

National Park System Advisory Board



Citizen advisors chartered by Congress to help the National Park Service care for special places saved by the American people so that all may experience our heritage.

Appendix E

Notes on New Models for the National Park System

National Park System Advisory Board

Planning Committee

November 2012

Notes on New Models for the National Park System

Annie C. Harris, Executive Director, Essex National Heritage Commission

Future Vision for the National Parks System

The second-century vision for the National Park Service focuses on creating a service where “we will fully represent our nation’s ethnically and culturally diverse communities....(and) the National Park Service will inspire a ‘more perfect union’.” To achieve this vision, the 20th century model of stand-alone national parks must change. The future for the National Park Service cannot be all about doubling the number of parks and acreage with hard, fixed boundaries owned and managed solely by the service. People and nature do not respond well to walled-in areas, and there are simply not enough public resources for the Park Service to own everything that should be protected. Instead, the goal for the next 100 years must be to reimagine the Park Service as an agency that is fully involved in conservation, preservation, recreation, interpretation, scientific investigation and education at every level of civic engagement. To accomplish this, the Park Service has to develop and hone its skills as a convener and coalition builder; the US Congress needs to provide the authorities that permit partnerships with NPS to flourish; and the current and future national parks need to be designed as places that truly welcome and foster partnerships.

Protected Landscapes (Conservation Study Institute white paper): “The National Park Service has nearly 100 years of experience to tell us that agencies working only within their boundaries cannot preserve large scale landscapes and ensure the viability of the populations which depend on them. Their boundaries are not big enough, their pockets not deep enough. They cannot control exotic species, influence regional air and water quality, shape local land use trends, preserve adequate habitat for species survival, protect whole ecosystems, or ensure economic viability of neighboring communities. New methods of working with partners and sharing responsibilities will be necessary to meet these goals.”

The limitations of traditional national park units

The traditional model of individual, stand-alone national park units is too limited. New models are necessary because there are substantial gaps and needs in the system that are not currently being met. Some of the most obvious shortcomings are:

- Existing national parks are impacted by the communities and environment just beyond their boundaries, often in very negative ways;
- Many important landscapes are occupied and they cannot be conserved without the consent and support of local communities and private land owners ;
- Urban populations are demanding equal access to open space and recreational opportunities;
- Connectivity between parks is needed for species migrations – and also to provide access for people from where they live;

- The conservation of very large landscapes requires multi-state and multi-jurisdictional approaches. The areas are simply too large and complex for a single agency or governmental agency to do it alone.

Models for the future of the National Park System

Fortunately, there are already many programs and examples of collaborative parks and conservation partnerships that are successfully working within the auspices of the National Park Service. It is not necessary to “reinvent the wheel” – but rather – we must take these existing examples and apply them more broadly and creatively to the system as a whole. All of us (Congress, NPS, the American public) need to recognize that the value of the National Park Services lies not just in the spectacular parks like Yosemite and Yellowstone but also in the under-appreciated, small historical parks and the “external” programs that are already operating where the majority of Americans reside. The Rivers, Trails & Conservation Assistance (RTCA) program, the National Heritage Areas (NHA), and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are programs that successfully engage millions of Americans. From the almost seamless collaborative partnerships such as the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to the unusual private management system at Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, many of the tools already exist that can help the Park Service evolve into the agency that truly *connects people to parks, advances the education mission, preserves America’s special places and enhances professional and organizational excellence* – the core elements of the 21st Century vision described in *A Call to Action*.

Here are suggestions of some of the programs and services that need a closer examination:

- **Urban national parks** – As more Americans become city dwellers, the importance of the National Park Service’s urban parks increases. Many of the major metropolitan areas in the USA have national park units within their boundaries but often these parks are small and have only a limited interpretive focus. The NPS should expand the mission of these urban parks and recognize that they can be important centers of collaboration located in the heart of densely populated urban areas. The basic investments have already been made. These parks are established, operating and are well positioned to reach urban populations, engage diverse audiences, and use existing NPS resources more effectively. (*Resource: Denis Galvin, NPS retired, on NPS Advisory Board Planning Committee call spring 2012*).
- **Public agency collaborative “parks”** – During the past 10 years, there have been considerable efforts to foster greater collaboration between federal agencies such as BLM, FWS, Forest Service, DOA, Army Corps, etc. This has resulted in somewhat better coordination of lands owned and managed by multiple agencies, but many believe that the National Park Service should assume a larger role in this arena. Of all the federal agencies, NPS is the best recognized and the most trusted by the American public. The confidence that Americans place in NPS provides a remarkable opportunity for the Park Service to assume a greater leadership role in complex landscape preservation – especially lands controlled and managed by multiple government agencies. The public’s almost universal recognition of the NPS ‘brand’ places the service in a unique position to garner citizen engagement and participation. However, the strategic planning systems necessary to develop greater success in this area are not well

developed within NPS. *(Resource: Protected Landscapes: Prepared by Park Planning and Special Studies, within directorate of Park Planning, Facilities and Lands. White paper. The PPSS planning team was composed of Patrick Gregerson, Program Manager; Tokey Boswell, Program Analyst; and Carol Cook, Program Analyst. The subjects were (1) models on which a treasured landscape initiative might be based; and (2) authorities that might be employed by the National Park Service to manage treasured landscapes.)*

- **Large landscapes** – There is growing recognition that large landscape conservation requires a hybrid approach in which public agencies and private organizations work together “at an appropriate geographic scale regardless of political and jurisdictional boundaries.” Examples of the benefits and challenges of this approach are analyzed in a recent study by Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. The Institute joined forces with the University of Montana’s Center for Natural Resources and Environmental Policy to look at seven case studies including America’s Longleaf Pine Initiative, Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, and the Everglades Restoration Plan. Other examples of places where this approach being adopted are - the Northern Great Plains Network, Northern Woods, Tall Grass Prairie, Crown of the Continent, Appalachian Mountain Trail, and the Chesapeake Gateway. In some of these examples, NPS has a large role, in others it doesn’t but the National Park Service ‘brand’ can be invaluable in bringing diverse partners together. An overall strategy should be developed for NPS to participate in these large scale initiatives because even a small role for the Service can be valuable in furthering the successful conservation of these vast resources. *(Resource - Large Landscape Conservation: A Strategic Framework for Policy and Action; Lincoln Institute of Land Policy by Matthew McKinney, Lynn Scarlett and Daniel Kemmis. Published by the Lincoln Institute of Cambridge MA and the University of Montana’s Center for Natural Resources and Environmental Policy. 2010.)*
- **Existing NPS Programs** – The National Park Service already has programs that offer technical and financial assistance to non-park partners. These programs such as the Rivers, Trails & Conservation Assistance (RTCA), the National Historic Landmarks (NHL), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the National Heritage Areas (NHA) should be regarded as essential to the future success of NPS. For far too long these ‘external’ programs have been the poor stepchildren to the park units. Instead we need to recognize that these programs provide very valuable services to Americans because they engage local communities and bring significant preservation and conservation expertise into every corner of American life. Embracing the ‘external’ programs and increasing their funding and authority will go a long way to enabling the Park Service to achieve its Second-Century vision. *(Resource – National Park Service Programs: A Companion Volume to NPS Management Policies, 2012)*
- **Partnership Programs** - Within the National Park System there already exist a number of collaborative parks. They are similar to the hybrid model for large landscapes described above but also different because these cooperative partnerships have a legislation foundation and are usually governed by a legal contract between the federal service and non-federal partner(s). A memorandum of understanding (MOU) or a cooperative agreement (CA) are typically the legal instruments that define the roles of the parties and prescribe the levels of financial involvement. These relationships often develop into highly successful collaborations that yield great benefits to the Park Service as well as to the surrounding community. There are three types of “partnership” programs – and they can be loosely defined as having these characteristics:
 - **“Internal” partnership parks** – These are national parks in which other, non-federal partners are included in the park’s legislation and the authority for NPS and the partner(s) to work together is somewhat defined. Examples of this are the Boston

Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Cape Cod Seashore, Lowell National Historical Park, and the Mississippi National River & Recreation Area.

- **“Affiliated” areas:** These are areas that receive some form of financial and technical assistance from NPS and often have Park Service staff but there is usually little or no NPS ownership. Pinelands National Reserve, NJ, and Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, MA and RI are examples of these areas in which NPS has played a significant, but untraditional, role.
- **“External” partnership areas and/or programs** –These are programs where the NPS provides some limited funding and technical assistance but there is no NPS ownership and usually no NPS staff involved ‘on-the-ground.’ These include:
 - Partnerships with cooperative agreements such as the National Heritage Areas;
 - Partnership programs that are technical assistance such as the RTCA program;
 - Cultural and historic programs such as NRHP, NHL

*(Resource document: **Collaboration and Conservation: Lessons Learned from NPS Partnership Areas in the Western United States**, A Report on a Workshop, March 18-19, 2003, Santa Fe, NM; convened for the NPS Planning and Special Studies Program by the Conservation Study Institute and QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment. By Nora Mitchell, Jacquelyn Tuxill and Jessica Brown.)*

Key Concepts for the Future:

As stated earlier, achieving the Second-Century vision requires that we look at the Park Service in a new way. The future should not be about doubling the amount of land owned by NPS; instead it should look to increasing the impact of NPS by enabling the service to do much more through affiliations and partnerships. The “old think” is park units with strict boundaries within which NPS must own, manage, maintain and operate everything. New think is “park areas” in which NPS works collaboratively with other public, private and non-profit organizations – each with a distinct role and complementary function. Here are the key concepts for achieving this new vision:

- **Larger, more porous boundaries:** The boundaries of “parks” need to be more flexible and less hard edge. The Park Service should be able to work beyond park unit boundaries and partners need to be able to work inside the boundaries too. Maybe this will be accomplished by designating boundaries much larger than the area of federal ownership. Boundaries could be drawn to encompass the whole resource area, watershed, and/or landscape and having park units be just nodes within the total park boundary region. Or perhaps boundaries will be defined as porous and within them, there are certain prescribed activities that the Park Service does but NPS isn’t required/allowed to do everything. Again, there are examples of this concept that should be studied such as Lowell National Historical Park, MA, Boston Harbor Islands NRA, MA and Santa Monica Mountains NRC, CA.
- **Bottom up:** Grassroots driven initiatives must be given a much greater role especially in cultural and historical interpretation. If the gaps in history and culture are going to be filled-in then the people whose history is being interpreted need to be part of the process and have a greater role in defining the nationally significant stories of their history. The NPS American Latino Heritage Project is a step in this direction.

- **Catalyst, not always exclusive owner:** The future Park Service should play a greater role as a catalyst and convener, and needs to be less constrained at having to be the exclusive owner and manager of nationally significant lands and resources. For example, in the Tall Grass Prairie area, the NPS cannot own all of the significant landscape areas that should be conserved but NPS can be the catalyst through its leadership and expertise and also by owning some key parcels.

Next steps

Stating that partnerships and collaboration are critical to the future of NPS does not mean that this is easy to accomplish. Even having examples of successful partnerships and collaborative programs with the National Park System does not ensure that the agency can scale them up to meet its vision. *A Call to Action* recognizes this and seeks to build success into the next century with both a bold vision and detailed plan for incremental action steps to assist the agency in bringing about the change it needs. In addition to the C2A plan, we recommend the following:

1. Study the NPS partnership parks that already exist such as:
 - **Lowell National Historical Park** – an urban park with a boundary drawn larger than the federal ownership and with legislated partnerships with local and state entities. Very successful model of partnerships.
(Resource: Discussion White Paper, Assessment of Preservation and Development in Lowell National Historical Park at its 30-Year Anniversary: Where have we been and where should we be going? Dennis Frenchman and Jonathan S. Lane1 (Heritage Preservation and Development White Paper A.pdf))
 - **John H Chaffee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor** – an early heritage area with a larger than usual amount of NPS management.
(Resources: Reflecting on the Past, Looking to the Future: A Technical Assistance Report to the John H. Chaffee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission by the Conservation Study Institute 2005)
 - **Appalachian National Scenic Trail** – a very robust partnership park with a strong non-profit partner, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy (ATC), that predates Park Service’s involvement; there is extensive land area co-managed by NPS and the non-profit ATC and there is very strong grassroots involvement. Many aspects of this partnership are unique within the NPS system but could provide important examples for the new directions that NPS needs to take.
(Resources: Appalachian National Scenic Trail, A Special Report by National Park Conservation Association, March 2010.)
 - **Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network:** A regional endeavor with extensive public-private partnerships and the role of NPS is still evolving; this is a good example of the challenges and complexities in dealing with large lived-in landscapes
(Resource - Chesapeake Treasured Landscape Initiative – coordinated by US DOI in collaboration with the US Department of Agriculture, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and Department of Defense (Draft 203 Strategy-Treasured Landscape Initiative1.pdf) 3 page summary

- **National Heritage Areas:** NHAs provide a good model for a NPS program that uses partnerships to achieve resource conservation and cultural interpretation by engaging local citizens. In 2012, NPS received independent evaluations on the accomplishments of 9 NHAs. The evaluations were performed by the Center for Park Management, a division of the National Parks Conservation Association. When these evaluations are published in 2013, they will provide an excellent in-depth analysis into the benefits and challenges of this program.

(Resources: *Charting a Future for the National Heritage Areas: A Report by the National Park System Advisory Board.* (NHAreport.pdf); *National Heritage Areas: Developing a Model for Measuring Success; 2004 US/ICOMOS International Symposium, Natchitoches, Louisiana. Summary of the benefits of the NHAs.* (NHA Developing a Model for Measuring Success.pdf); *National Heritage Areas (InfoSheet_NHAs in brief_4 2011 final.pdf)*; *Director Jarvis's Policy Memorandum 12-01 regarding the National Heritage Areas Program* <http://www.nps.gov/policy/PM-12-01.pdf>.)

- **Other examples of collaborative models that bear further research are:**

- **Mississippi National River & Recreation Area**

(Resource: *InsideNPS-Parks-Mississippi National River & Recreation Area – Park receives over \$1.0m for alternative transportation project by Susan Overson, January 2012. Relates this to the Call to Action-InsideNPS.docx*; *ATP Transportation Implementation Plan 2/2/2011 for Mississippi National River and Recreation Area:* This document that outlines the plan for the Mississippi River Train (MRT) from the twin cities to the Gulf of Mexico comprised of bike trails, commuter trails, motorized transit and more. Mentions the NPS Trails and Open Space Partnership (TOSP). There is 72 mile corridor in which NPS has the authority to act. MNR&RA is a partnership park in which NPS owns very little land and works with 25 local governments, several state agencies and numerous organizations to protect the 'globally significant resources' along 72 miles of the Mississippi River. (FINALTransportationImplementationPlan)

- **Glacier National Park and region**

(Resource: *Glacier National Park and its Neighbors: A Twenty-Year Assessment of Regional Resource Management* by Joseph L. Sax and Robert B. Keiter written for the George Wright Society, 2007)

- **Other resource sites**

(Resources: Two websites with articles about NPS and Partnerships
'<http://www.nps.gov/csi/pdf/collaboration.pdf>
<http://www.nps.gov/csi/pdf/westernCollaboration.pdf>.)

2. Determine the goals:

Everyone speaks of "gaps" in the system that need to be filled by new park units and more Park Service programs, but not everyone agrees on which gaps are the most important and the reasons for needing to fill them. It is important to understand the 'what' and 'why' as well as 'how.' What are the gaps in the system that need to be covered? Why are we trying to cover them? Here are some of the issues to be considered:

- Landscapes and watersheds - What is the purpose of conserving particular ones?
 - For their uniqueness
 - For their scenic and natural beauty
 - For their environmental value – clean air, clean water;
 - For environmental justice – everyone should have access to natural areas
 - To protect the environment around existing parks;
 - To preserve ways of life such as ranching and farming

- To preserve wilderness;
 - For redundancy and/or future expansion especially in view of climate change;
 - For quality of life and/or to deter sprawl
- Plant and animal protection – Which ones and why should NPS protect certain species and environments?
 - For their ecological value
 - For our scientific interest
 - For their medical value
 - For all the reasons listed under landscapes
- Cultural and historic parks; themes and stories - How do we decide which places to preserve and what stories to tell?
 - For their universal human interest
 - For their portrayal of unique human stories
 - For their value to historians
 - For their educational value
 - Because they are important or sacred to certain groups
- Recreational areas – Why do we want to create more recreational places?
 - For more access – especially near city centers?
 - To promote equity for urban populations?
 - To foster healthier lifestyles for all Americans
 - To create more variety of experiences where the public can hike, climb, kayak?
 - To create alternative places for people to recreate that will have less impact on fragile resources
- Corridors of conservation and of connectivity – Are our priorities people or species? Who do we want to connect to whom?
 - To allow for species migrations
 - To link existing natural or historical resources;
 - To connect existing parks
 - To create access routes for people
 - To connect urban centers with the great outdoors.

These questions and more need to be answered. It is important to understand where we want the National Park Service to go as well as how.

3. Define the challenges:

The challenges in reaching the 21st Century vision lie also within the way the National Park Service is structure and authorized. The authorities that Congress has and has not establish with NPS; the expectations of 'national significance,' and the culture of the Park Service are some of the hurdles.

- **NPS unit:** What is a unit? What isn't a unit? Should the definition of a unit be expanded? Here are some of the considerations that the National Park Service and congress have to content with as they look at parks in the future:

- The *traditional model* of creating a new NPS park unit requires that a special resource study be completed which establishes the uniqueness and national significance of the proposed park unit. As part of the study a boundary is determined and legislation is passed. A new park is created in which usually the National Park Service owns, manages, maintains and polices everything inside the boundary but has no control of anything outside this legislated dividing line.
- The *new model* that we are outlining in this note will require that a 'cooperative region' is defined perhaps with a park unit within it or with defined role for NPS but the designation will need to allow flexibility that is very different from the traditional model. The new region will need to be allowed to grow and change over time as the partnerships/coalitions work together. The natural and/or cultural significance of the park area would not necessarily have to be 'unique' because we need redundancy to ensure that species and landscapes survive. The national significance may take time to define and establish because the theme(s) may not meet traditional NPS criteria or be recognized as nationally significant under the current standards which were created for the most part to support the history of white Europeans. The new model will need to be more organic and capable of growing over time. Ebey's Landing and City of Rocks may provide role models of existing "park reserves" in which a unit is created with only a small portion of public ownership but over time more land is acquired and put in public ownership with the consent of local owners and the general public.
- **Authorities:** What authorities exist for partnerships and collaboration within NPS? Are there general authorities in place to allow more of the collaborations suggested in this note? Or are the authorities that are needed for strong partnership parks dependent on specific and unique individual park legislation? We need to investigate the current authorities and partnerships that allow such innovative areas as:
 - The public-private partners structures of Appalachian National Scenic Trail, Golden Gate and the Presidio, Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area and the Harbor Alliance;
 - The funding agreements, mostly cooperative agreements (CA), that enable NPS to partner with 'external' entities such as the National Heritage Areas;
 - And other authorities - some of which are described by CSI with examples in these resources:

(Resource: Protected Landscapes: Prepared by Park Planning and Special Studies, within directorate of Park Planning, Facilities and Lands. White paper; Collaboration and Conservation: Lessons Learned from NPS Partnership Areas in the Western United States, A Report on a Workshop, March 18-19, 2003, Santa Fe, NM; convened for the NPS Planning and Special Studies Program by the Conservation Study Institute and QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment)
 - Role of US Congress: In the end it may require new laws to enable the Park Service to be fully collaborative and to change the rigid standards of significance and uniqueness. The considerations of Congress are various and not yet well aligned with this 21st Century vision as debates about budgets, private property and the role of government have grown more contentious over recently.

- Criteria** – The current criteria for creating new parks and other NPS designations does not support many of the new goals for the Second Century such as equity, redundancy, grassroots driven, and inclusionary experiences. Current criteria require that NPS parks and programs support only the most unusual, the unique, and the best.

(Resource: Report on Criteria for Affiliated Areas: submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, US Senate: Pursuant to PL 100-336; National Park Service, February 1990)
- Authorization without NPS ownership** - It is difficult for many people including Congress and NPS friends to understand the concept of National Parks without National Park ownership. The idea of the publically owned NPS “unit” is firmly ingrained in our national psyche. Say National Park Service and most people think of Yellowstone, Yosemite or another of the iconic parks, but as we have discussed in this note, there is great value in the other 350+ park units and the many NPS programs that provide technical and financial assistance to resources around the country. To make progress on the Second Century vision, the value of the partnership/collaborative parks needs to receive more study and attention by the premier partners and friends of the service such as the National Parks Conservation Association and the National Park Foundation as well as the National Park Service leadership. The value that NPS provide as a catalyst and a convener is as important as the agency being an owner and a manager.
- NPS Brand** -The National Park Service ‘brand’ is respected and trusted nationally and international. The NPS is the only federal agency beloved by Americans. There are real concerns among those who highly value the National Park Service that collaborative partnerships will weaken the NPS brand by enabling less than nationally significant resources and interpretation into the system. While this is a very valid concern that requires careful study, an over preoccupation with significance and brand has served to segregate NPS from large portions of the American population and significant parts of our country - and most especially from areas with diverse populations, economic need and environmental blight. To be truly representative of the American experience means that NPS must be allowed to participate more fully in the American scene and that the standards for significance and uniqueness need to be broaden to allow more diverse points of view and redundancy.
- NPS culture** – The current leadership of the National Park Service and many individuals in the park ranks strongly support partnerships and coalitions, but the traditional culture of the service does not make partnering easy to accomplish. Hierarchical, top down management and the current system of control and reporting requirements result in many NPS superintendents being uncomfortable and unable to deal with the give and take required in successful partnerships. This is exacerbated by Congressional requirements and inquiries and OMB’s limited interpretation of the rules and requirements. CSI has several excellent ‘white papers’ on what is required for successful partnership parks and the challenges for NPS.

(Resources: Collaboration and Conservation: Lessons Learned from NPS Partnership Areas in the Western United States, A Report on a Workshop, March 18-19, 2003, Santa Fe, NM; convened for the NPS Planning and Special Studies Program by the Conservation Study Institute and QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment. By Nora Mitchell, Jacquelyn Tuxill and Jessica Brown.

Summary

New models are requirement for success in the 21st Century. As *A Call to Action* states “America has changed dramatically since the birth of the National Park Service” and the agency needs to change as well to stay relevant. What is needed is to create a culture of collaboration within the agency that allows diverse partnerships. But the Park Service must be given the authority to do this which means that Congress has a role as well. And even if Congress acts there will still be challenges around how places are selected. What criteria will be used? How will NPS maintain its brand and not lets its valued be diluted? If more partners are allowed to participate, how does the agency safeguard against private sector self-interest or, even worse, corruption? And in the end, even with the good regulations and planning, the best partnerships and collaborations depend on the people involved and the level of trust and mutual cooperation.

None of these are simple issues, but fortunately there are existing examples, case studies and research to help guide the way. This note has attempted in a small way to point towards some of the resources that are available.

Suggested readings for partnership models and large landscape conservation strategies

Compiled by Annie C. Harris for the National Park System Advisory Board's Planning Committee 2012

Models of NPS Partnership Parks and the Frameworks for Partnerships

Collaboration and Conservation: Lessons Learned from NPS Partnership Areas in the Western United States, A Report on a Workshop, March 18-19, 2003, Santa Fe, NM; convened for the NPS Planning and Special Studies Program by the Conservation Study Institute and QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment. By Nora Mitchell, Jacquelyn Tuxill and Jessica Brown. ** Defines partnership programs nicely – including Great Sand Dunes National Monument and Preserve in CO (page 10). Case studies including Northern Rio Grande NHA and Yuma Crossing, AZ, Ebey's Landing, Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River, Redwood National and State Parks. Keys to successful partnerships: shared vision, ownership of the partnership by all, shared decision making, trust, flexibility, share control, understand different perspectives, tell stories of people and place, maintain continuity and transfer knowledge, develop ways to continually share, celebrate success. Good discussion of role of NPS – convener, catalyst and enabler of action - and role of partner – critical link to local communities and value and bridge to federal agencies. ** Look at the end of this where they describe what it takes to get a real partnership and the kind of authority, partnership culture, need to share control, etc. pages 25-33 and then Creating a Sustainable Environment for Partnerships (pages 35-38). (westernCollaboration.pdf)

Collaboration and Conservation: Lessons Learned in Areas managed through National Park Service Partnerships; Report on a Workshop at Marsh Billings Rockefeller National Historical Park, 2000. Principles for forging long-term partnerships, observations on the benefits, challenges of change and vision for the future. (collaboration.pdf)

Protected Landscapes: Prepared by Park Planning and Special Studies, within directorate of Park Planning, Facilities and Lands. White paper. The PPSS planning team was composed of Patrick Gregerson, Program Manager; Tokey Boswell, Program Analyst; and Carol Cook, Program Analyst. The subjects were 1) models on which a treasured landscape initiative might be based; and (2) authorities that might be employed by the National Park Service to manage treasured landscapes. Outlines key concepts for large landscape preservation – these are: As the Department of the Interior looks for new ways to protect large scale, inhabited landscapes with natural and cultural resources, our study effort has found evidence that several key concepts should be considered as new programs are built, new areas designated or existing efforts renewed.

1. Go where invited
2. Make long-term commitments
3. Work from a strong foundation
4. Manage by network; lead partnerships
5. Have the right staff for the job

And then lists case studies: Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, OH, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, WA, City of Rocks National Reserve, ID, Grant-Kohrs National Historic Site, MN (ranching reserve). Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, MN, and also Affiliated Areas: Pinelands National Reserve, NJ, and Biosphere Reserve, Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, MA and RI, and Partnership Wild and Scenic Rivers: Eight Mile Partnership Wild and Scenic River, CT, and National Heritage Areas and RTCA program and Land and Water Conservation Fund State Assistance Program.

This White Paper also discussed **Case Studies** – Federal, State and other Agency Models: Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Nevada and CA with US Forest Service, Adirondack Park Agency, NY State, NJ Pinelands Commission, Pennsylvania Heritage Areas Program. And Case Studies – non-governmental Agency Models: Malpai Borderlands Group, Southeastern Arizona and Southwestern New Mexico, Undaunted Stewardship, Montana, (includes BLM and Univ of Montana);

And Land Trusts: Franklin Land Trust, Western Massachusetts, (with MA Agricultural Preservation Restriction program), Skagitians to Preserve Farmland, Skagit Valley, WA, And Case Studies – International Models: Biosphere Reserves, International Case Studies: National Scenic Areas and Areas of Natural Beauty, UK; Good bibliography list at the end. (proteclandscapes-ppss.docx)

Leading in a Collaborative Environment: Six Case Studies Involving Collaboration and Civic Engagement by NPS Conservation Study Institute. 2010 Publication 17 lists some of the other reports and their pdf files. Six case studies African Burial Ground National Monument, Big Cypress National Preserve, Lowell National Historical Park, Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park, Saguaro National Park, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (CSI Report Leading_in_a_Collaborative_Environment.pdf)

Redwood National and State Parks

- **New Horizons for Cooperative Management and Collaborative Partnership: Redwood National and State Parks, CA 1994-2010** by Joe Seney and Steve Chaney: short document (3 pages) about the successful partnership between NPS and the state of CA. This paper has good list of what it takes to make such a partnership work – namely that it take work! (1152seney.pdf)
- **Center for State of the Parks – Redwood National and state Park.** 2 page summary of this partnership. Prepared by the NPCA. (REDW_fact_sheet.pdf)

Mississippi National River and Recreation Area

- **ATP Transportation Implementation Plan 2/2/2011 for Mississippi National River and Recreation Area:** 66 page document that outlines the plan for the Mississippi River Train (MRT) from the twin cities to the Gulf of Mexico comprised of bike trails, commuter trails, motorized transit and more. Mentions the NPS Trails and Open Space Partnership (TOSP). Involved the

Denver Service Center and NPS staff and partners. There is 72 mile corridor in which NPS has the authority to act. MNR&RA is a partnership park in which NPS owns very little land and works with 25 local governments, several state agencies and numerous organizations to protect the 'globally significant resources" along 72 miles of the Mississippi River. Interesting purposes: (1) protect and enhance the MI corridor, (2) encourage coordination of federal, state and local programs, (3) provide a management framework to assist the state of Minnesota and units of government in the development and implementation of integrated resources management programs and ensure orderly public and private development of the area. Interesting purpose to save MI river which is a corridor of critical area – part of a 10 state non-profit for trail planning along the entire river. Identifying the route and providing signage. (FINALTransportationImplementationPlan)

- **InsideNPS-Parks-Mississippi National River & Recreation Area** – Park Receives over \$1.0m for alternative transportation project by Susan Overson, January 2012. Relates this to the Call to Action (InsideNPS.docx)

Chesapeake Treasured Landscape Initiative – coordinated by US DOI in collaboration with the US Department of Agriculture, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and Department of Defense (Draft 203 Strategy-Treasured Landscape Initiative1.pdf) 3 page summary

Discussion White Paper, Assessment of Preservation and Development in Lowell National Historical Park at its 30-Year Anniversary: Where have we been and where should we be going?
Dennis Frenchman and Jonathan S. Lane1 (Heritage Preservation and Development White Paper A.pdf)

Two websites with articles about NPS and Partnerships

<http://www.nps.gov/csi/pdf/collaboration.pdf>

<http://www.nps.gov/csi/pdf/westernCollaboration.pdf>

Miscellaneous Notes on Other NPS Partnership Resources

NPS unit managed by a non-profit (Teddy Roosevelt Inaugural Park.doc)

Historic Chattahoochee Commission (HCC), created by laws passed in Alabama and Georgia with concurrence by Congress to operate the commission as an interstate compact, funded in part by appropriations from both signatory states. The HCC is applying to become the local coordinating entity of the potential Chattahoochee Trace National Heritage Corridor. Although no findings have been reached for the feasibility study, this type of an arrangement could be looked at for park units that may cross state boundaries.

St Croix Riverway - GMP compared different partnership approaches for managing the river-way and look at sections of the St. Croix National Heritage Area Feasibility Study that provide an analysis of management options. Source - Barbara J. (BJ) Johnson, Division Chief, National Park Service, Denver Service Center Planning, 12795 West Alameda Parkway, Lakewood, Colorado 80228.

- St-Croix-FINA:-FS-Criterion 3.pdf

- St-Croix-FINA:-FS Management Alts Chapter.pdf
- St-Croix-FINA:-FS-Criterion 6.pdf
- St-Croix-FINA:-FS-Criterion 10.pdf

Manhattan Project Sites: Special Resource Study and EIS for Los Alamos, NM, Hanford, WA, Oak Ridge, TN, Dayton, OH (MAPR_FONSI_11-15-10.pdf)

The National Parks: Index 2009-2011 www.nps.gov/history/online_books/nps/index2009_11.pdf

Other writings on the National Park Service

Advancing the National Park Idea – National Parks Second Century Commission Report (Commission_Report.pdf). Important report on visioning the future of NPS

Coming soon - National Park Service Programs: A Companion Volume to NPS Management Policies. A Review of NP Service programs that extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout America and the world. Draft January 24, 2012.

“While it is common knowledge that the NPS manages units of the national park system, it is not common knowledge that the NPS also manages programs that reach far beyond national park boundaries. Although these programs operate mainly outside the national parks, they form a vital part of the NPS mission and help sustain and enhance the quality of life throughout America. This volume describes these programs and the various roles they play in helping the NPS extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world.”

“For a graphic, State-by-State illustration of the extent to which these programs are serving America, visit the interactive “State Pages Project” website at [www.nps.gov/\[name of state\]](http://www.nps.gov/[name of state]).”

National Park Service Authorized Studies 12/5/11 – a list of authorized studies (NPS Studies.pdf)

Report on Criteria for Affiliated Areas: submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, US Senate: Pursuant to PL 100-336; National Park Service, February 1990. This is an old report but it makes some interesting points about the criteria for establishing parks that need to be addressed. Law directs DOI to report on criteria for national significance. There is no consistent system. Report recommends that “affiliated area” be applied to a select group of nationally significant areas that have a formal cooperative relationship with NPS; and should NOT be considered as a ‘stepping stone’ toward becoming a unit of NP system and not be used simply as a way to provide funding. Criteria: (1) outstanding example, (2) possesses exceptional value or quality, (3) offer superlative opportunity, (4) retains a high degree of integrity – plus suitability/feasibility and management alternatives (criteria for management differ from NPS because these are not managed by NPS) . *Note – most of these criteria are very much at odds with trying to ensure redundancy and critical mass.* Some examples of affiliated areas: Boston African

American National Historic Site (privately owned but NPS administers), Pinelands National Reserve, Ice Age National Scenic Trail and Ice Age National Scientific Reserve. Suggests a designation process and national criteria. (1990ReportAffiliatedAreas.pdf)

Papers on Large Landscape Conservation

Large Landscape Conservation: A Strategic Framework for Policy and Action; Lincoln Institute of Land Policy by Matthew McKinney, Lynn Scarlett and Daniel Kemmis. Published by the Lincoln Institute of Cambridge MA and the University of Montana's Center for Natural Resources and Environmental Policy. 2010; 60+ pages. Dealing with the scale of large landscapes. No single entity; need to create formal and informal ways to work across boundaries, focus on land and water problems at the appropriate scale. Keys: Share information, encourage networks, establish national grants, improve policy tool kit, facilitate innovative funding. Seven case studies including Blackstone and Lake Tahoe. Also identifies the barriers to large landscape approaches. Look at some of this for recommendations to NPS. (Large Landscape Conservation final.pdf)

How to Treasure a Landscape: What is the Role of the National Park Service? by Brenda Barrett, CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship; Vol 7, Number 1, Winter 2010. (How to Treasure a Landscape CRM Journal.pdf)

Ecological Integrity and Canada's National Parks by Stephan Woodley. Forwarded by Mike Scott. (272woodley.pdf)

Climate change, biodiversity conservation and protected area planning in Canada by Lemieux and Scott, forwarded by Mike Scott (Lemieux_scott.pdf)

Ecological Urbanism for the 21st Century by Jon Christensen, Robert McDonald, and Carrie Denning; January 22, 2012, (Ecological_Urbanism_21st Century.docx)

National Heritage Areas and Large Landscape Conservation

Charting a Future for the National Heritage Areas: A Report by the National Park System Advisory Board. (NHAreport.pdf)

Director Jarvis's Policy Memorandum 12-01 regarding the National Heritage Areas Program
<http://www.nps.gov/policy/PM-12-01.pdf>.

Roots for the National Heritage Area Family Tree by Brenda Barrett, 2003, George Wright Forum. Describes the Pinelands and other partnership parks. (George Wright reprint)

Congressional Research Service: Heritage Areas: Background, Proposals and Current Issues by Carol Hardy Vincent, January 7, 2010 (CRS Report on NHAs.pdf)

National Heritage Areas: Developing a Model for Measuring Success; 2004 US/ICOMOS International Symposium, Natchitoches, Louisiana. Summary of the benefits of the NHAs. (NHA Developing a Model for Measuring Success.pdf)

National Heritage Areas and the National Park Service: Protecting Investment and Sustaining a Public-Private Partnership for the Future. White Paper by Alliance of National Heritage Areas (National Heritage areas: Case_final.pdf)

Best Practices in Heritage Development from the National Heritage Areas Fall 2005

Completed for the National Park Service and the Alliance of National Heritage Areas by Rosemary Prola, University of Maryland (Best Practices.pdf)

The National Park Service and the National Heritage Area Program Brief description by Annie C. Harris, Executive Director of the Essex National Heritage Area (National Heritage Area summary rev3a.doc)

Economic Impact of Six National Heritage Areas; December 2010 (revised 2008 Economic Impact 6 National Heritage Areas MGM2 by ANHA.doc)

National Heritage Areas (InfoSheet_NHAs in brief_4 2011 final.pdf)

Alliance of National Heritage Areas Annual Report (AnnualReport2010.pdf)

Alliance of National Heritage Areas Annual Report (AnnualReport2009.pdf)