

## Supporting Information Figures for *Efficiency of incentives to jointly increase carbon sequestration and species conservation on a landscape*

Nelson, E., S. Polasky, D. J. Lewis, A. J. Plantinga, E. Lonsdorf, D. White, D. Bael, and J. J. Lawler.

### SI Figure Legends

**SI Fig 1.** The Willamette Basin, Oregon, U.S.A.

**SI Fig. 2.** The area in green on each map indicates the geographic range of the terrestrial vertebrate species indicated by its scientific name on the right hand side of the map. Potential range inside urban growth boundaries areas is not included. The range maps used in this study are based on range maps from Adamus (2000). Blair Csuti and Jimmy Kagan used more recent data to modify the Adamus (2000) range maps for this study. A blue box around a species' range map indicates that a parcel can only be in the species' range if a permanent water source (e.g., stream, pond, etc.) is found in or on the border of the parcel and the parcel is in the species' range space. The animal icon in the upper right corner of each range map indicates whether the species is a bird, mammal, or reptile.

**SI Fig. 3.** Parcels eligible for a conservation contract under the five policy scenarios (*SI Text, Policy Simulation*). **A.** 3,889 parcels (1,315,685 hectares) are eligible for a conservation contract under the *All* scenario. **B.** 613 parcels (184,159 hectares) are eligible for a conservation contract under the *Rare Habitat* scenario. **C.** 2,211 parcels (788,407 hectares) are eligible for a conservation contract under the *Carbon* scenario. **D.** 1,941 parcels (740,162 hectares) eligible for a conservation contract under the *Riparian* scenario. **E.** 226 parcels (86,068 hectares) are eligible for a conservation contract under the *Species Conservation* scenario.

**SI Fig. 4.** The average truncated willingness-to-accept (WTA) a conservation contract for 500 simulations is shown for all 3,889 parcels eligible for a conservation contract under the *All* scenario. WTA values are given in annual per acre levels. WTA values of more than \$400 per acre per year were excluded as these lie above the assumed program ceiling payment level. Areas in white are not eligible for a conservation contract.

**SI Fig. 5.** Using the budget as a measure of cost, for the \$10 million *Species Conservation* scenario using the simple carbon sequestration and species conservation models, 57% of the species conservation increase is achieved with the incentive policy compared to the increase with the efficiency frontier evaluated at the same change in carbon sequestration value (-0.0004). Using the sum of the WTA (per acre per year) for landowners that accept a conservation contract as a measure of social cost, which in this case aggregates to approximately \$5 million, 81% of the species conservation increase is achieved with the incentive policy compared to the increase with the efficiency frontier at \$5 million.