MP, Slevin D et al (2019) Evaluation of terrestrial pan-Arctic carbon cycling using a data-assimilation system. *Earth Syst Dyn* 10:233–255. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-10-233-2019>
- Lucash MS, Scheller RM, Gustafson EJ, Sturtevant BR (2017) Spatial resilience of forested landscapes under climate change and management. *Landscape Ecol* 32:953–969
- Lucash MS, Weiss S, Duveneck MJ, Scheller RM (2022) Managing for red-cockaded woodpeckers is more complicated under climate change. *J Wildl Manag* 86:e22309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.22309>
- Lucash MS and Scheller RM (2021) *LANDIS-II Climate Library v4.2 User Guide*

- Mallory CD, Boyce MS (2018) Observed and predicted effects of climate change on Arctic caribou and reindeer. *Environ Rev* 26(1):13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2017-0032>
- Manning P, van der Plas F, Soliveres S et al (2018) Redefining ecosystem multifunctionality. *Nat Ecol Evol* 2:427–436. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0461-7>
- Millar CI, Stephenson NL, Stephens SL (2007) Climate change and forests of the future: managing in the face of uncertainty. *Ecol Appl* 17:2145–2151
- Mladenoff DJ, He HS (1999) Design, behavior and application of LANDIS, an object-oriented model of forest landscape disturbance and succession. Spatial modeling of forest landscape change: approaches and applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp 125–162
- Mukhortova L, Krivobokov L, Sergeeva O, Meteleva M, Schepaschenko D (2020) Specificity of phytocenotic structure and biomass of ground cover in northern boreal forests of Middle Siberia. In *BIO Web of Conferences*. EDP Sciences, vol 24, p 00057
- Newell JP, Simeone J (2014) Russia's forests in a global economy: how consumption drives environmental change. *Eurasian Geogr Econ* 55:37–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15387216.2014.926254>
- Osawa A, Zyryanova OA, Matsuura Y et al. (eds.) (2010) Permafrost ecosystems: Siberian Larch forests. Ecological studies, Springer Verlag, vol 209, pp 502
- Ouellette MR, Perera AH, and Boychuk D (2022) BFOLDS Fire Regime Module v2.2: User Guide for LANDIS II Extension. <https://www.Fire-Regime-Model.Com>
- Pan Y, Birdsey RA, Fang J, Houghton R, Kauppi PE, Kurz WA, Phillips OL, Shvidenko A, Lewis SL, Canadell JG, Ciais P, Jackson RB, Pacala SW, McGuire AD, Piao S, Rautiainen A, Sitch S, Hayes D (2011) A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's forests. *Science* 333:988–993
- Ponomarev E, Yakimov N, Ponomareva T, Yakubailik O, Conard SG (2021) Current trend of carbon emissions from wildfires in Siberia. *Atmosphere* 12:559. <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12050559>
- Rodgers KB, Lee S-S, Rosenbloom N, Timmermann A, Danabasoglu G, Deser C, Edwards J, Kim J-E, Simpson IR, Stein K, Stuecker MF, Yamaguchi R, Bódi T, Chung E-S, Huang L, Kim WM, Lamarque J-F, Lombardozzi DL, Wieder WR, Yeager SG (2021) Ubiquity of human-induced changes in climate variability. *Earth System Dynamics* 12:1393–1411. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-12-1393-2021>
- Roshydromet (2022) Report on climate features on territory of Russian Federation in 2021. Moscow: Federal Agency on Hydrometeorology of the Russian Federation. Retrieved from <https://www.meteorf.gov.ru/images/news/20220324/4/Doklad.pdf>
- Scheller RM, Mladenoff DJ (2004) A forest growth and biomass module for a landscape simulation model, LANDIS: Design, validation, and application. *Ecol Model* 180:211–229
- Scheller RM et al (2007) Design, development, and application of LANDIS-II, a spatial landscape simulation model with flexible temporal and spatial resolution. *Ecol Model* 201:409–419
- Scheller RM (2019) LANDIS-II Output Biomass Reclassification v3.0: Extension User Guide. Published on the Internet by the LANDIS-II Foundation. URL: <https://landis-ii-foundation.github.io/Extension-Output-Biomass-Reclass/>
- Schepaschenko D, McCallum I, Shvidenko A, Fritz S, Kraxner F, Obersteiner M (2011) A new hybrid land cover dataset for Russia: a methodology for integrating statistics, remote sensing and in situ information. *J Land Use Sci* 6:245–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423X.2010.511681>
- Schepaschenko D, Shvidenko A, Uoltsev V, Lakyda P, Luo Y, Vasylyshyn R, Lakyda I, Myklush Y, See L, McCallum I, Fritz S (2017) A dataset of forest biomass structure for Eurasia. *Sci Data* 4(1):1–11
- Schepaschenko D, Moltchanova E, Shvidenko A, Blyshchyk V, Dmitriev E, Martynenko O, See L, Kraxner F (2018) Improved estimates of biomass expansion factors for Russian forests. *Forests* 9(6):312
- Schepaschenko D, Moltchanova E, Fedorov S, Karminov V, Onikov P, Santoro M et al (2021) Russian forest sequestrers substantially more carbon than previously reported. *Sci Rep* 11(1):12825. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-92152-9>
- Shvidenko AZ, Gordov EP, Kabanov MV, Lykosov VN, Onuchin AA, and Vaganov EA (2007) Global change in Siberia: realities and expectations. In: *Proceedings of the international conference and young scientists school on computational information technologies for environmental sciences (CITES-2007)*, pp 87–89
- Shvidenko A, Bastos A, Maksyutov S, Ciais P, Patra PK, Poulter B, Belikov D, Glagolev M, Terentieva I, Karelin D, Kurbatova J, Kurganova I, Romanovskaya A, Korotkov V, Mukhortova L, Prokushkin A, Gustafson E, Kraxner F, Mamkin V, Lukina N, Krasovskiy A, Vaganov E, Schepaschenko D (In review). A system reanalysis of current budget greenhouse gases of terrestrial ecosystems of Russia. *Outlet: Global Biogeochemical Cycles*
- Shvidenko AZ, Schepaschenko DG (2013) Climate change and wildfires in Russia. *Contemp Probl Ecol* 6:683–692. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S199542551307010X>
- Shvidenko A, Schepaschenko D (2014) Carbon budget of Russian forests. *Sib J Forest Sci* 1:69–92
- Sitch S, Smith B, Prentice IC, Arneth A, Bondeau A, Cramer W, Kaplan J, Levis S, Lucht W, Sykes MT (2003) Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model. *Glob Change Biol* 9:161–185
- State Program of the Russian Federation (2020) Development of Forest Management for 2013–2020 [in Russian]. URL: www.mnr.gov.ru/upload/iblock/e82/GP_2013-2020.pdf
- Stolbovoi V and McCallum I (2002) Land Resources of Russia. Laxenburg, Austria: International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis and the Russian Academy of Science. CD-ROM. https://web.archive.iiasa.ac.at/Research/FOR/russia_cd/intro.htm
- Sturtevant BR, Gustafson EJ, Li W, He HS (2004) Modeling biological disturbances in LANDIS: a module description and demonstration using spruce budworm. *Ecol Model* 180:153–174
- Sturtevant BR, Scheller RM, Miranda BR, Shinneman D, Syphard AD (2009) Simulating dynamic and mixed-severity fire regimes: A process-based fire extension for LANDIS-II. *Ecol Model* 220:3380–3393
- Tchebakova NM, Parfenova EI, Korets MA, Conard SG (2016) Potential change in forest types and stand heights in central Siberia in a warming climate. *Environ Res Lett* 11:035016. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/035016>
- Venier LA, Thompson ID, Fleming R, Malcolm J, Aubin I, Trofymow JA, Langor D, Sturrock R, Patry C, Outerbridge RO, Holmes SB, Haeussler S, De Grandpré L, Chen HYH, Bayne E, Arsenault A, Brandt JP (2014) Effects of natural resource development on the terrestrial biodiversity of Canadian boreal forests. *Environ Rev* 22:457–490. <https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2013-0075>
- White JW, Rassweiler A, Samhuri JF, Stier AC, White C (2014) Ecologists should not use statistical significance tests to interpret simulation model results. *Oikos* 123:385–388
- Williams N, Lucash M, Ouellette M, Brussel T, Gustafson E, Weiss S, Sturtevant B, Schepaschenko D, Shvidenko A (2023) Simulating dynamic fire regime and vegetation change in a warming Siberia. *Fire Ecology* 19:33