

A methodology for the evaluation of the biodiversity interest present in three terrestrial ecosystems in the Palma beach system

Zeeba KHAN and Anna TRAVESET

SHNB



SOCIETAT D'HISTÒRIA
NATURAL DE LES BALEARS

Khan, Z. and Traveset, A. 2010. A methodology for the evaluation of the biodiversity interest present in three terrestrial ecosystems in the Palma beach system. *Boll. Soc. Hist. Nat. Balears*, 53: 25-42. ISSN 0212-260X. Palma (Mallorca).

An evaluation method for three terrestrial areas in the Palma beach system, Mallorca, Balearic Islands, Western Mediterranean is presented. Ses Fontanelles, Son Verí and Torrent dels Jueus are three fragments of semi-natural vegetation located within a very highly modified and exceedingly fragmented landscape. The Ratcliffe criteria (1977) were used as the basis for developing a multi-criteria decision making framework in order to score biodiversity value at sites. Ses Fontanelles is considered to be the area with the greatest biodiversity interest, followed by Son Verí and finally Torrent dels Jueus. As biodiversity value is an important factor in conservation planning, it is hoped that the information presented in this study will assist in guiding urban planning decisions in this and similar areas.

Keywords: *Palma beach system, Ses Fontanelles, biodiversity, evaluation, Ratcliffe.*

UNA METODOLOGIA PER A L'AVALUACIÓ DE LA DIVERSITAT BIOLÒGICA D'INTERÈS PRESENT EN TRES ECOSISTEMES TERRESTRES EN EL SISTEMA DE PLATJA DE PALMA. Es presenta un mètode d'avaluació de tres àrees terrestres en el sistema de la Platja de Palma, Mallorca, Illes Balears, Mediterrània Occidental. Ses Fontanelles, Son Verí i el Torrent dels Jueus són tres fragments de vegetació semi-natural ubicat dins d'un paisatge molt modificat i fragmentat. Els criteris de Ratcliffe (1977) es van utilitzar com a base per al desenvolupament d'un marc de decisió multicriteri per tal de valorar la diversitat biològica en aquests llocs. Ses Fontanelles és considerada com la zona amb el major interès per a la biodiversitat, seguit per Son Verí i finalment pel Torrent dels Jueus. Com que el valor de la biodiversitat és un factor important en la planificació de la conservació, s'espera que la informació presentada en aquest estudi ajudi a prendre decisions sobre planificació urbana en aquesta i altres àrees semblants.

Paraules clau: *Platja de Palma, Ses Fontanelles, biodiversitat, avaluació, Ratcliffe.*

Zeeba KHAN and Anna TRAVESET, Grup d' Ecologia Terrestre. Dept. Biodiversitat y Conservación, IMEDEA. Miquel Marquès 21. Esporles, 07190. Illes Balears, e-mails: zeebakhan@gmail.com and atraveset@uib.es

Recepció del manuscrit: 15-mai-10; revisió acceptada: 03-set-10

Introduction

The Mediterranean region is a hotspot for biodiversity and one of the world's

prime tourist destinations (Myers *et al.*, 2000). However, the land conversion process and the increased water demand associated with the growth of tourism have

had considerable negative impacts for biodiversity conservation (Amelung & Viner, 2006). The coastal areas have seen the highest rates of development. In Spain, 34% of the coastline is now classified as urban (Serra *et al.*, 2008), and Mallorca - receiving more than ten million tourists every year (IBESTAT, 2008) - registers almost half (49.1%) the coastline as having an urban land use (Balaguer *et al.*, 2008).

The Palma beach system is located on the coastal fringe of the Palma Basin. The area covers 10 km² and rests upon geological formations created during the Miocene and Pliocene epochs. The bedrock is calcareous in origin, with limestone and loamy soils characterising the zone (de la Cruz Caravaca *et al.*, 2001). The landscape is heavily marked by the numerous torrents that run down into the Bay of Palma from both the Sierra de Tramuntana mountains and the Puig de Randa mountain (Eptisa, 1999), and natural ecosystems found within the zone include beach systems, wetlands, pine forest and garrigue.

Due to the area's natural beauty, the tourist industry grew briskly from the 1960s onwards, and today the Palma beach system is one of the main centres of tourist activity on the island. Cheap, rapid development has characterised the area and the resident population of 34 000 is augmented by more than one million tourists every year (West 8, 2009).

In the competition for land resources, conservationists have developed methodologies which evaluate land for its present or potential biodiversity value. In this way, it is thought that biodiversity conservation can be promoted as a potential land use alongside other competing land uses, such as recreation, tourism and urban development. Also, as it has been widely proven that green spaces provide numerous physical, psychological, and recreational

benefits (Attwell, 2000; Eliasson, 2000; Millard, 2000; Gómez *et al.*, 2001) the protection and/ or restoration of certain areas is considered beneficial to the local population.

Thus, the rationale for this present study is to propose a suitable evaluation methodology and to employ this to determine the quality of the biodiversity interest in the remaining fragments of natural ecosystems found in the Palma beach system.

A number of approaches have been developed to evaluate the biological value of an area. In 1974, the United Nations Educational and Scientific Committee (UNESCO) issued the first international guidelines designed to evaluate sites for inclusion in the new protected area Man and Biosphere reserve system. The UNESCO set of criteria included the key tenets of diversity, rarity, naturalness and size and reflected the prevalent thinking of the day. Since then, various alternative methodologies have been developed. Many maintain the principal criteria included in the UNESCO plan, while developing additional points, such as a site's educational suitability (Gehlbach, 1975), number of structural plant formations (Van de Ploeg & Vlijm, 1978), intrinsic worth of resident species (Ehrenfield, 1976; Regan, 1981; Taylor, 1986; Gerowitt *et al.*, 2003) or an evaluation of the site's historical contribution to artwork (Everett, 1978).

More recently, the emphasis has shifted towards environmental economics and the assignation of monetary values to the services or benefits offered by ecosystems. This was first formally proposed by Helliwell (1969) and many researchers have since developed this line of study (Kumari, 1994; de Groot, 1992; Costanza *et al.*, 1997; Sathirathai, 1998; Balmford *et al.*, 2002). It is a methodology

often used by decision makers who call for values to be expressed in monetary terms, so that a cost benefit analysis can be utilised to assess the relative merits of different land use scenarios.

Some forty years after the first scientific evaluation methodologies were proposed, and despite the plethora of literature on the subject, there remains no one prevailing system to be used. Indeed, as much now as then, confusion arises from the multiplicity of criteria involved, and the broad range of conservation goals they reflect, many of these based on cultural values (Margulis & Usher, 1981; Roquette, 2009).

For the present study, the Ratcliffe method (1977) is utilised as the basis for an evaluation methodology. It develops upon concepts included in the UNESCO guidelines (1974), while elaborating six additional factors. It is the standard methodology employed by statutory agency Natural England in the United Kingdom for the evaluation of sites of special scientific interest, and is the longest standing evaluation methodology in practice in a European context (Natural England, pers. comm. 2010). Further, in a recent review by Roquette *et al.* (2009) of seven different biodiversity evaluation methods, the Ratcliffe criteria were defined as those most likely to attain objective results. Monetary based methodologies were not considered for this study as there has been no published work on similar ecosystems in similar locations, and an original valuation study was considered excessively expensive and time consuming. Also, the concept of saving nature based on cost-benefit analysis is controversial and subject to much methodological bias in the estimation of values and preferences (Daily, 1997; Brauer, 2003; Woodroffe *et al.*, 2005; McCauley, 2006).

Methods

The Study Areas

Ses Fontanelles (location: 39°32'05.92" N/ 2°43'41.60" E) (Fig. 1) is the last remnant of a lowland wetland area that historically covered a large part of the Bay of Palma (Amengual & Ramis, 2002). At just over 30 hectares, it is home to over 200 plant species, six dominant plant communities and one endemic sea lavender.

Son Verí (location: 39°29'22.44" N/ 2°45'04.48" E) represents approximately 83 hectares of traditional Mallorcan garrigue landscape. Divided into two by the MA 6014 main road, the lower part of Son Verí neighbours a residential area and sports centre, while the upper tract borders other garriga zones, agricultural land and a water waste treatment plant.

The Torrent dels Jueus (location: 39°30'12.38" N/ 2°45'38.62"E) passes through agricultural land before opening out into the Palma bay via the highly urbanised tourist nucleus of S'Arenal. It is an area with a moderate to high recreational use.

Data collection

The three sites were studied for a period of a year. Baseline data were gathered on plant species and communities, vertebrates and hexapods in April 2009. These were undertaken through completing series of transects that covered large areas of the sites. These were then monitored periodically throughout the subsequent 12 months. Standardised procedures were used throughout. Additional information on species presence was also incorporated into the study when not seen during transect studies. Aerial digital orthophotographs were also used to assist in the delineation of habitats. Randomly chosen points on the ground were then chosen to ground truth




Fig. 1. Relationship of evaluation scale to biological interest for the study sites.

Fig. 1. Relació de l'escala d'avaluació d'interès biològic als llocs d'estudi.

the estimates made. Most taxonomical identification was carried out in the field. When this was not possible, independent naturalists were contracted. Plants were identified by means of botanical guides and also by contacting different plant specialists when a doubt emerged.

Son Verí was divided into 2 distinct areas. This was due to the perceived difference in levels of use and commensurate degradation observed in the two areas. The upper tract was denominated Son Verí 1 and the lower part, closer to the coastline, Son Verí 2. This also reflects a historical separation of the area (Font, 1972).

Evaluation methodology

Sites were assessed on ten different criteria. Evaluation scales were developed and sites were awarded points, which were later converted into a five point scale. The evaluation scores for each criterion were then summed and reduced again to another five-point scale. This final score, scale I (most positive) to V (least positive), reflects the biodiversity value present in each area.

An explanation of the scoring system devised is explained below:

a) Fragility. The evaluation scale was based on the number and magnitude of factors that threaten the integrity of site. Each factor is assigned a score of either 1(lower) or 2 (higher), based on its magnitude of influence. The scores are summed and then related to an evaluation scale.

Translation of scores: I \geq 8; II 6 – 7; III 4 – 5; IV 1 – 3; V 0.

Evaluation scale: I site is highly fragile; II very fragile; III fragile; IV some fragility; V not fragile in normal circumstances.

b) Rarity. Scalings are made based on an index calculated by the level of legislative protection given, uniqueness of the genetic resources and species group.

Score for legislative protection: data deficient but with observed downward trends/locally protected, 1; national protection, 2; international protection, 3, e.g. International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red Lists or the Convention for international trade in endangered species (CITES Appendix 1).

Uniqueness of genetic resources: other species exist in the same genus 1, no other species in genus 5.

The two factors are multiplied together and a score calculated per species. The species scores are then summed with habitat scores.

Habitat scores: An additional 2 points are awarded for the presence of habitats classed as priority within the Red Natura system and an additional 1 point for habitats listed as of interest in Europe.

Translation of scores: I ≥ 35 ; II 25 – 34; III 15 – 24; IV 1 – 14; V 0.

Evaluation scale: I site possesses highly rare components; II relatively rare components; III moderately rare components; IV some rare components involved; V no rare species or habitats present.

c) Size (area or extent). Evaluation scale: I >100 ha; II 51–100 ha; III 30 – 50 ha; IV 11 – 30 ha; V <10 ha.

d) Diversity. Number of species are divided by number of ha to calculate average species per ha. These were then classified into high, medium and low diversity. A score of ≥ 5 species/ha receives a score of 3, 2 – 4,9 species/ha receive a score of 2, while <2 species per ha is awarded a score of 1.

Number of principal habitats located at a site are divided by number of ha to calculate average habitats per ha. A number of ≥ 0.12 habitats/ha receives a score of 3, 0.055 – 0.11 habitats/ha receive a score of 2, while 0 – 0,054 habitats/ha is awarded a score of 1.

These two scores are summed. The result is then combined with a value assessing levels of degradation.

Sites showing considerable degradation receive an additional score of 1, some degradation 2, and little or none 3.

The three summed scores are then translated into an evaluation scale.

Translation of scores: I 8 – 9; II 6 – 7; III 4 – 5; IV 2 – 3; V 0 – 1.

Evaluation scale: I site possesses very important diversity components; II some important diversity components; III some notable diversity components; IV few diversity components; V no or very few notable diversity components.

e) Potential Value. Based on the following criteria, sites were awarded either a score of 1 (low) or 2 (high) depending upon the level to which they meet the criteria.

1. Site is included or will be included in a protected area system

2. With informed management the area could be a unique component in the landscape matrix for its biodiversity interest

3. Provide a green corridor function

4. Provide opportunities for nature conservation education

The four summed scores are then translated into an evaluation scale.

Translation of scores: I 7 – 8; II 5 – 6; III 3 – 4; IV 1 – 2; V 0.

Evaluation scale: I site possesses very high potential value; II reasonably high potential value; III some important potential value components; IV some possible potential value; V no potential value.

f) Position with the Ecological and or Geographical Unit. Evaluation of the site is made by assessing its connectivity to the wider landscape matrix:

United to the wider landscape matrix – I

High potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix – II

Some potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix – III

Little potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix – IV

No potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix – V

Evaluation scale: I excellent geographical position; II good geographical position components; III moderate geographical position value; IV poor geographical position; V no observed positive component to geographical position.

g) Representativeness. It is assessed by making some measurement of the distinctiveness of the species and habitats in the site and whether they can be considered typical for the geographic region.

Evaluation scale: I sites maintain very important typical components; II some important typical components; III some notable typical components; IV some typical components; V no notable typical components.

h) Recorded History.

Excellent documentation available dating back to more than 100 years – I

Good documentation available dating back to more than 100 years – II

Some documentation available dating back to more than 100 years – III

Some documentation available about recent history – IV

No documentation available – V

Evaluation scale: I very good historical information; II good historical information; III some historic information available; IV little historical information; V no historical information.

i) Naturalness. Three scores are calculated and summed:

Level of human influence in the site: 1 high, 2 medium, 3 low or non existent

Number of native species: 1 low, 2 medium, 3 high current level of degradation: 0 very high, 1 high, 2 medium, 3 low

Translation of scores: I 8 – 9; II 6 – 7; III 4 – 5; IV 2 – 3; V 0 – 1.

Evaluation scale: I site possesses very important natural components; II some

important natural components; III some notable natural components; IV few natural components; V no or very little notable natural components.

j) Intrinsic Appeal. Based on the following criteria, sites were awarded either a score of 1, 2 or 3 depending upon the level to which they meet the criteria.

Four scores are calculated and summed:

Presence of habitats considered to have an emblematic value: 1 criteria poorly met, 2 criteria moderately met, 3 criteria strongly met

Presence of species considered to have an emblematic value: 1 criteria poorly met, 2 criteria moderately met, 3 criteria strongly met

Presence of species considered as pests or problematic: 1 two or more, 2 one, 3 none

Aesthetic value of the site: 1 low, 2 medium, 3 high

Socio cultural interest in the site, such as its use for recreation: 1 low, 2 medium, 3 high

Translation of scores: I 13 – 15; II 10 – 12; III 7 – 9; IV 4 – 6; V 1 – 3.

Evaluation scale: I site possesses very important intrinsic appeal; II important intrinsic appeal; III some notable intrinsic appeal; IV little intrinsic appeal; V no or very little intrinsic appeal.

Results

The methodology used provides a single numerical quantification of biodiversity interest for the four sites. The lower the overall score, the greater the interest a site has for conservation.

Ses Fontanelles scores the lowest and this translates into a high score for biodiversity interest. This positive evaluation is due to the highly fragile nature

of the site and the presence of a number of rare components, 14 in all, including one IUCN critical listed plant species, *Limonium barceloi*. Further, despite the low degree of naturalness present at the site, there is a very high diversity of plant species (220+) and of communities (6+). The site also receives a high score for being the remaining fragment of a previously much larger wetland extension and for its continuous presence in the historic record. It receives a low evaluation for geographic positioning as it is an ecologically isolated area, surrounded on all sides by main roads and urbanisations and it is also evaluated negatively for lack of intrinsic appeal due to a large number of pest species and low aesthetic value. Despite this, it remains the site with the most interest for nature conservation.

Son Verí 1 is the area considered to possess the next most valuable biodiversity interest. This is in part due to its relatively pristine condition and extension but also due to its position within the wider landscape and its intrinsic value. Mallorcan garrigue ecosystems are considered to be of value for their aesthetic and ecosystem service values.

Son Verí 2 is considered of lesser interest, as while it is a similar habitat type and size to Son Verí 1, its condition is inferior. Also, it shows less connectivity to the wider landscape than Son Verí 1.

Finally, the Torrent dels Jueus is a much degraded and much used recreation area. Despite this, it maintains an important conservation interest due to its geographical position. It has a very high potential as a green corridor within and beyond the Palma beach system, as it permits connectivity with the Puig de Randa. This is considered particularly important in improving long term sustainability for animal and plant populations subject to the effects of climate

| Criteria | SF | SV1 | SV2 | TJ |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Fragility | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Rarity | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Size | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Diversity | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Potential valor | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Position | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Representativeness | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Documented history | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Naturalness | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Intrinsic appeal | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 24 | 30 | 36 | 36 |
| Conversion to 5 point evaluation scale | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |

Table 1. Evaluation scores for the four areas. (SF) Ses Fontanelles, (SV1) Upper Son Verí, (SV2) Lower Son Verí, (TJ) Torrent dels Jueus.

Taula 1. Avaluació de les quatre àrees. (SF) Ses Fontanelles, (SV1) Son Verí superior, (SV2) Son Verí baix, (TJ) el Torrent dels Jueus.

change (Grabherr *et al.*, 1994; Burton, 2003; Konvicka *et al.*, 2003).

For a summary of the results, see Table 1. For a detailed breakdown of how the methodology was applied to each site, see Annex 1 to 4.

Discussion

The methodology chosen was primarily concerned with how to successfully bring together information from several criteria and reduce this to a single index of evaluation for biological interest. It is considered that this was achieved with some success. However in performing the analysis, difficulties arose, as the evaluation of some of the criteria, e.g. diversity or potential value require value judgements that must then be converted into numerical measurements. Some comment is made below on the problems considered inherent

in the evaluation of sites based upon the criteria chosen.

Caveats with the methodology

a) Fragility. This is considered the best single measure of conservation value in a natural environment (Nature Conservancy Council, 1989; Nilsson & Grelsson, 1995). However, to adequately evaluate a site's fragility, it is assumed that the dynamics and factors affecting the ecosystem and/or community in question are known. There are many causes of fragility, and each ecosystem will respond differently and natural areas may be vulnerable to change distant from the site itself. Furthermore, the scale utilised refers only to external factors and not the inherent fragility that an ecosystem could possess. Nor does the scale allow for the interaction of a combination of factors, so that for example, the presence of invasive species combined with the disturbance caused by climate change effects could result in a greater level of disturbance than two *other* factors acting together within the same time and space. This enhancement may also be dependent upon type of ecosystem, e.g. a forest may present greater resilience than a marshland (Miller & Hobbs, 2007).

b) Rarity. The definition of rarity is complex and cannot be given without reference to scale; one could refer to genetic rarity, species rarity or habitat rarity (Van de Maarel, 1978). All three were deemed worthy of evaluation in this context. Genetic rarity was assessed via the prioritisation of species that stand alone in their genus, and while this gives no exact quantification of the genetic rarity of the species in question it was considered adequate for this study. The species and habitat rarities were assessed through relating them to current legislation. Thus, if species or habitats were in some way

protected, then they could be evaluated as rare components in the evaluation. However, legislation does not always adequately reflect the true conservation status of species, as often, sufficient data do not exist to evaluate it (Butchard *et al.*, 2005; Good *et al.*, 2006). Further, there may be species present at a site which fail to be registered via the monitoring actions. Thus, this criterion is also a reflection of the survey intensity utilised.

c) Size. This measure plays a major part in determining the ecological interest of an area. A reduction in size of an area (e.g. through fragmentation) can reduce its nature conservation value considerably. Therefore, care must be taken when defining this criterion, as local context is very important. The evaluation scale chosen here reflects the Balearic island context, thus in Mallorca, 32 hectares is considered of moderate extension (Ses Fontanelles). In another context, an area of the same size could be considered small. Further, when defining the criterion, one must take into consideration the conservation interest that one wishes to protect, and minimum viable populations should be considered. Obviously, bears need much larger areas than insects or plants. While the minimum viable area is generally known for the species resident in the study areas, the methodology does not take into account the range requirements of species in a climate change scenario.

d) Diversity. The diversity of a site can refer to (1) species diversity (species richness) and to (2) habitat diversity (richness in habitats, such as dune system, woodland, grassland and marsh). Both low and high diversity have a high nature conservation value under different circumstances. High species diversity would be important for areas such as herb-rich grassland or ancient woodland,

whereas low diversity would be an important attribute for marshland or reed beds. It is not always a question of the greater the diversity the greater the value. Hence, this criterion alone is not an adequate measure of biodiversity value and must be considered alongside other criteria. Moreover, the condition and sustainability of diversity is an important factor to be considered. It is for this reason that a degradation index was incorporated into this evaluation's design. Additionally, the species and habitat diversity indices were based on plant diversity. Resources limited a more extensive sampling of the remaining biota, so it was considered that levels of plant diversity reflect general levels of diversity at a site. However, ideally other groups should be considered.

e) Potential value. Certain sites could, through appropriate management or natural change, develop a greater nature conservation interest. The realisation of this potential is dependent upon a number of factors, such as inclusion in a protected area system and so forth. However, what must also be taken into account are cultural values attributed to species or sites that may vary from region to region. For example, in Peru, medicinal plant resources are considered an important evaluation characteristic (Gavin, 2009), and in Burma, teak (*Tectona grandis*) is considered to be the most important forest resource to be conserved (Blower, 1985).

f) Position within an ecological/geographical unit. As the probability for species survival in fragments has been correlated with the quality of the surrounding matrix (Fischer *et al.*, 2005; Maiorano *et al.*, 2008), the position of the site in relation to the surrounding landscape is considered an important measure of biodiversity value. However, this criterion is again very dependent on species and

context. For example, sites for the conservation of mammals require greater connectivity than those for insects or birds (Beier & Noss, 1998) thus assessment should consider what biodiversity interest is to be conserved when measuring connectivity value.

g) Representativeness. As many other criteria that are ambiguous, it needs an appropriate definition. It could be interpreted as a measure of the distinctiveness of species and habitats in geographic regions. It could also be perceived as a quantification of the extent to which a habitat conforms to a habitat type. Or it could be seen as the extent to which required natural features occur within a habitat (Anderson, 1991). In this study, we used the first definition as we considered that other criteria within the methodology make some assessment of the other two definitions. This may not always be the case, and adjustments may need to be made.

h) Recorded history. The history of a site is important, especially where a site is to be used for research and education. A well documented past with detailed biological and/or natural history records of species and habitat change presents a valuable insight into the ecology of the site, and such information can provide a basis for current and future management. However, the quality of the information must be assessed, so that proposed management actions based on this information have a sound basis.

i) Naturalness. The definition of the naturalness criteria is exceedingly complex, and there can be various definitions: (1) naturalness as that which is part of nature, (2) naturalness as a contrast to artificiality, (3) naturalness as an historical independence from human actions, and (4) naturalness as possession of certain

properties. Further, these criteria could refer to species, habitats or processes (Anderson, 1991). In this study, three of the four definitions are incorporated into the evaluation. However, difficulties arise due to the highly modified nature of European habitats. In Europe, truly natural habitats, i.e. those unmodified by man are exceptionally rare; as the site of many early human civilisations, there has been heavy modification of the Mediterranean landscape during the last 10 000 years (Horden & Purcell, 2000). However, some measurement of naturalness must be made and thus, a historical benchmark is drawn at the advent of industrialisation. It is considered that this was a turning point, and from this date human actions in industrialised nations cease to fit within what can be called natural interaction with the landscape (Ridder, 2007). Therefore, habitats modified before this time are generally accepted to be natural. Son Verí 1, for example, is a classic example of Mediterranean garrigue, a habitat that only developed due to the deforestation of forested areas circa 1600, and as such is considered natural. In other regions of the world this concept of natural would not be accepted (Leard, 2004).

j) Intrinsic appeal. As a measure of the anthropogenic value associated with a species or habitat, this criterion was developed to assess the importance that the site may present to people. Emblematic values, socio-cultural interest, aesthetics and the presence of species perceived as problematic were all included in the evaluation. However, as for the potential value criterion, regional cultural differences must be taken into account, as in one area a component may be considered problematic or worth conserving, while in another the same may not be true. Also, a landscape considered aesthetically pleasing may not

necessarily be associated with any perceivable ecological importance. Indeed, it may be the contrary, such as a landscape full of attractive, exotic plants.

Additional criteria. It is thought that to improve on the methods utilised and to encourage greater relevance to local communities, additional criteria could be developed which directly incorporate stakeholder views. However, it must be remembered that as with aesthetic value, a site valued by stakeholders may not necessarily possess any significant biological interest (Buijs, 2009). Further, other relevant additional criteria could include assessments of sites for their carbon emission/sequestration potential and/or climate regulation function.

Conclusion

In the current socio-politic-economic environment, it is necessary to choose from among remaining natural sites, those that are the most valuable for conservation. Methodologies must therefore be developed that assist the evaluation of different sites. Despite the difficulties encountered in the application of the methodology presented here, it is considered that the Ratcliffe criteria (1977) and the scalings developed for this study were appropriate and useful in the present context. Thus, we elucidated that of the three areas studied in the Palma beach system, Ses Fontanelles is the area with the most biodiversity interest, as the site is deemed to have a medium to high conservation value. Son Verí 1 is considered the site with the next most important biodiversity interest, while Son Verí and the Torrent dels Jueus score equally as having a medium to low biological interest. We hope this information and/or the methodology

developed may be of use to conservationists and urban planners.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to, Juan Miguel González, Xavier Canyelles and David García for their help in the identification of, birds, insects and bats, respectively. We also thank Lleonard Llorens for confirming the name of *Limonium companyonis*, Jaume Reus who assisted in fieldwork and Nick Riddiford and Martin Honey from The Albufera Initiative for Biodiversity for help with moth identification. The project was financed by the Consorcio Playa de Palma.

Bibliography

- Amelung, B. & Viner, D. 2006. Mediterranean tourism: exploring the future with the tourism climatic index. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14: 349-366.
- Amengual, L. & Ramis, X. 2002. Anàlisi de Ses Fontanelles i del seu entorn i propostes d'actuació, planificació i gestió per tal de millorar la qualitat ambiental d'aquest espai. Unpublished report. University of the Islas Balears.
- Anderson, J.E. 1991. A conceptual framework for evaluating and quantifying naturalness. *Conservation Biology*, 5: 347-352.
- Attwell, K. 2000. Urban land resources and urban planting - case studies from Denmark. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 52: 145-163.
- Balaguer, P. 2008. A proposal for boundary delimitation for integrated coastal zone management initiatives. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 51: 806-814.
- Balmford, A., Bruner, A., Cooper, P., Costanza, R., Farber, S., Green, R. E., Jenkins, M., Jefferiss, P., Jessamy, V., Madden, J., Munro, K., Myers, N., Naeem, S., Paavola, J., Rayment, M., Rosendo, S., Roughgraden, J., Trumper, K. & Turner, K. 2002. Economic reasons for conserving wild nature. *Science*. 297: 950-953.
- Beier, P. & Noss, R.F. 1998. Do habitat corridors provide connectivity? *Conservation Biology*, 12 (6): 1241-1252.
- Blower, J. 1985. Conservation priorities in Burma. *Oryx*, 19: 79-85.
- Bolòs, O., 1996. La vegetació de les Illes Balears. Institut Català de Bibliografia.
- Brauer, S. 2003. Money as an indicator: to make use of economic evaluation for biodiversity conservation. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 98 (1-3): 483-491.
- Buijs, A. 2009. Lay people's images of nature: comprehensive frameworks of values, beliefs and value orientations. *Society & natural resources*, 22 (5): 417-432.
- Burton, J.F. 2003. The apparent influence of climatic change on recent changes of range by European insects (Lepidoptera, Orthoptera). *Proceedings of the 13th International Colloquium of the European Invertebrate Survey (EIS)*: 13-21. EIS-Nederland, Leiden.
- Butchart, S. H. M., Stattersfield, A. J., Bennun, L. A., Akçakaya, H. R., Baillie, J. E. M., Stuart, S. N., Hilton-Taylor, C. & Mace, G. M. 2005. Using red list indices to measure progress towards the 2010 target and beyond. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society London B*, 1454: 255-268.
- Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R. V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R. G., Sutton, P. & vandenBelt, M. 1997. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387: 253-260.
- Czech, B. 2004. A chronological frame of reference for ecological integrity and natural conditions. *Natural Resources Journal*, 44: 1113-1136.
- Daily, C. G. 1997. Nature's services. Island Press, Washington. DC.
- De Groot, R. S. 1992. Functions of nature in environmental planning, management and decision making. Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen.
- de la Cruz Caravaca, M. T., Balaguer Siquier J. & Hernando Costa, J. 2001. Suelos

- desarrollados sobre arenas residuales y arenas eólicas en Mallorca. *Edafología*, 8: 35-39.
- de la Cruz, M. 2009. 1510 Estepas salinas mediterráneas (Limonietales). *In: Bases ecológicas preliminares para la conservación de los tipos de hábitat de interés comunitario en España*. Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, y Medio Rural y Marino. 78 p.
- Ehrenfeld, D. W. 1976. The conservation of non-resources. *American Scientist*, 64: 648-656.
- Eliasson, I. 2000. The use of climate knowledge in urban planning, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 48: 31-44.
- Eptisa, 1999. El plan hidrológico de las Islas Baleares. Eptisa.
- Everett, R. D. 1978. Conservational evaluation and recreational importance of wildlife within a forestry area. PhD. thesis, University of York.
- Fischer, T. 2005. Making the matrix matter: challenges in Australian grazing landscapes. *Biodiversity and conservation*, 14 (3): 561-578.
- Font Obrador, B. 1972. Historia de Lluçmajor. Mallorca.
- Gavin, E. 2009. Conservation implications of rainforest use patterns: mature forests provide more resources but secondary forests supply more medicine. *The Journal of Applied Ecology*. 46: 1275-1282.
- Gehlbach, F. R. 1975. Investigation, evaluation and priority ranking of natural areas. *Biological Conservation*, 8: 79-88.
- Gerowitt, B., Isselstein, J., & Marggraf, R. 2003. Rewards for ecological goods - requirements and perspectives for agricultural land use. *Agriculture Systems and Environment*, 98: 541-547.
- Gómez, F. Tamarit, N. & Jabaloyes, J. 2001. Green zones, bioclimatic studies and human comfort in the future development of urban planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 55: 151-161.
- Good, T. C., Zjhra, M. L. & Kremen, C. 2006. Addressing data deficiency in classifying extinction risk: a case study of a radiation of *Bignoniaceae* from Madagascar. *Conservation Biology*, 20 (4): 1099-1110.
- Grabherr, G., Gottfried, M. & Pauli, H. 1994. Climate effects on mountain plants. *Nature*, 369: 448-448.
- Helliwell, D. R. 1969. Valuation of wildlife resources. *Regional Studies*, 3: 41-47.
- IBESTAT 2008. Las Illes Balears en cifras 2008. Govern de les Illes Balears.
- Khan, Z. & Traveset, A. 2009. Biodiversidad terrestre. *In: La Adaptación al cambio climático y la preservación de ecosistemas naturales, terrestres y marinos en el marco del proyecto estratégico de recalificación integral de la Playa de Palma*. Unpublished report. IMEDEA. 74p.
- Holden, P., & Purcell, N. 2000. *The corrupting sea: A study of Mediterranean history*. Blackwell. UK.
- Konvicka, M., Maradova, M., Benes, J., Fric, Z. & Kepka, P. 2003. Uphill shifts in distribution of butterflies in the Czech Republic: effects of changing climate detected on a regional scale. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 12: 403-410.
- Kumari, K. 1994. thesis, University of East Anglia, Norwich, discussed in Balmford et al., (2002), Economic reasons for conserving wild nature, *Science*, 297: 950.
- Leard, J. A. 2004. MA Thesis, University of North Texas. Ethics naturally: an environmental ethic based on naturalness.
- Maioranao, F. 2008. Size-dependent resistance of protected areas to land-use change. *Proceedings - Royal Society. Biological sciences*. 275: 1297-1304.
- Margules, C. & Usher, M. B. 1981. Criteria used in assessing wildlife conservation potential: A review. *Biological Conservation*, 21: 79-109.
- McCauley, P. 2006. Selling out on nature. *Nature*, 443: 27-28.
- Millard, A. 2000. The potential role of natural colonisation as a design tool for urban forestry - a pilot study, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 52: 173-179.
- Miller, J & Hobbs, R. J. 2007. Habitat Restoration? Do We Know What We're Doing?. *Restoration Ecology*, 15 : 382-390.

- Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., da Fonseca, G. A. B. & Kent, J. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature*, 403: 853-858.
- Nature Conservancy Council. 1989. Guidelines for the selection of biological SSSIs. Nature Conservancy Council, Peterborough, UK.
- Nilsson, A. 1995. The fragility of ecosystems. *The Journal of Applied Ecology*, 32: 677-692.
- Promallorca. 1991. Gran enciclopedia de Mallorca. Volumen XV.
- Ratcliffe, D. A. 1977. A nature conservation review, Cambridge University Press.
- Regan, T. 1981. The nature and possibility of environmental ethics. *Environmental Ethics*, 3: 19-34.
- Ridder, S. 2007. An exploration of the value of naturalness and wild nature. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*. 20 (2): 195-213.
- Rouquette, J. R., Postumus, H., Gowing, D. J. G., Tucker, G., Dawson, Q. L., Hess, T. M. & Morris, J. 2009. Valuing nature-conservation interests on agricultural floodplains *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 46: 289-296.
- Sathirathai, S. 1998. Economic valuation of mangroves and the roles of local communities in the conservation of natural resources: case study of Surat Thani, south of Thailand. Unpublished report, Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia, Singapore.
- Serra, P., Pons, X. & Saurí, D. 2008. Land-cover and land-use change in a Mediterranean landscape: a spatial analysis of driving forces integrating biophysical and human factors. *Applied Geography*, 28: 189-209.
- Taylor, P. W. 1986. Respect for nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics. Princeton University Press.
- UNESCO. 1974. Task force on criteria and guidelines for the choice and establishment of biosphere reserves. *MAB Report No. 22*. Paris, UNESCO.
- Van der Maarel, E. 1978. Ecological principles for physical planning. In: Holdgate, M. J. & Woodman, M. J. (eds.). *The breakdown and restoration of ecosystems*, 413-50. Ed. New York, Plenum Press.
- Van der Ploeg, S. W. F. & Vlijm, L. 1978. Ecological evaluation, nature conservation and land use planning with particular reference to methods used in the Netherlands. *Biological Conservation*, 14: 197-221.
- West 8, 2009. Plan director de reconversión integral de la Platja de Palma. Unpublished report. 74p.
- Woodroffe, R., Thirgood, S. & Rabinowitz, A. 2005. People and wildlife, conflict or co-existence? Cambridge University Press. New York.

Annex 1. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of Ses Fontanelles according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).

Annex 1. *Avaluació de Ses Fontanelles d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Ses Fontanelles | Score | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------|------------|-------|--------------------------|------------------|---|---|--------------------|----------------------|---|---|--------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---------|---|---|-----------------------|---------|---|---|------------------------|---------|---|---|--------------------------|---------|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|----------------------|---|---|--------------------------|----------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|---|---|---|-------|----|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Fragility | Maintenance of the system is dependent on the hydrological regime. 2 The area suffers high urban development pressure. 2 Predicted impacts of climate change expected to affect salinity and water levels. 2 Large number (>20) of invasive species. 2 | I (highly fragile) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rarity | Sum of scores: 8 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Species or Habitat</th> <th>Level of protection</th> <th>Uniqueness</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Limonium barceloi</i></td> <td>3 IUCN RL Critic</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Tamarix</i> spp</td> <td>1 Balearic Catalogue</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Ardeola ralloides</i></td> <td>2 National Catalogue</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Chlidonias niger</i></td> <td>2 National Catalogue</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Circus aeruginosus</i></td> <td>2 CITES</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Circus cyaneus</i></td> <td>2 CITES</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Falco eleonorae</i></td> <td>2 CITES</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Falco tinnunculus</i></td> <td>2 CITES</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Numenius arquata</i></td> <td>2 National Catalogue</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Rallus aquaticus</i></td> <td>1 Balearic Catalogue</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Tringa totanus</i></td> <td>1 Balearic Catalogue</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Vanellus vanellus</i></td> <td>1 Balearic Catalogue</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>L. habitat</i> (de la Cruz, 2009)</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>S. fruticosae</i> (Bolòs, 1996)</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>26</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Species or Habitat | Level of protection | Uniqueness | Score | <i>Limonium barceloi</i> | 3 IUCN RL Critic | 1 | 3 | <i>Tamarix</i> spp | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 1 | <i>Ardeola ralloides</i> | 2 National Catalogue | 1 | 1 | <i>Chlidonias niger</i> | 2 National Catalogue | 1 | 2 | <i>Circus aeruginosus</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | <i>Circus cyaneus</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | <i>Falco eleonorae</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | <i>Falco tinnunculus</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | <i>Numenius arquata</i> | 2 National Catalogue | 1 | 2 | <i>Rallus aquaticus</i> | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 2 | <i>Tringa totanus</i> | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 2 | <i>Vanellus vanellus</i> | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 2 | <i>L. habitat</i> (de la Cruz, 2009) | - | - | 2 | <i>S. fruticosae</i> (Bolòs, 1996) | - | - | 1 | TOTAL | 26 | | | II (Relatively rare components) |
| Species or Habitat | Level of protection | Uniqueness | Score | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Limonium barceloi</i> | 3 IUCN RL Critic | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Tamarix</i> spp | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Ardeola ralloides</i> | 2 National Catalogue | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Chlidonias niger</i> | 2 National Catalogue | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Circus aeruginosus</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Circus cyaneus</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Falco eleonorae</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Falco tinnunculus</i> | 2 CITES | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Numenius arquata</i> | 2 National Catalogue | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Rallus aquaticus</i> | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Tringa totanus</i> | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Vanellus vanellus</i> | 1 Balearic Catalogue | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>L. habitat</i> (de la Cruz, 2009) | - | - | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>S. fruticosae</i> (Bolòs, 1996) | - | - | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Size | Area en hectares Approx. 32.8 | III (Moderate extension in this context) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Diversity | 220 plant species. Species per hectare: 5.5. Relevant score: 3 At least 6 dominant plant communities. Community per hectare: 0.15. Relevant score: 3. Sum of scores 6. | II (Some important diversity components) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential value | Part of the site will be included in the protected area system via the designation of an "ABC" or Critical Biological Area. 1 Would be a unique component in the local landscape matrix. 2 Could provide excellent opportunities for nature conservation education, due to its biodiversity and location. 2. Sum of scores: 5 | II (Reasonably high potential value) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Position within the Ecological or Geographical unit | A relatively isolated fragment of natural space, bordered by two main roads and a motorway. An airport is located close by and the remainder of the immediate area is heavily urbanised. There is currently little potential for connectivity. 4 | IV (Little potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Representativeness | As the only remaining fragment of a much larger wetland extension, the area is considered to present highly important representativeness components. | I (Very important typical components) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recorded History | The first mention of the area now known as Ses Fontanelles, could possibly date back to the year 1144, when reference is made to a small cala next to Sant Jordi. Later, in the 16 th century mention is made of the lagoons of Sant Jordi which almost certainly include the areas of Ses Fontanelles and there is some detail of the plant and animal communities present at that time (Amengual & Ramis, 2002). Since then, the zone continues to reappear in historical literature and was the site of a great public drainage project. Later, in the 20 th century there are a number of historic photos and documents for the area. | II (Good documentation available dating back to more than 100 years) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Annex 1. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of Ses Fontanelles according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).

Annex 1. *Avaluació de Ses Fontanelles d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Ses Fontanelles | Score |
|------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Naturalness | High level of human influence. 1 Medium number of native species. 2 High level of degradation. 1 Sum of scores: 4 | III (Some notable natural components) |
| Intrinsic Appeal | Some habitats of emblematic value. 2 Some species of emblematic value. 2 Two or more problematic species. 1 Low aesthetic value due to presence of refuse. 1 High socio cultural interest in site due to location. 3 Sum of scores: 6 | IV (Little intrinsic appeal) |
| TOTAL | | 24 |

Annex 2. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of Son Verí 1 according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).

Annex 2. *Avaluació de Son Verí 1 d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Son Verí 1 | Score |
|--|---|--|
| Fragility | The area suffers some recreational pressure. 1 Sum of scores: 1 | IV (Some fragility) |
| Rarity | Species or Habitat TOTAL | IV (Some rare components involved) |
| Size | Area en hectares Approx. 24 hectares | III (Moderate extension in this context) |
| Diversity | 84 plant species. Species per hectare: 3.5. Relevant score: 2 At least 3 dominant plant communities. Community per hectare: 0.125. Relevant score: 3 | III (Some notable diversity components) |
| Potential value | Sum of scores 5. Would be a unique component in the local landscape matrix. 1 Could provide a green corridor function. 2 Could provide excellent opportunities for nature conservation education, due to its biodiversity and location. 1 Sum of scores: 4 | III (Some important potential value components) |
| Position within the Ecological/Geographical Unit | Bordered on one side by a main road, there exist few other boundaries that cause to separate the area from the surrounding landscape matrix, which extends far beyond the Palma Beach System. While most of this matrix is agricultural land, Son Verí includes a torrential stream which provides connectivity with the area around the Puig de Randa. | II (High potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix) |
| Representativeness | The habitats found here are those usually associated with Mediterranean scrubland landscapes and as such are considered to be very typical. However, as they are principally the result of the anthropogenic degradation of <i>Quercus</i> forests, their presence is relatively recent, dating back to 5 000 years maximum. | II (Some important typical components) |

Annex 2. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of on Verí 1 according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).
Annex 2. *Avaluació de Son Verí 1 d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Son Verí 1 | Score |
|------------------|--|--|
| Recorded history | First mention of Son Verí dates back to the year 1563 when the site was referred to as part of a much larger traditional farm holding with the same name. There is some historical inventory of farm animals and crops managed on the land. (Font, 1972) | IV (Some documentation available about recent history) |
| Naturalness | High level of human influence. 1 Medium number of native species. 2 High level of degradation. 1 Sum of scores: 4 | III (Some notable natural components) |
| Intrinsic Appeal | Some habitats of emblematic value. 2 Some species of emblematic value. 2 No problematic species. 3 High aesthetic value. 3 High socio cultural interest in site due to location. 2 Sum of scores: 12 | II (Important intrinsic appeal) |
| TOTAL | | 30 |

Annex 3. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of Son Verí 2 according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).
Annex 3. *Avaluació de Son Verí 2 d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Son Verí 2 | Score |
|--|--|--|
| Fragility | The area suffers recreational pressure. 2 Presence of invasive species. 1 Sum of scores: 3 | IV (Fragile) |
| Rarity | No rare components found | V (No rare species or habitats present) |
| Size | Area en hectares Approx. 59 hectares | II (Reasonably sized extension in this context) |
| Diversity | Could provide a green corridor function. 1 Could provide excellent opportunities for nature conservation education, due to its biodiversity and location. 1 Sum of scores: 2 | IV (Some important potential value) |
| Potential value | Bordered on three sides by roads, a housing urbanisation and a sports centre, the area has little direct connection with the surrounding landscape matrix although two underground concrete tunnels connect Son Verí 1 and 2. | III (Potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix) |
| Position within the Ecological/Geographical Unit | The habitats found here are those usually associated with Mediterranean scrubland landscapes and as such are considered to be very typical. However, as they are principally the result of the anthropogenic degradation of <i>Quercus</i> forests, their presence is relatively recent, dating back to 5 000 years maximum. | IV (Some typical components) |
| Representativeness | Could provide a green corridor function. 1 Could provide excellent opportunities for nature conservation education, due to its biodiversity and location. 1 Sum of scores: 2 | IV (Some important potential value) |

Annex 3. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of on Verí 1 according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).
Annex 3. *Avaluació de Son Verí 1 d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Son Verí 2 | Score |
|------------------|---|--|
| Recorded history | First mention of Son Verí dates back to the year 1563 when the site was referred to as part of a much larger traditional farm holding with the same name. There is some historical inventory of farm animals and crops managed on the land (Font, 1972). | IV (Some documentation available about recent history) |
| Naturalness | High level of human influence. 2 Medium number of native species. 2 High level of degradation. 3 Sum of scores: 7 | III (Some notable natural components) |
| Intrinsic Appeal | Some habitats of emblematic value. 2 Some species of emblematic value. 2 Presence of problematic species such as numerous invasive species. 1 High aesthetic value. 1 High socio cultural interest in site due to location. 3 Sum of scores: 9 | III) (Some notable intrinsic appeal) |
| TOTAL | | 36 |

Annex 4. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of Torrent des Jueus according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).

Annex 4. *Avaluació de Torrent des Jueus d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Son Verí 2 | Score |
|--|--|--|
| Fragility | The area suffers recreational pressure. 1 Presence of invasive species. 2 Sum of scores: 3 | III (Fragile) |
| Rarity | No rare components found | V (No rare species or habitats present) |
| Size | Area en hectares Approx. 28 hectares | IV(Reasonably small extension in this context) |
| Diversity | 80 plant species. Species per hectare: 2.857. Relevant score: 2 At least 2 dominant plant communities. Community per hectare: 0.07. Relevant score: 2 Sum of scores 4. | III (Some notable diversity components) |
| Potential value | Could provide a green corridor function. 2 Could provide excellent opportunities for nature conservation education, due to its biodiversity and location. 2 Sum of scores: 4 | III (important potential value) |
| Position within the Ecological/Geographical Unit | While bordered by urbanisations, thus limiting connectivity within the Palma beach system, the upper tract of the torrent connects to the lower reaches of the Puig de Randa. | II (High potential to be united to the wider landscape matrix) |

Annex 4. Evaluation of the biodiversity value of on Verí 1 according to the Ratcliffe criteria (1977).

Annex 4. *Avaluació de Son Verí 1 d'acord amb els criteris Ratcliffe (1977).*

| Criteria | Son Verí 2 | Score |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Representativeness | Despite being a torrent, there exists little of the vegetation normally associated with this habitat. A high number of invasive species are present and this combined with the large number of common nitrophilic species means that this zone maintains little that could be termed typical. | V (No typical components) |
| Recorded history | Some information available in local history documentation (Promallorca, 1991). | IV (Some documentation available about recent history) |
| Naturalness | High level of human influence. 1 Medium number of native species. 2 High level of degradation. 0 Sum of scores: 3 | IV (Few natural components) |
| Intrinsic Appeal | Some habitats of emblematic value. 1 Some species of emblematic value. 1 Presence of problematic species such as numerous invasive species. 1 High aesthetic value. 2 High socio cultural interest in site due to location. 3 Sum of scores: 8 | III) (Some notable intrinsic appeal) |
| TOTAL | | 36 |