

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