

Appendix:

CLN 1.1 Methods and Methodology

Progress Report Methodology

The Progress Report occurred in three project phases: Update GIS, Progress Measurements and Data Analysis, and Key Messaging and Communication.

1. Phase 1: Update GIS

In order to track progress made from 2011 to 2013 on the CLN, it was necessary to update the network GIS with the most recent Bay Area Protected Lands Database and land use map (see Fig. 1.2 in CLN 1.0 report page 18). This enabled the project team to produce a spatial dataset (called the CLN 1.0 Progress Report Basemap) from which most progress measurements were conducted. Note: no fine filter data from CLN 1.0 was updated. Such a comprehensive data update is anticipated to occur during the CLN 2.0 effort.

2. Phase 2: Progress Measurements and Data Analysis

After completed the GIS update, progress was measured by overlaying relevant progress metric data layers with the CLN 1.0 Progress Report Basemap.

3. Phase 3: Key Messaging and Communication

The write-up, messaging and www.bayarealands.org website update was completed.

Method: Making the CLN 1.0 Progress Report Basemap

The GAP layer was originally developed for use in the San Francisco Bay Area Conservation Lands Network 1.0 report. The original intention of the data layer was to be able to run a gap analysis on the coarse and fine filter targets and determine how well the CLN did at capturing the intended goals.

In order to run the gap analysis a grid layer with the following categories was created:

- Protected
- CLN Essential
- CLN Important
- CLN Fragmented
- Areas of Further Consideration
- Urban
- Cultivated
- RR10
- Other Lands (Essentially anything that was not in any of the above categories)

In order to accurately run the gap analysis there cannot be any overlap in this dataset, forcing all of the coarse and fine filter targets into one of the categories. A hierarchy and rules were established in order to deal with any overlap between layers. Below are an outline of those rules:

1. Any overlap between Converted Lands (Urban, Cultivated, RR10) and the Conservation Lands Network (CLN) has been already been removed from the CLN when it was finalized. In this case the Converted Lands took precedent over the CLN.
2. The riparian vegetation is an exception since it was added back into the CLN after the overlap had been removed and itself has overlap with converted lands. In this case, these riparian areas in the CLN took precedent over the Converted Lands.
3. So in the GAP layer there was some area defined as CLN that was considered urban, cultivated or RR10 in the final Converted Lands dataset.
4. There is also overlap between Protected Lands and the CLN since the CLN used Protected Lands as a starting point and was expanded from those core areas. Any overlap between these two becomes Protected Lands. As a result, the CLN category is only the CLN that was added to the existing protected lands.
5. There are also a relatively small amounts of Protected Lands that overlap with the Converted Lands, in this case that overlap becomes Converted Lands.
6. Lastly, anything remaining becomes Other Lands.

Once the final gap analysis dataset was created, a raster combine was run with the coarse filter targets (vegetation map). The resulting grid dataset shows what coarse filter targets (veg types) are in what gap category. Next, the grid attribute table was exported, acreages were calculated and then a pivot table was created to show how much of each coarse filter target is in each category. The same process was run with the fine filter targets.

- Veg types were tracked back to original gap status (CLN 1.0)

Method: Integrating Santa Cruz County into the CLN 1.0 Basemap

The Conservation Lands Network 1.0 did not include Santa Cruz County. However, the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County replicated the CLN methodology in their *Conservation Blueprint of Santa Cruz County (2011)*. Their analysis enabled the incorporation of Santa Cruz into the CLN 1.0 Progress Report. The addition of a tenth county in the Conservation Lands Network meant that the project team had to account for relative increases in acreage accounting from the 2010 datasets and conclusions in CLN 1.0. Throughout the CLN 1.0 Progress Report (also known as CLN 1.1), acreage changes due to the incorporation of Santa Cruz are noted wherever they were necessary.

Method: Counting Acreage from GIS data

A note on counting acreages of protected lands: data is imperfect.

Regional and County Acreage

In the CLN 1.0 Progress Report, we count the regional study area and total acreage of each county from the political boundary minus any acreage in the political boundary that fall within the SF Bay and Baylands Landscape Unit.

Protected Lands Acreage

In the CLN 1.0 Progress Report, two data sources supply information on data for protected landscapes: the Bay Area Protected Areas Database (BPAD) and the CLN 1.1 basemap, or GAP layer (called GAP because the later is essentially a “flattened” file whereby no acre assigned one value can be assigned another. See the description of CLN 1.1 GAP layer hierarchy above.)

See BPAD Summary tables from 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013.