Introduction to the "National Landscape Agenda":

When you read the National Landscape Agenda below just published by the American Society of Landscape Architects, consider it to be a partnership with the Big Park 8 volume National Park expansion play published by the National Parks and Conservation Association.

The plans together paint a target on your back.

When either plan talks about new parks and conservation areas, they are always talking about the removal of existing families, ranchers, businesses and the historic peoples of the area.

That means land acquisition. Land acquisition is government forced acquisition of private property using Kelo type condemnation otherwise called eminent domain.

If they don’t use condemnation, it means the landowners are forced to sell “willingly” under threat of condemnation. Condemnation is always used by the Park Service as a threat to get you to sell “willingly.”

When the National Park Service condemns a landowner and they go to court to fight over price, if the landowner settles before a judge rules, the sale is always listed by the Park Service as a “willing seller” situation when the NPS reports to Congress.

You can look at the maps below and get an idea of whether you or your neighbors, friends or local community are targets and are in danger.

You need to begin to fight the National Landscape Agenda now and urge your friends and others to do the same thing.

Look at Big Park. That is the 8 volume plan by the National Parks and Conservation Association first written in 1988. It is still fresh today. Especially with the author of the Big Park 8 Volume NPCA Plan being Destry Jarvis, the brother of Jon Jarvis, the new director of the National Park Service.

Chuck Cushman
Executive Director
A NEW NATIONAL LANDSCAPE AGENDA

The Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 is just a beginning.

By Frederick R. Steiner, FASLA, and Robert D. Yaro

IN MARCH, THE HOUSE AND SENATE passed the sweeping Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009, which was signed into law on March 30 by President Barack Obama. Its 1,218 pages provide deferred maintenance for eight years of not-so-benign neglect by the George W. Bush administration and even codify an important initiative established during the Clinton administration in the 1990s. The act includes more than 150 measures that create more than two million acres of new wilderness areas, along with national parks, wild and scenic rivers, historic sites, scenic trails, and other protected public lands.

Although a welcome—and overdue—action, the new law does not go far enough to create a nationwide system of protected landscapes. Some states and regions benefit from new protected areas; many others do not. While the new act makes the National Landscape Conservation System, created through an executive order by the Clinton administration, a permanent entity, the sys...
In 1987 a National Park Service team led by Glenn Eugster produced a national map, Potential Protected Landscapes, Local and State Landscape Conservation Areas, that documented state and local landscape conservation efforts under way in the continental United States, outlined here in dark green. Areas newly protected by the 2009 Omnibus Bill are highlighted in red.

Precedents for Large-Scale Landscape Protection

Precedents exist in the late 20th century for the development of conservation networks. In the wake of the first Earth Day in 1970, the federal government enacted a series of laws designed to protect the environment and to preserve land and other natural resources. Within this context, the heritage conservation movement emerged, as did large-scale planning efforts, the Lake Tahoe Initiative, and renewed planning activity in the Adirondacks. The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 authorized the creation of the nation’s first urban national historical park in Lowell, Massachusetts, and two new “greenline” parks—the New Jersey Pinelands National Reserve and the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. The one-million-acre Pinelands Reserve in Southern New Jersey was intended at the time to be the first in a national network of reserves that would be protected through partnerships between federal and state initiatives. Revisions to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provided assistance to help protect important river corridors, including the Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor (1984) and the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor (1986).

Other reserves were established to protect large scenic and natural areas containing both public and private lands. These include the Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Commission (1969), the Adirondack Park Agency (1971), the Martha’s Vineyard Commission (1974), the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area (1980), and the Sawtooth National Scenic Area (1986). The most ambitious land conservation initiative of this period emerged from the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, which identified and protected vast wilderness, park, and wildlife protection areas, including more than 43 million acres of new national

tem is limited to areas administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM). As a result, the reach of this national system is not national enough.

Using the Omnibus Public Land Management Act as a foundation, we suggest more comprehensive, bolder next steps. Even with this new law, America’s natural, scenic, historic, and working landscapes are threatened. In the East, vast areas of the Central Appalachians are being destroyed by mountaintop mining, and the great coastal estuaries are threatened by pollution from low-density subdivisions. In the West, public lands are threatened by mining, clear-cutting, and overgrazing. Our coasts, barrier beaches, islands, and wetlands are threatened by vacation home development and sea-level rise. Across the country, sprawl has consumed millions of acres of prime agricultural land.

Despite these threats, from the 1980s until the passage of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act in March, the federal government largely abandoned a leadership role in preserving natural, scenic, and historic landscapes or curbing suburban sprawl. As the Omnibus Bill illustrates, the accession to power of a new pro-environment president and Congress provides the opportunity for the United States to renew its historic commitment to preservation of the nation’s natural, scenic, and historic landscapes.
The environmental challenges now faced by the nation create an urgency to restart the promising initiatives from our recent past. The renewed attention to the environment by the Obama administration offers hope.

**Establish Nationwide Priorities for Preservation**

The next step is to assess what we have that merits protection. Also beginning in the 1970s, the late Ian McHarg advocated a national ecological inventory to identify the best lands for both development and conservation. The Environmental Protection Agency produced its EMAP system and, soon afterward, Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt, Honorary ASLA, proposed a national biological survey modeled on the U.S. Geological Survey.

Due to intense opposition from the Congress in the late 1990s, the national biological survey did not occur, but the U.S. Department of the Interior did initiate its GAP Analysis Program, a means for “assessing to what extent native animal and plant species are being protected.” It identifies the “gaps” between what is being protected and what should be. GAP analyses can be state, local, regional, or national but are primarily conducted at the state level and are coordinated by the United States Geological Survey’s Biological Resources Division. This assessment program helped set the stage for passage of the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program and State Wildlife Grants Program in 2000. Under this program, each state wildlife agency has developed a “comprehensive wildlife conservation strategy” to guide conservation action and prioritize federal funding.

The GAP model suggests a framework for a more comprehensive assessment of potential conservation areas. Such an assessment should have four components:

- Geological, Hydrological, and Ecological Protection Areas
- Cultural Protection Areas
- Resource Production Protection Areas
- Natural Hazard Protection Areas

The first two of these should be obvious to landscape architects. Let’s look at the latter two.

**Resource Production Protection Areas.** These areas include regionally or nationally significant farmlands, ranches, forests, mines, and water resources. Significant resources include essential products such as timber, minerals like sand and gravel, or the elements necessary for production such as prime-quality soil and water supplies. These resources can be renewable or nonrenewable.

The United States possesses some of the richest farmland in the world, yet the American Farmland Trust estimates that we are losing three acres of farmland an hour to development. An existing mapping tool that could be used in the survey is the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system. LESA uses several well-established USDA systems, such as the soil survey, to identify the best agricultural lands.

Drinking water protection is another important issue. Sprawl poses significant threats to the supply and quality of our drinking water across the country, in places as diverse as upstate New York and central Texas. At risk are both surface and ground-water supplies. A 30 percent impervious surface cover degrades the available supply; hence, maintaining a supply of clean drinking water is a powerful reason to protect the lands surrounding watersheds.

**Natural Hazard Protection Areas.** Areas prone to fire, geological hazards, floods, hurricanes, and avalanches may result in the loss of life and property if developed. An example of an effort to protect such areas is the National Consortium to Map Gulf Coast Ecological Constraints (see “Rebuilding the Gulf Coast,” Landscape Architecture, April 2006). It was convened following the devastation to the Gulf Coast caused by Hurricane Katrina in 2005. The consortium used existing data from federal, state, local, and private sources to map areas of societal, flood, high wind, and storm surge risk. Historical hurricane patterns, economic impacts, and sea rise vulnerability were overlaid with social vulnerability factors to determine cumulative
risk at the Gulf Coast regional scales.

In the 1970s, the Coastal Zone Management Act made noteworthy initial efforts to protect the nation's coastlines. In light of potential sea-level rise and continued frenzied development along the coasts, a renewed initiative is necessary. A first step would be to continue the reforms needed for the national flood insurance and disaster recovery programs to remove incentives for development in flood-prone areas and use FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) funds to buy out storm-damaged properties, particularly in those areas that are subject to repeated storm surges or are critical for wetlands retreat. The areas of the greatest risk could be set aside as preserves, having the dual benefits of protecting human health, safety, and welfare as well as providing wildlife habitat and coastal regeneration.

These four assessments should be combined in a National Landscape Survey. While geographic information systems and remote sensing imagery have advanced to a point where an abundance of data exists about our national landscapes, a coordinated effort to analyze and synthesize this data is lacking. This should be a goal of the National Landscape Survey. The effort should be coordinated by the federal government, enlisting state agencies and universities, and should result in a map of the most significant land and resources that merit protection. In addition, the survey should identify new and potential opportunities for large-scale interregional connectivity, such as the Appalachian Highlands, the Yellowstone–Yukon Initiative, the Colorado Conservation Partnership, or the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail.

The National Landscape Survey would provide a spatial representation and ranking of important landscapes requiring preservation and management nationwide. Intuitively, the result would be the identification of the large landscapes worthy of protection. Conservation of these areas must involve a partnership that combines technical expertise, financial resources, regulatory powers, and political engagement from all levels of government and the private sector. The strategies for realizing a national network would also need to vary among regions to take into account differences in public land management and water law. The National Landscape Survey would thus provide the basis for expanding the National Landscape Conservation System beyond BLM lands in the West and Alaska.
Regional Preservation Strategies

Federal and state public lands are distributed differently across the nation. Many states in the West are composed of high percentages of public land, encompassing the vast majority of the nation’s 634 million acres—or nearly 1 million square miles—of public land. By contrast, Texas and much of the Northeastern United States have very little public land. Water law also differs in the East and West. The coastlines and megaregions present special opportunities for this national landscape conservation strategy.

In the West, a crucial first step would be to revitalize national treasures in decline. Existing national parks need to be restored, their management systems improved, and funding increased. Chronic underfunding of the National Park Service’s operating and capital budgets for many years has left the system with a multibillion-dollar backlog simply to maintain existing parks. This has resulted in much deferred maintenance and shrinking staffs. Department of the Interior Secretary Ken Salazar’s announcement on April 23 that the National Park Service will invest $750 million in the nation’s parks is an important step in reversing the neglect under the Bush administration. Nearly 800 park projects will receive funds that will be used for construction, deferred maintenance, energy-efficient equipment replacement, trails, abandoned mine lands, and road maintenance.

A huge next step would be to create new national parks and monuments through redesignation of lands now controlled by the BLM or other federal agencies. National parks generally receive a higher level of protection than other federal lands. A map prepared by Glenn Eugster and his National Park Service colleagues in 1987 (see pages 70 and 71) presents a good picture of where those new parks could occur. Eugster and his team identified such areas as California’s Owens Valley, Arizona’s Verde Valley, Louisiana’s Atchafalaya Basin, and Adams County in Ohio.

Areas adjacent to existing National Parks—many of them subject to vacation homes, resorts, and tourism development—are especially vulnerable and need stronger protection. Efforts could also be expanded to engage so-called gateway communities in joint efforts to meet park visitors’ needs for lodging, food, and services while preserving the integrity of landscapes and the visitors’ experiences. For instance, Williams, Arizona, which is the gateway to the Grand Canyon, is an overpriced eyesore and tourist trap. Plans to improve the quality of this trinket town’s built environment and even create alternative gateways have been thwarted by politically influential local
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businesses. Stronger leadership from the National Park Service would help improve the character of places like Williams.

Wilderness and roadless areas in national forests and on BLM lands need to be restored and expanded. This would reduce the trend established during the George W. Bush administration, which eroded protection of roadless areas.

Based on the National Landscape Survey, new national forests and wildlife refuges should be created. New national scenic corridors and preserves should be established around existing protected areas such as wild and scenic river corridors. The coordinated efforts of the federal government, two states, and several local governments to protect the Columbia Gorge provide one example of such an undertaking. The Rio Grande and St. Lawrence River valleys present similar opportunities at the international level.

The national survey will result in the identification of important prairie preserve opportunities across the Great Plains where irrigated crop cultivation is no longer viable. In 1987, Deborah and Frank Popper put forth their initially controversial “Buffalo Commons” proposal to return much of the Great Plains to native flora and fauna. From initial skepticism from within the region, the concept has received wider acceptance. The Great Plains Restoration Council identifies the Buffalo Commons as “a cultural and social movement for positive, restorative social and ecological change on the Great Plains.”

As a model and a metaphor, the concept is now mature enough to investigate as a network of many “buffalo commons.” Such a network would include restored prairie ecosystems integrated into a comprehensive economic development program of business, solar, biomass, and wind power production, creating the potential for the plains to become a new Saudi Arabia of alternative energy. Two examples of places meeting preservation are the Flint Hills of Kansas and the Sand Hills of Nebraska. Both are landscapes of considerable rugged beauty and resilience.

In the East, biodiversity, watersheds, and scenic and historic areas can be protected through new national parks, new heritage areas, and new state and regional parks and preserves. In addition, the federal government needs to provide financial and technical expertise, while states impart management and regulatory powers and incentives for local cooperation.

A first step to protecting biodiversity, watersheds, and scenic and historic areas would be to revive the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Forest Legacy Program. These funding sources provide matching funds to the states and local government to undertake land conservation in keeping with federal priorities and guidance.

Based on the National Landscape Survey, regional reserves would protect large (100,000 acres or more) ecological, scenic, historic, recreational, agricultural, and water supply systems through state-initiated, regional land-use regulatory programs. Drawing from the National Landscape Survey, landscape architects and planners will be able to identify suitable candidate landscapes for preservation at the megaregion scale. For example, the Texas Triangle is formed by San Antonio and Houston at its base with Dallas—Fort Worth at the apex. It is most likely that any national survey, such as the one proposed here, will identify the Edwards Plateau and Hill Country on the west of the triangle and the Blackland Prairie and Coastal Plain on the east as significant landscapes. The Edwards Plateau and Hill Country area contains one of the richest aquifers in the nation and is a scenic landscape. The Blackland Prairie and Coastal Plain area includes the richest farmland in the state. The Coastal Plain also includes shorelines important for recreation and vulnerable to hurricanes.

In the Northeast megaregion, the University of Pennsylvania and the Regional Megaregions: A Network of Regional Reserves

Megaregions are networks of more than one metropolitan area, connected by economic, transportation, and environmental links. The Regional Plan Association projects that by 2050, more than 70 percent of population and economic growth will occur in 11 megaregions across the United States. Because of rapid growth in these megaregions, the protection of open space and important resource lands is especially crucial. As a result, the national strategy should promote networks of protected “regional reserves” in and adjoining the nation’s 11 emerging megaregions.
Plan Association have already identified 26 candidate landscapes and coastal estuaries that would appear suitable as regional preserves. Of these, only five (Adirondack Park, New Jersey Pinelands, Long Island Pine Barrens, New Jersey Highlands, and Cape Cod) are protected through existing systems.

Protecting our lands and natural resources must become a national priority. We must conserve and protect our most precious lands: first, through a National Landscape Survey, and second, through expanding the National Landscape Conservation System to ensure America's future. These landscapes hold a significant place in American history; if we want future generations to enjoy their scenic beauty and safeguard resources, there must be federal action, coupled with state, regional, and local efforts.

Frederick R. Steiner, FASLA, is dean of the school of architecture at the University of Texas at Austin. Robert D. Yaro is president of the Regional Plan Association and professor of practice at the University of Pennsylvania.

Resources
■ America 2050, www.americain2050.org
■ Envision Central Texas, www.envisioncentraltexas.org
■ Envision Utah, www.envisionutah.org
■ Greenbelt Alliance, www.greenbelt.org
■ Open Lands Project, www.openlands.org
■ Land Trust Alliance, www.landtrustalliance.org
■ Regional Plan Association, www.rpa.org