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Cultural Ecosystem Services for political decision-making
Outline
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2. Value mapping demo
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5. Results
6. Implications for management
Cultural Ecosystem Services

“...non-material benefits people obtain from ecosystems...that demonstrate a significant relationship between ecosystem structures and functions specified in the biophysical domain and the satisfaction of human needs and wants specified in the medical/psychological/social domain.”

- Daniel et al 2012 as adapted from Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
Value Maps
Diverse Stakeholders

- Logger
- Female
- Native American
- Long time resident
- Young

Stakeholder Values

Management plan or Policy Decision

Density Distribution of Values

Decision-Makers
WHERE ARE CULTURAL ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN POLITICAL DECISION-MAKING, AND CAN VALUE MAPS INCREASE THE CONSIDERATION OF CULTURAL ECOSYSTEM SERVICES?
Methods

- Site: Northern Olympic Peninsula
- Sample: ~85% of politicians for the region
  - Puget Sound Partnership Leadership Council
  - County Commissioners
  - Mayors
  - Forest Service Manager
- Case Example Decision: Shoreline Master Program (SMP)
- Conceptual Content Cognitive Mapping (Kearny and Kaplan)
- Pre/Post with visualization
Results

Full Mental Model

- Number of Items - 26.5
- Change in size of sorts after exposure - + 2.18
  \( p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16} \)

Budgetary concerns, personal legacy, Politics, tangible ecosystem services partnership with peer organizations
In Considerations:

“beauty”, “recreation”, “spiritual”, “for future generations”

In Conversation:

“I think people share the same value, which has to do with the beauty of, what the protection of this place that...see if they can be in front of their house, in front of their town.”

“This should be a place for people to live and enjoy.”

“Nowadays, it’s much more peaceful in the Quinault Valley, so how do I weigh that?”
Before/After Change in Presence:

**Before:** mean = 0.048  
**After:** mean = 0.059  
**Difference:** mean difference = 0.0108, Relative difference = +1.01%, p-value = 0.045

Before/After Change in Prioritization:

**Difference:** relative difference = 0%, p-value = 0.012
In Conversation:

“The purpose of the SMP is to “…preserve water uses and water dependent uses for all the state’s citizens… water belongs to the citizens of the state and all of them have an equal right to use it an enjoy it.”

In Considerations:

“public reaction”, “Shoreline property owners”, “Developers”, “tribes”, “All citizens of the state”, “timber industry considerations”
**RESULTS**

**Stakeholders**

People as proxy?

Before/ After Change in Presence:

**Before:** mean = 0.1048387  
**After:** mean = 0.1263441  
**Difference:** M difference = 0.0215, Relative difference = 1.5%, p-value = 0.0045

Before/ After Change in Prioritization:

**Before:** mean = 0.438  
**After:** mean = 0.548  
**Difference:** Relative difference = 1.5%, p-value = 0.01356

Written Decision Changes:

Half of the politicians include considerations of stakeholders in their decision after the exercise
Do MAPS AND VALUES MAKE CULTURAL ECOSYSTEM SERVICES MORE ACTIONABLE AND VISIBLE TO POLITICIANS?
Discussion

Do maps and values make Cultural Ecosystem Services more actionable and visible?

• Gap in CES academia mirrored in political decision-making
• Cultural Ecosystem Services are recognized, but are not large part of decision-making process
• Maps have a significant but minimal effect
• People as proxy?
• Future research
  • Experiments with longer exposure, a control, bigger sample size and
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Contact:
Bessie.Schwarz@Yale.edu  |  @Bessie.Schwarz

Visualization:
http://bit.ly/1gb8t8P
Behind the Map - PGIS

LANDSCAPE VALUES

AESTHETIC – I value this place for the scenery, sights, smells or sounds.

ECONOMIC – I value this place because it provides income and employment opportunities through industries such as forest products, mining, tourism, agriculture, shellfish, or other commercial activity. [On your worksheet, please describe the kinds of economic services this place provides.]

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY – I value this place because it helps produce, preserve, and renew air, soil and water or it contributes to healthy habitats for plants and animals.

FUTURE – I value this place because it allows future generations to know and experience it as it is now.

HEALTH – I value this place because it provides a place where I or others can feel better physically and/or mentally.

HERITAGE – I value this place because it has natural and human history that matters to me and it allows me to pass down the wisdom, knowledge, traditions, or way of life of my ancestors.

HOME – I value this place because it is my home and/or I live here.

INTRINSIC – I value this place just because it exists, no matter what I or others think about it or how it is used.

LEARNING – I value this place because it provides a place to learn about the natural environment.

RECREATION – I value this place because it provides outdoor recreation opportunities or a place for my favorite recreation activities. [On your worksheet, please describe the kinds of recreation you do in this place and whether you value it because it has recreational amenities – campgrounds or other services – or, alternatively, because it does not have amenities – primitive.]

SOCIAL – I value this place because it provides opportunities for getting together with my friends and family or is part of my family’s traditional activities. [On your worksheet, please describe the kinds of activities that you or your family do in this place.]

SPIRITUAL – I value this place because it is sacred, religious, or spiritually special to me.

SUBSISTENCE – I value this place because it provides food and other products to sustain my life and that of my family. [On your worksheet, please describe the kinds of subsistence services this place provides.]

WILDERNESS – I value this place because it is wild.
Value Maps

Are these just pretty maps?
Cog. Map Broken Down

“Salmon”

“My reputation”;
“Do we have the money for this?”

“Real-estate and Development Community”

“How will the next generation experience this place”
Distribution of Meaningful Places on the Olympic Peninsula

Contents
- Suggested Water Bodies
- SMA Lakes Adopted
- Marine Shoreline
- SMA Suggestions
- Forest Ownership
- OP Counties
- Values in National Forest
- Mason County
- Clallam County
- Jefferson County
- All Values
- Dissolved OP
- Heritage
- Health
- Future
- Environmental Quality
- Economic
- Aesthetic
PHOTOS of people doing cog map
Daniels et al. 2012 definition

Qualitative, content Analysis of items and

Quantitative analysis

Compare pre and post test

“Salmon”

“My reputation”; “Do we have the money for this?”

“Real-estate and Development Community”

“How will the next generation experience this place”
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