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Introduction

This inventory and status report is part of an ongoing initiative to create and expand the Practitioners’ Network for Large Landscape Conservation throughout North America. It may also be used to promote, support, and advance large landscape conservation in the Rocky Mountain West.

The Practitioners’ Network is an informal group of individuals and organizations committed to addressing the most important land and water issues facing North America—including land use patterns, water management, biodiversity protection, and climate adaptation. Realizing that these issues need to be addressed at several spatial scales simultaneously, ranging from the local to the global, participants in the Practitioners’ Network believe that it is increasingly imperative to address them at the scale of large landscapes.

Launched in 2011, the Practitioners’ Network provides a place where practitioners can exchange information, share best practices, promote and support policy, and build a national constituency to advance large landscape conservation. Participation in the network is voluntary, and there is no formal membership structure. To date, nearly 500 people have participated in meetings, projects, and activities of the Practitioners’ Network, including staff and directors of large landscape conservation initiatives, non-governmental organizations, government agencies, universities, businesses, and philanthropic foundations.

One of the inspirations for creating the Practitioners’ Network is the Land Trust Alliance, which provides a range of valuable services to members and affiliates. Like the Practitioners’ Network, the Land Trust Alliance was catalyzed via the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. In the case of large landscape conservation, the questions of what is or is not a large landscape and who is or is not a large landscape conservation practitioner make it more difficult to determine the target audience.

According to Large Landscape Conservation: A Strategic Framework for Policy and Action¹, large landscape conservation initiatives can be defined by three criteria: (1) multi-jurisdictional—the issues being addressed cut across political and jurisdictional boundaries; (2) multi-purpose—they address a mix of related issues, including but not limited to environment, economy, and community; and (3) multi-stakeholder—they include public, private, and nongovernmental actors. While these criteria help define what is or is not a large landscape conservation initiative, it is important to realize that initiatives meeting these criteria come in various sizes—from less than 10,000 acres to nearly 500 million acres.

Using this rubric, various partners have stepped forward to help build the Practitioners’ Network by completing an inventory and map of “who is doing what” with respect to large landscape conservation in different regions across the continent. Existing and proposed regional inventories are depicted in Figure 1.
Regional Plan Association completed an inventory for the Northeast region of the United States in 2012. It can be viewed at www.rpa.org/northeastlandscapes and includes information on 165 initiatives across 13 states; The Conservation Fund is interested in working with other partners to create an atlas for the Great Plains and Midwest region; and The Center for Natural Resources & Environmental Policy at The University of Montana has prepared this atlas for the Rocky Mountain Region.

This region-by-region approach is driven in part by limited resources. However, it allows people who know these distinct regions to compile and assess the state-of-practice within each region and to clarify the most significant differences among these larger regions. **The ultimate goal is to create a continental picture of the practice of large landscape conservation in North America. This continental inventory and mapping will not only identify who is doing what, but also clarify where there may be opportunities to work together, fill gaps, and prioritize investments.** The region-by-region inventories are also critical in building the Practitioners’ Network by helping identify and connect practitioners to transfer lessons, share tools and resources, and support appropriate policy initiatives.
Rocky Mountain West:
Defining Characteristics

To understand the nature and status of large landscape conservation in the Rocky Mountain West (the eight states of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming), it is helpful to clarify some of the region’s defining characteristics. Perhaps the two features that most distinguish the Rocky Mountain West are water and federal lands.

In the first instance, water—or more accurately the lack thereof—provides the ultimate unity for the Rocky Mountain West. More than any other region of the continent, this region is defined by a lack of water. Figure 2 highlights the average annual precipitation within each state.

However, the Rocky Mountain West also contains the headwaters of many of the continent’s major river systems—including the Columbia, Missouri/Mississippi, Rio Grande, and Colorado—as well as the driest parts of the country—the Mojave, Sonoran, Great Basin, and Chihuahua deserts. Water has always been a vital, scarce, and variable resource in the Rocky Mountain West, the source of both conflict and community.

As illustrated by Figure 3, water has been the focus of several large landscape conservation efforts throughout the American West—in this case, taking the very formal nature of interstate water compacts and international treaties. There is much to learn from these experiences given what is at stake and the comity in which these water compacts were developed.

The second distinguishing feature of the Rocky Mountain West is that much of the region is owned by the federal government and managed as public land, including national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and multiple-use public lands. Figure 4 illustrates the percent of federal public land by state in the American West.
Figure 4: Federal Land Ownership as a Percent of Total Land Area

Source: Nationalatlas.gov
Over the past few years, the federal agencies responsible for governing these lands and resources have embraced the idea of large landscape conservation and are working hard to operationalize the idea in planning and management. For example:

- The US Fish and Wildlife Service established “landscape conservation cooperatives” (see Appendix 1) to provide the scientific and technical expertise needed to support conservation planning at landscape scales and to promote collaboration among their members in defining shared conservation goals. Under Secretary Ken Salazar, landscape conservation cooperatives have become a broader effort of the Department of the Interior.

- The Bureau of Land Management is conducting a series of “rapid ecoregional assessments” (see Appendix 2) to improve the understanding of existing conditions of western landscapes, and explore how conditions may be altered by ongoing environmental changes and land use demands.

- The US Forest Service, at the direction of the US Congress, has created a Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (see Appendix 3) to encourage the collaborative, science-based ecosystem restoration of priority forest landscapes.

- The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), through several Farm Bill programs, has been utilizing a “conservation beyond boundaries” framework to target natural resource conservation objectives within multiple large landscape conservation initiatives across the country (see Appendix 4).
The Rocky Mountain region is also home to several of the fastest growing communities and states in the United States. These demographic changes are influencing land use and management decisions throughout the region. Figures 5 and 6 reveal that employment, population, and personal income in the West are growing more rapidly than in non-West areas. In *West is Best*, the authors suggest that the region’s national parks, monuments, wilderness areas, and other public lands are one of the primary reasons the West has out-performed the rest of the nation. The research shows that higher-wage service industries—such as high-tech and health care—are leading the West’s job growth and diversifying the economy. Moreover, entrepreneurs and talented workers are choosing to work where they can enjoy outdoor recreation and natural landscapes.

Figure 5: **West vs. Non-West Employment Growth, 1970-2010**

![Graph showing West vs. Non-West Employment Growth, 1970-2010](source: West is Best, Headwaters Economics)

Figure 6: **West vs. Non-West Growth Measures, 1970-2010**

![Graph showing West vs. Non-West Growth Measures, 1970-2010](source: West is Best, Headwaters Economics)
Figure 7 illustrates that at least two “megaregions” are emerging in the Rocky Mountain West—one stretching from north of Denver to Albuquerque and another centered around Phoenix and Tucson. Each of these regions, no matter how large the metropolitan footprint, includes and relies on resources the cities cannot live without—water, food, energy, wood products, open space, wildlife corridors, and recreational opportunities—sometimes referred to as ecosystem services.

The regional economy is changing, and a number of traditional industries—including farming, ranching, mining, and timber harvesting—are being supplemented with other economic opportunities. With more people and economic activities, many of the region’s landscapes are under more pressure than ever.

Figure 7: **Megaregions in the American West**
One way to appreciate the influence of demographic and economic trends in the Rocky Mountain West is to compare one of the region’s most compelling economic drivers—energy development—to conservation priorities. Figures 8 and 9 are composite maps showing pronghorn corridors and sage grouse habitat, respectively, overlaid on a map of renewable energy resources in the Rocky Mountain West. The significant areas of overlap suggest that energy development and distribution may significantly impact wildlife habitat and corridors on a regional scale.

Collectively, these maps and figures indicate that the land and water problems facing the Rocky Mountain region require a new approach—a new paradigm that compels us to think and act at the scale of large landscapes.
Large Landscape Conservation Initiatives

The practice of large landscape conservation (LLC) in the Rocky Mountain West illustrates that necessity is the mother of invention. According to this inventory and status report, there are 122 initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West that in some way embrace a large landscape. *It is important to emphasize that this inventory and status report are by definition a work in progress. This inventory does not represent a comprehensive picture of LLC initiatives in the region, but rather is representative of the types and location of LLC activity in the Rocky Mountain West. If you know of other LLC initiatives that should be included in this inventory and the associated online map, please let us know.*

Consistent with the overarching objective of the Practitioners’ Network to create a continental picture of large landscape conservation in North America, this inventory and status report clarifies who is doing what with respect to LLC in the Rocky Mountain West. We also plan to use this information to catalyze a peer-to-peer learning network within the region that will allow practitioners to share lessons, identify gaps and opportunities to work together, and leverage resources.

**LLC Initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West**

To learn more about the initiatives listed below, including links to each initiative’s website, visit [www.largelandscapenetwork.org](http://www.largelandscapenetwork.org).

1. Alliance for the Wild Rockies
2. American Prairie Reserve
3. Animas La Plata Project
4. Arkansas River Compact
5. Bear River Compact
6. Belle Fourche River Compact
7. Big Hole Watershed Committee
8. Blackfoot Challenge
9. Blaine County Land, Water, and Wildlife Program
10. Boundary Waters Treaty
11. Cache la Poudre River National Heritage Area
12. California - Nevada Interstate Compact
13. Canadian River Commission
14. Canyon Country Partnership
15. Central Flyways Council
16. Clark Fork Coalition
17. Clearwater Resource Council
18. Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection
19. Coalition to Protect the Rocky Mountain Front
20. Colorado River Compact
21. Colorado River Cooperative Agreement
22. Colorado River Delta Legacy Program
23. Columbia River Treaty
24. Convention with Mexico on the Rio Grande above Fort Quitman, Texas
25. Costilla Creek Compact Commission
27. Crown of the Continent Conservation Initiative
28. Crown of the Continent Ecosystem Education Consortium
29. Crown of the Continent Geotourism Council
30. Desert Fish Habitat Partnership
31. Desert Landscape Conservation Cooperative
32. Diablo Trust
33. East Kootenay Conservation Program
34. Envision Utah
35. Flathead Basin Commission
36. Flathead Lakers
37. Four Forests Restoration Initiative
38. Freedom to Roam Initiative
39. Front Range Roundtable
40. Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Program
41. Grand Canyon Trust
42. Great Basin Landscape Conservation Cooperative
43. Great Basin National Heritage Area
44. Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative
45. Great Plains Landscape Conservation Cooperative
46. Great Plains Restoration Council
47. Greater Flagstaff Forests Partnership
48. Greater Yellowstone Coalition
49. Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee
50. Headwaters Montana
51. Heart of the Rockies Initiative
52. Henry’s Fork Watershed Council
53. High Plains Partnership for Species at Risk
54. Imagine Greater Tucson
55. Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan
56. Intermountain West Joint Venture
57. International Sonoran Desert Alliance
58. Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative
59. La Plata River Compact
60. Las Cienegas National Conservation Area
61. Lemhi Regional Land Trust
62. Livermore Area Habitat Conservation Plan
63. Lower Colorado River Multi-species Conservation Plan
64. Malpai Borderlands Group
65. Mexican Treaty on the Rio Grande, Tijuana, and Colorado Rivers
66. Moutains to Plains Project
67. Nevada Land Conservancy
68. NFRIA-WSERC Conservation Center
69. Northern Great Plains Initiative
70. Northern Rio Grande National Heritage Area
71. Northwest Connections
Figure 10: Large Landscape Conservation Initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West (locations are approximate)

- Northwest Power and Conservation Council (112)
- Pecos River Compact Commission (73)
- Plains and Prairie Potholes Landscape Conservation Cooperative (74)
- Platte River Recovery Implementation Program (75)
- Plum Creek Native Fish Habitat Conservation Plan (76)
- Powder River Basin Resource Council (77)
- Republican River Compact Commission (78)
- Restore New Mexico (79)
- Rio Grande Compact Commission (80)
- Rio Grande Initiative (81)
- Rocky Mountain Wild (82)
- Roundtable on the Crown of the Continent (83)
- Sage Grouse Initiative (84)
- San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program (85)
- San Miguel Watershed Coalition (86)
- Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area (87)
- Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater (88)
- Sky Island Alliance (89)
- Snake River Compact (90)
- Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (91)
- South Park National Heritage Area (92)
- South Platte River Compact (93)
- Southern Nevada Agency Partnership (94)
- Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project (95)
- Southern Rockies Landscape Conservation Cooperative (96)
- Southwest Jemez Mountains (97)
- Southwest Utah Planning Authorities Council (98)
- Southwestern Crown of the Continent (99)
- Sun River Watershed Group (100)
- Swan Ecosystem Center (101)
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (102)
- Uncompahgre Plateau (103)
- University of Montana / University of Calgary Transboundary Initiative (104)
- Upper Colorado River Compact (105)
- Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Plan (106)
- Utah Partners for Conservation and Development (107)
- Vital Ground (108)
- Washington County Habitat Conservation Plan (109)
- Watershed Management Group (110)
- Weiser-Little Salmon Headwaters (111)
- Western Governors’ Wildlife Council (112)
- Western Native Trout Initiative (113)
- Western Regional Partnership (114)
- Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative (115)
- Yellowstone Business Partnership (116)
- Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative (117)
- Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area (118)
- Zuni Mountain (119)

Geographic Scale (in Acres):
- XXS < 500,000
- XS 500,000–999,999
- S 1–5 Million
- M 6–10 Million
- L 11–50 Million
- XL 51–100 Million
- XXL > 100 Million

Source: Center for Natural Resources & Environmental Policy
Methodology

Using the definition of large landscape conservation presented earlier in this report, this inventory was compiled using various sources. Starting with previous research on regional collaboration in the West, we consulted a number of practitioners, agency officials, and scholars. After a preliminary list was developed, a representative from each initiative was contacted and asked if he or she was aware of any additional initiatives that should be included.

Again, this inventory is at best a representative sample of LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West and does not present a comprehensive review of all LLC initiatives in the region.

Analysis

This preliminary inventory illustrates that there is no single model for LLC within the region. On the contrary, this emerging inventory demonstrates that LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West vary in terms of age, geographic scale, objectives, governance, and leadership.

Age

As shown in Figure 11, the age of LLC initiatives in this region ranges from 106 years to less than one year. Large landscape conservation initiatives established from 1906 to 1940 consist primarily of formal treaties and compacts to allocate water quantity among states and nations. The 1950s to 1980s mark the birth of the oldest LLC initiatives led by nonprofit organizations and watershed councils. Notably, most of the initiatives—approximately 72%—emerge after 1990. In part, this proliferation of LLC initiatives can be attributed to a growing awareness of the need to address land and water resources at the scale of ecosystems, along with new approaches for collaboration and consensus building.

New LLC initiatives are still forming today. The 15 initiatives that have emerged in the past two years suggest that the need for large landscape coordination and conservation is still present and that opportunities for new partnerships and agreements continue to emerge.

Figure 11: Year Established

Source: Center for Natural Resources & Environmental Policy
**Geographic Scale**

Although all the initiatives in this inventory have been identified as “large,” no unifying definition of large is readily apparent. The median size is 10,000,000 acres, but the range extends from just less than 7,500 to almost 500 million acres (see Figure 12). The “average” size of an LLC initiative in the Rocky Mountain West is just over 43 million acres.

While the geographic size of these initiatives varies tremendously, they are all defined by their multi-jurisdictional, multi-purpose, and multi-stakeholder nature, making communication, coordination, and collaboration across boundaries essential ingredients of LLC.

**Objectives**

As depicted in Figure 13, the objectives of LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West include promoting economic sustainability, protecting cultural resources, enhancing recreational opportunities, supporting sustainable agriculture and forestry practices, protecting and restoring habitat, and protecting water resources. Within those broad categories, LLC initiatives seek to accomplish a range of goals, from exchanging information and building trust, to fostering common visions, completing scientific studies, protecting cultural resources, developing plans and agreements to share resources, conserving land for multiple uses, and allocating water resources. Most initiatives have multiple objectives, which indicates that there is no single formula for achieving long-term landscape scale stewardship.

Clusters of LLC initiatives appear in proximity to the region’s major rivers, particularly the Colorado River, and national parks, especially Yellowstone National Park, Grand Canyon National Park, and Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park, suggesting that stewardship of these hallmark landscape features is a catalyst for large landscape conservation activity.
At least 12 LLC initiatives have a distinctly urban focus. Six of the 12 initiatives are focused on establishing more sustainable development patterns and transportation plans or enhancing human and environmental health. These include the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Imagine Greater Tucson, Yellowstone Business Partnership, Front Range Roundtable, Envision Utah, and Watershed Management Group. The remaining six are water compacts that help ensure adequate water supply for the West’s growing urban areas.

**Governance**
The governance of LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain region can be classified based on increasing levels of formality—as illustrated in Figure 14:

*Figure 14: Continuum of Governance Models*

According to this framework,

- 30 percent of LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West are networks;
- 28 percent are partnerships; and
- 42 percent are institutions.

As demonstrated by the percentages, there is a relatively equal distribution of governance models used by LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West.

Additionally, as shown in Figures 15 and 16, each of the three governance models is being utilized to advance LLC at various scales and across a wide range of objectives. This suggests that the “right” governance model for a particular LLC initiative depends more on the relationships between the partners and jurisdictions involved than on the scope and scale of what the initiative hopes to achieve.
Figure 15: **Governance and Geographic Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>51-100 Million</th>
<th>6-10 Million</th>
<th>500,000-999,999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for Natural Resources & Environmental Policy

Figure 16: **Governance and Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quantity/Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for Natural Resources & Environmental Policy
Given that much of the Rocky Mountain West is characterized by aridity and federal public lands, it is perhaps not surprising that a number of formal governance arrangements have emerged to address land and water conservation challenges at the scale of large landscapes. Figure 17 illustrates the number and type of formally authorized LLC initiatives in the eight Rocky Mountain states. The most common formal mechanism is a water compact among states and/or nations, demonstrating a long-standing need to negotiate clearly defined arrangements to manage scarce water resources among neighbors.

**Figure 17: Formally Authorized Initiatives**

![Diagram showing the number of formally authorized initiatives](source: Center for Natural Resources & Environmental Policy)

**Leadership**

As seen in Figure 18, nonprofit organizations and agencies most frequently take a leadership role in catalyzing, coordinating, and implementing LLC initiatives. Leadership, however, comes in many shapes and sizes. Some initiatives have no formal leadership entity or serve only in an advisory capacity, while others are led by a commission with decision-making authority. When comparing leadership with governance structure, several items stand out:

- Almost all initiatives with informal governance arrangements are led by nonprofit organizations (32 of 37).
- Although federal agencies only lead a third of initiatives characterized as partnerships, agencies are almost always listed among the key partners in nonprofit-led partnerships.
- Formal governance most often correlates to a federal agency or commission-led initiative, but nonprofits and multi-stakeholder steering committees and advisory boards also lead formally authorized initiatives.

Regardless of who takes the lead, LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West frequently cite the need to work with local, state, tribal, and federal governments, nonprofits, businesses, landowners, academic institutions, farmers and ranchers—the whole range of people and organizations interested in or affected by the LLC initiative.

While Figure 18 shows that only one tribe is providing leadership to an LLC initiative in the Rocky Mountain West, tribes actively participate in at least seven other LLC initiatives identified in this report.
Figure 18: Leadership

Source: Center for Natural Resources & Environmental Policy
Conclusions

Before offering any overarching conclusions, it is important to point out the limitations of this preliminary inventory and status report. Perhaps the most compelling limitation is that the data presented is at best representative, not comprehensive. For example, we are confident that there are many watershed groups, regional planning initiatives, and tribal-led initiatives in the eight Rocky Mountain states that could and should be included in this emerging inventory. As it now stands, we suspect that this preliminary inventory captures at least one-half of the LLC initiatives in the Rocky Mountain West.

Our hope is that this report—and the corresponding on-line atlas that will be made available at www.largelandscapenetwork.org—will catalyze interest in this movement and encourage practitioners to go online, complete a profile of their LLC initiative, share lessons, and explore opportunities to work together. If practitioners respond in this way, it should be possible to continuously update this inventory and status report and draw more robust comparisons, lessons, and observations about the future of LLC in the Rocky Mountain West.

Aside from these limitations, the Rocky Mountain West is blessed with a number of LLC initiatives. Much like the inventory and status report recently completed by Regional Plan Association for the Northeast United States, this report strongly suggests that there is a national (or continental) movement emerging—a new conservation paradigm for addressing land, water, and related issues at the large landscape scale.

As the Practitioners’ Network for Large Landscape Conservation continues to evolve and take shape, we believe that there is tremendous value in connecting these various initiatives to transfer lessons, identify opportunities to work together, identify gaps, and prioritize future investments. Our hope and plan is to:

- Clarify the message to citizens and leaders that LLC is good business, good government, and good conservation;
- Continue building knowledge about who is doing what—in part by encouraging practitioners to complete an online profile of their initiative;
- Create peer-to-peer learning networks, problem-solving clinics, transferability workshops, regional forums, webinars, and other venues to connect practitioners and build capacity;
- Develop and deliver a national training workshop that builds on the best practices of practitioners and inspires and informs federal agency leaders so they can more effectively participate in LLC initiatives throughout the country;
- Organize and convene a national conference on large landscape conservation for practitioners to share stories, learn from each other, and promote policy initiatives consistent with the vision of large landscape conservation; and
- Create a national competitive grants program—by encouraging federal agencies, private sector businesses, and philanthropic foundations to pool their resources—to promote and support LLC initiatives throughout the United States.

Figure 19: Western Political & Administrative Associations

- Western Governors’ Association
  www.westgov.org
- Council of State Governments-WEST
  www.csgwest.org
- Western Interstate Region, National Association of Counties
  www.naco.org/legislation/policies/WIR/Pages/default.aspx
- Western States Water Council
  www.westernstateswater.org
- The Western Planner
  www.westernplanner.org
In the Rocky Mountain West, LLC initiatives may increasingly come alongside local, state, and federal officials to help them achieve their mandates and aspirations. At the same time, western political leaders and administrators, including the associations listed in Figure 19, are increasingly looking for innovative, cross-boundary solutions to the region’s land and water challenges.

As the region continues to experiment with new forms of collaborative governance, it is encouraging that several university-based centers—as illustrated by Figure 20—have emerged that support LLC in the region by conducting ecological and policy research, as well as catalyzing, convening, and coordinating LLC efforts.

In the days ahead, we look forward to continuing this dialogue and learning from practitioners, political leaders and administrators, scholars, agency leaders, and engaged citizens throughout the Rocky Mountain West and North America. By working together, we have the best opportunity to “create a society to match the scenery,” as famously said by writer and historian Wallace Stegner.
Appendix 1: **US Fish & Wildlife Service, Landscape Conservation Cooperatives**

Appendix 2: Bureau of Land Management, Rapid Ecoregional Assessments

Appendix 3: **US Forest Service, Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Initiatives**

![Map of Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Initiatives](image)

- **Projects first funded in 2010**
- **Projects first funded in 2012**
- **Priority projects funded outside of CFLR in 2012**

Source: People Restoring America’s Forests: 2012 Report on the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Appendix 4: Natural Resources Conservation Service Landscape Initiatives

Source: USDA, NRCS, USGS Data
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