

# Index

## A — B

- adaptive management
  - in ag landscapes, 3, 13, 51
  - for conservation programs, 149–152
  - overview, 6, 148–149
  - and policymakers, 21
  - and response timing, 146
  - state agency perspective, 180
  - using existing data, 152
- agriculture
  - environmental impact of, 27
  - landscapes, 4
  - management, 18, 28–30
  - sustainability, 5
- air quality benefit-cost analyses, 94
- alternative futures, 135–136
- animal feeding operations, concentrated, 178
- antibiotic resistance, 5
- applicant pool, 95, 98
- aquatic communities, 121–122, 126
- benefit-cost analyses, 22, 92, 94, 98, 99
- best management practices
  - adoption of, 18–19
  - Chesapeake Bay Program, 163–169
  - P and sediment loads, 34, 36
  - wetland restoration, 31
- bid-based payments, 99
- bidding systems, 38, 98–101
- biodiversity conservation, 78–79
- biogeochemical processes, 11, 32, 33, 67–69, 70
- biological contamination, 5
- biophysical science
  - data dilemma, 52–53
  - disproportionality, 109
  - integration with social sciences, 17–20
  - in targeted management, 90–91
- biotic response, 16
- buffers
  - conservation, 73–76
  - riparian, 118–121, 128–129, 152
- applying lessons, 165–167
- background, 160–163
- lessons learned, 163–165
- managing nutrient discharge, 117
- climate, 5, 13, 30, 119
- concentrated animal feeding operations, 178
- conceptual challenges, 7–9
- conflicts, evaluating, 4
- conservation buffers, 73–76
- conservation dollars, 38
- conservation effectiveness
  - at landscape-scale, 130–131, 134
  - monitoring, 145
- Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP)
  - and environmental management research, 30
  - goals of, 51
  - large-scale, long-term, 10
  - linkage to ecological context, 37
  - as monitoring model, 8
  - NRCS perspective, 181–182
  - social factor absent, 18–19
- conservation efficiency, 75–76
- conservation management and technological innovations, 53–54
- conservation planning, cooperative, 7
- conservation plans, execution of, 55–56
- conservation practices
  - adoption by landowners, 38, 40, 105–107
  - agricultural pollution, 7
  - and biotic response, 16
  - significant unknowns, 153–155
- conservation programs
  - adaptive management for, 149–152
  - benefit-cost analyses, 22
  - and ecosystem services, 13
  - enrollment, 92–95
  - landscape-scale, 8
  - public-funded, 7–8
- Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), 32
- Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)
  - and bidding, 100–101
  - cornerstone policy, 122–123
  - cost-share program, 38
  - effects on wildlife and habitat, 127–128
  - and public benefit, 18
  - public-funded, 7–8
- Conservation Security Program (CSP), 22, 38

## C

carbon sequestration, 38–40, 41

chemical contamination, 5

Chesapeake Bay Program

adaptive management-based program, 12–13

conservation vs. restoration, 115–116  
 contaminants, 5, 124–126  
 contents approach, 6, 17–18  
 context approach, 6, 17–18  
 cooperative conservation planning, 7  
 cost-benefit analyses. *see* benefit-cost analyses  
 cost-effectiveness, 8, 81, 92  
 cost-share programs, 38  
 culture (social), 19  
 cumulative effects, 128–129

## D – E

data coverage, 44, 51, 57–59  
 decision-making for effective restoration, 136–137  
 demography, 19  
 digital watershed, 11  
 disproportionality, 40–42, 104–110  
 drinking water, 5  
 DRIP syndrome, 53  
 ecohydrologic models, 11  
 ecological recovery, 129, 130  
 ecological restoration  
   aquatic communities, 121–122  
   cumulative effects, 128–129  
   future directions, 131–137  
   pollutants and wastes, 117–121  
   response time, 123–128, 130–131  
   riparian buffers, 118–121  
   terrestrial wildlife, 122–123  
   water chemistry, 117  
   water temperature, 116–117  
 ecological systems interaction with social sciences, 18–20  
 economics  
   costs, 64  
   growth, 19  
   tools, 69, 72–73  
   values, 3–4, 16, 129, 134  
 ecoregions, 72  
 ecosystem services approach  
   ag environmental performance, 7  
   biologically-based, 11  
   and information content, 21  
   landscape-scale, 13  
   overview, 3–4  
   for planning, 10  
   resonance with public, 16  
 ecosystems, 5, 7  
 environmental behavior, 105–107  
 environmental benefits, 16

Environmental Benefits Index (EBI), 94–95, 97–98, 100–101  
 environmental conservation, targeted, 65  
 environmental damage, quantification of, 4  
 environmental impacts of agriculture, 5, 9, 27  
 environmental interconnectedness, 10  
 environmental management, new approaches to, 30–37  
 Environmental Mapping and Analysis Program (EMAP), 10  
 environmental observations, 9–11  
 Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), 38, 100–101  
 Evoland, 136  
 experiments, 29, 119–120

## F – H

farm policy, 31  
 farm-scale approaches, 18, 28–29, 132–133  
 farmers, stereotypical, 105–107  
 feedback loops, 31  
 field-scale approaches, 28–29  
 filter strips, 119  
 financial incentives, 38, 92, 97–98  
 flooding, 5  
 functional assessment techniques, 31–32, 33  
 funding, public, 7–8, 182  
 geographic scalability, 29–30  
 geomorphic data, 153  
 geospatial data, 42, 52–53, 68–69  
 geostatistical techniques, 153–154  
 goods and services, nonmarket, 3–4  
 gradient analysis, 153–154  
 Greencover Program, 8, 18  
 groundwater, 124–126  
 habitat. *see also* wildlife  
   aquatic, 121–122, 126  
   functional attribute, 33  
   loss of, 5  
   targeted management, 71–73, 74–76  
   time lag in ecological response, 121–122, 126, 127–128  
 heterogeneity of landscapes, 27, 64  
 hierarchy, 6, 8, 17  
 historical trajectories, 6, 18, 135  
 human behavior, 37, 105–107  
 human health, 5  
 hydrology. *see also* water quality  
   and climate effects, 119

functional attribute, 33  
 hydrologic observatories, 11  
 linking with biology, 10–12  
 sensitive areas, 76–77  
 timing of ecological response, 145  
 wetland restoration, 31–32, 33

## I – L

Illinois Conservation Reserves Enhancement Program, 8  
 incentives, financial, 38, 92, 97–98  
 information exchange, 19  
 innovations for effective restoration, 132–133  
 knowledge exchange, 19  
 Lake Decatur, 173–175  
 land management, targeted. *see* targeted land management  
 land ownership, 129, 131–132  
 land retirement, 38  
 landscape-scale approaches  
   C sequestration, 38–40, 41  
   conservation effectiveness, 130–131, 134  
   disproportionalities, 40–42  
   integrated, 43  
   new approach, 29–30  
   nitrate management, 32–34, 35  
   P management, 34, 36  
   sediment loads, 34, 36  
   state agency perspective, 179  
   water quality, 38–40, 41  
   wildlife management, 36–37  
 landscapes  
   ag dependent on, 27–28  
   ecology, 4–6, 7, 8, 10, 72  
   heterogeneity, 27, 64  
   interconnectedness, 80  
   legacies, 6, 130  
   linking to streams, 70–71  
   management, 173–182  
 legacies, landscape, 6, 130  
 legislation, 65  
 level of payment, 92  
 linkages of trust, 70  
 long-term experiments  
   landscape-scale approach, 30  
   for model testing, 51  
   multi-year monitoring, 36  
   multiple-scale, 52–53  
   outcome assessment, 46  
   responses, 145

longevity of processes, 18  
 Longterm Ecological Research network (LTER), 12, 19

## M

Management Systems Evaluation Areas (MSEA), 30  
 manures, 118  
 marketing, 16  
 measurements, 3, 9, 21. *see also* scale  
 methodology, 42–46, 51  
 models  
   adoption of conservation practices, 39–40  
   Chesapeake Bay Program, 12–13  
   complexity of, 16  
   data coverage, 43–46  
   to define alternative futures, 135  
   ecohydrologic, 11  
   for environmental observations, 11–12  
   incorporating social science, 12  
   limitations of current, 51  
   multiple future scenarios, 151  
   new approaches, 52–53  
   optimization algorithms, 45–46  
   policy-relevant choices, 44–45  
   for prioritizing conservation programs, 8  
   quality of, 12  
   regional, 8–9  
   scale of, 13  
   uncertainty, 45  
   user specific, 57–59  
   water quality, 68–69  
 modifiable area unit problem, 6  
 monitoring  
   biogeochemical processes, 67–69  
   Chesapeake Bay Program, 12–13  
   conservation effectiveness, 145  
   content and context, 17–18  
   for effective restoration, 133  
   landscape ecological approaches, 4–6  
   long-term, 36, 146  
   for prioritizing conservation programs, 8  
   regional, 8–9  
   scale of, 13  
   and spatial location, 17  
   types of, 148–149  
   water quality, 36

**N – O**

National Agri-Environmental Health Analysis and Reporting Program (NAHARP), 10  
 National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), 12  
 national park system, 65  
 National Water Quality Assessment program (NAWQA), 10  
 Natural Resources Conservation Service, 181–182  
 The Nature Conservancy (TNC), 78–79  
 nature preserves, 72  
 nitrates  
   local stakeholder’s perspective, 173–174  
   management, 32–34, 35  
   time lag in ecological response, 124–126  
 nitrogen cycle, 136–137  
 nongovernmental organizations, 38  
 nonmarket goods and services, 3–4  
 nutrient management, 28, 30–31  
 nutrient responses, 124–126, 128–129  
 optimization algorithms, 45–46  
 outcome assessment, 46, 52–53

**P**

paired comparisons, 152  
 park system, national, 65  
 performance-based payments, 98–99, 102  
 perspectives  
   local stakeholder, 173–177  
   Natural Resources Conservation Service, 181–182  
   policymaker, 181–182  
   state agency, 178–180  
 pesticides, 118  
 pharmaceuticals, veterinary, 118  
 phosphorus  
   cycle, 145  
   ecological restoration, 117–118  
   management, 34, 36  
   soil-test as targeting criteria, 77–78  
 physical contamination, 5  
 pilot projects, 22  
 place-based approach, 9, 17  
 planning  
   for effective restoration, 134–136  
   for environmental observations, 9–10  
   local, 65  
 plot-based approaches, 28  
 policy

cumulative effects, 129  
 industrial vs. agricultural, 152  
 relevant choices for models, 44–45  
 in targeted management, 90–91  
 tools, 18  
 policymakers  
   educating, 16  
   perspectives of, 181–182  
   role in ecological response, 145  
   targeting water quality, 69  
   what can science provide, 21–23  
 politics, 19, 81  
 pollutants, 7, 64, 117–121  
 practice-based payments, 98, 102  
 precision of targeted management, 80  
 private benefits, 18  
 producer application, 93–94  
 public benefits, 18  
 public goods, 22  
 public perception, 21

**R**

regional-scale approaches, 8–9, 13, 134  
 regionalization, 32–37  
 regulation, 38  
 request for proposals (RFP), 93  
 research strategies. *see also* methodology  
   integrated, 19–20  
   new approaches, 30–37  
   traditional approaches, 28–30  
 Resilience Alliance, 19  
 restoration vs. conservation, 115–116  
 riparian buffers, 118–121, 128–129, 152  
 risk effects, 97  
 river navigation, 5  
 runoff, 10

**S**

sampling strategies, 9, 29, 56  
 scalability, geographic, 29–30  
 scale  
   compatibility, 43–44  
   in ecosystem analysis, 6  
   landscape, 13  
   in landscape ecology, 8  
   linking, 8  
   of measurements, 3  
   need for multiple, 52–53

- public vs. private benefits, 18
- regional, 8–9
- scaling up or down, 54–55
- of targeted management, 81
- sediment loads, 34, 36, 173–174
- sensor networks, 42–43, 52–53
- social institutions, 19
- social science
  - disproportionality, 109
  - incorporation in models, 12
  - integration with biophysical sciences, 17–20
  - interaction with ecological systems, 18–20
  - privacy issues, 9
  - in targeted management, 90–91
- societal benefits, 7
- socioeconomic component
  - data, 16, 52–53
  - integration with biophysical component, 37–42
  - new approaches, 30
  - and practice adoption, 97
  - of targeted management, 81
- soil erosion, 5, 65, 94
- soil fertility, 5
- soil tests, 77–78
- spatial arrangement, 5–6
- spatial variance, 6, 17
- spillovers, 18
- state-and-transition, 80
- State of the Nation's Ecosystems*, 53
- streams, 70–71
- surrogate indicators, 16
- sustainability, 5
- systems approaches, 30–33
- systems orientation, 29

## T

- targeted land management
  - based on soil-test P, 77–78
  - biodiversity conservation, 78–79
  - case for, 64
  - challenges for future, 79–80
  - conservation buffers, 73–76
  - definition, 63–64
  - disproportionality, 109–110
  - evolving concept, 65–66
  - hydrologically sensitive areas, 76–77
  - policymaker's perspective, 181–182
  - precision, 80
  - terrestrial habitat for wildlife, 71–73

- water quality protection, 66–71
- technology
  - changes in, 19
  - innovations, 53–54
  - targeted management, 67–69, 72
- terrain indices, 42
- thresholds, 80, 154
- time lags, 118, 123–128
- timeframes, 130–131, 146
- tipping points, 18, 80
- tradeoffs, 4, 22, 38, 99–100
- trading programs, 38
- trajectories
  - ecological restoration, 145
  - historical, 6, 18, 135
  - influencing, 146
- trophic structures, 18

## U – W

- uncertainties, 45, 153–155
- uniform payments, 38, 97–98
- users, profiling, 57–59
- variance, spatial, 6
- veterinary pharmaceuticals, 118
- volunteerism, 38
- Walnut Creek monitoring project, 125–126
- waste management systems, 132–133
- water chemistry, 117
- water quality. *see also* Chesapeake Bay Program
  - benefit-cost analyses, 94
  - and climate effects, 119
  - crises, 7
  - monitoring, 36
  - socioeconomic challenge, 38–40
  - targeted management, 65, 66–71, 73–74
  - temperature, 116–117, 124
- water supply, 5
- WATERS Network, 11
- Watershed Evaluation of Beneficial Management Practices (WEBs), 8
- watersheds
  - digital, 11
  - integrated models, 43
  - management, 174–177
  - paired comparisons, 36
  - scale approaches, 35, 130–131
- wetlands, 65
  - restoration, 31–32, 33
- wildlife management
  - benefit-cost analyses, 94

larger scale, 36–37  
targeted management, 65, 122–123, 127–128  
traditional approaches, 28–29  
willingness to accept, 95–97, 98, 99, 102

winning, 92–95  
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources,  
178–180  
World Wildlife Fund (WWF), 78