

Revised manuscript *ECOSER-D-15-00043R1* submitted for publication in *Ecosystem Services*

Physical landscape associations with mapped ecosystem values with implications for spatial value transfer: An empirical study from Norway

[Word count: Approximately 8,500]

Greg Brown*
School of Geography, Planning and Environmental Management
The University of Queensland
Brisbane, QLD 4072
greg.brown@uq.edu.au Ph: 07 3365 6654

Vera Helene Hausner
Department of Arctic and Marine Biology, Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway
vera.hausner@uit.no

Eiliv Læg Reid
Department of Arctic and Marine Biology, Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway
eiliv.laegreid@gmail.com

*Corresponding author

Physical landscape associations with mapped ecosystem values with implications for spatial value transfer: An empirical study from Norway

Abstract

The identification of spatial associations between perceived ecosystem values and physical landscapes is confronted by a diversity of mapping methods, heterogeneous human populations, and variability in physical landscape classification systems. This study reviews previous research on spatial associations and reports new empirical findings from Norway to describe the potential for spatial “value transfer” methods that extrapolate ecosystem values to other locations. Public participation GIS (PPGIS) survey methods were implemented in two separate study areas in Norway to identify ecosystem values and to analyze their spatial association with land cover data. The ecosystem value associations with land cover were generally consistent with global findings reported elsewhere, with forested areas providing multiple ecosystem “bundles” supporting both recreation-related and provisioning values. Alternative value transfer methods were demonstrated using recreation value to compare actual with predicted distributions using land cover indices derived from value proportions, deviations from expected distribution, and correlation coefficients with ecosystem value bundles. The use of simple ecosystem value percentages located within land cover classes provided the best predictive results for value transfer in this study. The limitations and potential for value transfer methods based on spatial associations between mapped ecosystem values and physical landscape characteristics are discussed.

Keywords: ecosystem services, land cover, social values, PPGIS, value transfer

1. Introduction

Over the last two decades, significant research has focused on identifying and measuring ecosystem services that provide necessary and beneficial services for human well-being (see e.g., Costanza et al., 1997; De Groot et al., 2002; Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA), 2005; Wallace, 2007; Fisher et al., 2009; Kumar, 2010; Haines-Young and Potschin, 2013). Parallel to this research, advances in geospatial technologies and spatially-explicit public participation methods have encouraged experimentation with methods to identify and map the distribution of ecosystem values, especially cultural ecosystem values (Brown and Fagerholm, 2015). The purpose of this paper is to review studies that have examined the relationship between mapped ecosystem values and physical landscape characteristics as a context for reporting empirical research conducted in Norway. The spatial associations found in Norway are used to demonstrate the potential and limitations for inferring ecosystem values from land cover through a process known as spatial value transfer (Troy and Wilson, 2006).

The concept of ecosystem “service” and “value” are often conflated in the literature. The terms are related, but not identical. Ecosystem services are the “benefits people obtain from ecosystems” (MEA, 2005, p. 49) that consist of “the conditions and processes through which natural ecosystems, and the species that make them up, sustain and fulfil human life” (Daily, 1997, p. 3). Ecosystem values are measures of how important ecosystem services are to people and contain both use and non-use values associated with ecosystems. The participatory mapping of ecosystem values is particularly useful for identifying cultural ecosystem services under the assumption that the values elicited identify spatially-explicit ecosystem properties that contribute to human well-being. Thus, mapped ecosystem values identify the spatial location of ecosystem services.

The ecosystem services and values terminology has been further complicated by participatory mapping studies that have used similar value typologies but with different labels. For example, value typologies have been variously described as *landscape values* (Alessa et al., 2008; Brown, 2005; Zhu, et al., 2010), *landscape services* (Fagerholm et al., 2012), *place values* (Brown and Reed, 2012), *community values* (Raymond et al., 2009), *social values for ecosystem services* (Sherrouse et al., 2011; van Riper et al., 2012), or simply *social values* (Bryan et al., 2010). In practice, participatory mapping typologies disproportionately contain values associated with cultural ecosystem services as described in the MEA (2005). The supporting rationale is that of the four major classes of ecosystem services described in the MEA (i.e., provisioning, regulating, supporting, and cultural), the general public has a

1
2
3
4 stronger capacity to identify provisioning and cultural services that are grounded in the experience of
5 living in a region (Brown et al., 2012). Participatory mapping appears ideally suited to identify cultural
6 ecosystem services because mapped values are *relationship* values (Brown and Weber, 2012) that
7
8 bridge *held* values (what is important to the person) and *assigned* values (landscape features that are
9 important). For consistency, we refer to values that are mapped and linked to spatially-explicit
10 landscape features using participatory methods as *ecosystem values* throughout this article.
11
12
13
14

15 The incorporation of cultural ecosystem values into formal ecosystem assessments faces
16 significant barriers including often vague definitions and indefinite relationships between ecosystem
17 structures and functions and human needs and wants (Daniel et al., 2012). Further, individuals perceive
18 social values differently according to their backgrounds, even at homogeneous local scales (Plieninger
19 et al., 2013). Methodological challenges include over-reliance on case study research methods that have
20 low external validity or the ability to extrapolate to other populations, settings, and conditions. Because
21 most cultural ecosystem values are not directly observable in the physical landscape, they require either
22 (1) proxy or indicator measures derived from observed or inferred human behavior, or (2) direct human
23 inquiry about the benefits received. Both approaches involve epistemological assumptions with
24 implications for the internal validity of the values collected. For example, Raudsepp-Hearne et al.
25 (2010) used proxy measures for cultural ecosystem services such as the number of tourist attractions
26 within a given area for tourism benefits and the number of observations of rare species for nature
27 appreciation benefits. Are these valid and accurate proxy measures for the spatial distribution of
28 ecosystem services? Direct methods for assessing cultural ecosystem values often involve spatially-
29 explicit participatory mapping where best practice has yet to coalesce (Brown and Fagerholm, 2015).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 In describing physical landscapes, there are also barriers including the availability of spatial
44 data and standardization in collection and reporting. Where physical landscape spatial data does exist,
45 there are often multiple classification systems, collected at multiple scales, at different points in time.
46 While the availability and standardization of spatial data has increased, especially at a national level,
47 the availability of local spatial data is often a limiting factor, especially in data poor developing
48 countries. For example, although land cover is one of the most common spatial data layers for GIS
49 applications, until recently, there was no uniform, global land cover classification system at a spatial
50 resolution useful for analyzing ecosystem values. And while standardization of spatial data is important
51 for interregional or international analyses, standardization can also be a limiting factor through
52 omission of less common, but locally or regionally important physical landscape features.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The continuing quest for identifying universal or at least predictable relationships between
5 ecosystem values and physical landscape characteristics is a natural consequence of methodological
6 barriers, combined with the propensity for science to want to explain and predict relationships from
7 observed phenomena. For example, significant quantitative relationships between ecosystem values
8 and physical landscape features can be used as a method for spatial “value-transfer” where ecosystem
9 values are extrapolated to different regions (Sherrouse et al., 2011) or even countries (Brown and
10 Brabyn, 2012a) in the absence of primary data. The use of value-transfer methods requires confidence
11 in the validity and reliability of the ecosystem value and physical landscape relationships.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *1.1 Participatory Mapped Ecosystem Values and Physical Landscape Relationships*

21
22 There have been multiple empirical studies where ecosystem values have been identified using
23 spatially-explicit mapping methods, commonly referred to as public participation GIS (PPGIS)
24 (NCGIAa; NCGIAb; Obermeyer, 1998), participatory GIS (PGIS) (Rambaldi et al, 2006), or
25 volunteered geographic information (VGI) (Goodchild, 2007). All three of these terms describe
26 methods for generating and/or using non-expert spatial information for wide range of applications. As
27 described by Brown and Kyttä (2014), the use of the terms PPGIS and PGIS often reflect the situational
28 context. The term PGIS has been associated with practice in developing countries that emphasize social
29 learning and community engagement, primarily in rural areas, with the resulting maps a potentially
30 useful, but secondary outcome of the process. In contrast, PPGIS has focused on populations in
31 developed countries with an emphasis on the generation of spatial data intended to inform future land
32 use through enhanced public participation methods whose purpose is to improve the quality of land use
33 decisions. The term volunteered geographic information (VGI) describes the harnessing of tools to
34 create, assemble, and disseminate geographic data provided voluntarily by individuals (Goodchild
35 (2007). PPGIS and PGIS mapping studies often include a volunteer sample or VGI component and
36 ecosystem values have been mapped using methods described as PPGIS/PGIS/VGI (Brown and
37 Fagerholm, 2015).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Research to date on mapped ecosystem values is limited, in part, because participatory mapping
52 is relatively recent with the first mapping study of values occurring in 1998 (Brown, 2005). Of the 30
53 participatory mapping studies of ecosystem values reviewed by Brown and Fagerholm (2015), less than
54 half analyzed the participatory mapped data for relationships with physical landscape features. Table 1
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 provides descriptive information for participatory mapping studies where the spatial data were analyzed
5 for association with physical landscape features.
6
7

8
9 **[Insert Table 1]**

10
11 Ecosystem value locations can be mapped with either points or polygons, but with one
12 exception, participatory mapping studies that have assessed relationships with physical landscapes have
13 used points to identify locations. The mapped points are assumed to represent a spatial area of
14 ecosystem value and can be combined with other proximate points to provide a spatial estimate of the
15 ecosystem value area. In contrast, physical landscape data is generally represented as raster or polygon
16 data, with the exception of roads (polylines). The most common physical data that has been analyzed
17 with mapped values is land use/land cover, but other landscape features have included roads, water
18 bodies, landform, elevation, vegetation, built infrastructure, and GIS modeled locations of physical data
19 such as species distributions and carbon storage. The relationships of mapped ecosystem values to
20 administrative boundaries such as protected areas (see e.g., Brown et al., 2014; Palomo et al., 2013;
21 Hausner et al., in press) or municipalities (e.g. Raudsepp-Hearne et al. 2010; Martin-Lopez et al. 2012;
22 Quiroz et al. 2015) have also been analyzed in multiple studies.
23
24

25
26 Two approaches have emerged in practice for assessing mapped ecosystem values and physical
27 landscape relationships. The SolVES model (<http://solves.cr.usgs.gov/>) was developed by U.S.
28 Geological survey as a raster-based model that quantifies the relationship between the density of
29 mapped ecosystem values, aggregated into a “value index”, and physical landscape metrics such as
30 elevation, slope, distance to roads, and distance to water (Sherrouse et al., 2011). The SolVES model
31 has evolved and now includes Maxent maximum entropy modeling and the option to include
32 potentially different environmental variables such as land cover and landform (Sherrouse et al, 2014).
33 The SolVES model has been applied to participatory mapped data from national parks in Australia (van
34 Riper et al., 2012) and the U.S. (van Riper and Kyle, 2014), and national forests in Colorado and
35 Wyoming (Sherrouse et al., 2011; Sherrouse et al., 2014). A more recent SolVES study examined
36 relationships between mapped ecosystem values and the modeled environmental variables of carbon
37 sequestration and storage, scenic viewsheds, sediment regulation, and water yield (Bagstad et al, 2015).
38 This study found weak relationships between perceived and physically modeled services, suggesting
39 that public perception of ecosystem service provisioning regions is limited.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 To date, the use of SolVES models has provided limited insight into ecosystem values and
5 physical landscape relationships for several reasons. First, published SolVES studies have only
6 reported relationships between a selected subset of individual ecosystem values and landscape features.
7 For example, the national park and national forest studies reported a maximum of three value/landscape
8 relationships in each study. A second limiting factor is the SolVES choice of landscape features to
9 examine potential relationships. The landscape variables of elevation, slope, distance to water, and
10 distance to roads are widely available spatial data for modeling, but are not particularly useful variables
11 because they are too general. Slope and elevation are continuous, rather than discrete variables with
12 limited ability to detect relationships with landscape features that do not have distinctive boundaries
13 associated with changes in slope or elevation. The distance to a landscape feature variable is also not a
14 great choice, especially when the object of interest lacks specificity. For example, there are different
15 types of water bodies (e.g., rivers, lakes, oceans) and it is water body type, not necessarily the distance
16 to water that drives the relationship. Further, distance to water may be less important than the ability to
17 see the water, as reported by Brown and Brabyn (2012b). When elevation and distance variables are
18 analyzed, SolVES produces zonal statistics (means or frequencies) that can mask more specific,
19 underlying relationships with specific landscape features.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 An alternative approach for examining relationships between mapped ecosystem values and
34 landscape characteristics quantifies the distribution of ecosystem values within landscape class layers
35 such as land cover, landform, water bodies, water views, and infrastructure (Brown and Brabyn,
36 2012b). With a landscape classification system, one can assess the direct spatial concurrence of mapped
37 ecosystem values with multiple landscape classes or features rather than distance to landscape features
38 which is generated by SolVES. Further, landscape classes provide for hypothesis testing about whether
39 certain types of ecosystem values are more or less abundant in the landscape classes than would be
40 expected. The mapped locations of ecosystem values can be statistically analyzed against randomness,
41 expected counts from mapping, or expected counts based on the proportion of area occupied by the
42 landscape feature. Using this type of analysis, Palomo et al. (2014) reported land uses in Spain with the
43 highest richness of ecosystem services were associated with wetlands, inland waters, and shrublands,
44 while urban areas and agricultural lands had the lowest richness. In Germany, Plieninger et al. (2013)
45 found that recreation, aesthetic, and education values were related to water bodies consisting of fishing
46 ponds and lakes, while social values were related to settlement. In New Zealand, Brown and Brabyn
47 (2012b) found greater than expected ecosystem values associated with urban areas, water features,
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 native vegetation, and mountains, and fewer than expected values associated with flatter, agricultural
5 landscapes. This latter relationship was consistent with the Plieninger et al. (2013) study that found
6 weak relationships with croplands and grasslands. In Colorado (U.S.), Brown et al. (2012) found open
7 water had proportionately higher recreation values while developed areas had proportionately more
8 cultural values. In Alaska, Alessa, et al. (2008) found significant, positive relationships between
9 mapped biological diversity values and net primary productivity.

10
11 With place-specific case studies, the validity of the findings is geographically limited to the
12 study area and the target study population. Further, case studies invite customization with differences in
13 how the ecosystem values are defined and operationalized in the participatory methods. In the only
14 meta-analysis of multiple studies, Brown (2013) examined the relationship between mapped ecosystem
15 values and global land cover in 11 different studies. The analysis used land cover as a common
16 landscape feature and ecosystem values with similar definitions, and thus had the capacity to identify
17 spatial associations that transcended specific geographic locations. While there was significant intra-
18 and inter-study variability, some clear relationships emerged from the analysis. For example,
19 agricultural lands contained significantly fewer aesthetic values, forested areas and especially water
20 bodies, contained significantly greater abundance of ecosystem values of all types, and areas of
21 permanent snow/ice contained fewer ecosystem values of all types.

22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 *1.2 Physical landscape associations with ecosystem service “bundles”*

38
39 Participatory mapping studies have consistently shown spatial correlations between multiple
40 ecosystem values, thus, it is useful to explore potential spatial associations between multiple, spatially
41 clustered ecosystem values and physical landscapes. Ecosystem services that repeatedly appear
42 together across space or time are known as ecosystem service bundles (Raudsepp-Hearne et al., 2010)
43 and they capture how different ecosystem services interact. Bundles appear to be distinct from
44 inventories of individual ecosystem services that are simply added because they avoid double counting
45 by taking into account the varying social values placed on different ecosystem services (De Groot et al.,
46 2002). The patterns of spatial association among ecosystem services result from the interaction between
47 multi-functional landscapes (Potschin and Haines-Young, 2013) and socio-cultural factors that include
48 diverse individual perceptions, knowledge, and associated values (Martín-López et al., 2012).

49
50 To determine whether the same ecosystem values appear together in space, there are several
51 options depending on the structure of the spatial data. If the mapped ecosystem values are points, one
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 can calculate correlations between pairs of ecosystem values occupying the same spatial units such as a
5 grid cells. Another alternative is to generate hotspots from the point data and then randomly sample
6 locations across the spatial extent of the study area to calculate cross-correlation coefficients (Alessa et
7 al. 2008). The magnitude of the correlation coefficient indicates the extent to which the pairs of
8 services appear in the same location. Another method is to use principal component analysis (PCA) of
9 quantified ecosystem service counts in multiple land units to identify strong correlates of the principal
10 components, followed by cluster analysis of the results (Raudsepp-Hearne et al., 2010; Plieninger et al,
11 2013; Turner et al., 2014; Queiroz et al., 2015). Multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) can also be
12 used to visualize associations between individual ecosystem values and categorical variables
13 representing the physical landscape. Both PCA and MCA can be used to create discrete classes based
14 on different clustering methodologies (e.g. Raudsepp-Hearne et al., 2010). Canonical correspondence
15 analysis or redundancy analysis that bundle values in relation to multiple explanatory factors have been
16 used to a lesser extent (but see Martin-Lopez et al., 2012).

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 Multiple empirical studies have reported bundled spatial distributions of ecosystem services
29 across the study area. For example, Raudseppe-Hearne et al. (2010) identified six ecosystem bundle
30 types using proxy ecosystem data for 137 municipalities in Canada. In Spain, Martín-López et al.
31 (2012) identified three bundles of ecosystem services for urban populations, rural people in multi-
32 functional landscapes, and provisioning services related to food (agriculture and fishing). In Germany,
33 Plieninger et al., (2013) identified two ecosystem service bundles—an activity-based recreational
34 bundle and a second bundle that appeared related to the cognitive meanings of landscapes and
35 ecosystems. In Denmark, Turner et al., (2014) identified six ecosystem service bundle types for
36 specialized areas of agricultural production, coastal cultural services, multifunctional mixed-use
37 bundles around urban areas, and forest recreation bundles with high hunting potential. In Norway,
38 Hausner et al., (in press) reported ecosystem service bundles related to cognitive meanings of
39 landscapes and bundles associated with historical rights to provisioning services in land tenures. And in
40 Sweden, Queiroz et al., (2015) found multifunctional ecosystem service bundles in human-dominated
41 landscapes, while densely populated urban areas were hotspots for cultural services. In this study, we
42 first analyze the Norwegian spatial data for the presence of ecosystem value bundles, and then examine
43 whether these bundles are spatially associated with land cover.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1.3 Research questions

This study seeks to provide additional insight into the relationship between ecosystem values and physical landscape characteristics by analyzing data from two participatory mapping studies in Norway and to evaluate the use of ecosystem value and land cover spatial associations for the purpose of value transfer. Our analysis was guided by the following research questions: (1) what are the spatial associations between mapped ecosystem values and land cover in two case study areas in Norway and are these associations consistent with other reported studies? (2) what types of ecosystem value bundles are present in the two study areas, how do these bundle types compare to other studies, and are these bundles spatially associated with land cover? (3) can empirical spatial associations between ecosystem values and land cover be used for the purpose of “value transfer” mapping to geographic areas where primary ecosystem value data does not exist? and (4) given the results of the value transfer analyses, what are the implications for the future use of value transfer methods for ecosystem values?

2. Methods

2.1 Study locations and context

Two PPGIS case study areas in Norway were selected that provide a contrast in both physical landscape character and land tenure (Hausner et al., in press). The southern study area, located in the Sogn region, is characterized by fjords stretching 200 km through glaciers and mountain plateaus and includes more than 10 of the highest peaks in Norway. We included six municipalities along this fjord belonging to the counties of Sogn og Fjordane and the mountain plateau in Oppland covering a total of 15,862 km². Less than 5% of the study area is used for cultivation or forestry with about half of the properties in the region being less than one ha in size (Mathiesen et al., 2013). In the valley of Sogn, most of the land is privately owned, while land located on mountain plateaus is almost entirely covered by village or state commons with local usufruct rights to grazing, hunting, fishing, and tourism income. The main economic activities are livestock grazing, tourism, and hydroelectric power, while lowland areas are more diverse and include cruise tourism, aquaculture, and fruit and berry cultivation. Villages are generally small, but there two major hubs in Sogn, Voss and Sogndal with 14,006 and 7,623 inhabitants respectively. There are four national parks located in the study region (Breheimen, Jotunheimen, Reinheimen, Jostedalshreen) mostly situated in the uplands and there are two large protected landscapes, Stølsheimen and Nærøyfjorden.

1
2
3
4 The Nordland region is characterized by a narrow coastline with connection to the open sea,
5
6 with several small fjords and sharp peaks in the west. The area covers six municipalities in the county
7
8 of Nordland. The total area is 8,337 km² with 52% owned by the state through the state-owned
9
10 company Statsskog SF. This state property differs from state commons land as it does not have user
11
12 rights extending beyond the right of common access for locals, but Sami reindeer herders have usufruct
13
14 rights to grazing and other traditional uses. The alpine areas in the region are especially important for
15
16 reindeer husbandry, as these areas are often lichen-rich, good pasture for reindeer. The municipalities
17
18 of Bodø and Fauske have about 50,000 and 9,000 inhabitants respectively but the remainder of the
19
20 study area has a small, rural population with a high proportion employed in the primary industries.
21
22 There are five national parks in the study region: Rago, Sjunghatten, Junkerdal, Saltfjellet-Svartisen,
23
24 and Lahko, and five protected landscape areas.

25 **[Insert Figure 1]**

26 *2.2 Data collection and sampling*

27
28 The research team designed, pre-tested, and implemented two internet-based PPGIS websites
29
30 (Nordland and Sogn) in Norwegian language for data collection. The websites consisted of an opening
31
32 screen for participants to either enter or request an access code, followed by an informed consent
33
34 screen for participation, and then a Google® maps interface where participants could drag and drop
35
36 digital markers onto a map of the study area. The mapping interface consisted of a “tab” panel
37
38 containing markers with 14 ecosystem values plus a marker to identify the location(s) of cabins or
39
40 summer farms (see definitions in Table 2). The selection of ecosystem values to be mapped was based
41
42 on a values typology first developed by Brown and Reed (2000) for participatory mapping in Alaska.
43
44 The typology was modified and adapted for use in Norway based on consultation with protected area
45
46 managers in the two study areas.
47

48
49 The instructions requested that participants drag and drop the markers onto map locations that
50
51 are important for the values listed. The different types of markers and their spatial locations were
52
53 recorded for each participant on a web server in a database, along with other information including a
54
55 timestamp of when the marker was placed, the Google® map view, and the Google® map zoom level
56
57 (scale) at which the marker was placed. Participants could place as few or as many markers as they
58
59 deemed necessary to identify ecosystem values. Following completion of the mapping activity (placing
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 markers), participants were directed to a new screen and provided with text-based survey questions to
5 assess socio-demographic characteristics.
6
7
8

9 **[Insert Table 2]**

10
11 Household sampling was used in both the Nordland and Sogn study areas to recruit study
12 participants. In Sogn, the municipalities of Voss, Sogndal, Luster, Skjåk, Vågå, Aurdal were sampled
13 and 10% of the adult population (>18 years) were randomly drawn for a potential 3,104 participants.
14
15 Selected individuals were sent a letter of invitation and a reminder two weeks after the initial invitation.
16
17 Parallel to household recruitment, we contacted a number of regional organizations (n=274), either by
18 email or Facebook, to inform them about the study and to encourage volunteer participation.
19
20
21

22 In Nordland, households in the municipalities of Bodø, Fauske, Saltdal, Gildeskål, Sørfold and
23 Beiarn were randomly sampled for a potential 3,054 participants. A total of 216 organizations were
24 also contacted for potential volunteer participation through email or social media.
25
26
27
28

29 **2.3 Analyses**

30 *2.3.1 Participant characteristics*

31
32 We assessed the representativeness of participants in both study areas with Norwegian census
33 data on the variables of age, gender, education, income, and family structure. We also examined the
34 geographic distribution of participants within the study areas based on postcode provided.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *2.3.2 Data preparation*

42
43 The global land cover GIS layer used in this study was developed by the European Space
44 Agency in collaboration with the Université Catholique de Louvain (Bontemps et al., 2011). The land
45 cover map has a spatial resolution of 300 m with 22 land cover classes. The overall accuracy weighted
46 by the class area was 67.5% using 2,190 globally distributed points, including homogeneous and
47 heterogeneous landscapes (Bontemps et al., 2011, p. 47). The global land cover layer was clipped to the
48 boundaries of the Nordland and Sogn study areas and spatially intersected with the mapped ecosystem
49 value points. Thus, each mapped ecosystem value had an associated land cover class.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 To perform ecosystem service bundle analysis, a 2 km vector grid (a.k.a. fishnet) was overlaid
57 with each study area. This grid size was chosen as a heuristic to achieve the highest possible resolution
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

but with the fewest number of empty grid cells. The number and type of mapped points were tabulated in each grid cell. The proportion of each land cover class was also tabulated within each grid cell.

2.3.3 Data analysis—relationship between ecosystems values and land cover

We assessed the relationship between ecosystem values and land cover in each study area using multiple methods. In the first analysis, we generated cross-tabulations, chi-square statistics, and standardized residuals to examine the distribution of mapped ecosystem values by land cover class. The chi-square test for independence was applied between the categorical variables of ecosystem value type and land cover class to determine whether there was a significant association between the variables. Standardized residuals were calculated to determine whether the number of mapped points differed significantly from the expected number of points in each land cover class. Expected counts are the projected point frequencies in each land cover class if the null hypothesis is true, i.e., if there is no association between ecosystem values and land cover class. This type of analysis does not account for the areal distribution of land cover classes within the study area.

In the second analysis, land cover area was considered and expected counts were calculated under the assumption that mapped point distributions in each land cover class should be proportional to the area occupied by the land cover class. For example, if a land cover class occupies 60 percent of a study area, 60 percent of the total mapped points would be expected to fall within this land cover class. To determine whether specific mapped values were proportionately distributed within land cover classes, Z scores were calculated for each value/land cover pair as follows:

$$Z = \frac{P_s - P_\mu}{S_p}$$

where: P_s = sample proportion (proportion of value points within a land cover class)

P_μ = population proportion (proportion of study area occupied by the land cover class)

S_p = standard error of the population

Z scores greater than +1.96 (two-tailed test, $\alpha=.05$) indicate that the proportion of value points falling within a given land cover class are significantly greater than expected, while Z scores less than -1.96 indicate the proportion of value points are significantly less than expected.

2.3.4 Assessment of spatial “bundles” of ecosystem services

To determine whether ecosystem values were mapped in spatial “bundles”, we overlaid the Nordland and Sogn study areas with a two kilometer vector grid resulting in n=2,970 grid cells (Nordland) and n=4,544 grid cells (Sogn). The ecosystem values by marker type (n=14) were tabulated in each grid cell. The two data sets were then combined and all grid cells containing one or more ecosystem values were retained for analysis resulting in n=3030 grid cells. The grid cell counts for the ecosystem values were then factor analyzed (SPSS v.22) using principal components extraction with the number of extracted factors determined by eigenvalues greater than one (Kaiser, 1960). The resulting factors were rotated using varimax rotation to enhance interpretation. Factor scores for each grid cell were generated using regression and Spearman rank correlations were calculated between the factor scores and the proportion of land cover class located in each grid cell. This correlational analysis provides an indicator of whether ecosystem value bundles are related (or not) to land cover classes.

2.3.5 Demonstrating value transfer methods based on land cover spatial associations

The final analysis was to demonstrate and evaluate the results of value transfer methods between the two study areas using the land cover spatial associations derived from previous analyses. This study represents a “best case” scenario for demonstrating value transfer methods because of the similarity in land cover classes in the two study areas and the social and cultural characteristics of the two populations sampled. Recreation value was selected for the purpose of value transfer analysis because it was the most frequently mapped ecosystem value in both the Nordland and Sogn study areas, thus providing the best opportunity to identify and quantify spatial associations for the purpose of value transfer. The Sogn study area was selected to benchmark “actual” versus “value transfer” spatial distributions using indices derived from: (1) recreation value proportions within each land cover class, (2) deviations from expected recreation counts with land cover classes (chi-square residuals), and (3) Spearman correlation coefficients between land cover classes and ecosystem bundles containing recreation values. These value transfer indices were selected to provide contrast in the range of possible quantitative methods for value transfer mapping. Spatial association indices were generated using recreation value distributions in Nordland and then applied to render recreation value distributions in Sogn. The percent (proportion) of mapped recreation values in each land cover class is the simplest of value transfer indices. This method assumes that recreation values would be similarly distributed across land cover classes where primary data was not collected. The use of chi-square standardized residuals

1
2
3
4 as indices assumes that deviations of mapped ecosystem values from expected counts reflect the
5 relative importance of the ecosystem value between different land cover classes. The use of correlation
6 coefficients between ecosystem bundles containing the ecosystem value of interest and land cover
7
8 assumes that ecosystem values are best understood as spatially associated groups of values rather than
9 individual values.
10
11
12

13 Maps showing the spatial distribution of recreation values by land cover class in Sogn were
14 generated from (1) the Sogn mapped data, and (2) transfer indices derived from empirical spatial
15 associations found in Nordland (see Table 6). The maps were generated by applying the proportion,
16 residual, and correlation values associated with each land cover class in Nordland to the same land
17 cover class in Sogn. To visually compare the results, the same defined intervals of transfer indices and
18 color ramps were applied to the two maps (actual vs. value transfer). The similarity or contrast in map
19 color provides a qualitative indicator of the error involved when using a particular value transfer
20 method.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The similarity between the actual and value transfer maps was quantified by calculating
29 product-moment correlations between the actual and transfer values associated with each land cover
30 cell (300 m) in Sogn (n=345,351). This aggregate measure of map similarity accounts for the similarity
31 between the actual and transfer index values in each land cover class as shown in Table 6 (similar
32 actual and transfer values increase the map correlation coefficient) and the proportion of the study
33 region contained in the land cover class (similar actual and transfer values in the largest land cover
34 classes increase the map correlation coefficient).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **3. Results**

44 *3.1 Study Response and participant characteristics*

45
46 A total of 440 and 486 participants accessed the Sogn and Nordland study websites
47 respectively, placing one or more markers from November 2014 to January 1, 2015. See Table 3. The
48 response profiles for the two study areas were similar. The estimated response rates, after accounting
49 for non-deliverable letters of invitation, was 14 percent in Sogn and 16.3 percent in Nordland. A total
50 of 19,134 markers were mapped across both study areas wherein 64% of the markers placed were
51 ecosystem value markers used in this analysis.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[Insert Table 3]

Most participants (approximately 90%) learned of the study directly through a recruitment letter from the Arctic University of Norway. Referrals to the study website were encouraged and an estimated 10% of participants learned of the study indirectly from friends, organizations, or social media. Table 3 also provides a socio-demographic profile of study participants with comparative Norway census data derived from Statistics Norway (2013). The mean age of participants was 49 years, with more males, higher levels of formal education, and higher self-reported household income than comparable Norwegian census data. About half of the participants were from families with children. The PPGIS participation bias toward more highly educated and higher income males is consistent with other reported PPGIS studies in developed countries (Brown and Kyttä, 2014). We also assessed the geographic distribution of participants by plotting the number of participants by their post code. See Figure 1.

3.2 Relationships between ecosystem values and land cover

Norway's land cover classes comprise a smaller subset of the 22 possible land cover classes identified in the global land cover database (Bontemps et al., 2011). Each class is identified with a unique numeric code and land cover description. For example, class 50 is "closed broad-leaved deciduous forest" while class 220 is "permanent snow and ice". Tables 5 and 6 provide the land cover descriptors associated with each unique code used in the analysis. Figure 2 shows terrestrial global land cover by class compared to land cover in the two Norway study areas, and the percent of total ecosystem values mapped in each land cover class. Land cover in the two study areas is dominated by forests, sparse vegetation, and bare areas with little land in agriculture, grassland, or developed area classes. In the forest cover classes, mapped value proportions exceed areal proportions, but ecosystem values were under-represented in the "bare" class. The differences in proportions were assessed for statistical significance with results reported in Figures 3 and 4. Statistical significance ($p \leq 0.05$) is shown by z score bars extending beyond +1.96 (over-represented) and less than -1.96 (under-represented).

[Insert Figure 2]

1
2
3
4 In general, z scores were positive for all ecosystem values in forest classes (Classes 50 – 110)
5 and negative in bare areas (Class 200) and snow/ice (Class 220). Pasture/grazing and gathering values
6 were disproportionately higher in broad-leaved forests (Class 50). Only Nordland had land classified as
7 artificial/developed (0.05%), and this area was mapped disproportionately higher with social
8 interaction and therapeutic values. The most striking proportional difference between Nordland and
9 Sogn was for sparse vegetation (Class 150) where Nordland participants mapped more scenic,
10 recreation, therapeutic, naturalness, and hunting/fishing values (positive z scores), while z scores for all
11 ecosystem values in this class were negative in Sogn.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **[Insert Figure 3 and Figure 4]**
21

22 The analysis of ecosystem values by land cover using chi-square residuals provides a different
23 approach to assessing relationships because it does not assume that ecosystem values should be
24 distributed proportional to land cover area. Residuals reflect mapped participant associations of
25 ecosystem values with land cover without regard to the actual proportion of land cover. The chi-square
26 residuals results are presented in Figures 5 and 6. Similar to the proportional analysis, there were more
27 significant value/land cover results in Nordland (25 over/24 under) than Sogn (6 over/5 under).
28 Residuals analysis also shows greater variability in ecosystem value distributions within a given land
29 cover class as evidenced by the contrast in positive and negative residual scores. Every land cover class
30 had at least one statistically significant association with an ecosystem value. Many of the residual
31 results were similar to the proportional results based on the directionality of the association (above or
32 below 0), but there were some exceptions. For example, scenic values had positive z scores in all forest
33 classes in proportional analysis, but the residuals were negative in closed broad-leaved forests (Class
34 50) and open mixed forest (Class 100). Similarly, naturalness values had positive proportionality z
35 scores for all forest classes, but statistically significant negative residuals for closed broad-leaved
36 forests (Class 50), open needle-leaved (Class 90), and mixed forest/shrubland (Class 110). Higher than
37 expected mapping of clean water and fishing values in water bodies (Class 210) emerged as significant,
38 while mapped special places were higher than expected in areas of permanent snow and ice (Class
39 220). Spiritual and natural values were also significantly higher than expected in bare areas (Class 200)
40 using residuals analysis.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **[Insert Figure 5 and Figure 6]**
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 In Sogn, hunting and fishing values were higher than expected in bare areas (Class 200) and
5
6 lower than expected in closed broad-leaved forests (Class 50), while biological and therapeutic values
7
8 were higher than expected in areas of permanent snow and ice (Class 220). The one class of wetlands
9
10 (Class 180) found in the two study areas only had one significant association, with hunting/fishing
11
12 values higher than expected in Nordland. Overall, the empirical results indicated some regional
13
14 differences in spatial associations between Nordland and Sogn, while proportional results were
15
16 generally consistent with the residuals in spatial association directionality.
17

18 3.3 Ecosystem bundles and relationship to land cover

19
20 To determine whether ecosystem values were mapped in spatial “bundles”, we performed factor
21
22 analysis on the quantities of ecosystem values found within two kilometer grid cells across the two
23
24 study regions. The results of the factor analysis appear in Table 4. Four factors were extracted from the
25
26 14 values that account for 52 percent of the overall variance. The values that load on the first factor and
27
28 capture 32 percent of the variance are items that relate to the concept of *place attachment* as described
29
30 by Williams and Vaske (2003) consisting of the two dimensions of *place identity* and *place*
31
32 *dependence*. The *place attachment* construct is closely related to the cultural ecosystem service
33
34 identified in the MEA report (2005) called “sense of place”. *Place identity* refers to the mixture of
35
36 feelings about specific physical settings and symbolic connections to place that define who we are,
37
38 while *place dependence* is the functional or goal-directed relationship to the setting and the extent to
39
40 which the setting supports intended uses. The mapped income value appears indicative of place
41
42 dependence (i.e., the place is functional because it provides a source of income) while cultural identity
43
44 and spiritual values appear indicative of place identity (i.e., the place is a source for emotions and
45
46 relationships that give meaning to life). The loading of “special places” on this factor is also consistent
47
48 with interpretation of this factor as Brown and Raymond (2007) found mapped special places to be
49
50 significantly related to *place identity* and *dependence* constructs. The other three factors suggest
51
52 ecosystem bundles representing recreation values with social and therapeutic co-benefits (3 items, 10%
53
54 of variance), natural landscape bundles (4 items, 8% of variance) where scenery, biodiversity, clean
55
56 water, and undisturbed nature co-locate, and provisioning bundles (3 items, 7% of variance) that
57
58 provide opportunities for hunting/fishing, gathering, or forage for domestic animals.
59

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 The Spearman rank correlations of ecosystem bundles with land cover were weak, although half
5 of the correlations were statistically significant and in the expected direction (Table 5). The place
6 attachment bundle was positively correlated with needle-leaved forests (Class 70), water bodies (Class
7 220), and developed areas (Class 190)—areas near where residents live—and negatively correlated
8 with wetlands (Class 180). Recreation bundles were positively correlated with most forest land cover
9 classes and developed areas, but were negatively correlated with sparse vegetation (Class 150) and bare
10 areas (Class 200). Natural landscape bundles were related to sparsely vegetated areas (Class 150),
11 wetlands (Class 180), and negatively correlated with developed areas (Class 190). The provisioning
12 bundles share the same significant land cover correlations as recreation bundles but were also
13 negatively correlated with permanent snow and ice (Class 220).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **[Insert Table 5]**

24 *3.4 Value transfer results based on land cover spatial associations*

25
26 Figure 7 contains three pairs of maps depicting the spatial distribution of recreation value in
27 Sogn. The maps in the top half of the figure were rendered using the spatial association of recreation
28 value with land cover classes found in Sogn. The maps in the lower half of Figure 7 were rendered
29 using the empirical spatial associations found in Nordland. The specific quantitative indices used to
30 render the pairs of maps appear in Table 6.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **[Insert Table 6]**

39 **[Insert Figure 7]**

40
41
42 When the spatial distribution of recreation values in Sogn were generated from the proportion
43 of recreation values mapped in land cover classes in Nordland, the value transfer distribution was quite
44 similar to the actual distribution (Figure 7a). The overall measure of map similarity was high ($r=0.98$, p
45 < 0.001) and resulted from relatively small differences in recreation value proportions associated with
46 the different land cover classes in the two study areas. When standardized residuals were used to
47 transfer spatial associations found in Nordland to Sogn, large and visually significant differences were
48 visible (Figure 7b) with overall map similarity small and negative ($r=-0.07$, $p < 0.001$). The low map
49 similarity resulted from study participants in the two regions expressing different relative quantities of
50 recreation values with land cover, especially in the forest cover land classes (i.e., Classes 50 – 120).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 When the correlation coefficients of ecosystem bundles containing recreation values were used
5 to generate the value transfer map, the visual differences were not as large as with the residuals. The
6 overall measure of map similarity was modest ($r=0.35$, $p < 0.001$). The bundle correlation coefficients
7 associated with forest Classes 50 and 70, and water bodies (Class 210), account for the largest
8 differences in the rendered maps (see Table 6). Although not shown, the number and composition of
9 the ecosystem bundles differed between the two study areas with the Nordland factor analysis
10 generating four ecosystem bundles and Sogn, three bundles. There were also some differences in the
11 specific ecosystem values that comprised the bundle containing recreation value. Thus, the derivation
12 of ecosystem bundles appears sensitive to the study context which has negative implications for the use
13 of ecosystem bundle correlations with land cover in value transfer mapping.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **4. Discussion**

26
27 This study assessed the spatial relationships between participatory mapped ecosystem values
28 and land cover in two study regions in Norway. The Norwegian landscape, while topographically
29 dramatic, is not diverse in land cover and is dominated by sparse or bare vegetation in the uplands, and
30 mixed forests in the lower elevations. The spatial associations of ecosystem values with land cover
31 were consistent with findings reported in other studies (Brown, 2013), with forested areas providing
32 multiple ecosystem bundles supporting both recreation-related and provisioning values. The Norwegian
33 uplands are valued for their relatively undisturbed character and scenery, but local identity and place
34 attachment have stronger association with forested and settled areas in proximity to water bodies. Sense
35 of place (place attachment), a cultural ecosystem service identified in the MEA report (2005), emerged
36 as a distinctive ecosystem bundle in this Norwegian context
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 What are the implications of the spatial associations reported herein? A common theme
46 identified in the ecosystem services literature is the need to better integrate ecosystem values into land
47 use planning and decision support (De Groot et al., 2010; Opdam, 2013), but the formal assessment of
48 cultural ecosystem services with primary data collection is relatively rare. In the absence of primary
49 data, the ability to identify the distribution of ecosystem values from secondary or proxy data for
50 planning decision support has significant appeal. Spatial associations with physical landscape
51 characteristics, if valid, can be used to “value transfer” or extrapolate ecosystem values to areas or
52 regions where no primary data exists. And yet, as Eigenbrod et al., (2010a) caution, generalization
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 errors in the value transfer process can be sufficiently large so as to undermine decisions based on
5 extrapolated maps. Generalization error can be subdivided into three components of uniformity,
6 sampling, and regionalization (Plummer, 2009). Uniformity error occurs when ecosystem values are
7 not constant (uniform) for a particular land cover, sampling error results from too few study areas to
8 develop transfer indices or coefficients, and regionalization error occurs when the study area is not
9 representative of the area being transfer mapped. Although these generalization errors have been
10 assessed for biophysical indicators of ecosystem services, these errors appear equally applicable to
11 value transfer processes that use participatory mapped data.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 How do these errors relate to the value transfer analysis in this study? In the value transfer of
20 recreation values to Sogn using Nordland spatial associations, there was an assumption that recreation
21 value distributions were uniform within each of the land cover classes, for example, Class 150 (sparse
22 vegetation). This was clearly not the case as evidenced by the clustering of recreation value points at
23 specific locations within the land cover class. Further, cultural ecosystem values appear especially
24 susceptible to uniformity errors because cultural values tend to be place-specific and clustered on the
25 landscape. As noted by Eigenbrod et al., (2010b), uniformity error alone can make ecosystem service
26 maps generated through the transfer process unsuitable for identifying hotspots or priority areas for
27 multiple services.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 With respect to sampling error, the sample size of one (i.e., Nordland) used to generate transfer
36 indices for Sogn suggests a very large sampling error. Ideally, multiple participatory mapping studies
37 would be conducted throughout Norway to increase confidence that the spatial associations of
38 ecosystem values with land cover in Nordland are not unique or indicative of outliers. Regionalization
39 error is also a distinct possibility within Norway because although the physical landscapes in the two
40 study areas were reasonably similar, there are significant differences in land tenure between Nordland
41 and Sogn with empirical evidence indicating that land tenure influences the distribution of ecosystem
42 values (Hausner et al., in press). The sparse land cover class in the mountains includes areas that are
43 locally important for recreational fishing, naturalness, and scenic qualities. Social and therapeutic
44 values were typically mapped near settlements, particularly in the more urbanized locations in
45 Nordland, reflecting the importance of green infrastructure connected to recreational and ski trails.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 The value transfer process using ecosystem bundle correlation coefficients showed poor
56 performance with low similarity ($r=.35$) between the actual and value transfer maps. The use of
57 ecosystem bundles to generate singular transfer indices is subject to the same type of error in
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 aggregation identified by Eigenbrod et al. (2010a) who found that combining multiple ecosystem
5 services into a single layer for benefit transfer is problematic because it contains errors for each
6 constituent layer. The generalization and aggregation errors in the value transfer mapping process are
7 layered on the top of error that is intrinsic to the participatory mapping process itself, such as value
8 construct validity, sampling error, and spatial accuracy. Although empirical research to date indicates
9 that participatory mapping of ecosystem values can generate reasonably accurate outcomes for some
10 types of ecosystem values (Brown et al., 2014; Cox et al., 2014), a common characteristic of
11 participatory mapping for ecosystem values is the use of regional case studies where external validity is
12 intrinsically weak, constraining generalization outside the study area (Brown and Fagerholm, 2015).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Given the high probably of error in generating transfer maps that may not be reliable for
22 decision support in land use planning, is the pursuit of more accurate value transfer methods misguided
23 effort? Not necessarily, but a fair degree of skepticism is warranted. Eigenbrod et al., (2010a) describe
24 the limited range of circumstances where transfer mapping may be suitable: (1) when the heterogeneity
25 of ecosystem services within a land cover type is low, such as in smaller study areas; and (2) if the goal
26 of transfer mapping is simply to rank the relative importance of a small number of highly distinct land
27 cover types in terms of their importance for one or more ecosystem services. The use of land cover data
28 for value transfer is understandable given its availability, but it is possible to enhance value transfer
29 mapping methods using additional physical landscape data layers. Value transfer mapping that includes
30 more extensive physical landscape features such as those in the New Zealand landscape classification
31 system (i.e., land cover, dominant land cover, landform, water bodies, water views, and infrastructure
32 (Brabyn, 2009) have the potential to improve value transfer accuracy for some ecosystem values. This
33 type of comprehensive, hierarchical landscape classification system was not available for Norway, but
34 it could be developed in the future.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 As a caveat, even with more accurate value transfer mapping, the results may not be adequate
47 for land use decision support when confronted with high variability in the social systems that drive the
48 valuation process. Although mapped ecosystem values in rural regions appear to be relatively stable
49 over time (Brown and Donovan, 2014; Brown and Weber, 2012), cultural ecosystem values, in
50 particular, have the potential to couple or decouple with physical landscape features. But given the
51 paucity of research that has examined spatial associations between mapped ecosystem values and
52 physical landscapes, it would be premature to dismiss the potential utility of value transfer mapping
53 without further effort to identify and calibrate the spatial associations. We concur with Eigenbrod et al.,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(2010a) that at this point in time, available resources may be better invested to map the actual distribution of ecosystem services than in value transfer methods per se. A direct benefit of new empirical data collection would be to increase the knowledge base of spatial associations between mapped ecosystem values and physical landscapes which at the present, is limited in geographic scope and socio-cultural coverage. Further, the P(P)GIS mapping of ecosystem services that are relevant to indigenous and local people living in sparsely populated and data poor regions may be the most viable option to identify and model the spatial distribution of ecosystem values (Ramirez-Gomez, 2015). Value transfer mapping can be revisited in the future with an expanded knowledge base to determine its utility for land use decision support.

4.1 Conclusion

This study identified the empirical spatial associations between physical landscape features (land cover) and mapped ecosystem values, and then used the results to evaluate value transfer outcomes. The study affirmed spatial associations described elsewhere, for example, the importance of forested landscapes that provide a wide range of both cultural and provisioning ecosystem services. However, the capacity to extrapolate or transfer spatial associations from one geographic location to another depends on the validity and comprehensiveness of physical landscape descriptors (e.g., land cover), the validity of ecosystem value descriptors (e.g., ecosystem value types), and the ability to operationalize and accurately measure these components.

The initial SOLVES model (Sherrouse et al., 2011) used landscape features such as roads, water, and elevation as the basis for value transfer. These landscape descriptors appear too general for the purpose of value transfer. An alternative approach, described herein, uses a landscape classification system such as land cover as the basis for value transfer. Although land cover is an improvement over general landscape features, land cover may also be too general to capture the complexity of physical landscapes in sufficient detail for the purpose of value transfer. A more promising approach would use comprehensive and detailed landscape classification systems such as those developed by Brabyn (2009) for New Zealand or landscape character systems developed by Käyhkö (2015) for Zanzibar, Tanzania. Unfortunately, comprehensive landscape classification systems require considerable effort to develop and validate and thus are not widely available. For the ecosystem valuation component, the participatory mapping of ecosystem values is relatively new and underdeveloped (Brown and Fagerholm, 2015) and like physical landscape descriptors, lacks sufficient specificity to capture the

1
2
3
4 complexity of the human valuation process across heterogeneous populations. Progress in value
5 transfer methods will depend on enhanced classification and valuation systems that better capture and
6 measure the complexity of both physical landscapes and the human valuation process.
7
8

9
10 With the relatively homogenous physical landscape and culture found in Norway compared to
11 other global geographic locations, this case study presented a best case scenario to demonstrate the
12 viability of value transfer methods. While the use of standardized residuals and ecosystem value
13 bundles for value transfer did not perform well, the use of simple percentages describing ecosystem
14 value/land cover spatial associations generated reasonably strong results (i.e., high similarity between
15 actual and value transfer maps). While we share the multiple concerns expressed by Eigenbrod et al.,
16 (2010b) regarding the validity of value transfer methods for ecosystem services, our empirical results
17 have left open the possibility that value transfer methods can be useful for some applications in the
18 future including the spatial identification of cultural ecosystem values.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Alessa, L.N., Kliskey, A.A., Brown, G., 2008. Social–ecological hotspots mapping: A spatial approach for identifying coupled social–ecological space. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 85, 27-39.
- Bagstad, K. J., Reed, J. M., Semmens, D. J., Sherrouse, B. C., Troy, A. 2015. Linking biophysical models and public preferences for ecosystem service assessments: a case study for the Southern Rocky Mountains. *Regional Environmental Change*, 1-14.
- Berkes, F., Colding, J., Folke, C. (Eds.). 2002. *Navigating social-ecological systems: building resilience for complexity and change*. Cambridge University Press. 416 p.
- Bontemps, S., Defourny, P., Van Bogaert, E., Arino, O., Kalogirou, V., Ramos Perez, J. 2011. GLOBCOVER 2009–Products description and validation report. Available from <http://due.esrin.esa.int/files/GLOBCOVER2009_Validation_Report_2.2.pdf > Accessed (13 July 2015).
- Brabyn, L. 2009. Classifying landscape character. *Landscape research*, 34(3), 299-321.
- Brown, G., 2013. The relationship between social values for ecosystem services and global land cover: An empirical analysis. *Ecosystem Services* 5, 58-68.
- Brown, G., Montag, J.M., Lyon, K., 2012. Public participation GIS: A method for identifying ecosystem services. *Society & Natural Resources* 25, 633-651.
- Brown, G., Raymond, C. 2007. The relationship between place attachment and landscape values: Toward mapping place attachment. *Applied Geography*. 27(2):89-111.
- Brown, G., Weber, D., de Bie, K., 2014. Assessing the value of public lands using public participation GIS (PPGIS) and social landscape metrics. *Applied Geography* 53, 77-89.
- Brown, G., 2005. Mapping spatial attributes in survey research for natural resource management: Methods and applications. *Society & Natural Resources* 18, 17-39.
- Brown, G., Brabyn, L., 2012a. The extrapolation of social landscape values to a national level in New Zealand using landscape character classification. *Applied Geography* 35, 84-94.
- Brown, G., Brabyn, L., 2012b. An analysis of the relationships between multiple values and physical landscapes at a regional scale using public participation GIS and landscape character classification. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 107, 317-331.
- Brown, G. and Fagerholm, N. 2015. Empirical PPGIS/PGIS mapping of ecosystem services: A review and evaluation. *Ecosystem Services* 13, 119-133.
- Brown, G., Kyttä, M., 2014. Key issues and research priorities for public participation GIS (PPGIS): A synthesis based on empirical research. *Applied Geography* 46, 122-136.

- 1
2
3
4 Brown, G., Reed, P. 2000. Validation of a forest values typology for use in national forest planning.
5 Forest Science 46(2), 240-247.
6
7
8 Brown, G., Weber, D. 2012. Using Public Participation GIS (PPGIS) on the Geoweb to monitor
9 tourism development preferences. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 21(2), 192-211.
10
11 Bryan, B.A., Raymond, C.M., Crossman, N.D., Macdonald, D.H., 2010. Targeting the management of
12 ecosystem services based on social values: Where, what, and how? Landscape and Urban
13 Planning 97, 111-122.
14
15
16 Clement-Potter, J. 2006. Spatially explicit values on the Pike and San Isabel national forests in
17 Colorado (Ph.D. thesis). Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University.
18
19
20 Costanza, R., R. d'Arge, R. de Groot, S. Farberk, M. Grasso, B. Hannon, K. Limburg, S. Naeem, R.
21 O'Neill, J. Paruelo, R. Raskin, P. Suttonkk, and M. van den Belt. 1997. The value of the world's
22 ecosystem services and natural capital. Nature 387:253–260.
23
24
25 Daily, G. 1997. Nature's services: Societal dependence on natural ecosystems. Island Press.
26
27 Daniel, T.C., Muhar, A., Arnberger, A., Aznar, O., Boyd, J.W., Chan, K.M.A., Costanza, R., Elmqvist,
28 T., Flint, C.G., Gobster, P.H., Grêt-Regamey, A., Lave, R., Muhar, S., Penker, M., Ribe, R.G.,
29 Schuppenlehner, T., Sikor, T., Soloviy, I., Spierenburg, M., Taczanowska, K., Tam, J., von der
30 Dunk, A., 2012. Contributions of cultural services to the ecosystem services agenda. PNAS, 1-8.
31
32
33
34 De Groot, R. S., Wilson, M. A., Boumans, R. M. 2002. A typology for the classification, description
35 and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services. Ecological economics, 41(3), 393-408.
36
37
38 De Groot, R. S., Alkemade, R., Braat, L., Hein, L., Willemsen, L. 2010. Challenges in integrating the
39 concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and decision
40 making. Ecological Complexity, 7(3), 260-272.
41
42
43 Eigenbrod, F., Armsworth, P. R., Anderson, B. J., Heinemeyer, A., Gillings, S., Roy, D. B., et al.
44 2010a. Error propagation associated with benefits transfer-based mapping of ecosystem services.
45 Biological Conservation, 143(11), 2487–2493. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.06.015>
46
47
48 Eigenbrod, F., Armsworth, P.R., Anderson, B.J., Heinemeyer, A., Gillings, S., Roy, D.B., Thomas,
49 C.D., Gaston, K.J., 2010b. The impact of proxy-based methods on mapping the distribution of
50 ecosystem services. Journal of Applied Ecology 47, 377–385.
51
52
53 Fagerholm, N., Käyhkö, N., Ndumbaro, F., Khamis, M., 2012. Community stakeholders' knowledge in
54 landscape assessments – Mapping indicators for landscape services. Ecological Indicators 18,
55 421-433.
56
57
58 Fisher, B., Turner, R. K., Morling, P. 2009. Defining and classifying ecosystem services for decision
59 making. Ecological Economics, 68(3), 643-653.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Goodchild, M. F. 2007. Citizens as sensors: the world of volunteered geography. *GeoJournal*, 69(4),
5 211-221.
6
7
8 Haines-Young, R. and Potschin, M. 2013. Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services
9 (CICES): Consultation on Version 4, August-December 2012. EEA Framework Contract No
10 EEA/IEA/09/003.
11
12
13 Hausner, V., Brown, G., and Læg Reid, E. In press. Effects of land tenure and protected areas on
14 ecosystem services and land use preferences in Norway. *Land Use Policy*.
15
16
17 Kaiser, H. F. 1960. The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and*
18 *psychological measurement*. 20, 141-151.
19
20
21 Käyhkö, N. 2015. Participatory landscape character assessment (LCA) for land use planning and forest
22 management in Zanzibar, Tanzania. Paper presented at the International Association for
23 Landscape Ecology (IALE) Congress, July 5-10, Portland, Oregon. Abstract retrieved from
24 http://ialeworldcongressabstracts.org/presentation.php?author_last=Kayhko&author_first=Niina
25
26
27 Klain, S.C., Chan, K.M.A., 2012. Navigating coastal values: Participatory mapping of ecosystem
28 services for spatial planning. *Ecological Economics* 82, 104-113.
29
30
31 Kumar, P. 2010. The economics of ecosystems and biodiversity: Ecological and economic foundations.
32 UNEP/Earthprint.
33
34
35 Martín-López B, Iniesta-Arandia I, García-Llorente M, Palomo I, Casado-Arzuaga I, et al. 2012.
36 Uncovering Ecosystem Service Bundles through Social Preferences. *PLoS ONE* 7(6): e38970.
37
38 Mathiesen, H., Tenge, I., Lågbu, R., Snellingen Bye, A., 2013. Arealstatistikk: Eiendommer og
39 Utmark. Norsk Institute for Skog og Landskap. Available from:
40 [http://www.skogoglandskap.no/filearchive/rapport_21_13_arealstatistikk_eiendommer_og_utmar](http://www.skogoglandskap.no/filearchive/rapport_21_13_arealstatistikk_eiendommer_og_utmark.pdf)
41 [k.pdf](http://www.skogoglandskap.no/filearchive/rapport_21_13_arealstatistikk_eiendommer_og_utmark.pdf) (accessed 13.02.15).
42
43
44 MEA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment), 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: A Framework*
45 *for Assessment*. Island Press, Washington D.C.
46
47
48 National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis (NCGIA). 1996a. Summary report: GIS and
49 society workshop, South Haven, MN, 2–5 March. FFF. 1996b.
50
51
52 National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis (NCGIA). 1996a. Summary report: Public
53 participation GIS workshop, Orono, ME, 10–13 July.
54
55
56 Obermeyer, N.J. 1998. The evolution of public participation GIS. *Cartography and Geographic*
57 *Information Systems*, 25(2), 65-66.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Opdam, P., 2013. Using ecosystem services in community-based landscape planning: Science is not
5 ready to deliver, in Fu, B., Jones, K.B. (Eds.), *Landscape Ecology for Sustainable Environment*
6 *and Culture*. Springer Netherlands, pp. 77-101.
7
8
- 9 Palomo, I., Martín-López, B., Potschin, M., Haines-Young, R., Montes, C., 2013. National Parks,
10 buffer zones and surrounding lands: Mapping ecosystem service flows. *Ecosystem Services* 4,
11 104-116.
12
13
- 14 Palomo, I., Martín-López, B., Zorrilla-Miras, P., Del Amo, D.G., Montes, C. 2014. Deliberative
15 mapping of ecosystem services within and around Doñana National Park (SW Spain) in relation
16 to land use change. *Regional Environmental Change*, 14(1), 237-251.
17
18
- 19 Plieninger, T., Dijks, S., Oteros-Rozas, E., Bieling, C., 2013. Assessing, mapping, and quantifying
20 cultural ecosystem services at community level. *Land Use Policy* 33, 118-129.
21
22
- 23 Plummer, M.L. 2009. Assessing benefit transfer for the valuation of ecosystem services. *Frontiers in*
24 *Ecology and the Environment*, 7, 38–45
25
26
- 27 Potschin, M., Haines-Young, R., 2013. Landscapes, sustainability and the place-based analysis of
28 ecosystem services. *Landscape Ecology* 28, 1053-1065.
29
- 30 Queiroz, C., Meacham, M., Richter, K., Norström, A.V., Andersson, E., Norberg, J., Peterson, G.
31 2015. Mapping bundles of ecosystem services reveals distinct types of multifunctionality within a
32 Swedish landscape. *Ambio* 44, 89–101.
33
34
- 35 Rambaldi, G., Kwaku Kyem, A.P., Mbile, P., McCall, M., Weiner, D. 2006. Participatory spatial
36 information management and communication in developing countries. *EJISDC*, 25, 1.
37
38
- 39 Ramirez-Gomez S.O.I., Torres-Vitolas, C.A., Schreckenberg, K., Honzák, M, Cruz-Garcia, G.S.,
40 Willcock, S., Palacios, E., Pérez-Miñana, E, Verweij, P.A., Poppy, G.M. 2015. Analysis of
41 ecosystem services provision in the Colombian Amazon using participatory research and
42 mapping techniques. *Ecosystem Services* 13, 93-107.
43
44
- 45 Raudsepp-Hearne, C., Peterson, G.D., Bennett, E.M., 2010. Ecosystem service bundles for analyzing
46 tradeoffs in diverse landscapes. *PNAS* 107, 5242-5247.
47
48
- 49 Raymond, C. M., Bryan, B. A., MacDonald, D. H., Cast, A., Strathearn, S., Grandgirard, A., Kalivas,
50 T. 2009. Mapping community values for natural capital and ecosystem services. *Ecological*
51 *economics*, 68(5), 1301-1315.
52
53
- 54 Raymond, C., Brown, G., 2007. A spatial method for assessing resident and visitor attitudes towards
55 tourism growth and development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 15, 520-540.
56
57
- 58 Troy, A., Wilson, M. A. 2006. Mapping ecosystem services: practical challenges and opportunities in
59 linking GIS and value transfer. *Ecological Economics*, 60(2), 435-449.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 van Riper, C.J., Kyle, G.T., Sutton, S.G., Barnes, M., Sherrouse, B.C., 2012. Mapping outdoor
7 recreationists' perceived social values for ecosystem services at Hinchinbrook Island National
8 Park, Australia. *Applied Geography* 35, 164-173.
9
- 10
11 van Riper, C.J., Kyle, G.T., 2014. Capturing multiple values of ecosystem services shaped by
12 environmental worldviews: A spatial analysis. *Journal of Environmental Management* 145, 374–
13 384.
14
15
16
17 Shannon, C.E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*,
18 27, 379-423 and 623-656.
19
20
21 Sherrouse, B.C., Clement, J.M., Semmens, D.J., 2011. A GIS application for assessing, mapping, and
22 quantifying the social values of ecosystem services. *Applied Geography* 31, 748-760.
23
24
25 Sherrouse, B.C., Semmens, D.J., Clement, J.M., 2014. An application of Social Values for Ecosystem
26 Services (SolVES) to three national forests in Colorado and Wyoming. *Ecological Indicators* 36,
27 68-79.
28
29
30 Statistics Norway (2013). Population and housing census 2011. <http://www.ssb.no>
31
- 32
33 Turner, K.G., Odgaard, M.V., Bøcher, P.K., Dalgaard, T., Svenning, J.C. 2014. Bundling ecosystem
34 services in Denmark: Trade-offs and synergies in a cultural landscape. *Landscape and Urban*
35 *Planning*, 125, 89-104.
36
37
38 Wallace, K.J. 2007. Classification of ecosystem services: problems and solutions. *Biological*
39 *Conservation*, 139(3), 235-246.
40
41
42 Williams, D.R., Vaske, J.J. 2003. The measurement of place attachment: Validity and generalizability
43 of a psychometric approach. *Forest Science*, 49(6), 830-840.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Zhu, X., Pfueller, S., Whitelaw, P., Winter, C., 2010. Spatial differentiation of landscape values in the
Murray River Region of Victoria, Australia. *Environmental Management* 45, 896-911.

Table 1. Participatory mapping studies that examined relationships between mapped cultural ecosystem values and physical landscape features.

Study Year ^a	Location	Cultural ecosystem values mapped	Physical landscape features	Spatial Mapping Method	Sampling method, participants, data collection method	Spatial Analyses	Published References	Selected relationships/findings
2013	Australia, New Zealand, U.S. (11 PPGIS studies)	Landscape value typology (n=14 values)	Global land cover database (Bontemps et al., 2011)	Points	Varied by study	Point data tabulated within land use areas to determine spatial association between ecosystem values and land use categories	Brown, 2013	Highest frequencies associated with forested land cover; water bodies highly valuable relative to area occupied; agricultural land and areas of permanent snow and ice least valuable
2012	Channel Islands, US	12 landscape values	Slope, land cover, distance to marine protected areas, and distance to coastline	Points	Onsite visitors to Channel Islands (survey) (n=323)	SolVES 2.0 model	van Riper and Kyle, 2014	Results for physical relationships not reported
2012	Saxony, DE	Spiritual, educational, inspiration, aesthetic, social, sense of place, cultural heritage, recreation and ecotourism	Land cover classes (forest, cropland, grassland, water body, settlement, and quarry)	Assign attributes to pre-identified sites on a map	Purposive resident household (interviews) (n=93)	Counts of services identified/attached with land cover classes	Plieninger et al., 2013	Recreation, aesthetics, and education related to fishing ponds and lake; social related to settlement; grasslands, croplands, and quarry weakly related to services
2011	Hinchinbrook National Park, Queensland, AU	12 landscape values but only aesthetic, biodiversity, and recreation used in analysis	Slope, distance to water, distance to trails	Points	Onsite visitors (survey) (n=209)	SolVES 1.0 model analysis by subgroup (consumptive vs. non-consumptive) using zonal statistics	van Riper et al., 2012	Consumptive subgroup aesthetic values covered broader area spanning terrestrial and aquatic environments (near water and walking track) while non-consumptive subgroup more intensely valued a smaller area with steeper slopes, close to trails, and farther from bodies of water.
2011	Doñana and Sierra Nevada protected areas, Andalusia, ES	MEA services customized for each of two sites	Land use	Points	Purposive expert (workshops) (n=41)	Point data tabulated within land use areas to determine spatial association between ecosystem services and land use categories	Palomo et al., 2014	Land uses with highest richness of ecosystem services were wetlands and inland waters and shrublands. Urban areas and agricultural lands had lowest richness indicators.
2010	Grand County, Colorado, US	Modified MEA typology	Land use/cover	Points	Random household (survey) (n=58)	Point data tabulated within land use/cover areas to determine spatial association between ecosystem services and land use/cover categories	Brown et al., 2012	Open water had proportionately recreation values. Developed areas had proportionately more social and cultural service values.
2010	Cheju-Unguja Ukuu Keabona, Zanzibar, Tanzania	Landscape services (material vs. non-material)	Land use/cover	Points	Purposive resident (interviews) (n=218)	Distance of mapped locations to home; spatial overlay points with land cover	Fagerholm et al., 2013	Material benefits cluster in the village environments with majority of the material assets found within a kilometer distance from settlement on forest and scrubland areas. Non-material benefits also locate near settlement areas but shared cultural traditions rarely co-exist with other landscape benefits.
2011	Otago and Southland Regions, NZ	Landscape values typology	Hierarchical land classification system: landform, land cover, water, water views, and infrastructure.	Points	Random household, onsite visitors, volunteer (survey) (n=608)	Point data tabulated within land classes to determine spatial association between ecosystem services and land use categories	Brown and Brabyn, 2012a and 2012b	Greater than expected landscape values associated with urban areas, water features, indigenous landcover, and mountains. Fewer than expected values associated with flatter, agricultural landscapes
2008	Murray-Darling Basin, South Australia, AU	Modified MEA typology	Four natural capital assets-- land, water, biota, atmosphere.	Points	Non-proportional quota decision-makers (interviews) (n=56)	Spatial distribution of individual values were summed (intensity) and	Raymond et al., 2009; Bryan et al. 2010	Highest cultural value intensities were related to surface water and biota assets for cultural services.

overlaid on four natural capital assets

2005	Pike and San Isabel National Forests, Colorado, US	12 landscape values; only aesthetic, biodiversity, and life-sustaining used in analysis	Scenic viewsheds, vertebrate species richness, carbon sequestration and storage, sediment regulation, water regulation and supply	Points	Random household (survey) (n=684)	SolVES 3.0 model and regression	Bagstad et al., 2015	Weak relationships between cultural and physically modeled services; public perception of ecosystem service regions is limited
2004-2008	Pike and San Isabel, Shoshone, and Bridger-Teton National Forests Colorado and Wyoming, US	Landscape values typology but only results for recreation value for Bridger Teton NF reported	Elevation, slope, distance to distance to water, land cover, and elevation-derived landform	Points	Random household (survey) (n=359) for Bridger-Teton	SolVES 2.0 application calculates Value Index derived from mapped services densities to identify relationships with physical features.	Sherrouse et al., 2014	Highly intensities of recreation values more proximate to roads and open water, and occur on lower slopes in landforms such as valley flats.
2005	Pike and San Isabel National Forests, Colorado, US	Landscape values typology	Elevation, slope, distance to roads, distance to water	Points	Random household (survey) (n=684)	SolVES application calculates Value Index derived from mapped ES to identify relationships with physical features and provides for value transfer (extrapolation). Maxent modelling integrated in latest version.	Clement-Potter, 2006; Sherrouse et al., 2011;	Elevation and distance to roads positively and significantly correlated with mapped value intensities. Slope and distance to water less strongly correlated. Areas closer to water were more likely to be valued highly, especially for recreation and aesthetic values.
2002	Kenai Peninsula, Alaska, US	Landscape values typology but only results for biological value reported	Net primary productivity	Points	Random household (survey) (n=561)	Linear regression between standardized NPP index and standardized index of biological value from density weighting	Alessa et al., 2008;	Moderately significant, positive relationships between perceived biological value and net primary productivity for six aggregated community responses.
1998	Chugach National Forest, Alaska, US	Landscape values typology	Distance from communities, roads	Points	Random household (survey) (n=821)	Mean distance and cumulative frequency distributions as a function of distance	Brown et al., 2003	Cultural values clustered near communities but distance depends on value. Recreation, aesthetic and economic values closer to roads than intrinsic, life sustaining and future values.

^a Year of spatial data collection, not publication of results.

Table 2. Ecosystem values typology with operational definitions and suggested ecosystem service category: P=Provisioning, C=Cultural, S =Supporting.

Ecosystem Value	Operational definition
(P) Hunting/fishing	Areas are important because of hunting and/or fishing.
(P) Pastures/fodder	Areas are important because they are used for haymaking and pastures for reindeer, sheep, cows
(P) Gathering	Areas are important for berries, mushroom or collecting herbs/plants here.
(P) Water quality	Areas are important because they provide clean water.
(S) Biological diversity	Areas are important because they provide a variety of plants, wildlife, and habitat.
(C) Recreation	Areas are important for outdoor recreation activities (e.g., camping, walking, skiing, alpine, snowmobiling, cycling, horse riding etc.)
(C) Scenic areas	Areas are important because they include beautiful nature and/or landscapes.
(C) Culture/identity	Areas are important because of their historical value, or for passing down the stories, myths, knowledge and traditions, and/ or to increase understanding of the way of life of our ancestors.
(C) Income^a	Areas are important because they provide tourism opportunities, mining, hydroelectric power or other potential sources of income.
(C) Undisturbed nature (naturalness)^a	Areas are relatively untouched, providing for peace and quiet without too many disturbances.
(C) Social^b	Areas are important because they provide opportunities for social activities (e.g. associated with fireplaces, picnic tables, ski –or alpine arrangements, shelters, shared cabins, cabin complexes).
(C) Spiritual	Areas are important because they are valuable in their own right or have a deeper meaning; emotionally, spiritually, or religious.
(C) Therapeutic/health	Places are valuable because they make me feel better, either because they provide opportunities for physically activities important for my health and/or they give me peace, harmony and therapy
(C) Special places	Please describe why these places are special to you.

^a The income and undisturbed nature categories are not specifically listed in the MA, TEEB, or CICES classifications but these values are related to existing service categories. For example, income may be derived from ecotourism (MA) and tourism (TEEB) activities. However, in the Norwegian context, income can also be generated from forestry, grazing, and hydroelectric power development. The undisturbed nature (naturalness) value is related to aesthetics and inspiration services (MA, TEEB). All of the mapped values need to relate to ecosystem features to be defined as ecosystem values.

^b The social category is identified in the MA report as a “social relations” cultural service wherein ecosystems influence the types of social relations that are established in particular cultures.

Table 3. Participation statistics and respondent characteristics for two study areas.

Participation Statistics		Nordland		Sogn	
Number of participants (one or more locations mapped)		440		486	
Number completing post-mapping survey		380		409	
Number of locations mapped		9,039		10,095	
Range of locations mapped (min, max points)		1 to 276		1 to 527	
Mean, median of all locations mapped		20.5, 14		21.6, 13	
Mean, median of values and places mapped		14.7, 9		14.9, 9	
Mean, median of preferences mapped		5.8, 1.5		6.3, 1.0	
How participants learned of study					
Mail (UiT)		91%		89%	
Other organization/referral		9%		11%	
Overall response rate		14.0%		16.3%	
Demographic Statistics					
		Study Participants		Census Data	
Age (mean)		48.7	50.5	49.9	48.2
Gender	Male	57%	50%	57%	52%
	Female	43%	50%	43%	48%
Education (highest level completed)					
	Primary	3%	27%	6%	33%
	Secondary	37%	49%	38%	43%
	Higher	60%	24%	56%	24%
Household income (annual) ^a					
	0 - 200,000	9%	7%	6%	8%
	200,000 - 300,000	3%	11%	1%	11%
	300,000 - 400,000	12%	11%	7%	11%
	400,000 - 500,000	15%	11%	14%	11%
	500,000 - 600,000	12%	15%	12%	10%
	More than 600,000	40%	47%	48%	49%
	Not disclosed	10%	N/A	12%	N/A
Families with children		50%	41%	45%	40%

^a Census income categories do not align with categories in survey question. Census data was estimated to match survey data.

Table 4. Results of factor analysis of spatial distribution of ecosystem values (marker counts per 2 km²) using principal components extraction (PCA) with varimax rotation for combined Nordland and Sogn study areas. Four factors account for 52% of the overall variance. Largest item loadings on each factor are highlighted.

Nordland and Sogn	PCA Component / Ecosystem Service Bundle			
	1 ($\lambda=3.8$, 27%)	2 ($\lambda=1.4$, 10%)	3 ($\lambda=1.2$, 8%)	4 ($\lambda=1.0$, 7%)
Thematic content	Place identity/dependence	Recreation/ socialization	Naturalness	Provisioning
Hunting/fishing	.353	-.296	.326	.482
Pastures/grazing	.158	.086	-.179	.637
Gathering	-.086	.228	.153	.638
Water quality	-.013	-.021	.524	.266
Biological diversity	.172	.039	.591	-.048
Recreation	-.058	.583	.453	.418
Scenic areas	.299	.388	.524	.188
Culture/identity	.716	.310	.078	.079
Income	.685	.322	-.053	.109
Undisturbed nature	.120	.137	.639	-.145
Social	.378	.731	.052	.146
Spiritual	.592	.051	.138	-.069
Therapeutic/health	.245	.749	.089	.027
Special places	.598	.041	.255	.103

Table 5. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients between ecosystem service bundles (rows) and land cover type (columns) located in 2 km² grid cells (n=3030). Significant positive correlations are highlighted in green, negative correlations in red.

Ecosystem bundle	50 Closed broad leaved deciduous	70 Closed needle leaved evergreen	90 Open needle leaved deciduous or evergreen	100 Closed to open mixed broad leaved and needle leaved	110 Mosaic forest-shrubland grassland	120 Mosaic grassland forest shrubland	150 Sparse vegetation	180 Closed to open vegetation regularly flooded	190 Artificial/developed areas	200 Bare areas	210 Water bodies	220 Permanent snow and ice
Place identity/dependence	.019	.095 ^{**}	.013	-.006	-.025	-.024	-.019	-.053	.047 [*]	-.003	.095 ^{**}	.004
Recreation	.095 ^{**}	.008	.073 ^{**}	.093 ^{**}	.130 ^{**}	.120 ^{**}	-.079	.059	.055 ^{**}	-.074	.004	-.010
Naturalness	-.024	-.019	.033	-.024	.035	.019	.081 ^{**}	.082 ^{**}	-.045	-.018	.027	-.023
Provisioning	.138 ^{**}	-.015	.098 ^{**}	.122 ^{**}	.118 ^{**}	.125 ^{**}	-.011	.071 ^{**}	-.029	-.173 ^{**}	.035	-.136 ^{**}

^a significance levels: ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

Table 6. Indices used to “value transfer” the spatial distribution of recreation values in Nordland to Sogn. The “actual” column is based on the spatial distribution of mapped recreation values associated with land cover classes in Sogn. The “transfer” column contains spatial associations with land cover classes in Nordland that were used to generate the maps shown in Figure 7.

	Value Transfer Indices					
	Percent of Total Recreation Values		Std. Residuals		Recreation Bundle Correlation Coefficients	
	Actual (Sogn)	Transfer (Nordland)	Actual (Sogn)	Transfer (Nordland)	Actual (Sogn)	Transfer (Nordland)
50 Closed broad leaved deciduous	11.2	15.0	-1.4	2.2	.108	.028
70 Closed needle leaved evergreen	0.1	0.3	0.8	-2.0	.021	.136
90 Open needle leaved deciduous or evergreen	14.6	11.3	-0.1	-1.1	.025	.044
100 Closed to open mixed broad leaved and needle leaved	11.6	6.5	1.2	-0.5	.067	.030
110 Closed to open mixed broad leaved and needle leaved	1.8	6.1	-0.6	-0.8	.035	.027
120 Mosaic grassland forest shrubland	2.0	4.0	-0.1	1.3	.027	.031
150 Sparse vegetation	36.2	43.1	0.0	0.6	.024	.004
180 Closed to open vegetation regularly flooded	4.0	4.8	1.9	2.2	.063	.041
190 Artificial/ developed areas	N/A	0.2	N/A	-1.6	N/A	.097
200 Bare areas	12.9	5.0	1.3	-0.4	.042	.041
210 Water bodies	3.3	3.1	-1.0	-4.8	.060	.132
220 Permanent snow and ice	2.2	0.8	-1.9	0.7	.019	.052

Figure 1

Two study areas located in: (a) southern Norway (Sogn), and (b) northern Norway (Nordland). Maps show land tenure and the number of study participants by geographic location.




Figure 2

Distribution of global land cover classes (terrestrial, non-water) compared to distribution of classes located within Nordland and Sogn study areas, along with the percentage of ecosystem value points mapped by land cover class.




Figure 3

Z-scores (y-axis) of ecosystem values by land cover class (x-axis) in Nordland. Z-scores greater than +1.96 or less than -1.96 indicate that value distribution differs significantly from what would be expected based on proportion of land cover class within the study area.





Figure 4

Z-scores (y-axis) of ecosystem values by land cover class (x-axis) in Sogn. Z-scores greater than +1.96 or less than -1.96 indicate that value distribution differs significantly from what would be expected based on proportion of land cover class within the study area.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49