

Regionalism in the West: An Inventory and Assessment

Public Land and Resources Law Review (vol. 23, 2002): 101-191

Matthew McKinney, Craig Fitch, and Will Harmon ¹

1. Introduction
2. Methodology
3. Why Regionalism in the West?
4. Types of Regional Initiatives
5. Types of Institutional Frameworks
6. Accomplishments of Regional Initiatives
7. Key Ingredients to Success
8. Obstacles and Challenges
9. Strategies to Support and Promote Regionalism
10. Conclusion

Appendix 1: Index of Regional Initiatives by Geographic Scale and Function

Appendix 2: Profiles of Regional Initiatives in the West

¹ Matthew McKinney is the Executive Director of the Western Consensus Council. Craig Fitch is a Research Associate with the Council, and Will Harmon is the Director of Research and Communication for the Western Consensus Council.

1. Introduction

In 1890, after surveying the West, John Wesley Powell published an essay titled “Institutions for the Arid Lands.”² In that essay, Powell articulated his vision that the most appropriate institutions for governing western resources are commonwealths defined by watersheds. He reasoned that, “. . . there is a body of interdependent and unified interests and values, all collected in [a] hydrographic basin, and all segregated by well-defined boundary lines from the rest of the world. The people in such a district have common interests, common rights, and common duties, and must necessarily work together for common purposes.” Powell went on to conclude that such people should be allowed to organize “. . . under national and state laws, a great irrigation district, including an entire hydrographic basin, and . . . make their own laws for the division of waters, for the protection and use of the forests, for the protection of the pasturage on the hills, and for the uses of the powers [created by the flow of water].”

Powell’s prescription to organize around watersheds was largely ignored in the formative years of natural resource policy in the West.³ His vision of watershed democracies, however, is part of a larger story of how American citizens and communities have attempted to govern public affairs on the basis of regions—defined by Webster’s as “a broad geographic area containing a population whose members possess sufficient historical, cultural, economic, or social homogeneity to distinguish them from others.”⁴ While the history of regionalism is characterized by a mix of successes and failures, there is a renewed interest throughout North America in addressing land use, natural resource, and environmental problems on a regional basis.⁵

According to a group of regional practitioners that recently met in Salt Lake City, regionalism is by definition an integrative approach to policy and management for at least two reasons. First, regionalism looks beyond political and jurisdictional boundaries, embracing a distinctly trans-boundary approach that recognizes “the natural territory of public issues,” such as watersheds, ecosystems, bioregions, or other organic regions. Second, although regional initiatives typically start by focusing on a specific issue, most eventually touch on a mix of social, economic, and environmental issues.

² John Wesley Powell, “Institutions for the Arid Lands,” *The Century Magazine* (May-June, 1890): 111-116.

³ The standard biography of Powell and his ideas is Wallace Stegner, *Beyond the Hundredth Meridian* (University of Nebraska Press, 1953).

⁴ *Webster’s Unabridged Third New International Dictionary* (1993).

⁵ For an excellent summary of the history of regionalism in the United States, see Kathryn A. Foster, *Regionalism on Purpose* (Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2001). See also Martha Derthick, *Between Nation and State: Regional Organizations of the United States* (The Brookings Institution, 1974); and Ethan Seltzer, “Regional Planning in America: Updating Earlier Visions,” *Land Lines* (Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, November 2000): 4-6.

As defined here, regionalism shares many values and strategies with “civic environmentalism⁶,” “community-based conservation⁷,” “deliberative democracy⁸,” and “consensus building⁹.” These disciplines are similar in that they are focused on improving communication and participation in natural resource policy and public decision making through inclusive, informed, deliberative forums.

Using different language, each discipline seems to rest on a common premise: if you bring together the right people in constructive forums with the best available information, they are likely to shape effective solutions to shared problems. What distinguishes regionalism from these other disciplines is its focus on the geography of human needs and interests.

Regional initiatives include countless small-scale projects, such as watershed councils and community-based growth management efforts, as well as larger-scale ventures such as the Yukon to the Yellowstone initiative.¹⁰ The focus may be water, wildlife, air quality, federal lands, land use and growth management, transportation, or economic development. Regardless of their scale or objective, regional initiatives share a common set of values and beliefs—the need to think and act regionally, across political and jurisdictional boundaries. They also share a common set of frustrations (and advantages) as they seek to create and sustain effective organizations that do not comfortably fit into the established framework of local, state, and federal governments. For this reason, the conversation about regionalism should not be limited to a particular type of regional initiative, such as those with environmental or economic objectives, but should be inclusive of all types of regionalism.

In response to the emergence of regional initiatives throughout North America, Dr. Charles H.W. Foster convened the Harvard Environmental Regionalism Project in 1994.¹¹ The intent of the Harvard Environmental Regionalism project is to examine trends in regional approaches to land use, natural resource, and environmental issues; identify key ingredients to success; and to develop research and educational materials to further advance this field.

In October 2000, Dr. Foster invited the Western Consensus Council to join this project and focus on regional approaches to natural resource and environmental issues in the American

⁶ Dewitt John, *Civic Environmentalism: Alternatives to Regulation in States and Communities* (Congressional Quarterly, 1994).

⁷ Philip Brick, Donald Snow, and Sarah Van De Wetering, eds., *Across the Great Divide: Explorations in Collaborative Conservation and the American West* (Island Press, 2001).

⁸ John Dryzek, *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond* (Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁹ Lawrence Susskind, et al., eds., *The Consensus Building Handbook* (Sage Publications, 2000).

¹⁰ See the attached inventory of regional initiatives in the West for specific examples.

¹¹ Dr. Foster is a Research Professor at the Kennedy School of Government, and has been actively involved in regional policy, planning, and management for over 50 years. Charles H.W. Foster and William B. Meyer, *The Harvard Environmental Regionalism Project* (Environment and Natural Resources Program, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, December 2000); Charles H. W. Foster, *Managing Resources as Whole Systems: A Primer for Managers* (Environment and Natural Resources Program, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, December 1997).

West. The Western Consensus Council, an independent not-for-profit organization that promotes collaborative approaches to natural resource and public policy in the American West, agreed, and organized The Western Regionalism Project (WRP). The WRP is a long-term initiative to document, evaluate, and promote regional approaches to natural resource and environmental policy in the American West. The basic proposition of the WRP is that regional, trans-boundary approaches to land use, natural resource, and environmental issues often lead to more sustainable communities and landscapes. In this respect, regionalism is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Two corollaries to this proposition are (1) that regionalism offers a supplemental, if not alternative, way to govern natural resource-related issues; and (2) the institutional framework for regional initiatives varies according to the objectives, scale, participants, and timeframe of each initiative. The WRP focuses on alternative institutional arrangements that support and promote regionalism, and different strategies for sharing decision-making responsibility and governing regional institutions.

This article is the first step in developing a research, education, and policy agenda to promote regionalism in the West. In short, this article presents the results of three related projects conducted during the past year: (1) an inventory of regional initiatives in the West; (2) a survey of regional practitioners in the West; and (3) a workshop of regional practitioners and scholars in the West. We hope the information and analysis presented in this article provide a baseline of sorts, a preliminary inventory of regional initiatives in the West and prescriptions—for practice, policy, research and education—on how to support and promote regional thinking and action.

2. Methodology

In January 2001, students at The University of Montana School of Law started to inventory regional initiatives in the West as part of Dr. McKinney's class on *Natural Resource Dispute Resolution*. The intent of the preliminary inventory was to identify and create a profile of different types of regional initiatives in the West. For purposes of the inventory, the West is defined as those states located entirely west of the 100th meridian, minus Alaska and Hawaii. It includes the eight federal land states that compose the Rocky Mountain West, as well as the states along the West Coast and the western edge of the Great Plains¹².

We identified and created profiles of 72 regional initiatives. Each profile includes a list of participants, the objectives of the initiative, a description of the institutional framework, the scale or region of the initiative, and contact information. We tried to include examples of regional initiatives across the range of objectives, rather than focusing on one type of regional initiative. This inventory is by no means comprehensive or complete; it is very much a work in progress.

To learn more about the 72 initiatives, the Western Consensus Council distributed a short survey in August 2001. This survey asked regional practitioners to explain why their regional initiative was started; what it has produced; the key ingredients to success; the obstacles and

¹² The complete inventory is presented as an appendix to this article, and is also available on-line at www.headwatersnews.org.

challenges they face in terms of sustaining an effective initiative; and suggestions on the types of services that a “center of excellence” might provide. As of September 11th, we received responses from 46 of the 72 initiatives surveyed, for a response rate of 64 percent.

During August, we continued to identify additional regional initiatives in the West. In addition to the 72 cases, the National Association of Regional Councils lists 60 councils of government or metropolitan planning organizations in the West.¹³ Not surprisingly, California has the greatest number of regional councils, at twenty-four. Only Montana and Wyoming do not have any regional councils. We did not survey all 60 of the regional councils of government or metropolitan planning organizations, but we have completed preliminary profiles on many of these regional initiatives. Based on the inventory and survey, we convened a workshop in December 2001, in Salt Lake City, to learn more about the status, trends, and possibilities of regionalism in the West. Twenty-two people, including 18 practitioners (people who lead and manage regional initiatives) participated in the working session.

3. Why Regionalism in the West?

One of the discussions at the working session explored the forces and trends driving the emergence and proliferation of regional initiatives. Participants cited four primary forces converging on the American West at the end of the 20th century that are consistent with the literature on regionalism.¹⁴

First, informed by complexity theory, we can see that regionalism is an organic, inner-directed response to human needs and interests.¹⁵ The comparative advantage of regionalism as a framework for policy and management is its insistence on addressing human needs and interests according to the “natural geography” of the problem or opportunity. This approach has emerged in part from attempts to protect endangered species and their habitat, an improved understanding of ecosystems (or “natural regions”), and an increased ability and willingness to take integrative approaches to solving problems. Regionalism recognizes the value of integrating social, economic, and environmental concerns; multiple interests and viewpoints; and different ways of learning.

Second, advances in information, communication, and transportation technologies allow people to work together at global (Earth being the largest example of a “natural,” organic region), continental, and subcontinental scales.¹⁶ Globalization has led to the integration of the world’s economies, which forces people to think and act regionally to remain competitive, both to sustain the local economy and to interact with markets around the globe.

¹³ See www.narc.org.

¹⁴ See footnote 5.

¹⁵ Daniel Kemmis, *This Sovereign Land: A New Vision for Governing the West* (Island Press, 2001).

¹⁶ See footnote 15.

Third, regionalism is a response to the failure of existing institutions to effectively solve problems that transcend political and jurisdictional boundaries.¹⁷ People are looking for better ways to resolve trans-boundary issues such as transportation planning in urban centers, wildlife management in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, air quality on the Colorado Plateau, or land use and recreation in the Columbia River Gorge. Some regional efforts are attempts to pre-empt heavy handed or misguided regulatory enforcement. In other cases, people recognize a “common fate”—that “our” future is linked to “their” future and cooperation is the best path to a sustainable solution.

Fourth, the re-emergence of federalism and emphasis on decentralized government compels states and communities to think and act regionally to pool resources and resolve common problems. In short, regionalism is proving to be an effective way to sustain communities and landscapes. The larger the playing field, the more resources can be applied to the problem, and the easier it is to make tradeoffs among competing interests. In addition, Congress and other leaders have promoted regional approaches from the top down through policies and executive orders¹⁸. Some public interest laws (and subsequent litigation) have compelled agencies to engage in regional approaches¹⁹.

4. Types of Regional Initiatives

Based on our preliminary inventory, regional initiatives in the West can be characterized by who initiates them, at what geographic scale, and for what purpose.

A. Initiation

Regional initiatives in the West are initiated by a number of different actors. Citizens, perhaps frustrated by the inability of existing jurisdictions and institutions to solve particular problems, have catalyzed and convened a number of regional initiatives. The Malpai Borderlands Group, Grand Canyon Trust, Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Coalition, and the Lead Partnership Group are just a few of the many regional initiatives in the West that have been initiated and convened by citizens. Some of these initiatives are more organized than others, some are more advocacy-oriented, and others are more inclusive forums for education and problem solving.

Other regional initiatives have been catalyzed and coordinated by one or more levels of government. Some initiatives, such as the Missouri River Basin Association, the Greater

¹⁷ Peter Calthorpe and William Fulton, *The Regional City: Planning for the End of Sprawl* (Island Press, 2001).

¹⁸ See footnote 11.

¹⁹ See Robert B. Keiter, Ted Boling, and Louise Milkman, “Legal Perspectives on Ecosystem Management: Legitimizing a New Federal Land Management Policy,” in N.C. Johnson et. al., eds, *Ecological Stewardship: A Common Reference for Ecosystem Management* (Elsevier Science, 1999): volume 3, 9-41. See also Robert B. Keiter, “Taking Account of the Ecosystem on the Public Domain: Law and Ecology in the Greater Yellowstone Region,” *University of Colorado Law Review* 60(4)(1989): 923-1007.

Yellowstone Coordinating Committee, and the Southwest Strategy, represent partnerships among multiple levels of government, including local, state, federal, and in some cases tribal jurisdictions. Other initiatives, such as the Sierra Nevada Framework for Conservation and Collaboration, reflect the commitment of particular government agencies to think and act regionally within the confines of their own jurisdiction. The Sierra Nevada Framework is one of the most ambitious efforts undertaken by the U.S. Forest Service to employ the philosophy and strategy of ecosystem management to the stewardship of national forests.

Still other regional initiatives are initiated and managed by public-private partnerships. The Pacific Northwest Economic Region is designed to promote economic development and free trade among several states and provinces in the Pacific Northwest. It was statutorily endorsed by the multiple states and provinces, and is governed and funded by representatives from the public and private sectors. Likewise, the Outside Las Vegas Foundation is a trans-boundary partnership among local, state, and federal governments and the private sector designed to manage growth and preserve the environmental quality surrounding Las Vegas.

The fact that regional initiatives are initiated by a diversity of actors suggests that there is widespread recognition of the need for and value of trans-boundary approaches to land use, natural resources, and other environmental issues. The variety of ways in which regional initiatives emerge also reflects a natural laboratory in which multiple experiments flourish and provide different lessons on what works.

B. Geographic Scale

Regional initiatives in the West are organized at different geographic scales, from small watersheds to multi-national ecosystems. At one end of the spectrum are numerous intra-state watershed councils.²⁰ As used here, “watershed council” is an umbrella term for regionally based initiatives defined by a focus on one or more aspects of a watershed. While there are literally hundreds of watershed councils throughout the West, all of which might be defined as experiments in regionalism, the inventory of regional initiatives is limited to watershed councils that encompass more than one established jurisdiction, such as a county or national forest boundary, but fall within a particular state. For example, the Big Hole Watershed Committee cuts across two counties, two national forests, federal land managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, state land managed by the Montana Department of Natural Resources, and private land.

The second type of regional initiative, defined by geographic scale, is intra-state place-based partnerships. These partnerships are delineated by geographical and social characteristics that define a region within a particular state. In some cases, the region may be a watershed, but the initiative’s focus reaches beyond water management issues. For example, the Applegate Partnership defines itself in part by the boundaries of the Applegate River watershed in southwestern Oregon, but the partnership’s objectives include promoting economic diversity and

²⁰ Perhaps the best summary and evaluation of watershed councils in the West is Doug Kenney, et al., *The New Watershed Sourcebook* (Natural Resources Law Center, University of Colorado School of Law, 1999).

community values. Likewise, the Great Valley Center focuses its efforts on supporting the economic, social, and environmental well being of California's Great Central Valley, which spans several watersheds between the Sierras and the coast ranges from Redding in the north to Fresno in the south. Other place-based partnerships focus on a swath of forest, range of mountains, or region of economies.

From intrastate regional initiatives, we move to inter-state initiatives. These initiatives encompass more than one state and may be defined by watersheds, such as the Missouri River Basin Association, or other regional characteristics, such as the Grand Canyon Trust.

The fourth type of regional initiative in terms of geographic scale, is multi-national initiatives. Some of these initiatives are defined by partnerships among national governments, such as the Glacier-Waterton International Peace Park and Biosphere Reserve, which is focused on the preservation of unique wildland resources in the northern Rocky Mountains region in the United States and Canada. Others include working arrangements among multiple states and provinces, such as the Pacific Northwest Economic Region. Other multi-national initiatives are defined by watersheds that cut across international boundaries, such as the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Coalition along the U.S.-Mexico border, and the Yellowstone to the Yukon initiative, which reaches from the headwaters of the Yellowstone River in the U.S. to the Yukon River in Canada.

The fifth and sixth types of regional initiatives focus on issues bounded by metropolitan areas, such as transportation, wastewater, and related urban challenges. Urban planning initiatives include efforts by neighboring cities and counties to work together to solve common problems or to gain efficiency and economies of scale by sharing infrastructure and services. For example, Envision Utah brings together state and local governments, private industry, and non-profit organizations to develop growth management strategies focused on preserving Utah's quality of life. Regional councils of government are more formalized partnerships among local governments. The Sante Fe Regional Planning Authority, for example, is designed to promote effective land use planning and growth management in the city and county of Sante Fe. The Western Colorado Council of Government, by contrast, encompasses multiple counties west of the continental divide, to not only coordinate the delivery of services, but also to foster a regional political coalition in affairs with the more populous eastern slope of the Rockies, including the greater Denver metropolitan area.

This typology of regional initiatives based on geographic scale suggests that regionalism is at once a unifying theme and an adaptive concept. The idea of people and organizations, both public and private, working across political and jurisdictional boundaries seems to be a desirable way to approach land use, natural resource, and other public problems at nearly all geographic scales.

C. Purpose

There seem to be at least six objectives for creating regional, trans-boundary initiatives. These different objectives reinforce one another, and suggest a natural progression from knowledge- and community-building to advocacy and governance.

Knowledge Building: The first objective is to conduct research and education. Several initiatives, such as the Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project, the Blue Mountain Natural Resources Institute, and several regional think tanks, are designed to promote a deeper sense of the social, economic, and ecological characteristics of a particular region. Some initiatives are also designed to develop the capacity of citizens and officials within a region to work together on issues of common concern. Knowledge building seems to be the foundation for most regional initiatives, suggesting that it is a necessary condition before moving on to other objectives.

Community Building: In addition to fostering awareness and understanding of a particular region, some initiatives are expressly designed to stimulate conversation, mutual understanding, and a common sense of place within a particular region. Many watershed councils and other place-based partnerships, for example, often start as forums to exchange ideas and better understand their region. In many cases, these regional forums take on other objectives, such as solving particular problems. The Western Charter Project, for example, is designed to foster a conversation about the region—its past, present, and future. Since 1997, the Great Valley Center has raised awareness and understanding of the Great Central Valley as a distinct region in California and now works to improve planning and decision-making processes in the region.

Share Resources: Another objective or function of regional initiatives is to share resources, particularly information. The Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee, the Glacier-Waterton International Peace Park and Biosphere Reserve, and several other initiatives are designed to improve coordination of programs and services among agencies and organizations within a region.

Advisory: The fourth objective of regional initiatives is to provide input and advice in the spirit of solving particular problems. Not surprisingly, this is a relatively common objective. A variety of urban planning initiatives, such as efforts in Washoe County, Nevada, the Santa Fe Regional Planning Authority, and Envision Utah, are designed to solve trans-boundary issues related to growth and land use. The Missouri River Basin Association is an interstate forum to address problems related to the use and management of the Missouri River, which flows through at least ten different states.

Advocacy: Another objective or function of some regional initiatives is to promote a distinctive agenda within a particular region. The Northern Rockies Ecosystem Project, the Grand Canyon Trust, and the Greater Yellowstone Coalition, for example, are designed to pursue environmental objectives in their respective regions. The Pacific Northwest Economic Region is designed to promote economic opportunities within that region, and the CANAMEX project fosters interstate transportation planning. While the specific objectives of these regional initiatives varies, they are all designed to advocate a particular outcome or policy.

Govern: The sixth and final objective or function of regional initiatives is to govern—that is, to make, administer, and enforce policy within a designated region. This type of regional initiative appears to be relatively rare in the West. The only two examples that we have identified to date are the Columbia River Gorge Commission and the Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Authority.

5. Types of Institutional Frameworks

Given the source and diversity of objectives of regional initiatives, it is not surprising that there appear to be at least nine different institutional models for creating and structuring regional institutions.

A. Ad Hoc Partnerships. These types of arrangements are most often characterized as citizen-driven initiatives. That is, they emerge from the efforts of citizens with a common interest in a particular region, and often do not have any official government sanction or authority. Some ad hoc partnerships may include governmental representatives, but many do not.

B. Non-Government Organizations. More often than not, regional initiatives that are designed to promote environmental objectives are formed and governed as not-for-profit organizations. Examples include the Greater Yellowstone Coalition, the Alliance For The Wild Rockies, and the Flathead Lakers. Other regional initiatives, such as the Missouri River Basin Association, also operate as not-for-profit corporations.

C. Research Organizations. Initiatives whose primary goal is to accumulate and disseminate information are typically affiliated with a university. Examples include the Utton Transboundary Resource Center and the Center of the American West. The West is also home to a number of centers for research, study, and theory development on regional issues. These think tanks, such as the Center for the Rocky Mountain West; the Stegner Center for Land, Resources, and the Environment; and others, tend to emphasize multi-disciplinary approaches to exploring the natural, cultural, political, and economic aspects of decision- and policy-making in the West.

D. Government Sponsored Initiatives. These initiatives are catalyzed and/or supported by one or more levels of government. This category is composed of several subcategories:

- (a) **Statutory** - recognized by state or federal legislature. Examples include the Flathead Basin Commission (created by the Montana legislature), the Pacific Northwest Economic Region (created by several state and provincial legislatures), and the Henry's Fork Watershed Council (created by the Idaho legislature).
- (b) **Executive Order** - mandated through executive action by the President or a Governor. Examples include the Southwest Basin Native Fish Watershed Advisory Group (created by the Governor in Idaho).
- (c) **Interstate/International Compacts** – between state/federal or state/state agencies. Examples include the Colorado River Water Compact, Northwest Power Planning Council, and the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park and Biosphere Reserve.
- (d) **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** – an understanding that the various groups will attempt to coordinate or mutually delegate some level of planning or authority.

Examples include the Southwest Strategy and the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee.

- (e) **Agency-driven.** This category is often found when a state or federal agency (or both) realizes that there is a problem or issue that is generally in the public interest. In response, one or more agencies take the initiative to create an otherwise ad hoc partnership, such as the San Carlos/Safford/Duncan Watershed and the Little Colorado River Multiple Objective Management Group.

- E. Hybrid Initiatives.** This category includes groups that originated under one institutional framework and were later transformed into another type of institution or organization. For example, the Rio Puerco Watershed Management Committee was originally formed in an ad hoc manner and was later recognized by Congress under Public Law 104-333.

6. Accomplishments of Regional Initiatives

Given that the intent of this article is to provide an overview of the status and trends of regionalism in the West, we have not developed case studies or examined in detail the performance of any regional initiatives. However, regional practitioners were asked in the survey to characterize the nature of their accomplishments. The survey did not impose a definition of success for regional initiatives, but rather provided a list of different indicators of accomplishments, and asked respondents to check the ones that characterized their performance.

Forty-two out of 46 organizations responding to the survey report that they have improved communication and collaboration; 38 out of 46 have increased understanding of the social, economic, and environmental characteristics of the region; 34 out of 46 have increased public awareness of the region; 33 out of 46 have fostered policy outcomes; and 29 out of 46 have implemented on-the-ground projects.

These results indicate that, at least for the regional initiatives that responded to the survey, much of their self-defined success revolves around procedural indicators—improving communication and collaboration, increasing understanding, and raising public awareness. These accomplishments do not, in and of themselves, immediately result in on-the-ground accomplishments. However, they establish the necessary relationships and foster a common understanding that provides the foundation for future success. The fact that the most frequently cited indicators of success are procedural also suggests that it takes time to develop and implement policy and management plans. From this perspective, it appears that small steps to improve the process of regionalism may provide the motivation for more substantial accomplishments down the road.

At the same time, the accomplishments in terms of process are important in themselves. Many respondents seemed to be quite enthusiastic and satisfied by successfully creating trans-boundary partnerships, conducting research, and raising awareness and understanding of their particular region. Given that regional thinking and action runs perpendicular to our established system of arbitrarily defined jurisdictions and institutions, regional initiatives should be viewed

as long-term experiments. The results of our survey, albeit somewhat limited, suggest that important process changes are under way.²¹

7. Key Ingredients to Success

Although the regional initiatives surveyed vary in many respects, they seem to share a number of common ingredients in terms of their success. The most frequently cited reason for success was the dedication of the participants. Forty out of 46 respondents noted the critical importance of having motivated, committed people to help create a regional vision and then develop the means to make the vision a reality. Whether public or private, professional or volunteer, talented leaders often create and sustain regional initiatives despite a lack of resources and political or public support.

Another commonly cited ingredient to effective regional initiatives, one that no doubt reflects the ability of strong, thoughtful leaders, is collaboration among individuals and groups with diverse viewpoints. Thirty-six survey respondents identified the critical need to build partnerships with people and organizations across jurisdictions, to foster broad-based political coalitions, and to promote processes that provide an opportunity for all interests to be meaningfully involved. Participants at the Salt Lake City workshop echoed this conclusion, and emphasized the need to establish ground rules for inclusive participation early on as a way to build trust and understanding, which lays the foundation for building agreements and a sense of community within a region.

Thirty-one respondents said that agency support was critical to their success. Local, state, and federal officials can provide legitimacy and credibility, as well as authority, to regional initiatives. They also provide funding and technical assistance. The workshop participants agreed that, if the intent of a regional initiative is to influence public decision-making, one of the most valuable contributions of agencies is to link the efforts and outcomes of ad hoc forums to formal decision-making structures and existing political jurisdictions. In addition to agency

²¹ For more on the success of regional initiatives, see Doug Kenney, et al., *The New Watershed Sourcebook* (Natural Resources Law Center, University of Colorado School of Law, 1999); The Keystone Center, *The Keystone National Policy Dialogue on Ecosystem Management: Final Report* (The Keystone Center, October 1996); and Stephen L. Yaffee, et al., *Ecosystem Management in the United States: An Assessment of Current Experience* (Island Press, 1996). John E. Thorson, *River of Promise, River of Peril: The Politics of Managing the Missouri River* (University Press of Kansas, 1994), provides a superb study of efforts to manage the Missouri River Basin, one of the largest eco-regions in the United States. Robert B. Keiter, "Taking Account of the Ecosystem on the Public Domain: Law and Ecology in the Greater Yellowstone Region," *University of Colorado Law Review* 60(4)(1989): 923-1007, provides an insightful examination of regional approaches to land and resource management in and around America's first national park.

support, public support was cited by 19 respondents as critical to implementing effective regional initiatives.

Another important ingredient to success is the availability of resources, including people, funding, information, equipment (particularly geographic information systems) and time. Twenty-five respondents said that the availability of adequate resources at the appropriate time is critical to moving regional initiatives forward.

Finally, 21 respondents said that it is important to define “meaningful, realistic boundaries.” Building on this observation, participants at the workshop agreed that effective regional initiatives focus on a core area that has integrity and definition, and are more comfortable with the boundaries of a region being fuzzy.

8. Obstacles and Challenges

When asked to identify obstacles and challenges to sustaining the effectiveness of a regional initiative, 31 out of 46 survey respondents said “limited resources,” making this the most common response. Resources found lacking include knowledge, time, funding, and information. Workshop participants echoed this theme. One said that “Regional practitioners learn on the job. We need training, mentoring, and opportunities to share experience and ideas with other practitioners.” Another agreed, saying that practitioners need training in collaborative problem solving in particular. “We struggle with time issues,” said another participant, “deadlines, time as money, conflicting expectations of how fast or slow to move, and the public’s short attention span.” The lack of resources can lead to turnover, burnout, and generational change (within regional organizations and among constituents), which makes it difficult to build on progress and reconcile old and new values.

The next three most commonly cited challenges focus on agency-related problems, inadequate participation, and opposition from the general public, political officials, and/or private interests.

Several survey respondents said that many agencies are reluctant to engage in multi-jurisdictional processes because they have different missions and mandates and limited resources. Some agencies claim that existing laws and regulations, particularly the Federal Advisory Committee Act, create a significant barrier to working with citizens, interest groups, and other agencies. Several respondents and workshop participants also perceived that many agencies are reluctant to engage in regional, trans-boundary initiatives because of historical animosity, the need to maintain control over the agenda and outcomes, and little to no experience in sharing responsibility for common problems.

Practitioners also said that hierarchical decision making—common in bureaucracies—doesn’t work on regional issues. “No *one* person makes the sorts of decisions we deal with,” they said. Sometimes decision makers are uncooperative, uninterested, or overwhelmed. “Government agencies tend to do their work ‘by the book,’” said one practitioner, “with no room for flexibility or creativity. Some resist sharing power or decision making authority.”

Fragmented jurisdictions owned by multiple public and private parties make it difficult to work effectively at the regional level. Distrust among stakeholders is often a problem. People also need to be convinced that they are likely to achieve more of their interests by working together at a regional level than through any alternative approach—in short, that regional, trans-boundary approaches add value. One practitioner said that “People focus on immediate, personal concerns and personal agendas. They lose sight of larger-scale opportunities and long-range potential.”

Practitioners often face opposition to the idea of regional approaches in general, and sometimes to a particular initiative. The public is often wary of government-initiated regional initiatives. Workshop participants said that negative public reactions most likely stem from misinformation and misperceptions, and skepticism about a new way of doing business. Some people extrapolate from unfavorable experiences with government planning and regulation. One workshop participant noted that political will is not always built on local public opinion. “Political support often comes from outside the region,” he said, “particularly on environmental issues. Urban centers provide political and financial support, but we struggle to build similar constituencies within the region itself. When people’s sense of self-identity doesn’t jibe with the region’s identity (as defined by a given issue), it is hard to promote a cohesive sense of place. We also face a constant tension among local, state, and national interests.”

A final concern shared by most regional practitioners is the question of authority. As one practitioner put it, “When we make decisions that carry clout, we run into questions of governance—how is governance shared among the region’s constituencies? Who has the power to enforce these decisions? Who provides incentives for compliance? Who pays the bills?”

9. Strategies to Support and Promote Regionalism

Based on the proposition that regionalism is an effective approach to land use, natural resources, and environmental protection in the West, we asked people in the survey and during the practitioners’ workshop what resources or services would most help them. Taken as a whole, people responding to the survey and participants at the workshop seem to suggest that it would be helpful to (1) build the capacity of existing regional practitioners and initiatives to be as effective as possible; and (2) build a constituency for regionalism. Four related strategies to accomplish these objectives emerge from the survey and Salt Lake City workshop.

The first strategy is to sustain and expand the network of practitioners that convened in Salt Lake City. The participants agreed that the audience should in large part be limited to practitioners—people who have similar jobs leading and managing regional initiatives. They suggested that it might be valuable to invite other regional practitioners, particularly people working on regional initiatives within federal, state, and local government. The participants also concluded that it is important to hear from scholars and other regional thinkers, and that it is valuable to meet on at least an annual basis to exchange ideas and identify best practices.

To further build the capacity of existing regional practitioners, participants suggested the potential value of creating a listserv and a website. They also suggested that it would be helpful to document successful models of regionalism, and to develop training seminars on designing

regional initiatives, managing regional organizations, and strategies for collaborative problem solving.

The second strategy is research and communication. Twenty-two respondents to the survey agreed that it would be valuable to gather, analyze, and redistribute information. The participants at the workshop were even more emphatic about the need for additional research, case studies, and communication materials.

Two of the most practical research questions identified by the participants at the workshop are (1) How do regional initiatives survive and thrive in the current system of local, state, and federal government systems? and (2) How can and/or should the efforts of non-governmental regional initiatives be effectively connected to the existing system of public decision making? This second question raises the related question of what the most appropriate roles are for the public and private sectors. Participants also suggested that it would be valuable to identify and examine different models of regionalism, to identify when regional approaches are most appropriate, and to identify the key ingredients to convening and coordinating effective regional initiatives.²²

Several people also expressed an interest in learning more about regional models of governance, understanding how they emerge, how they are structured, and how effective they are. While this would help existing practitioners, additional evidence on the comparative advantages of regionalism in terms of environmental quality, economic development, and social equity, and the conditions under which regionalism works, would be helpful in promoting regionalism within existing institutions.

²² Several people have suggested that it might be valuable to convene the community of scholars that specialize in regional, trans-boundary approaches to policy and management to identify the “best practices” in terms of the scientific and technical “field tools” required for regionalism. Such a meeting or ongoing conversations among “experts” would complement an annual gathering of practitioners. It might also be valuable to create local partnerships among practitioners and universities with expertise in regional science and policy. In other words, encourage university faculty and programs to support regional initiatives that are close in proximity.

This research and communication program should also examine legal opportunities and barriers to regional governance,²³ as well as review and develop policy initiatives and incentives to think and act regionally.²⁴ It should produce peer-reviewed case studies—both successes and failures, and prepare training manuals on the use of collaborative problem solving, computer modeling²⁵, implementation strategies, and other techniques to improve the effectiveness of regional initiatives.

At a very practical level, participants suggested that it is important to clarify our vocabulary as a means to improve our ability to communicate with each other and to build a constituency to support regionalism. Along these lines, participants agreed that we need a more rigorous framework for thinking about the place of regionalism among other approaches to natural resource policy and management. Finally, participants agreed that we should develop and incorporate effective feedback loops into both the theory and practice of regionalism. On the one hand, practitioners should build in opportunities for reflective learning, which might then suggest ways to adapt their practice to be more effective. Likewise, practitioners and scholars should evaluate what works, explain why, and integrate such lessons into education and training programs.

The third strategy is to provide education and training. Twenty-seven survey respondents suggested that it would be valuable to convene seminars, workshops, and other educational programs. Based on the very successful model of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy,²⁶ this strategy might begin with a senior executive institute for existing practitioners.²⁷ The institute could provide opportunities for peer consultation and advice (suggested by 25 out of 46 survey respondents); advice on fund-raising (suggested by 27 out of 46 respondents); strategies for public participation and collaborative problem solving, particularly among stakeholders who are difficult to bring to the table; and technical assistance and referrals to appropriate experts on other topics. Participants at the workshop also suggested that it might be valuable to establish a fellowship and/or mentoring program that would allow practitioners, and perhaps members of their boards of directors, to spend time working with other regional practitioners.

²³ See Robert B. Keiter, Ted Boling, and Louise Milkman, “Legal Perspectives on Ecosystem Management: Legitimizing a New Federal Land Management Policy,” in N.C. Johnson et. al., eds, *Ecological Stewardship: A Common Reference for Ecosystem Management* (Elsevier Science, 1999): volume 3, 9-41.

²⁴ See, for example, the ENLIBRA Principles adopted by the Western Governor’s Association. www.westgov.org.

²⁵ For example, several people suggested that it would be very helpful to encourage public and private organizations to use a common format for geographic information systems, census data, and other relevant information.

²⁶ See www.lincolnst.org

²⁷ The “network of practitioners” might be reframed as a senior executive institute.

To complement the senior executive institute, the education and training strategy should also include one or more skill-building courses to build the capacity of practitioners and the constituency for regional initiatives. As one member of the national advisory board for the Harvard Environmental Regionalism Project said, we need to “. . . train people who can facilitate thinking across boundaries, to work together to recognize and save natural character, natural resources and the environment. One attribute of these leaders might be that they are respectful of both people and places.”²⁸

The fourth and final strategy is to build a constituency for regional thinking and action by working with policy makers and other officials within existing institutional arrangements. If regionalism is more than a supplement to existing institutions and systems for public decision-making—if it offers an alternative form of governance—then it is critical to raise awareness, understanding, and interest among existing decision makers and other people who may be affected by regional approaches to policy and management.

The participants identified two specific needs along these lines. First, local, state and federal governments should be encouraged to re-organize, or at least to allow re-organization, to fit regional needs and interests. This is fundamentally a challenge of fostering the political and public will to change our systems of problem solving and governance. Second, as mentioned above, new models for regional governance (the authority to make and enforce policy) need to be identified, examined, and developed to facilitate a change in political and public will.

To begin to accomplish these objectives, the participants agreed that the Bush administration, particularly the Council on Environmental Quality, should develop an executive order and/or policy guidance on the need for and value of regional initiatives. Recently, there has been a strong push to seek Congressional authorization for a series of “pilot projects” or experimental approaches to federal lands management.²⁹ The National Forest Foundation and the Bush Administration have also expressed interest in pilot projects, which might include one or more regional, trans-boundary approaches to natural resource policy and management.³⁰ Members of Congress should build on this interest and explore the possibility of creating a Congressional Caucus on Regionalism. To promote regionalism at the local and state level, and to establish more efficient and effective mechanisms to coordinate activities with relevant agencies and public officials, the Kennedy School of Government, in consultation with regional practitioners, should develop model executive orders, statutes, and other policy instruments.

²⁸ Letter from Robert L. Bendick, Florida Chapter of The Nature Conservancy, to Dr. Charles H.W. Foster, dated February 8, 2002.

²⁹ See Daniel Kemmis, *This Sovereign Land: A New Vision for Governing the West* (Island Press 2001); and www.crmw.org.

³⁰ One of the primary challenges facing proposals for “pilot projects” is how to provide people a sufficient amount of autonomy to create innovative and effective strategies, while at the time requiring an appropriate degree of accountability. On strategies to foster “accountable autonomy,” see Archon Fung, “Accountable Autonomy: Toward Empowered Deliberation in Chicago Schools and Policing,” *Politics and Society* 29(1)(2001):73-103; and Edward P. Weber, “The Question of Accountability in Historical Perspective: From Jackson to Contemporary Grassroots Ecosystem Management,” *Administration and Society* 31(4)(1999): 451-494.

In addition to the four strategies outlined above, the participants in the workshop also considered the value of creating a “center of excellence.” The idea of a center of excellence, whose mission would be to support and promote regionalism in North America, emerged from the Harvard Environmental Regionalism Project and is based on the premise that there is currently no such center to meet the needs and interests of existing and emerging regional practitioners.³¹

Participants agreed that it would be helpful to have some sort of framework to promote and support regional initiatives, but rather than a “center of excellence,” they preferred to talk in terms of a “network of practitioners.” Several people expressed concern about creating any formal organization or arrangement to “institutionalize” regionalism, suggesting that regionalism is more likely to thrive if it is free to be organic, flexible, and integrative. Most of the participants agreed that a network of practitioners would best serve the needs and interests of practitioners, and could most likely be supported by existing intellectual and facilitative resources. That said, it is important to acknowledge that sustaining a network of practitioners would in itself require some type of organizational home and resources. So, whether it is characterized as a “center of excellence” or simply a network of practitioners, participants seem to agree that there is value in creating and sustaining a place to serve the needs and interests of regional practitioners.

Based on responses to the survey, and the input and advice of participants at the workshop, a “center of excellence” could provide one or more of the services outlined above, and might also establish a clearinghouse of ideas, information, models, and success stories; maintain a roster of who knows what and who can provide which resources and services; generate and distribute funding; and encourage entrepreneurship and experimentation with different models.

10. Conclusions

This article is a first step. It documents the status and trends of regionalism in the West, analyzes the promise and pitfalls of regional initiatives, and offers several prescriptions for practice, policy, research, and education. The image that emerges from this inventory and assessment is that regionalism is an important means to sustain communities and landscapes. What is most promising is that regionalism is not confined to the federal government or any other sector. Many different groups are playing important roles at many different levels. While many of the initiatives are relatively young, compared to other approaches to management and policy, they provide an emerging set of experiments for learning about the theory and practice of regionalism.

Regionalism is challenging because it runs counter to established policies and institutions, and requires the type of “collaborative leadership” that is often hard to find. However, considering the feedback from the survey and the enthusiasm of participants at the workshop, it is exciting to consider the possibilities. People are excited about a renewed vision for land use, natural resource, and environmental management, and while success is at times

³¹ Charles H.W. Foster, *Fostering Conservation and Environmental Regionalism: The Center of Excellence Approach* (Harvard Environmental Regionalism Project, Draft of January 15, 2002).

slow and incremental, there is a shared sense that “we are really on to something,” as the workshop participants concluded.

The challenge now is to create a portfolio of strategies that support existing regional initiatives and foster regional thinking and action within existing institutional arrangements.

Appendix 1. Index of Regional Initiatives by Geographic Scale and Function

ρ = Primary function o = Other functions

Regional Initiative	Research & Education	Community Building	Sharing Resources	Advisory	Advocacy	Governance
Watershed Councils (intrastate)						
Big Hole Watershed Committee	•	o	o	o		
Deschutes Resources Conservancy		o	o		•	
Flathead Basin Commission	o			o	•	
Gila Monster Watershed Council	o		o	o	o	•
Henry's Fork Watershed Council	o	o	o	•	o	
Little Colorado Multiple Objective Management Group	o	•	o		o	
Mary's River Riparian/Aquatic Restoration Project	o				o	•
Mussellshell River Basin Water Mngmnt Advisory Committee	o			•	o	
Rio Puerco Watershed Management Committee	o		o	•	o	
San Carlos/Safford/Duncan Watershed	o				•	
San Miguel Watershed Coalition		o	o	o		•
Snake River Corridor Project	o		o			•
Southwest Basin Native Fish Watershed Advisory Council	o	o	o	•	o	
Upper San Pedro Watershed Association	o		o			•
Verde Watershed Association	o	o	•	o	o	
Other Intrastate Initiatives						
Applegate Partnership	o	•			o	
Butte Valley Basin	o				•	
Canyon Country Partnership	o	o	•			
Diablo Trust	o	•			o	
East Fork Management Plan	o		o		•	
Elliot State Forest Management Plan	o		o			•
Flathead Lakers					•	
Grand Canyon Forests Partnership/Foundation	o		o			•
Oregon Plan for Salmon & Watersheds	o		o		o	•
Powder River Basin Resource Council	o	o			•	
Quincy Library Group	o	o		o		•
Santa Ana River Working Group	o	o	•			
Southwest Utah Planning Authorities Council		o	o			•
Western Slope Environmental Resource Council	o	o			•	
Wild Stock Initiative	o		o	o	o	•
Winiger Ridge Ecosystem Management Pilot Project	o		o			•
Yellowstone River Conservation Forum	o		o		•	

Regional Initiative	Research & Education	Community Building	Sharing Resources	Advisory	Advocacy	Governance
Urban Area Initiatives						
Envision Utah	0	•		0	0	
Flagstaff Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan	0	•	0	0	0	
Middle Rio Grande Council of Governments	0	•	0			0
Santa Fe Regional Planning Authority	0	0	0			•
Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition	0	0	0			•
Treasure Valley Partnership		•	0	0		
Washoe County, Nevada	0	0	0			•
Interstate Initiatives						
Alliance For the Wild Rockies	0				•	
Bitterroot Ecosystem Management Research Project	•	0				0
Blue Mountain Natural Resources Institute		•	0			
Center of the American West	•	0			0	
Center for the Rocky Mountain West	•	0			0	
Columbia River Gorge Commission		0	0			•
Grand Canyon Trust					•	
Great Plains Restoration Council					•	
Greater Yellowstone Coalition					•	
Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee	0		0	•		
High Plains Partnership for Species at Risk	0		•		0	
Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan	0		0			•
Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Authority	0	0		0		•
Lead Partnership Group		0	0	0	•	
Malpai Borderlands Group	0	0	0		•	
Missouri River Basin Association		0	0	•		
National Association of Regional Councils	0	0	•		0	
Northwest Power Planning Council	0		•			
Platte River Endangered Species Partnership	0		0		0	•
Prairie Pothole Joint Venture	0		0		•	
San Juan Forum		0	0	0		
Selway-Bitterroot Advisory Committee on Grizzly Bears	0	0	0	•	0	0
Sierra Business Council		0	•		0	
Sierra Nevada Framework for Conservation & Collaboration	0	0	•			0
Snake River Resources Review	0		0	0		•
Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project	0				•	
Southwest Strategy		0	0			•
Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program	0		0	0	0	•
Wallace Stegner Center for Land, Resources, & Environment	•	0			0	
The Western Charter	0	0			•	
Western Regional Air Partnership			0			•

Regional Initiative	Research & Education	Community Building	Sharing Resources	Advisory	Advocacy	Governance
Multi-national Initiatives						
CANAMEX: Corridor of Innovation	0		0	•	0	
Crown of the Continent	•		0			0
International Flood Mitigation Initiative for the Red River Basin		0	0	•		
Pacific Northwest Economic Region	0	•	0		0	
Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Basin Coalition		•	0		0	
Utton Transboundary Resource Center	0		•			
Yukon to the Yellowstone			0		•	
Regional Councils of Government						
Maricopa Association of Governments	0	0	0	•		
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	0	0	•	0	0	
Pima Association of Governments	0	0	•			
SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization	0	0	•			
Western Arizona Council of Governments	0	0	•			
Association of Bay Area Governments	0	0	•	0		
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments	0	0	•	0		
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	0	0	0	0		•
Butte County Association of Governments	0	0	0	0		•
Council of Fresno County Governments	0	0	•			
Kern Council of Governments	0	0	•	0		
Merced County Association of Governments	0	0	•	0		
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	0		0	0		•
San Bernadino Associated Governments	0	0	0	0		•
San Diego Association of Governments	0	0	0			•
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments	0		0	•		
Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency	0		0			•
Southern California Association of Governments		0	0	•	0	
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments	0	0	0	•		
San Joaquin Council of Governments	0		0			•
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments	0	0	0			•
Western Riverside Council of Governments	0	0	0	•		
King County Association of Governments			•	0		
Denver Regional Council of Governments	0	0	•	0		
North Front Range Transp. & Air Quality Planning Council	0	0	•	0		
Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments	0		0	•		
Northwest Colorado Council of Governments	0	0	•			
Pueblo Area Council of Governments	0		0	0		•
Community Planning Association	0	0	0	•		
Southeast Idaho Council of Governments	0	0	•	0		
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments		•	0	0		

Regional Initiative	Research & Education	Community Building	Sharing Resources	Advisory	Advocacy	Governance
Lane Council of Governments	o	o	•	o		
Rogue Valley Council of Governments	o	o	•			
Central Oregon Governmental Council	o	o	•			
Bear River Association of Governments	o	o	•			
Southwest Utah Planning Authorities Council	o	o	•			
Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization	o		o			•
Wasatch Front Regional Council	o	o	•	o		
Mountainland Association of Governments	o		•			
Five County Association of Governments			•			
Six County Association of Governments			•			
Uintah Basin Association of Governments			•			
Benton-Franklin Council of Governments	o	o	•			o
Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments	o	o	•	o		
Puget Sound Regional Council	o	o	o	o		•
Thurston Regional Planning Council	o	o	o	•		
Whatcom Council of Governments	o	o	o	o		•
Yakima Valley Council of Governments	•	o	o	o		

Appendix 2: Profiles of Regional Initiatives in the West

The following regional initiatives are organized into six categories depending on the geographic scale of their efforts: Watershed Council (intrastate), Other Place-based (intrastate), Urban Area, Interstate, Multi-national, and Regional Councils of Government. This is a preliminary typology, and will most likely be refined as we learn more about the different types of regional, transboundary initiatives in the West. These initiatives often list specific public and private entities within the “Participants” category which often have abbreviated acronyms. The most common of these are the acronyms for the various federal agencies whose full names are listed here for easy reference.

BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM = United States Bureau of Land Management
EPA = Environmental Protection Agency
NPS = National Park Service
RC&D = Resource Conservation and Development Area
USDA = United States Department of Agriculture
USDI = United States Department of Interior
USFS = United States Forest Service
USFWS = United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS = United States Geological Service

1. Watershed Councils (Intrastate)

“Watershed council” is an umbrella term for regionally based initiatives that are defined by and focus on one or more aspects of a watershed. While there are literally hundreds of watershed councils throughout the West, all of which might be defined as experiments in regionalism, the following list of cases emphasizes watershed councils that encompass more than one established jurisdiction, such as a county or national forest boundary. As such, the following list is designed to be representative, not comprehensive. It includes watershed councils that are “citizen-driven” and those that are “government-driven.”

Big Hole Watershed Committee

Participants: Local ranchers; sportsmen; outfitters; local, state, and federal government agency representatives including USFS and USFWS; Beaverhead Conservation District; Beaverhead County Commissioners; private parties including PPL Montana, Big Hole Outfitters & Guides, and Butte Silverbow Water Utilities; and nonprofit groups including Trout Unlimited and The Nature Conservancy.

Scale/Region: The Deschutes River Basin covering federal, tribal, state, and private lands in Oregon.

Contact: Gail Achterman, Executive Director
P.O. Box 1560
Bend, OR 97709-1560
541-480-0694 (p)
www.dbrc.org

Flathead Basin Commission

Participants: Twenty-one commissioners appointed by the Governor of Montana.
Objectives: To encourage economic development and use of the basin's resources to their fullest extent without compromising the high quality of the basin's waters.

Institutional

Framework: Created by statute in 1983. Governed by a 21-person commission appointed by the Governor.

Scale/Region: The Flathead River Basin in northwest Montana.

Contact: Mark Holston
Flathead Basin Commission
33 2nd Street
Kalispell, MT 59901
406-752-0081 (p)

Gila Monster Watershed Council

Participants: USFS, BLM, USGS, USFWS and the Bureau of Reclamation; Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, New Mexico Environmental Department, and local agencies including several soil and conservation districts; environmental groups, non-government organizations such as The Nature Conservancy, and People for the USA; and local concerned citizens and landowners.

Objectives: To develop a coordinated, interstate, inter-regional effort to implement partnering-based water quality programs for holistic management of the upper Gila watershed.

Institutional

Framework: Created in 1993-1994 as a collaborative memorandum of understanding between the AZ DEQ, the NM Environment Department and the USFS.

Scale/Region: Covers the Gila and San Francisco watersheds located in southeastern Arizona and southwestern New Mexico, an area of about 13,000 square miles spread over four or more counties.

Contact: Harold J. Bray

Gila Monster Watershed Council
Black Range Resource Conservation and Development, Inc.
2610 North Silver St.
Silver City, NM 88061
505-388-9566 (p)
505-388-0376 (f)
or:
Patty Rost, Director
Gila Monster Watershed Association
505-388-4152 (p)

Henry's Fork Watershed Council

Participants: Eight federal agencies, seven state agencies, several local conservation districts, the primary local water district, several environmental groups, and a number of academia and citizens. In all, there are sixty organizations and agencies participating in the council.

Objectives: A grassroots community forum that uses a non-adversarial, consensus-based approach to problem solving and conflict resolution among citizens, scientists, and agencies with varied perspectives.

Institutional

Framework: Henry's Fork Watershed Council was chartered by the 1994 Idaho Legislature.

Scale/Region: It covers the entire basin of the Henry's Fork Watershed, an area of 1.7 million acres encompassing more than 3,000 miles of rivers spread over four counties of eastern Idaho and western Wyoming, plus the southwest corner of Yellowstone National Park.

Contact: Henry's Fork Foundation
P.O. Box 550
605 Main St.
Ashton, ID 83420
208-652-3567 (p)
208-652-3568 (f)
hff@henrysfork.com
www.henrysfork.com

Little Colorado River Multiple Objective Management Group

Participants: BLM, USFS; state and local agencies from both New Mexico and Arizona; three tribes; several soil and water conservation districts; the Nature Conservancy; the Grand Canyon Trust; and local concerned citizens and citizen groups.

Objectives: To maintain and enhance the resources of the Little Colorado River Watershed by fostering partnerships, education, and communication among stakeholders and by facilitating local strategies and projects.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1997 when Navajo County asked the Little Colorado River RC&D to convene a group interested in preserving the Little Colorado River. The group is currently an ad hoc partnership that is strictly voluntary.

Scale/Region: Covers the entire basin of the Little Colorado River Watershed, an area covering approximately 17 million acres spread over northeastern Arizona and northwestern New Mexico. Land ownership is divided as follows: 48% Native American land, 23% private land, 14 % national forest land, 10% state trust land, and 4% BLM land.

Contact: James Cary
Little Colorado River Multiple Objective Management Group
51 W. Vista Dr. #4,
Holbrook, AZ 86025
520-524-6063 (p)
520-524-6609 (f)
kslade@littlecolorado.org

Mary's River Riparian/Aquatic Restoration Project

Participants: USFS and BLM have agreed to cooperatively manage their lands in the project area. Partners also include the Nevada Division of Wildlife; The Northeastern Nevada Chapter of Trout Unlimited; The Bring Back the Native Program; National Fish & Wildlife Foundation; and Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.; and other concerned landowners.

Objectives: Restore Lahontan cutthroat trout habitat with the objective of securing the delisting of the species and balancing use among various user groups. The project continues ongoing recovery actions, to benefit not only Lahontan cutthroat, but also songbirds, waterfowl, wading birds, upland game birds, big game, river otters, and other mammals, particularly in a portion of the stream system which came under public ownership through a land exchange completed in 1996.

Institutional

Framework: The USFS and BLM have an unofficial memorandum of understanding to cooperatively manage their lands in the project area as a result of the Nevada Division of Wildlife's plan for the Humboldt River Basin. The plan was completed in 1987, and a land exchange in 1996 allowed the plan to be implemented in its current level of operation.

Scale/Region: The Mary's River is one of the major tributaries of the Humboldt River and encompasses 332,800 acres in Northeast Nevada.

Contact: Ray Lister or Dave Best

BLM Elko District
P.O. Box 831
3900 East Idaho Street
Elko, NV 89802
775-753-0200 (p)

dlbest@the-onramp.net
775-635-5567 (p)

Musselshell River Basin Water Management Advisory Committee

Participants: Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation; Central Montana RC&D; Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks; Montana Department of Environmental Quality; several counties and conservation districts; several local government representatives; local concerned landowners; and USFWS.

Objectives: The objectives of the group have shifted a little over the years with primary focuses moving between problems with water quality and quantity, but the group is currently focused on satisfying a court-ordered water quality restoration plan by the year 2002.

Institutional

Framework: Founded in 1993, originally through an ad hoc partnership in response to chronic dewatering and misappropriation of water in the Musselshell River Basin.

Scale/Region: Covers the entire basin, six million acres of central Montana, spread over six counties.

Contact: John Hunter
Musselshell River Basin Water Management Advisory Committee
Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation
613 NE Main, Suite E
Lewistown, MT 59457
406-538-7459 (p)
406-538-7089 (f)
johunter@state.mt.us
www.dnrc.mt.gov/wrd/home.html

Rio Puerco Watershed Management Committee

Participants: BLM, USFS, EPA, USGS, USFWS and BIA; several Pueblo tribes, and the Navajo Nation; several state agencies; the Sandoval County Commissioner, all of the local soil and water conservation districts; several non-government organizations including Albuquerque Wildlife Federation, National Audubon Society, Society for Range Management, and Tree New Mexico; and several concerned landowners.

Objectives: To address problems associated with inadequate interagency or inter-jurisdictional coordination, inadequate attention/funding being given to natural resource problems, the lack of local involvement in resource management, and general environmental degradation.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1996 by an ad hoc partnership of concerned individuals and agency representatives. The Committee was officially recognized by Congress under Public Law 104-333, which established the Rio Puerco Management Committee, chaired by BLM.

Scale/Region: Covers the entire Rio Puerco Watershed located in northwest New Mexico, an area of about two million acres spread over three counties. The watershed is socially and ecologically complex with elevations ranging from 9,000 to 4,000 feet and an intermingled land ownership pattern consisting of federal, state, tribal, and private land.

Contact: Steve Fischer; or
Ed Singleton, Albuquerque Field Manager
BLM 435
Albuquerque, NM 87107
505-761-8700 (p)
steve.fischer@nm.blm.gov

San Carlos/Safford/Duncan Watershed

Participants: USDA, several tribal governments, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, environmental groups, and other public interest groups.

Objectives: The original objectives focused solely on protecting water quality through the control of non-point source pollution within the watershed. The current objectives have enlarged in scope to protect the quality and quantity of the water and the natural resources throughout the watersheds.

Institutional

Framework: Founded in 1994 in response to non-point source concerns. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality initiated discussions with concerned area citizens and the group now operates as an ad hoc partnership.

Scale/Region: The watersheds cover about 700,000 acres spread over southeastern Arizona and southwestern New Mexico.

Contact: Pete Brawley or Bill Brandeau
520-428-2607 (p) BLM
e-mail: loretta@aep.net.com 711 14th Avenue,
Safford, Arizona
520-348-4400 (p)

www.gilamonster.southwest-water.org/SSD/ssd.html

San Miguel Watershed Coalition

Participants: USFS, BLM, USGS, EPA, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment, Colorado Water Conservation Board, Colorado Department of Natural Resources Telluride Institute, Seven townships, San Miguel County, The Nature Conservancy, Telluride Visitor Services, commercial river outfitters, and others.

Objectives: As stewards of some of the world's highest, wildest, and most beautiful lands, the San Miguel Watershed Coalition seeks to develop, through a process of collaborative planning and substantive public involvement, a watershed management plan to conserve and enhance the natural, cultural, recreational, social, and economic vitality of local communities. The Coalition guides the plan's implementation and addresses ongoing issues in the watershed.

Institutional

Framework: A coordinated focus on the San Miguel River began in 1990 with a group called the San Miguel River Coalition. The NPS, through its Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program, became involved in the process in 1994. Jointly, the NPS and the Telluride Institute agreed to act as facilitators in a community planning process that would result in a watershed-wide action plan.

Scale/Region: One million-acre watershed, 60 % of which is in federal public lands, in southwestern Colorado. The San Miguel River runs 72 miles from high alpine meadows above Telluride to its confluence with the Dolores River near the Utah border.

Contact: Linda Luther, Coordinator
San Miguel Watershed Coalition
PO Box 283
Placerville, CO 81430
970-728-4364 (p)
www.co.blm.gov/ubra/coalition.htm

Snake River Corridor Project

Participants: USFS, BLM, NPS, and Army Corps of Engineers; Trout Unlimited; Jackson Hole Alliance for Responsible Planning; Lower Valley Power and Light Company; several state and local government agencies; concerned citizens and landowners.

Objectives: Preserve and enhance the natural character of the Snake River; improve recreational opportunities sensitive to impacts on the resources and the quality of the experience; and create a system of cooperative planning for river management.

Institutional

Framework: In the fall of 1993, Teton County applied for a technical assistance grant from the National Park Service. The grant provided the county with professional planning assistance for the Snake River Corridor.

Scale/Region: 69 miles of Snake River between the outlet of Jackson Lake Dam to the Palisades Reservoir.

Contact: Tim Young, Project Facilitator
Snake River Corridor Project
Teton County
P.O. Box 1727
Jackson, WY 83001
307-733-8225 (p)
307-733-8034 (f)
tyoung@wyoming.com

Southwest Basin Native Fish Watershed Advisory Group

Participants: USFS, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Idaho Department of State Lands, Idaho Fish and Game, three conservation districts, six counties and several water districts, tribal representatives, Idaho Rivers United, state fly fisherman's association, and other concerned landowners.

Objectives: To sustain fish, wildlife, and endangered species, such as bull trout and redband.

Institutional

Framework: Founded in 1997 by executive order from the Governor of Idaho, Phil Batt, in response to the implementation of Idaho's Bull Trout Conservation Plan.

Scale/Region: Covers the Middle Snake River Basin in western Idaho, an area of about 12 million acres spread over ten counties.

Contact: Robert Steed
Southwest Basin Native Fish Watershed Advisory Group
1445 N. Orchard, Boise, ID 83706
208-373-0550 (p)
208-373-0287 (f)
rsteed@deq.state.id.us

Upper San Pedro Watershed Association

Participants: USFS, NPS, BLM, and USGS, USFWS; Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, State Land Department, and State water Quality; local agencies; The Nature Conservancy, National Audubon Society; and local concerned citizens/landowners.

Objectives: To coordinate and cooperate in the identification, prioritization and implementation of comprehensive policies and projects to assist in meeting water needs in the Sierra Vista Sub-watershed of the Upper San Pedro River Basin. The Upper San Pedro Partnership has established as its first priority the development of an Upper San Pedro Conservation Plan with the goal of "ensuring an adequate long-term groundwater supply is available to meet the

reasonable needs of both the area's residents and property owners (current and future) and the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area (SPRNCA)."

Institutional

Framework: The Upper San Pedro began as an unofficial memorandum of understanding between government members although it operates as a voluntary, ad hoc partnership.

Scale/Region: The Upper San Pedro River Watershed extends from its headwaters in Mexico to a geologic formation known as the "narrows" just north of Benson, Arizona. The watershed has been further divided into three sub-watersheds. The Benson sub-watershed extends from the "narrows" to another geological feature known as the northern edge of the "Tombstone Caldera", which is a point just downstream from a major tributary stream, the Babocomari River. The sub-watershed forming the headwaters is then divided at the political boundary between Mexico and the United States into the Sierra Vista Sub-watershed and the Mexican Sub-watershed.

Contact: George P. Michael, PE
Coordinating Manager
Upper San Pedro Partnership
2160 E. Fry Blvd. # 217
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
520-378-4046 (p)
gmichael2@mindspring.com

Verde Watershed Association

Participants: USFS, BLM, and other federal land management agencies, state agencies, Native American communities which include Yavapai-Apache Nation, Tonto-Apache Tribe, Yavapai Prescott Tribe, The Hopi Tribe, The Navajo Nation, The Hualapai Tribe, Salt River Maricopa-Pima Indian Community, Fort McDowell Mohave-Apache Indian Community, Havasupai Tribe and a collection of local government, non-government, water district, academic and citizen organizations., including Friends of the Verde, People for the West, Friends of the Forest, Northern Arizona Audubon Society, Yavapai Cattle Growers, Sierra Club, Keep Sedona Beautiful.

Objectives: The Association's mission is based on a belief that wise and sustainable use of water resources is best accomplished by a voluntary association of members of the watershed communities. Thus, the Association strives to preserve and manage the Verde River watershed with local direction while encouraging long term, productive use of natural resources. This organization was prompted through citizen/agency cooperation with the goal of getting a diverse group of stakeholders together as a forum to discuss the river's water quality and quantity problems.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1992 by an ad hoc partnership of citizens and agency personnel who were concerned over the Verde River and its tributaries.

Scale/Region: Covers 5.2 million acres in Arizona spread over three counties and four ecoregions from high desert to Juniper-Pine.

Contact: Daniel Salzler, or Bob Hardy
Verde Watershed Association Verde Watershed Association
3033 N. Central Ave. 520-634-5526 (p)
Phoenix, AZ 85012.
602-207-4507 (p)
602-207-4467 (f)
www.verde.org

2. Other Place-based Partnerships (Intrastate)

These partnerships are defined by regional characteristics other than a specific watershed. It includes partnerships that are organized within a particular state. Some of these partnerships are “citizen-driven” and others are more “government-driven.”

Applegate Partnership

Participants: Representatives from industry, conservation groups, natural resource agencies, research scientists, and residents.

Objectives: To promote and sustain the ecological health, economic diversity, and community values of the valley through community involvement, education, and application of natural resource principles on all land within the watershed.

Institutional

Framework: An ad hoc, community-based partnership.

Scale/Region: The Applegate Watershed is located in the Siskiyou Mountains of Southwestern Oregon and covers 500,000 acres. About 70 % of the land is federal (39 % USFS, 31 % BLM); the remaining 30 % is divided among state, county and private lands.

Contact: Jack Shipley
1340 Missouri Flat
Grants Pass, OR 97527
503-846-6917 (p and f)
www.rvi.net/~arwc/index/html

Butte Valley Basin

Participants: USFS, California Department of Fish & Game, Ducks Unlimited, the Butte Valley Resource Conservation District, and local private landowners and grazing permittees.

Objectives: Restore and maintain Butte Valley’s native grassland and wetland ecosystems, restore and maintain the productivity of native rangeland vegetation, optimize water storage and use, and provide an ecological approach to multiple resource management.

Institutional

Framework: In 1986 the USFS began a coordinated resource management planning process to restore traditional waterfowl and wetland habitats in the area.

Scale Region: 36,000 acres in Northern California

Contact: Jim Stout, Resource Officer
US Forest Service
Klamath National Forest

Goosenest Ranger District
37805 Highway 97
Macdoel, CA 96058
530-398-4391(p)

Canyon Country Partnership

Participants: USFS, BLM, and NPS; Utah Division of Wildlife; Utah Division of State Parks and Recreation; and local government representatives from several different counties. The public is involved through issue committees which work on strategies with the partnership on issues such as recreation.

Objectives: To share information and resources so that management decisions can be made with an understanding of potential impacts to adjacent lands and sustainable land management.

Institutional

Framework: In 1993, under the BLM's new direction toward ecosystem management, the agency embarked on a large-scale resource management plan for the Colorado Plateau region. In 1994, the ad hoc partnership grew out of the vision and efforts of local agency management.

Scale/Region: Southeastern Utah. Officially, the east-central Colorado Plateau. Effectively, the four southeastern Utah counties: Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan.

Contact: Joel Tuhy
Colorado Plateau Public Lands Director
The Nature Conservancy
P.O. Box 1329
Moab, UT 84532
801-259-4629 (p)
or
Craig Bigler, Coordinator
1924 Roadrunner Hill
Moab, UT 84532
801-259-8372 (p)

The Diablo Trust

Participants: USFS, USFWS, USGS, NRCS, Arizona Fish & Game, Arizona State Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, University of Arizona, Northern Arizona University, Prescott College, Hopi Nation, city and county officials, students, ranchers, environmentalists, and local and regional artists.

Objectives: Today the Trust, open to everyone, provides a forum for the community to actively participate in a land stewardship process. Additionally, the ranch lands

provide “hands-on” proving grounds for new, collaborative land management ideas.

Institutional

Framework: Initiated in 1993 by the Flying M Ranch and the Bar T Bar Ranch when an unlikely assemblage of several dozen Northern Arizonans met in a Flagstaff conference room to confront land issues including grazing, wildlife, water, trees, and recreation. Through a process of effective facilitation the participants decided to form a group to use a collaborative process. The Trust is currently a not-for-profit 501 (c) (3) corporation.

Scale/Region: 426,000 acres of private, state, and USFS land, located between Mormon Lake and Winslow (southeast of Flagstaff).

Contact: Mandy Metzger, Vice President/Director
The Diablo Trust
P.O. Box 31239
Flagstaff, AZ 8600
928-523-0588 (p)
928-523-1080 (f)
Mandy.Metzger@nau.edu
www.diablotrust.org

East Fork Management Plan

Participants: USFS and BLM; Wyoming Game and Fish Department; industry groups; Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation; Sierra Club; Trout Unlimited; and local officials.

Objectives: To perpetuate the region’s wildlife by preserving sufficient habitat.

Institutional

Framework: In the mid 1980’s, WGFD began to emphasize ecosystem-based approaches to land management. In 1991-1993, WGFD bought 54,000 acres of wildlife habitat and entered into an MOU with surrounding landowners/agencies to work on habitat issues.

Scale/Region: About 500,000 acres from Horse Creek drainage north to the Continental Divide and south to Crow Creek on the Wind River Indian Reservation in northwestern Wyoming.

Contacts: Chuck Clarke, Habitat Management Coordinator
Wyoming Game and Fish Department
260 Buena Vista
Lander, WY 82520
307-332-2688 (p)

Elliot State Forest Management Plan

Participants: Oregon Department of Forestry, and other state land management agencies; USFS and USFWS; Oregon State University; several county government officials; industry groups; and local concerned landowners.

Objectives: To agree on management practices within the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) guidelines and the formation of partnerships with other natural resource agencies which will protect biodiversity through ecosystem based initiatives.

Institutional Framework: In 1992 the Oregon Department of Forestry initiated an ad hoc partnership with other state and federal agencies.

Scale/Region: Approximately 98,000 acres in Southwestern Oregon.

Contact: Ross Holloway
State Lands Program Director
Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street
Salem, OR 97310
503-945-7348 (p)

Flathead Lakers

Participants: Over 1,000 citizens concerned about water quality in Flathead Lake, including residents, part-time residents, and anybody else who is interested.

Objectives: To promote responsible land use in the basin surrounding Flathead Lake in order to preserve water quality in the Flathead river basin. The group also works to protect clean water, a healthy ecosystem and the preservation of quality of life.

Institutional Framework: A non-governmental organization started in 1958.

Scale/Region: Flathead River Basin in northwest Montana.

Contact: Robin Steinkraus
P.O. Box 70
Polson, MT 59860
406-883-1346
lakers@flatheadlakers.org

Grand Canyon Forests Partnership

Participants: An alliance of 18 environmental and governmental organizations dedicated to researching and demonstrating approaches to forest ecosystem restoration in the ponderosa pine forests surrounding Flagstaff, Arizona. The partnership includes USFS; USFWS; multiple Arizona state, city, and county agencies; Northern Arizona University; The Nature Conservancy; the Grand Canyon Trust and other non profit organizations; as well as several private entities.

Objectives: To restore natural ecosystem structures, function, and composition of ponderosa pine forests; manage forest fuels to reduce the probability of catastrophic fire; and research, test, develop, and demonstrate key ecological, economic, and social dimensions of restoration efforts.

Institutional

Framework: Created in 1997 through an ad hoc partnership between the Coconino National Forest and the Grand Canyon Forests Foundation following the forest fires of 1996. The Partnership includes several functional teams—the Grand Canyon Forests Foundation, the Partnership Management Team, the Partnership Advisory Board, a Communications Team, a Research Team, and a Business Development Team.

Scale/Region: The Flagstaff urban-wildland interface, a landscape of about 100,000 acres surrounding the city of Flagstaff, Arizona. It is made up of federal, state, city, and privately owned lands, although national forest lands make up the bulk of the area.

Contact: Taylor McKinnon or John Gerritsma
Grand Canyon Trust U.S. Forest Service
520-774-7488 (p) 520-527-3600 (p)
www.gcfp.org/gcfp.html

Oregon Plan for Salmon & Watersheds

Participants: USFS, BLM, NPS, USFWS, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation; every Oregon state natural resource and land management agency; and local watershed councils across the state.

Objectives: To restore salmonids and healthy watershed conditions throughout Oregon by cooperative management between local watershed councils, local governments, and state, federal, and tribal governments.

Institutional

Framework: In 1995 the governor of Oregon initiated the Coastal Salmon Restoration Initiative meant to utilize state law and resources to prevent salmonid listings in collaboration with local citizen driven watershed councils. The watershed councils were to organize as ad hoc partnerships interested in managing local river watersheds, and would receive state funding and aid once the local councils were recognized by the appropriate soil and water conservation districts. In 1999, the governor formalized the plan through executive order and the federal partners signed a memorandum of federal partnership.

Scale/Region: Currently 88 watershed councils across the entire state.

Contact: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB)
503-986-0181
www.oweb.state.or.us

Powder River Basin Resource Council

Participants: Open membership of about 500 with a general agricultural profile.
Objectives: To educate and empower citizens of Wyoming to work toward improving and preserving the rural lifestyle, and protecting the western lifestyle and environment.

Institutional

Framework: Farmers and ranchers in Powder River Basin convened back in 1973 over concerns about strip mining for coal in the area.

Scale/Region: The group originally focused strictly on the Powder River Basin but now works throughout eastern Wyoming.

Contact: Vicky Goodwin, Organizer
P.O. Box 1178
Douglas, WY 82633
307-358-5002 (p)
doprbrc@coffee.com

Quincy Library Group

Participants: 175 participants including 30 core members representing industry and environmental groups.

Objectives: To address forest health and community stability, with the belief that sustainable resource management must have sound technical foundation, a broad political base, and strong local participation

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1992 through an ad hoc partnership originally between a timber industry forester, a county supervisor, and an environmental attorney. The group is now run through a steering committee.

Scale/Region: Covers 2.5 million acres spread over three counties and three national forests in northeastern California.

Contact:	John Sheehan	or	Linda Blum
	Quincy Library Group		Quincy Library Group
	P.O. Box 1749		P.O. Box 1749
	Quincy, CA 95971		Quincy, CA 95971
	530-283-3739 (p)		
	plumasco@psln.com		llblum@plsn.com
	www.qlg.org		

Santa Ana River Watershed Group

Participants: The principal conveners of the group are the three counties, the five major water agencies, and the major waste water agency of the 2,600 square mile Santa Ana Watershed (discharging to the Pacific Ocean). Participants include state and federal agencies under a separate MOU signed in 2000 (including, e.g., EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, USDI, and USDA, California Secretary for Resources, Cal EPA, California Department of Food and Agriculture), cities, non-profit groups such as the Sierra Club and the Endangered Habitat League, local concerned landowners, resource conservation districts and others. Participation is open and focused on concerns, issues, and opportunities within the watershed. Participation includes

Objectives: The group considers itself a collaborative planning model. It “scopes” in the spirit of NEPA concerns, issues, and opportunities within the watershed, with the objective of developing a diverse fabric of agencies, organizations, and efforts collaboratively and strategically improving the institutional framework within the watershed and, critically, getting things done on the ground. The group does not undertake projects on its own (nor does it make recommendations or advocate positions), but rather assists existing or created organizations successfully address topics scoped, often in collaboration with others.

Institutional

Framework: An MOU among the principal conveners (the three counties, five water agencies and the major waste water agency) , together with an MOU with key state and federal agencies signed in 2000. These two documents provides the framework for convening facilitated, “unbounded” processes focused on “nodes” of concerns, issues, and opportunities within the watershed to scope considerations, impacts, and alternatives in developing collaborative strategies to address them.

Scale/Region: 2,600 square miles comprising the developing tier of Los Angeles (to the southeast, with population expected to increase from 5 to 7 million in 20 years, with one-fifth of the state economy, one-sixth of the state legislature and 11 members of Congress—and the largest concentration of dairy animals in the world).

Contacts: Lindell Marsh
Siemon, Larsen, and Marsh
19800 MacArthur Blvd., Suite 1070
Irvine, CA 92612
949-752-1538 (p)

Southwest Utah Planning Authorities Council

Participants: Several federal land management and natural resource agencies, including BIA, BLM, and USFS; nearly every Utah state land management or natural resource agency, several county commissioners, planning boards and other local

government agencies; one or more water districts/organizations; and the Paiute Tribe

Objectives: To establish better lines of communication; to resolve problems related to water supply and quality, fish and wildlife maintenance, land-use management, and cultural, social and economic well being; and to establish a forum for dealing with issues before they become problems.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1993 by the executive initiative of Governor Levin, who sits as chair of the council.

Scale/Region: The area of concern includes over 9,624,076 acres spread over four counties, and all or part of three national parks, three national monuments, a national recreation area, and four wilderness areas.

Contact: Scott Truman
Southwest Utah Planning Authorities Council
351 W. Center, Cedar City, UT 84720
435-586-7852 (p)
435-586-5475 (f)
www.utahreach.usu.edu/rosie/supac/
Truman@suu.edu

Western Slope Environmental Resource Council

Participants: 250 members in Western Colorado

Objectives: To protect and restore forests and rivers in western Colorado. Also, to protect and restore the quality of life and environmental resources in the Western Slope of Colorado.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1977 in order to gather information on the booming energy market and to prevent the construction of a large coal-fired power plant, the council shifted focus in the early 1990s to look at the overall well being of the Western Slope region.

Scale/Region: Western Colorado, with a special focus on the North Fork of the Gunnison River Valley.

Contact: Tara Thomas, Executive Director
WSERC
P.O. Box 1612 Paonia, CO 81428
970-527-5307 (p) & (f)
tara@wserc.org
www.wserc.org

Wild Stock Initiative

Participants: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; Northwest Treaty Indian Tribes; and over forty other representatives of fishing, environmental, and land and water use interests.

Objectives: The goal is to protect and increase the long-term productivity, abundance, and diversity of wild salmonids and their ecosystems to sustain fisheries, non-consumptive fish benefits, and related values.

Institutional

Framework: The initiative was launched in 1992 by WDFW and Northwest Treaty Indian Tribes in response to the continuing depletion of many wild salmonid stocks.

Scale/Region: Streams and their watersheds throughout the state of Washington within which salmon and steel-head trout have been identified.

Contact: Rich Lincoln
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
600 Capitol Way North
Olympia, WA 98501-1091
206-902-2750 (p)

Winiger Ridge Ecosystem Management Pilot Project

Participants: USFS, Colorado Forest Service, Boulder County, City of Boulder, Eldorado Canyon State Park, Denver Water Board, Boulder County Fire Fighters Association, and Landowners/Interested Individuals, along with interested citizens.

Objectives: This USFS pilot project is attempting to put into practice ecosystem management principles across jurisdictional boundaries, and coordinate such cross-jurisdictional land use management. The group is specifically looking to reduce the potential for catastrophic insect, disease, and fire events on 48,000 acres of public and private land in Boulder County.

Institutional

Framework: The project was sponsored by the Boulder County Ecosystem Cooperative in 1996 as a test area for the USFS ecosystem management, stewardship contracting test pilot program.

Scale/Region: 48,000 acres from the city of Boulder to the city of Nederland East to West.

Contact: Craig Jones
Interagency Project Coordinator
Colorado State Forest Service
936 Lefthand Canyon Drive
Boulder, CO 80302
303-442-0428 (p)
bodist@rmi.net

Yellowstone River Conservation Forum

Participants: Bikenet, Montana Wilderness Association Eastern Wildland Chapter, Montana Wildlife Federation, Yellowstone Valley Audubon Society, Billings Rod and Gun Club, Magic City Fly Fishers (Trout Unlimited), Montana Parks Association, Yellowstone River Parks Association, Yellowstone Valley Citizens Council - Chapter of the Northern Plains Resources Council, Public Land Access Association, Montana Conservation Corps, Humane Society of the U.S., Zoo Montana, Sierra Club, The Nature Conservancy, American Rivers, Greater Yellowstone Coalition.

Objectives: Address and influence issues such as water quality, urban sprawl/floodplain development and loss of wildlife on the middle and lower Yellowstone River.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1999 by Billings area conservation and sportsman organization, who teamed up with area Conservation Districts, and conservation organizations advocating for the Corps of Engineers to study the cumulative impacts of permitting of channelization projects on the River. Under the administrative umbrella of the Montana Parks Association.

Scale/Region: Primary focus is on the middle and lower Yellowstone River in Montana.

Contact: Mike Whittington Or Mike Penfold
406-254-9447 406-254-0884
mandl@wtp.net penrodmt@aol.com

3. Urban Area Initiatives

Urban area initiatives typically focus on trans-jurisdictional planning issues such as transportation, air and water quality, and growth management. Some of these initiatives are specific to a metropolitan area, while others function in communities across the state.

Envision Utah

Participants: A vast array of public state and local government figures from the governor to the legislature; non-profit organizations, private enterprises, city and county governments and several state agencies.

Objectives: Envision Utah's mission is to promote a publicly supported growth strategy that will preserve Utah's high quality of life, natural environment, and economic vitality.

Institutional

Framework: Quality growth planning in the state began with a 1995 summit called together by the state legislature and the governor which was intended to develop legislative solutions to the growth challenges facing the state. In 1997, the State partnered with Envision Utah, a public/private community partnership

dedicated to studying the effects of long-term growth, creating a publicly supported vision of the future, and advocating strategies necessary to achieving that vision.

Scale/Region: 171 square miles of land in Utah.

Contact: Stephen Holbrook
Envision Utah
P.O. Box 30901
Salt Lake City, UT 84130
801-973-3307 (p)
www.envisionutah.org
holbrods@kutv.com

Flagstaff Regional Land Use & Transportation Plan

Participants: The city of Flagstaff; Coconino County; the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Objectives: Promoting efficient planning which will produce a Greater Flagstaff with a compact land use pattern that shapes growth by preserving the region's natural environment, livability and sense of community. The vision promotes efficient land use, appropriate land use patterns, regional cooperation, and the preservation of open space among other things.

Institutional

Framework: The project began in 1998 when the city and county hired a consulting team to work on developing a plan and at the same time convened a citizen task force to help define problems, issues and preferred plan goals.

Scale/Region: 525 square miles.

Contact: William Towler,
Community Development Director, Coconino County.
Western Planning Resources, Inc.
2500 Fort Valley Road
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
520-226-2700 (p)
520-226-2701 (f)
btowler@co.coconino.az.us

Middle Rio Grande Council of Governments

Participants: The four counties of: Bernalillo, Sandoval, Valencia, and Tarrant.

Objectives: The Council currently is a forum for planning issues and initiatives. The specific focus is on the four county urban area's issues of water, economic development districts, transportation planning and natural resource

conservation. The Council offers technical planning assistance to communities in need.

Institutional

Framework: The Council was originally formed back in the late 1960s to develop a regional transportation plan for the Metro Albuquerque area.

Scale/Region: 9,300 square miles.

Contact: Lawrence Rael, Executive Director
Executive Director, MRGCOG
317 Commercial Blvd NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-247-1750 (p)
lrael@mgcog.org

Santa Fe Regional Planning Authority

Participants: The Authority consists of four county commissioners and four city council members, and is staffed by both city and county personnel.

Objectives: The RPA plans to develop a long-range, regional land use plan for the 5-mile extra-territorial area surrounding the city.

Institutional

Framework: The RPA was originally formed through a joint powers agreement in the late 1990s between the City of Santa Fe and the county in order to allow for the delegation of authority between the two.

Scale/Region: The 5 mile extra-territorial area surrounding the city of Santa Fe.

Contact: Steve Burstien
Director of RPA
128 Grant Ave. Suite 108
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-986-6382 (p)
sfrpra@cybermesa.com

Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition

Participants: Clark County; the city of Las Vegas; the city of North Las Vegas; Henderson City; Boulder City; & the Clark County School District.

Objectives: The Coalition looks at innovative strategies for planning and development. The long term goal is to prepare a regional policy plan which addresses conservation, population, land use and development, and conserve open spaces and natural resources.

Institutional

Framework: The Coalition was authorized by the 1999 Nevada Legislature. The Legislature charged the Coalition with crafting a regional plan that promotes the efficient

use of land within existing urban areas, allows for conversion of rural lands to other uses in a well planned fashion, and promotes sustainable growth.

Scale/Region: Central/Southern Nevada.

Contact: Mary Kay Peck
Community Development Director
240 Water Street
Henderson, NV 89015
702-565-2474 (p)
MKP@gty.ci.henderson.nv.us

Treasure Valley Partnership

Participants: Eleven elected county/city officials within two counties.

Objectives: The TVP is a collaborative effort by 11 elected officials in the Boise area working together to “keep the environment healthy, promote smart growth and forge common ground that will provide the framework for future growth of generations.”

Institutional

Framework: The TVP emerged from a meeting of Idaho regional representatives called together in 1997 by the mayor of Boise. It is currently a nonprofit partnership of ten elected officials who work together to address environmental, planning and growth issues in the valley “as a whole.”

Scale/Region: Two counties within the valley with an overall population of over 300,000.

Contacts: Elizabeth Connor, Executive Director
Treasure Valley Partnership
P.O. Box 140176
Garden City, Idaho 83714
208-869-7298 (p)
208-938-4456 (f)
econnor@treasurevalleypartners.org
www.treasurevalleypartners.org

Washoe County, Nevada

Participants: Washoe County, the city of Reno, and the city of Sparks.

Objectives: The three entities are updating a regional growth plan approved in 1991 and updated in 1996 along with a land use diagram.

Institutional

Framework: The Nevada State Legislature required coordinated planning development between the county and the two cities in their 1989 session. The County is legislatively charged with developing and implementing an open space plan.

Scale/Region: Washoe County

Contact: Mike Harper
Planning Manager
Washoe County Community Development Department
P.O. Box 11130
Reno, NV 89512
775-328-3604 (p)
775-328-3648 (f)
mharper@mail.co.washoe.nv.us

4. Interstate Initiatives

Interstate initiatives are those organizations and associations whose scope of work crosses state boundaries. They may be created through some formal mechanism, such as statute or executive order, or on a more ad hoc basis.

Alliance For the Wild Rockies

Participants: The Alliance is made up of more than 100 “organizational” members across the nation, with nearly 2,000 individual/corporate members.

Objectives: To promote the establishment of an integrated framework for the protection and management of land and wildlife in the Northern Rockies; to establish core ecosystem areas; to create additional wilderness areas; to establish a system of “biological linkage” corridors to reduce habitat fragmentation; and to create an interagency, intergovernmental team to oversee the ecosystem.

Institutional

Framework: The organization began in the late 1980s when a group of scientists attempted to put together a wilderness bill for the state of Montana. The group quickly realized the need for greater, regional protection across the Northern Rockies. To that extent the Alliance has focused on the passage of ecosystem protection legislation introduced in Congress in 1993 (H.R. 488 in the 107th Congress). The Alliance also works to protect bull trout and grizzlies and their habitat.

Scale/Region: Encompasses 20 million acres in the Northern Rockies, including five major “core” ecosystems.

Contact: Leana Schelvan, Outreach Coordinator
P.O. Box 8731
Missoula, MT 59807
406-721-5420 (p)
awr-outreach@wildrockiesalliance.org
www.wildrockiesalliance.org

Bitterroot Ecosystem Management Research Project

Participants: Project decisions rest with USFS district rangers, yet many environmental groups and “wise use” groups routinely participate in public involvement processes. Forestry Science Laboratory and University of Montana scientists in Missoula Montana are the operational participants along with the USFS and the Rocky Mountain Research Station. Focus group analysis is also used to better understand local sentiments. The states affected include Montana and Idaho.

Objectives: The research team is seeking to restore the dominance of ponderosa pine and western larch within the management area. They also seek to strengthen the scientific theory and practice of managing Rocky Mountain ecosystems at the landscape level within the context of social, economic, and ecological opportunities and constraints.

Institutional

Framework: The Forestry Science Laboratory started this project in 1994 to assist the USFS in its goal of restoring forest health.

Scale/Region: Eastern Idaho/Western Montana.

Contact: Dr. Greg Jones, Team Leader
USDA Forest Service
Forestry Science Laboratory
P.O. Box 8089
Missoula, MT 59807
406-542-4150 (p)

Blue Mountain Natural Resources Institute

Participants: Over 80 partners in federal state and local agencies, tribal representatives, and industry, as well as private landowners, environmental interests, university partners, and civic groups in Oregon and Washington.

Objectives: To enhance the long-term economic and social benefits derived from the area’s natural resources in a sustainable and ecologically sensitive manner.

Institutional

Framework: In 1989, the group began as an ad hoc discussion/management partnership when citizens voiced concerns over USFS management practices. The USFS began the discussions to lessen disputes over agency management practices and to develop methods to manage region-wide conflicts.

Scale/Region: 19 million acres, generally mountainous with large flat valleys, in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington.

Contact: Ms. Lynn Starr
Blue Mountains Natural Resources Institute
1401 Gekeler Lane
La Grande, OR 97850
503-962-6529 (p)

503-962-6529 (f)

Center of the American West

Participants: Faculty, students, and the public.

Objectives: To explore, debate, and celebrate the distinctive qualities of the West. By uniting the insights of the humanities, the physical sciences, and the social sciences, the center informs Westerners about public policy and enables them to shape desirable futures for their communities.

Institutional

Framework: Founded in 1989, the center is housed at the University of Colorado and governed by a 24-member board of directors.

Scale/Region: The American West.

Contact: Tom Precourt
Center of the American West
CU-Boulder
Macky 229, 282 UCB
Boulder, CO 80309
303-492-4879 (p)
303-492-1671 (f)
info@centerwest.org
www.centerwest.org

Center for the Rocky Mountain West

Participants: Leading scholars, public policy experts, faculty, and students.

Objectives: To foster and facilitate a greater understanding of the uniquely Western attitudes, philosophies, cultures and heritage as a means of providing a useful and meaningful basis for advancement.

Institutional

Framework: Regional studies and public policy center based at the University of Montana guided by a 12-member advisory board.

Contact: Dan Kemmis
Milwaukee Station, 2nd Floor
The University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59812-1158
406-243-7700 (p)
406-243-7709 (f)
rocky@crmw.org
www.crmw.org

Columbia River Gorge Commission

Participants: Partners include Oregon and Washington; USFS; four treaty tribes (Nez Perce, Umatilla, Warm Springs, and Yakama Indian Nations); Clark, Klickitat, and Skamania counties in Washington; and Hood River, Multnomah, and Wasco counties in Oregon.

Objectives: The Commission was established to develop and enforce policies and programs that protect and enhance the scenic, natural, cultural, and recreational resources of the Gorge, while encouraging compatible growth within existing urban areas of the Gorge and allowing economic development outside urban areas consistent with resource protection

Institutional

Framework: The Columbia River Gorge Commission was authorized by the 1986 Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act and created through a bi-state compact between Oregon and Washington in 1987.

Scale/Region: The Columbia River Gorge

Contact: Martha Bennett
Executive Director
288 Jewett Avenue
P.O. Box 730
White Salmon, WA 98672
509-493-3323 (p)
509-493-2229 (f)
crgc@gorge.net

Grand Canyon Trust

Participants: Includes 6,000 individuals and organizations, including residents of plateau communities; Native Americans; state, federal, and tribal government officials; public and private land managers; scientists; business interests; and citizens from 48 states and 9 foreign countries.

Objectives: To protect and restore the ecological integrity of nine major landscapes within the Colorado Plateau—the Greater Grand Canyon, Navajo-Hopi lands, the Little Colorado River, the Virgin River, Escalante, Arches-Canyonlands, Cedar Mesa, San Rafael Swell, and Book Cliffs.

Institutional

Framework: A non-governmental organization with offices in Arizona, Utah, and Washington, D.C.

Scale/Region: The canyon country of the Colorado Plateau in Utah and Arizona.

Contact: Geoffrey Barnard, President
2601 N. Fort Valley Road
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
520-774-7488

Great Plains Restoration Council

Participants: Approximately 1,000 members, including private, corporate, and other non-profit members.

Objectives: To bring the buffalo back and restore healthy, sustainable communities to the Great Plains, from the Indian Reservation to the prairie outback to the inner city and beyond. GPRC organizes specifically where the areas of environment, human rights and human health, and animal protection interact in social change.

Institutional

Framework: GPRC is a multi-cultural organization that grew out of a vision for restoration of the great plains area by Professors Frank and Deborah Popper. The group became a registered non-profit in May of 1997, and had its first full year of activity in 1999.

Scale/Region: The great plains region of North America from the Canadian Provinces to the north down through Mexico to the south.

Contact: Jarid Manos
Executive Director
303-575-1760 (p)
greatplains@gprc.org

Greater Yellowstone Coalition

Participants: 10,000 members.

Objectives: To protect the lands, waters and wildlife of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, now and for future generations. Also, to promote the concept of ecosystem management, maintaining the wildlife and biodiversity of the region, protecting geothermal features, and advocating responsible land use planning.

Institutional

Framework: A non-profit, non-government conservation organization formed in 1983.

Scale/Region: The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem—18 million acres of private, federal, state and tribal lands in Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

Contact: Michael Scott, Executive Director
Greater Yellowstone Coalition
13 S. Willson, Suite 2
P.O. Box 1874
Bozeman, MT 59771
406-586-1593 (p)
406-586-0851 (f)
gyc@greateryellowstone.org

Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee

Participants: NPS, USFS, BLM, and USFWS.

Objectives: To conserve a sense of naturalness and maintain ecosystem integrity; conserve opportunities which are biologically and economically sustainable, and improve inter-agency coordination.

Institutional

Framework: The original coordinating committee was created in 1964, but was inactive until 1986. The group currently works under an MOU between the federal agencies.

Scale/Region: The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, including over 11 million acres. Public lands make up 69% of the greater Yellowstone area. Private lands comprise 24%, Indian reservations comprise 4%, and 3% of the lands are state lands. The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem extends across 17 counties in 3 states.

Contact: Larry Timchak (former executive director)
Custer National Forest
1310 Main St.
Billings, MT 59105
406-657-6200 x222
latimchak@fs.fed.us

High Plains Partnership for Species at Risk

Participants: Includes several state agencies each from five states: Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma; the Western Governors Association; USFWS, USFS, BLM; tribal governments, agricultural interests, industry groups; and environmental groups.

Objectives: To work across traditional public and private boundaries to reverse declining populations of wildlife by implementing voluntary, community-based solutions.

Institutional

Framework: Created in 1996 and convened by the Western Governors' Association.

Scale/Region: Multi-state Great Plains area.

Contact: Randy Randall
Western Governors' Association
1515 Cleveland Place
Suite 200
Denver, CO 80202-5114
303-623-9378 (p)
303-534-7309 (f)
rrandall@west.gov.org

Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan

Participants: BLM, USDA, USFS, and other federal agencies.

Objectives: Develop a scientifically sound plan for the region's public lands.

Institutional

Framework: Changing social values concerning old growth and forest health was one of the major factors in President Clinton's decision to direct BLM, USFS and other federal agencies to develop a scientifically sound plan for the region's public lands.

Scale/Region: 144 million acres in Eastern Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada and Utah.

Contact: Rick Roberts OR Tom Quigley
U.S. Forest Service
Pacific Northwest Research Station
P.O. Box 3890
Portland, OR 97208-3890
541-962-6534 (p)

Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Authority

Participants: State of California; State of Nevada.

Objectives: To preserve, restore, and enhance the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe region. To adopt and enforce environmental standards, regulate land use, density, rate of growth, and scenic impacts.

Institutional

Framework: A bi-state regional environmental planning agency created by compact and statute in 1969 between the two states.

Scale/Region: The Lake Tahoe area on the border of California and Nevada.

Contact: Juan Palma
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
308 Dorla Court
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
775-588-4547 (ext. 253) (p)
www.trpa.org
jpgalma@trpa.org

Lead Partnership Group

Participants: A consortium of roughly 20 northern California and southern Oregon bioregional, watershed, and community-based groups—each comprised of

representatives from the timber industry, environmental, groups and other interested citizens. Includes representatives from the Applegate Partnership, the Quincy Library Group, and the Shasta-Tehama Bioregional Council.

Objectives: To improve ecosystem health and the well-being of local communities; to improve citizen participation in natural resource decision making; and to provide input to federal agencies about partnerships and appropriate collaborative strategies for adaptive management, national forest and other land, and resource management.

Institutional Framework: Created in 1993 as an ad hoc coalition. Meets about nine times a year to focus on common issues.

Scale/Region: Northern California and southern Oregon.

Contact: Jonathon Kusel
Forest Community Research
4405 Main Street
P.O. Box 11
Taylorsville, CA 95983
530-284-1022 (p)
www.fcresearch.org/html/EduDualLPG.html

Malpai Borderlands Group

Participants: Grassroots coalition of private landowners and ranchers working closely with local conservation districts, universities, and federal and state agencies, and with significant support from The Nature Conservancy and the Animas Foundation.

Objectives: To restore and maintain the natural processes that create and protect a healthy, unfragmented landscape to support a diverse flourishing community of human, plant and animal life in the Borderlands Region.

Institutional Framework: The group was formed through partnerships between members concerned with the preservation of an “open space way of life.”

Scale/Region: Southwestern New Mexico, southeastern Arizona and northern Sonora in the Republic of Mexico encompassing 962,000 acres.

Contact: Dr. Ben Brown, program director
Animas Foundation
HC 65, Box 179-B
Animas, NM 88020
505-548-2622 (p)
505-548-2267 (f)
benbrown@vtc.net

Missouri River Basin Association

Participants: Governor-appointed representatives from Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, tribal governments, representatives of eight federal agencies, and river users including navigation, recreation, municipal water supply, fish and wildlife, hydropower, and flood/drought control.

Objectives: To provide a forum to discuss issues such as endangered species recovery and drought flow management; to develop and implement plans to enhance the basin's economic and environmental resources; to coordinate planning and management activities.

Institutional

Framework: A not-for-profit organization founded in 1981 by the Missouri basin governors. Governed by a board of directors that includes representatives from the states, tribes, and federal government.

Scale/Region: The Missouri River Basin, from its headwaters in Montana to its confluence with the Mississippi River in Missouri, including all of its major tributaries.

Contact: Richard H. Opper
Executive Director
P.O. Box 301
Lewistown, MT 59457-0301
406-538-4469 (p)
406-538-4369 (f)
rhopper@wtp.net

National Association of Regional Councils

Participants: Regional councils of government and metropolitan planning organizations.

Objective: NARC fosters regional approaches for cooperation and the building of communities with federal and state governments on a variety of social, environmental, and economic fronts. NARC's activities include advocacy for the building of regional initiatives; member education and services, including conferences, publications, technical assistance and training; and regional outreach.

Institutional

Framework: National membership association.

Scale/Region: Nationwide.

Contact: Patsy Chappelle Marshall
NARC
1700 K St., Suite 1300
Washington D.C. 20006
202-457-0710 (p)

Northwest Power Planning Council

Participants: Governor-appointed representatives from Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

Objectives: To provide policy leadership and integrate planning for energy, fish, and water among the four states and the federal government.

Institutional

Framework: Created by Congress in 1980.

Scale/Region: Columbia River Basin, including the states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

Contact: John Hines
NWPPC
1301 Lockey Capitol Station
Helena, MT 59620
406-444-3952 (p)
406-444-4339 (f)

Platte River Endangered Species Partnership

Participants: The states of Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska; USFWS; the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; BLM; Wyoming Water Users; Colorado Water Users; Nebraska Water Users; The Platte River Trust; Environmental Defense Fund; and National Audubon Society.

Objectives: To develop and implement a recovery program to improve and conserve habitat for four threatened and endangered species that use the Platte River in Nebraska: the whooping crane, piping plover, interior least tern, and pallid sturgeon; and to enable existing and new water uses in the Platte River Basin to proceed without additional actions required (beyond the recovery program) for the four species under the Endangered Species Act.

Institutional

Framework: A Cooperative Agreement, signed by the three states and USDI on July 1, 1997, guides the effort and describes the program. A governance committee with members from the three states, water users, environmental groups, and two federal agencies has been established to implement the Cooperative Agreement.

Scale/Region: The Platte River Basin from its upper reaches in Colorado and Wyoming to the Central Platte River Valley of Nebraska.

Contact: Dale Strickland
Executive Director
Platte River Endangered Species Partnership Office
2003 Central Avenue

Cheyenne WY 82001
307-634-1756 (p)
307-637-6981 (f)
www.platteriver.org
platte@www.usbr.gov

Prairie Pothole Joint Venture

Participants: USFWS; state wildlife agencies in Iowa, Montana, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and several conservation organizations.

Objectives: To involve the public in a broad-scale unified effort to increase waterfowl populations by preserving, restoring, creating, and enhancing wildlife habitat in the Prairie Pothole region of the five states.

Institutional

Framework: In 1987, USFWS organized the Prairie pothole Joint Venture Steering Committee, consisting of USFWS, state wildlife agencies, and conservation organizations.

Scale/Region: 64 million acres in five states. The Prairie Pothole region extends over a large area in both the U.S. and Canada.

Contact: Carol Lively
Conservation Coordinator
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 25486 (DFC)
Denver, CO 80225
303-236-8155 (ext. 252) (p)
303-236-8680 (f)
Carol_Lively@fws.gov

San Juan Forum

Participants: The San Juan Forum includes the cooperative efforts of the Southern Ute Tribe; the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe; the Navajo Nation; the Jicarilla Apache Nation; San Juan County, New Mexico; La Plata, Archuleta, Montezuma, Dolores, and San Juan counties in Colorado; San Juan County, Utah; the Resource, Conservation, and Development Council of Northeast Arizona; and state representation from New Mexico and Colorado. Private business interests are represented as well on the forum board of directors.

Objectives: To enhance economic development in the Four Corners region while preserving and advancing the quality of life for area residents. The forum is currently working on health care, telecommunications, transportation, value-added and sustainable agriculture, business development, tourism, federal agency collaboration and cooperation with local entities for rural community

development, and regional air service. It strongly supports the concept of regional cooperation across the somewhat arbitrary federal, state, tribal, and county boundaries currently existing in the San Juan Basin.

Institutional

Framework: A non-profit corporation formed in January 1991.

Scale/Region: The San Juan River watershed in the four corners region of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah.

Contact: Dave Eppich
Executive Director
1000 Rim Drive
Durango, CO 81301
970-247-7328 (p)
eppich_@fortlewis.edu
www.fortlewis.edu/sjf/sjf.html

Selway-Bitterroot Citizen Advisory Committee on Grizzly Bears

Participants: States of Idaho and Montana; USFS; USFWS; the Nez Perce Tribe; Defenders of Wildlife; National Wildlife Federation; Intermountain Forestry Association; Three Rivers Timber Mill; and Resource Organization on Timber Supply.

Objectives: To reintroduce and manage grizzly bears in their native habitat in the Bitterroot Mountains of Central Idaho and Montana.

Institutional

Framework: An ad hoc partnership, created in 1993 between the environmental organizations and the industry groups, forged an agreement to create a Citizen Advisory Committee to oversee the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the Selway-Bitterroot ecosystem. The federal agencies have adopted the partnership's recommendation as the best alternative for implementation of grizzly bear reintroduction.

Scale/Region: Includes the Selway-Bitterroot Mountains in Montana and Idaho, an area of 8 million acres of wilderness and 13 million acres of national forest.

Contact: Chris Servheen
US Fish and Wildlife Service
University Hall 309
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812
406-243-4903 (p)
Grizz@selway.umt.edu

Sierra Business Council

Participants: SBC is a nonprofit association of more than five hundred businesses, agencies, and individuals in California and Nevada.

Objectives: To secure the economic and environmental health of the Sierra Nevada region for this and future generations. The council serves as a resource for business leaders, government officials, and other decision-makers seeking solutions to local and regional challenges.

Institutional

Framework: SBC is a nonprofit association founded in 1994. It favors a proactive, collaborative approach, and the council's work includes research, policy analysis, public education, leadership development, and collaborative initiatives with local partners.

Scale/Region: 21 counties in the Sierra Nevada of California and Nevada.

Contact: [Jim Sayer](#), President
The Sierra Business Council
P.O. Box 2428,
Truckee, CA, 96160
530-582-4800 (p)
sbcinfo@sbcouncil.org.
www.sbcouncil.org

Sierra Nevada Framework for Conservation and Collaboration

Participants: Nine national forests (Sequoia, Stanislaus, Inyo, Plumas, Modoc, Humboldt-Toiyabe, Sierra, Eldorado, and Tahoe) in two different regions, two USFS research stations, three National Parks (Sequoia, Kings Canyon, and Yosemite), several county governments and state agencies, tribal communities, the California Biodiversity Council and other interest groups in both California and Nevada.

Objectives: To improve the health of the Sierra Nevada ecosystem and communities; to integrate science into natural resource management through a variety of approaches and at a variety of geographic scales. To foster more effective coordination, cooperation, and collaboration among the various parties.

Institutional

Framework: Created by the USFS Southwest Region, the Pacific Southwest Research Station and the Intermountain Region in 1998. The Sierra Nevada Framework for Conservation and Collaboration team includes a number of people working full or part time in the offices in Sacramento, at other agencies, and on national forests throughout the Pacific Southwest Region.

Scale/Region: The Sierra Nevada ecosystem, including nine National Forests and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.

Contact: Kent Connaughton
Project Manager
801 Street

Sacramento, CA 95814
916-492-7754 (p)
916-492-7570 (f)
www.r5.fs.fed.us
kconnaughton@fs.fed.us

Snake River Resources Review

Participants: BLM, USFS, USGS, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, NPS, Henrys Fork Foundation, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Nature Conservancy, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, Idaho Dept. of Parks & Recreation, Idaho Dept. of Lands, Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game, Idaho Dept. of Water Resources, Wyoming Game & Fish Dept., University of Montana, University of Idaho, Colorado State University, Washington State University.

Objectives: To develop a decision support system, including an information network and public outreach, that would enhance, refine, and improve Reclamation's ability to make sound resource decisions related to the management and operation of the Snake River system.

Institutional

Framework: A program initiated by U.S. Bureau of Reclamation in 1995 and concluded in 2001, as a means of finding the best way possible to make sound decisions about the operation of the system.

Scale/Region: The Snake River from Jackson Lake in the Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming, to Brownlee Dam on the Idaho/Oregon border. The river flows for more than 700 miles in this reach and drains 72,590 square miles in Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada, and Oregon. The Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho and the Duck Valley Indian Reservation on the Idaho-Nevada border are located in the basin.

Contact: Chris Jansen Lute
USBR
Boise, ID
208-378-5319 (p)
cjansen@pn.usbr.gov

Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project

Participants: SREP facilitates and coordinates several smaller ad hoc partnerships, each of which works on local management of resource issues with local, state, and federal government agencies throughout New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Objectives: To identify, protect, and restore areas critical to the maintenance of biological diversity and ecological richness in the Southern Rockies bioregion; to

implement a wildlands recovery proposal which will reverse the decline of wildlife and wilderness and will recover whole ecosystems and landscapes; to complete an ecoregional analysis of northern New Mexico, Colorado, and southern Wyoming—The State of the Southern Rockies; to join the science of conservation biology with citizen activism to develop ecosystem protection plans in the Southern Rockies.

Institutional

Framework: A non-profit, grassroots organization established in 1992 and incorporated in 1995.

Scale/Region: The ecological region defined by northern New Mexico, Colorado, and southern Wyoming.

Contact:	Bill Martin The Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project 2260 Baseline Rd., Suite 205 Boulder, CO 80302 303-258-0433 (p) srep@indra.co wwmartin@indra.com	Doug Shinneman P.O. Box 349T Laramie, WY 82071-3499 dougshin@fiberpipe.net
-----------------	---	---

Southwest Strategy

Participants: BIA, BLM, USGS, USFWS, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, NPS, Natural Resources Conservation Service, EPA, USFS; Arizona state agencies, New Mexico state agencies, conservation districts, counties, and other local governments.

Objectives: To maintain and restore the cultural, economic, and environmental quality of Arizona and New Mexico.

Institutional

Framework: Created in 1997 by an MOU among the participating agencies.

Scale/Region: The southwestern United States, primarily Arizona and New Mexico.

Contact: William Maxon, Executive Director
Southwest Strategy
P.O. Box 1306
Albuquerque, NM 87103
505-248-6914 (p)
505-248-6883 (f)
www.swstrategy.org
bill_maxon@swstrategy.fws.gov

Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Participants: USFWS, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, NPS, Western Area Power Administration, State of Colorado, State of Utah, State of Wyoming, The Nature Conservancy, Environmental Defense, Colorado Water Congress, Utah Water Users Association, Wyoming Water Development Association, Colorado River Energy Distributors Association.

Objectives: To recover endangered Colorado River basin fish and provide for future water development for agricultural, hydroelectric and municipal uses. Endangered Colorado pikeminnow, razorback sucker, bonytail, and humpback chub will be considered recovered when there are self-sustaining populations of each fish species and threats to the fish species have been minimized or removed.

Institutional Framework: Established in 1988, the program is a partnership of public and private organizations.

Scale/Region: The upper Colorado River basin, which is upstream of Lake Powell in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Major rivers included are the Colorado, Gunnison, Dolores, White, Yampa, Little Snake, Green, Duchesne, Price and San Rafael.

Contact: Debbie Felker
Information and Education Coordinator
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 25486, DFC
Lakewood, CO 80225
303-969-7322, ext. 227(p)
debbie_felker@fws.gov.

The Wallace Stegner Center for Land, Resources, and Environment

Participants: The center is designed to enable faculty, students, and the public to explore the complexities of contemporary problems surrounding natural resources and the environment.

Objective: Addressing the West's environmental problems in a humane and sensitive manner at the local, national, and international level.

Institutional Framework: An interdisciplinary academic center at the University of Utah College of Law. The center conducts annual symposia, periodic conferences, occasional publications, and a literary series.

Scale/Region: Primarily the American West.

Contact: Robert Keiter, Director
The Wallace Stegner Center
The University of Utah College of Law
332 South 1400 East
Salt Lake City UT 84112-0730
801- 585-9695

The Western Charter

- Participants:** Co-sponsors are the Center for the Rocky Mountain West and the Center for Resource Management. The charter dialogue has also engaged leaders and representatives from regional organizations; agriculture; industry; local, state, and federal government; environmental organizations; tribes; the media; educational institutions; and telecommunications and other “new economy” sectors from around the Rocky Mountain West.
- Objectives:** To understand what westerners value most and want to protect about their unique region; identify critical regional trends that may threaten commonly shared values; develop a western charter or set of principles based on common values that can help guide choices about the region’s shared future; and build the political will and leadership within the region to begin implementing those shared principles.
- Institutional Framework:** The project team includes the Center for the Rocky Mountain West, the Center for Resource Management, a 4-person steering committee and a 15-member advisory board.
- Scale/Region:** The Rocky Mountain West—Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.
- Contact:** Terry Minger
Center for Resource Management
1410 Grant St., Suite C-307
Denver, CO 80203
303-832-6855 (p)
303-832-5622 (f)
info@crm.org

Western Regional Air Partnership

- Participants:** Includes agencies from Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming along with numerous tribal governments; the National Tribal Environmental Council; the Western Governors’ Association, NPS, USFWS, EPA, and USFS.
- Objectives:** To implement the recommendations of the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission; to provide western states and tribes with the technical and policy tools needed to comply with EPA’s regional haze rule and protect air quality in mandatory federal Class I areas (national parks and wilderness areas) across the west.

Institutional

Framework: State, tribal, federal partnership created in 1997 as the successor organization to the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission.

Scale/Region: The thirteen member states and tribes across the west.

Contact: Patrick Cummins
Western Governors' Association
1515 Cleveland Place
Suite 200
Denver, CO 80202-5114
303-623-9378 (p)
303-534-7309 (f)
pcummins@westgov.org

5. Multi-national Initiatives

Multinational initiatives engage participants in two or more countries—in the American West, this means Canada, the U.S., and Mexico. Some are formalized relationships among the national governments, while others operate under federal guidelines but on a more regional or even local level.

CANAMEX: Corridor of Innovation

Participants: The states of Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Montana, in the United States; the Mexican states of Sonora, Sinaloa, Nayarit, Jalisco, Guanajuato, Queretero, Estado de Mexico, and the Federal District; and the Canadian province of Alberta.

Objectives: To guide strategic transportation, telecommunications, and other infrastructure investment for the regional corridor with the primary objective of developing and implementing the CANAMEX Corridor Plan. The plan provides areas of collaboration by the states with the goals of stimulating investment and economic growth in the region and enhancing safety and efficiency within the corridor.

Institutional

Framework: Created in 1995 through an MOU among the governors of the five states, in response to the North American Free Trade Act, which established a set of preferential economic relationships among Canada, the United States, and Mexico. The U.S. Congress defined CANAMEX as a priority transportation and infrastructure corridor. The CANAMEX Corridor Plan is available for review and comment.

Scale/Region: The principal north-south transportation corridor, running from Canada to Mexico, in the heart of the Rocky Mountains.

Contact: Carol Sanger

Executive Director
CANAMEX
206 South 17th Avenue, MD 310B
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-256-7659 (p)
www.canamex.org
jwestphal@dot.state.az.us

Crown of the Continent/Glacier-Waterton International Peace Park and Biosphere Reserve

Participants: NPS and Parks Canada

Objectives: Established as a biosphere reserve, the initiative provides further impetus to research activities, and has a biologist currently at work on international wildlife studies aimed at restoring, protecting and enhancing endangered or threatened populations.

Institutional

Framework: Governmental—in the U.S., Glacier National Park, National Park Service. In Canada, Waterton Lakes National Park, Parks Canada.

Scale/Region: Glacier National Park in Montana and Waterton Lakes National Park, Alberta, Canada.

Contact: Denis Davis

Assistant Superintendent
Glacier National Park
P.O. Box 128
West Glacier, MT 59936
406-888-7905 (p)
406-888-7904 (f)
denis_davis@nps.gov

Superintendent
Waterton Lakes National Park
Waterton Park, Alberta, TOK 2MO, CANADA
403-859-2224

International Flood Mitigation Initiative for the Red River Basin

Participants: Representatives from Minnesota and North Dakota from the United States and Manitoba, Canada, multiple governmental officials, and citizens.

Objectives: To provide an ongoing forum to mitigate the impact of floods while enhancing social, economic, and ecological opportunities.

Institutional

Framework: An ad hoc, multi-party consensus-building forum started in 1998.

Scale/Region: The Red River Basin (RRB) is an international, multi-jurisdictional area, approximately 45,000 square miles (28 million acres of land and water) in size. Nearly 40,000 square miles of the RRB are in the United States; the remaining 5,000 square miles are in Canada

Contact: Brad Crabtree
The Consensus Council
1003 E. Interstate Avenue, Suite 7
Bismarck, ND 58503-0500
701-224-0588 (p)
ndcc@agree.org

Pacific Northwest Economic Region

Participants: The member states and provinces include Alaska, Alberta, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and the Yukon Territory.

Objectives: PNWER is a statutory public/private partnership with a purpose to increase the economic well being and quality of life for all the citizens of the region. They provide information, discussion forums and training for economic stakeholders in the Pacific Northwest with the goal of increasing “the economic well-being and quality of life for all citizens of the region, and to coordinate provincial and state policies.”

Institutional

Framework: The group was legislatively established in all seven states and provinces in 1991. The six original Working Groups included Environmental Technology, Tourism, Recycling, Value-Added Timber, Workforce Training, and Telecommunications.

Scale/Region: The entire western region comprised of the seven member sovereigns.

Contact: Matt Morrison
Pacific NorthWest Economic Region
2200 Alaskan Way, Suite 460
Seattle, WA 98121
206-443-7724 (p)
206-443-7703 (f)
matt@pnwer.org

Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Basin Coalition

Participants: Tribes, local governments, environmental groups, and other non-government organizations, academia, and citizens.

Objectives: To facilitate local communities in restoring and sustaining the environment, economies, and the social well-being of the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Basin.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1994 by an ad hoc partnership of concerned citizens and government agency personnel. The group was formalized in 1996 by a basin-wide steering committee comprised of representatives from local working groups and is now an incorporated nonprofit organization.

Scale/Region: Covers the entire basin which extends from southeastern Colorado to the Gulf of Mexico, an area of approximately 182,000 square miles spread over three states and two countries.

Contact: Bess Metcalf
U.S. Executive Director
Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Coalition
109 N. Oregon, Suite 617
El Paso, TX 79901
915-532-0399 (p)
915-532-0474 (f)
www.rioweb.org
coalition@rioweb.org

Utton Transboundary Resources Center

Participants: Multi-disciplinary teams conduct academic research and field work.

Objectives: To promote equitable and sustainable management of transboundary resources through impartial expertise, multi-disciplinary scholarship, and preventive diplomacy. Solutions for complex transboundary resource issues are reached using preventive diplomacy and fact-based analysis. The Utton Center examines and analyzes problems, develops teams to collaborate on solutions, and helps avoid costly litigation while fostering sustainable resource management plans.

Institutional

Framework: The center is housed in the University of New Mexico School of Law and works closely with the university's Water Resources Program.

Scale/Region: The Rio Bravo/Rio Grande watersheds and lands along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Contact: Marilyn C. O'Leary
University of New Mexico, School of Law
Utton Transboundary Resources Center
1117 Stanford NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131
505-277-7809
uttoncenter@law.unm.edu

Yukon to the Yellowstone

Participants: Over 160 organizations, institutions and foundations, representing almost one million conservation-minded individuals who have recognized the value of working together.

Objectives: To restore and maintain the unique natural heritage of the Yellowstone to Yukon region and the quality of life it offers residents and visitors alike. Working to define and designate a life sustaining network of wildlife cores, connecting movement corridors and transition areas.

Institutional

Framework: Founded in 1996 as a joint Canadian-U.S. initiative. The initiative dates to late 1993, when a group of top scientists and conservationists met near Calgary, Alberta, to talk about the possibility of applying the principles of conservation biology to the Rockies of Canada and the northern U.S.

Scale/Region: The ecoregion is part of the western mountain system of North America, stretching 1,990 miles from west-central Wyoming to Peel River in the northern Yukon. The region ranges from 125 to 500 miles wide and includes some of the most spectacular wilderness in the world which hosts not only a rich diversity of wild habitats and creatures, but also a wide variety of human communities and cultures.

Contact:	Jeff Gailius, Outreach Coordinator Y2Y Conservation Initiative 710 9 th Street, Studio B Canmore, Alberta T1W2V7 Canada 403-609-2666(p) 403-609-2667 (f) jeff@y2y.net www.rockies.ca/y2y	Katie Deuel, Outreach Coor. Y2Y Conservation Initiative 114 West Pine Missoula MT 59802 406-327-8512 (p) Katie@y2y.net
-----------------	--	---

6. Regional Councils of Government in the West

Regional councils of government are organizations that foster cooperation among towns, cities, counties, and other local or regional governments. Some form voluntarily in response to recognized trans-jurisdictional issues or opportunities, while others are mandated by legislative action. Many are planning oriented, though some focus on research, intergovernmental coordination, or specific issues.

Arizona

Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG)

Participants: MAG membership currently consists of the 24 incorporated cities and towns within Maricopa County, two tribal communities, and Maricopa County. The Arizona Department of Transportation and the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee serve as ex-officio members for transportation-related issues.

Objectives: MAG is the designated MPO for transportation planning in the Maricopa County region. The members work cooperatively on regional issues such as

transportation, air quality, land use, water quality, solid waste, and human services. Through an executive order from the governor, MAG also develops population estimates and projections for the region.

Institutional

Framework: MAG was formed in 1967 by the elected officials to serve as the regional agency for the metropolitan Phoenix are. The elected officials recognized the need for long-range planning and policy development on a regional scale. They realized that many issues such as transportation and air quality affected residents beyond the borders of their individual jurisdictions.

Scale/Region: 9,224 square miles.

Contact: James M. Bourey, Executive Director
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 300
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
602-254-6300 (p)
602-254-6309 (f)

Northern Arizona Council of Governments (NACOG)

Participants: The counties of Apache, Coconino, Navajo, and Yavapai and associated cities.

Objectives: NACOG serves local governments and the citizens in a region by dealing with issues and needs that cross city, town, county, and even state boundaries. Mechanisms used to address these issues may include communication, planning, policymaking, coordination, advocacy, and technical assistance.

Institutional

Framework: A public organization encompassing a multi-jurisdictional regional community.

Scale/Region: The four Arizona counties of Apache, Coconino, Navajo, and Yavapai.

Contact: 119 East Aspen Avenue
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001-5222
520-774-1895 (p)
520-773-1135 (f)
nacog@nacog.org

Pima Association Of Governments (PAG)

Participants: The cities of Tucson and South Tucson; Pima County; the towns of Marana, Oro Valley, and Sahuarita; Arizona departments of Transportation, and Environmental Quality Economic Security; University of Arizona; U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration; U.S. EPA; and Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.

Objectives: PAG's mission is to provide accurate, credible information to decision makers. Programs focus on transboundary issues such as air quality, water quality, and transportation. This mission is accomplished through: (1) sharing information

between all levels of governments and the public; (2) generating data and information for decision makers; and (3) using an inclusive, consensus-building approach to address issues related to future growth, development, and quality of life in the region. PAG embraces a regional vision recognizing the independence of each PAG member jurisdiction and celebrates the diverse environmental and cultural influences that distinguish the region.

Institutional

Framework: In December, 1973, the governor designated the association as the MPO for the Tucson metropolitan area. PAG is a non-profit corporation governed by a regional council comprised of elected officials from six local jurisdictions and a member of the State Transportation Board. PAG coordinates regional planning issues such as air quality, water quality, transportation, land use, and human services.

Scale/Region:

Contact: Main Office
177 N. Church Ave., Suite 405
Tucson, AZ 85701
520-792-1093 (p)
520-620-6981 (f)

SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization (SEAGO)

Participants: The four counties of Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, and Santa Cruz; and the cities and towns of Benson, Bisbee, Clifton, Douglas, Duncan, Huachuca City, Nogales, Patagonia, Pima, Safford, Sierra Vista, Thatcher, Tombstone, and Wilcox.

Objectives: SEAGO's mission is to assist local governments in seeking cooperative solutions to area-wide problems; and to provide a forum for regional policy development and serve as a coordinating link between city, county, regional, state, and federal agencies. SEAGO's goal is to provide accurate, credible information to decision makers so that the best choices can be made for the region's future. Programs focus on transboundary issues, such as water quality and transportation.

Institutional

Framework: SEAGO was formally organized in 1972. An intergovernmental agreement was signed by all elected representatives of the four counties and the 14 cities and towns in the southeastern corner of the state. SEAGO is a private, non-profit corporation owned and operated by the cities, towns, and counties in the region. Although SEAGO is technically not a unit of government, it is an organization established by, of, and for local government. Thus, SEAGO serves as the focal point for regional cooperation and coordination needed to promote economic and social development. Lastly, SEAGO also serves as a consulting

firm designed by, of and for the cities, towns, and counties in southeastern Arizona.

Scale/Region: The area includes the counties of Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, and Santa Cruz.

Contact: SEAGO
118 Arizona St.
Bisbee, AZ 85603
520-432-5301 (p)
520-432-5858 (f)
seago@seago.org.

Western Arizona Council of Governments (WACOG)

Participants: La Paz, Mohave, and Yuma Counties, and cities within these counties.

Objectives: Chief among WACOG's objectives is the development of an effective means of planning, cooperation, and coordination of local governmental activities within a regional framework.

Institutional

Framework: WACOG is a voluntary association of local governments established in 1971 by concurrent resolution of its member governments. The boundary area was delineated by Executive Order of Governor Williams.

Scale/Region: The boundaries of Western Arizona Council of Governments comprise the county limits of Mohave, La Paz and Yuma Counties

Contact: [Brian H. Babiars](#), Executive Director
Main Office
928-782-1886 (p)
928-329-4248 (f)
www.wacog.com

California

Association of Bay Area Governments

Participants: 100 cities and the nine counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma.

Objectives: ABAG is working to help solve problems in areas such as land use, housing, environmental quality, and economic development. ABAG's mission is to protect local control, plan for the future, and promote cooperation on area-wide issues.

Institutional

Framework: ABAG is owned and operated by the cities and counties of the San Francisco Bay Area. It was established in 1961. The General Assembly is the overall

governing body of the organization. Each member city and county designates a representative. ABAG's operations are directed by an executive board composed of 38 elected officials from member cities and counties.

Scale/Region: The nine counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma. More than 6 million people live in this 7,000 square mile area.

Contact: Eugene, Leong
Executive Director
PO Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94604-2050
510-464-7900 (p)
510-464-7970 (f)
info@abag.ca.gov

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (MBAG)

Participants: Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz counties, and 18 associated cities.

Objectives: To establish a permanent forum for planning, discussion, and study of regional problems of mutual interest and concern to the associated counties and cities and for the development of studies, plans, policy, and action recommendations.

Institutional

Framework: AMBAG's board of directors is composed of locally elected officials appointed by their respective city council or board of supervisors. Each member city has one representative on the board, while each member county has two.

Scale/Region: The three counties of Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz.

Contact: Nicolas Papadakis, Executive Director
445 Reservation Road, Suite G
P.O. Box 809
Marina, California 93933
831-883-3750 (p)
831-883-3755 (f)
info@ambag.org
www.ambag.org

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

Participants: The nine counties of the San Francisco Bay Area: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, Solano, Sonoma, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara.

Objectives: MTC is the region's MPO, acting as the chief planning agency for the region's transportation projects; allocating funds to mass transit, local streets and roads, highways, freight facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian routes; coordinating the region's transit operators; operating the region's roving tow truck service and

call box network (in partnership with the California Highway Patrol and the California Department of Transportation); and advocating for state and federal funding for regional projects. MTC also directs the region's Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways, and since 1998, the Bay Area Toll Authority.

Institutional

Framework: MTC was created by the California Legislature in 1970 and is directed by a 19-member policy board.

Scale/Region: 6,923 square miles (excluding water).

Contact: Pamela Grove, Public Information
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607
510-464-7787 (p)
510-464-7848 (f)
pgrove@mtc.ca.gov
www.mtc.ca.gov

Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG)

Participants: BCAG is an association of local governments formed by Butte County and the cities of Biggs, Chico, Gridley, Oroville, and the Town of Paradise.

Objectives: BCAG is responsible for the preparation of all federal and state transportation plans and programs that go to secure transportation funding for highways, local streets and roads, transit, aviation, rail and bikeway/pedestrian facilities.

Institutional

Framework: BCAG is the MPO and Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Butte County. BCAG works in cooperation with local government, state and federal agencies and the public to improve transportation in Butte County.

Scale/Region: Butte County, California.

Contact: Jon Clark, Executive Director
[965 Fir Street](#),
Chico, CA 95928
530-879-2468 (p)
530-879-2444 (f)
jonclark@bcag.org

Council of Fresno County Governments (Fresno COG)

Participants: The cities of [Clovis](#), [Coalinga](#), [Firebaugh](#), [Fowler](#), [Fresno](#), [Huron](#), [Kerman](#), [Kingsburg](#), [Mendota Orange Cove](#), [Parlier](#), [Reedley](#), [San Joaquin](#), [Sanger](#), [Selma](#), and [Fresno County](#).

Objectives: The major role of the COG is to foster inter-governmental communications and cooperation, undertake comprehensive regional planning with an emphasis

on transportation, provide for citizen involvement in the planning process and provide technical services to the member agencies.

Institutional

Framework: Fresno COG is a voluntary association of local governments. The COG was informally created in 1967 by elected officials of Fresno County and its incorporated cities as a means of providing a cooperative body for the discussion and resolution of issues which go beyond their individual boundaries. Subsequent state and federal laws encouraged such efforts, and the COG was formalized in 1969.

Scale/Region: Fresno County.

Contact: Barbara Goodwin, Executive Director
2100 Tulare Street, Suite 619
Fresno, CA 93721
559-233-4148 (p)
559-233-9645 (f)
bgoodwin@fresnocog.org

- [Coachella Valley Association of Governments](#)

Kern Council of Governments (KERN COG)

Participants: The County of Kern and the eleven incorporated cities within Kern County.

Objectives: Kern COG is an association of city and county governments created to address regional transportation issues while protecting the integrity and autonomy of each jurisdiction.

Institutional

Framework: In 1967 Kern County and the eleven affiliated cities formed a regional planning advisory commission. In 1970 these government agencies signed an executive joint powers agreement under section 6500 et seq. of the California Code.

Scale/Region: Kern County

Contact: Ronald Brummett, Executive Director
1401 19th Street, Suite 300
Bakersfield, California 93301
661-861-2191 (p)
661-324-8215 (f)
rbrummett@kerncog.org

The Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG)

Participants: Merced County and incorporated cities of Atwater, Livingston, Los Banos, Dos Palos, and Gustine.

Objectives: MCAGs' most significant responsibility and challenge remains the financing of transportation infrastructure, both capacity enhancement and system maintenance.

Institutional

Framework: MCAG was formed through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) signed by member jurisdictions on November 28, 1967. It is periodically renewed, most recently for a term of ten years beginning November 1997.

Scale/Region: Merced County.

Contact: Merced County Association of Governments
369 West 18th Street
Merced California 95340
209-723-3153 (p)
209-723-0322 (f)
feedback@mcag.cog.ca.us

- [Stanislaus Area Association of Governments](#)

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Participants: SACOG is formed by [six counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba and 19 associated cities](#).

Objectives: SACOG coordinates transportation planning and funding for the entire [Sacramento region](#).

Institutional

Framework: SACOG is an association of local governments that provides a forum for the study and resolution of regional issues.

Scale/Region: The six counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba.

Contact: Martin Tuttle, Executive Director
3000, S Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95816
916-457-2264 (p)
916-457-3299 (f)
sacog@sacog.org

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)

Participants: The SANBAG Board of Directors is comprised of the five members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors, as well as a mayor or council members from each of the 24 cities in the county.

Objectives: SANBAG is responsible for cooperative regional planning and furthering an efficient multi-modal transportation system countywide. As the County

Transportation Commission, SANBAG supports freeway construction projects, regional and local road improvements, train and bus transportation, railroad crossings, call boxes, ridesharing, congestion management efforts and long-term planning studies.

Institutional

Framework: SANBAG was created as a council of governments in 1973. SANBAG is the council of governments and the transportation planning agency for San Bernardino County.

Scale/Region: 20,000 square miles

Contact: Norm King, Executive Director
472 N. Arrowhead Avenue,
San Bernardino, CA 92401
909-884-8276
nking@sanbag.ca.gov

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

Participants: 18 incorporated cities and one county government equal the 19 voting members of SANDAG; in addition, SANDAG has seven advisory (non-voting) members; the advisory members are the state department of transportation, the San Diego County Water Authority, the San Diego Unified Port District, the U.S. Department of Defense, both the San Diego Metropolitan and North San Diego County Transit Development Boards, and the Consul General of Mexico.

Objectives: SANDAG is a forum for regional decision-making, strategic planning (transportation, open space/habitat, energy, housing, economic prosperity, etc.), resource allocation (primarily transportation funds) research, informational products, and local technical assistance to member agencies.

Institutional

Framework: SANDAG is an independent Joint Powers Agency formed under California law in 1972.

Scale/Region: 2.8 million residents living in a 4,200 square mile region, approximately the size of the State of Connecticut.

Contact: Garry Bonelli, Communications Director
SANDAG
Wells Fargo Plaza
401 'B' Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231
619-595-5360 (p)
619-595-5605 (f)
www.sandag.org

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG)

- Participants:** Santa Barbara County and its eight incorporated cities (Buellton, Carpinteria, Guadalupe, Goleta, Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, and Solvang).
- Objectives:** SBCAG's central purpose is to provide a forum for collaborative discussion and resolution of problems and issues that are regional or multi-jurisdictional in nature. It's primary responsibilities are in the area of transportation.
- Institutional Framework:** SBCAG was created through a joint powers agreement executed by each of the general purpose local governments in Santa Barbara County. SBCAG is an independent entity governed by a 13-member Board of Directors and is the designated MPO and regional transportation planning agency for Santa Barbara County. It also serves as the Airport Land Use Commission, Local Transportation Authority, and Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE).
- Scale/Region:** SBCAG's boundaries are the same as those of Santa Barbara County and encompass 2,774 square miles, including the four islands comprising Channel Islands National Park.
- Contact:** William F. Derrick, Executive Director
26 Castilian Drive
P.O. Box 8208
Goleta, CA 93118-8208
805-961-8900
bderrick@sbcag.org

Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency

- Participants:** Shasta County and the cities of Anderson, Redding, and Shasta Lake.
- Objectives:** The RTPA is responsible for the development and adoption of transportation policy; review and coordination of transportation planning; a Regional Transportation Plan; and a Regional and Federal Transportation Improvement Program. These planning activities enable the local jurisdictions within the County of Shasta to qualify for a variety of state and federal funding for transportation projects and facilities.
- Institutional Framework:**
- Scale/Region:** Shasta County
- Contact:** Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer
1855 Placer Street
Redding, California 96001
530-225-5654 (p)
530-225-5667 (f)
shasroad@snowcrest.net

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

Participants: The six counties of: Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura and Imperial and associated cities.

Objectives: To promote, through leadership, vision and progress, the economic growth, personal well being, and livable communities for all Southern Californians.

Institutional

Framework: As the designated MPO, the association is mandated by the federal government to research and draw up plans for transportation, growth management, hazardous waste management, and air quality. Additional mandates exist at the state level.

Scale/Region: The region encompasses a population exceeding 15 million persons in an area of more than 38,000 square miles.

Contact: Southern California Association of Governments
818 W. Seventh Street, 12th Floor (Main Office)
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213-236-1800 (p)
213-236-1825 (f)

- [Sierra Economic Development District & Sierra Planning Organization](#)

San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

Participants: The cities of: Alhambra, Arcadia, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Bradbury, Claremont, Covina, Diamond Bar, Duarte, El Monte, Glendora, Industry, Irwindale, La Cañada-Flintridge, La Puente, La Verne, Monrovia, Montebello, Monterey Park, Pasadena, Pomona, Rosemead, San Dimas, San Gabriel, San Marino, Sierra Madre, South El Monte, South Pasadena, Temple City, Walnut, West Covina

Objectives: To ensure the valley's "fair share" of scarce federal, state, and local resources by fostering consensus among cities in the San Gabriel Valley regarding policies and programs that address issues relating to land use, air quality, transportation, solid waste and other matters deemed essential to our cities.

Institutional

Framework: The council was created in 1994 to provide an official framework in which these 30 cities can work together in addressing issues that transcend their respective boundaries. The participating cities are organized under a governing board.

Scale/Region: San Gabriel Valley is a 375 square mile area stretching from Pasadena on the far west, proceeding along the San Gabriel Mountains on the north out to

Claremont and the County line; proceeding south along the 57/210 freeway to Diamond Bar on the south and the Orange County line; back along the 60 freeway to Monterey park and the Los Angeles City limits.

Contact: Nicholas T. Conway, Executive Director
3871 E. Colorado Blvd, Ste 101
Pasadena, CA 91107-3970
626-564-9702 (p)
626-564-1116 (f)
sgv@svgcog.org

San Joaquin Council Of Governments

Participants: The County of San Joaquin and the cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Lodi, Manteca, Ripon, Stockton and Tracy.

Objectives: While regional transportation planning is its primary role, SJCOG also takes a look at population statistics, airport land use, habitat and open space planning, and other regional issues.

Institutional

Framework: SJCOG is an association of the area's seven incorporated cities and the county government, operating under a joint powers agreement to decide planning policies for the San Joaquin County region.

Scale/Region: The County of San Joaquin.

Contact: Julia E. Greene, Executive Director
6 South El Dorado Street
Stockton, CA 95202-2804
209-468-3913 (p)
209-468-1084 (f)
mailto:jgreene@sjcog.org

San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG)

Participants: San Luis Obispo County and seven associated cities.

Objectives: As the designated RTPA, MPO, and CDA for San Luis Obispo County, SLOCOG is responsible for a wide variety of actions that support a continuous, comprehensive, coordinated planning process that will help ensure the development of an efficient, coordinated and balanced transportation system to meet the mobility needs of the San Luis Obispo region.

Institutional

Framework: SLOCOG was formed in 1968 as an Area Planning Council, through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) among the incorporated cities and the County of San Luis Obispo. SLOCOG was subsequently designated as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for San Luis Obispo County. As of July 1, 1992 the SLOCOG was designated as the MPO.

Scale/Region: San Luis Obispo County.
Contact: Ronald L. DeCarli, Executive Director
1150 Osos St. Ste 202
San Luis Obispo, CA. 93401
805-781-4219 (p)
805-781-5703 (f)
info@slocog.org

Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG)

Participants: Riverside County and 15 associated cities.
Objectives: The purpose of the WRCOG is to unify western Riverside County so that it can speak with a collective voice on important sub-regional and regional issues.

Institutional

Framework: WRCOG jurisdictions agreed to form a COG following discussion and negotiation on common goals and objectives. WRCOG was consummated by execution of a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) in 1991.

Scale/Region: Riverside County

Contact: Rick Bishop, Executive Director
3880 Lemon Street, Suite 300
Riverside, California 92501
909-787-7985 (p)
909-787-7991 (f)

Kings County Association of Governments (KCAG)

Participants: Kings County and the cities of Avenal, Corcoran, Hanford, and Lemoore.
Objectives: KCAG is responsible for addressing inter-jurisdictional public policy matters.

Institutional

Framework: KCAG was formally created in 1967 as a voluntary association of local governments, designated by the State of California.

Scale/Region: Kings County.

Contact: Bill Zumwalt, Executive Secretary
1400 W. Lacey, Blvd.
Hanford, CA 93230
559-582-3211 (p)
bzumwalt@co.kings.ca.us

- [Orange County Council of Governments](#)
- [Council of San Benito County Governments](#)

- Tulare County Association of Governments (no Web site available)
E-mail: [Doug Wilson](mailto:Doug.Wilson)

Colorado

Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)

Participants: DRCOG is a voluntary association of 51 county and municipal governments in the greater Denver, Colorado, area.

Objectives: Through the council of governments, local governments work together to address issues of regional concern. Those issues include growth and development, transportation, the environment, provision of services to the region's older population, and analysis of economic and development trends. Besides promoting regional cooperation and coordination among local governments, the council of governments resolves common problems, performs regional planning and provides services to its members.

Institutional

Framework: DRCOG began when 39 elected officials and staff members met in 1955 at the Denver Athletic Club in response to an invitation from Denver's then-Mayor Quigg Newton "to consider a four-county district authority to plan for the development of the metropolitan area...and to meet the common problems that confront the four counties."

Scale/Region: The counties of Boulder, Arapahoe, Adams, Gilpin, Clear Creek, Jefferson and Douglas.

Contact: 2480 W. 26th Avenue
Suite 200B
Denver, Colorado 80211
303-455-1000 (p)
303-480-6790 (f)
drcog@drcog.org

North Front Range Transportation & Air Quality Planning Council (NFRT&AQPC)

Participants: Larimer and Weld Counties, including the cities of Fort Collins, Greeley, and Loveland, and the towns of Berthoud, Evans, Garden City, Johnstown, LaSalle, Timnath and Windsor.

Objectives: Recognizing the unique character of the region, NFRT&AQPC provides an environmentally, socially, and economically sensitive multi-modal transportation system that protects and enhances the region's quality of life and addresses transportation and air quality planning issues in Colorado's North Front Range.

Institutional

Framework: NFRT&AQPC is an association of local governments formed in 1987.

Scale/Region: Larimer and Weld counties.
Contact: NFRT & AQPC
235 Mathews Street
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524
970-416-2252 (p)
970-416-2406 (f)
kwood@nfrmpo.org

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG)

Participants: El Paso, Park and Teller Counties, and twelve associated cities and towns.
Objectives: PPACG is a regional planning agency, the purpose of which is to assist local elected officials in making coordinated decisions affecting the development of all geographic areas of the region. It also collects data and prepares and analyzes socioeconomic data of the region, allocates certain transportation and aging funds and other resources within the region, provides technical assistance to member local governments, and evaluates the impacts of laws and regulations on local government.

Institutional

Framework: Formed in 1967 under the Colorado laws regarding regional planning and intergovernmental contracting, PPACG is not a unit of local government but a voluntary organization of local governments serving a regional community. The governing body of PPACG is composed of elected officials from participating local governments, and memberships are open to all general purpose local governments in the Pikes Peak region. The PPACG Articles of Association stipulate that PPACG is an interlocal advisory board—any policies, plans or programs adopted by PPACG must also be adopted by the governing body of a member county or municipality before it obligates that county or municipality.

Scale/Region: The Pikes Peak region, comprised of El Paso, Park and Teller Counties.

Contact: [Fred Van Antwerp](#), Executive Director
15 South Seventh Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80905
719-471-7080 (p)
719-471-1226 (f)
fvanantwerp@pcisys.net

- [SW Colorado Transportation Planning Commission](#)
- [Southeast Colorado Enterprise Development](#)

Northwest Colorado Council of Governments

Participants: Today, NWCCOG serves 25 member jurisdictions in a five-county region including Eagle County and the towns of Avon, Basalt, Eagle, Gypsum, Minturn, Red Cliff and Vail; Grand County and the towns of Fraser, Granby, Grand Lake, Hot Sulphur Springs, Kremmling and Winter Park; Jackson County and the Town of Walden; Pitkin County and the City of Aspen; and Summit County and the towns of Breckenridge, Dillon, Frisco, Montezuma, and Silverthorne.

Objectives: The purpose of the NWCOG is to be responsive to our members' needs and interests by providing guidance and assistance in problem solving; information sharing and partnership building; advocating members' interests and needs with local, state, and federal entities; and providing quality services to our membership that are relevant, effective, and efficient.

Institutional

Framework: NWCCOG is a voluntary association of county and municipal governments and was established as Colorado Planning and Management Region XII in 1972 by executive order of the governor in response to the Federal Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. Regional planning was encouraged as a means to avoid overlap, duplication, and competition between local planning activities.

Scale/Region: Eagle, Grand, Jackson, Pitkin and Summit counties, covering a six thousand square mile area.

Contact: Gary Severson, Executive Director
P.O. Box 2308
249 Warren Ave.
Silverthorne, CO 80498
970-468-0295 (p)
970-468-1208 (f)
gjs@nwc.cog.co.us

Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG)

Participants: Pueblo County Board of Commissioners, Pueblo City Council, Pueblo Board of Water Works, Pueblo School District No. 60, Pueblo School District No. 70, Pueblo West Metropolitan District, Colorado City Metropolitan District, and Salt Creek Sanitation District

Objectives: The Council serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (Federal Highway Transportation Act) for the Pueblo Region; the Area Agency on Aging (Older Americans Act) for the Pueblo Region; the Areawide Water Quality Management Planning Agency (Federal Clean Water Act) for the Pueblo Region; and the Regional Planning Commission for the Pueblo Transportation Planning Region.

Institutional

Framework: The Council was organized on October 28, 1971 under the Colorado Intergovernmental Cooperation Act.

Scale/Region: 2,414 square miles.

Contact: Mr. Kim Headley, PACOG Manager
229 West 12th Street
Pueblo, CO 81003-2810
719-583-6100 (p)
kheadley@co.pueblo.co.us

Idaho

Community Planning Association (COMPASS)

Participants: Treasure Valley, Idaho.

Objectives: COMPASS is a regional planning organization whose mission is fourfold: provide a forum to address and prioritize region-wide issues; serve as a catalyst to ensure local government involvement in building region-wide consensus; develop and support policies to achieve region-wide solutions; maintain resources to support efficient region-wide planning and development.

Institutional

Framework: COMPASS is a voluntary association of local governments which meets to discuss issues affecting a wider area than one city or county. In 1977, the governor designated COMPASS as the MPO for Ada County and its cities.

Scale/Region: Ada and Canyon counties.

Contact: Clair Bowman, Executive Director
Community Planning Association
800 S. Industry Way
Suite 100
Meridian Idaho 83642
208-855-2558 (p)
208-855-2559 (f)
cbowman@compassidaho.org

The Southeast Idaho Council of Governments (SICOG)

Participants: SICOG serves the seven counties of Bingham, Bannock, Caribou, Bear Lake, Franklin, Oneida, Power and associated cities.

Objectives: To improve the quality of life for southeast Idaho residents by cooperatively assessing, planning, developing, and implementing public service.

Institutional

Framework: SICOG is a voluntary association of local governments and community organizations funded through local, state, and federal sources.

Scale/Region: 9,200 square miles

Contact: SICOG
P.O. Box 6079
Pocatello ID 83205
208-233-4032
208-233-4841
deann@sicog.org
www.sicog.org

New Mexico

- [New Mexico Association of Regional Councils](#)
- [Middle Rio Grande Council of Governments](#)

Oregon

- [METRO-serving Portland and the surrounding counties](#)

Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments (COG)

Participants: Benton, Lincoln, and Linn counties and associated cities.

Objectives: The COG was created to provide services and address issues on a regional basis and works to best position each community within the COG to be as economically viable as possible while retaining their livable community characteristics.

Institutional

Framework: The Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments began in the late 1960s in response to federal grant requirements imposed upon local governments.

Scale/Region: Benton, Lincoln, and Linn counties.

Contact: Bill Wagner, Executive Director
Cascades West Center
1400 Queen Ave SE
Albany, OR 97321
541-967-8720 (p)
541-967-6123 (f)
hewing@cw cog.or.us

- [Umpqua Regional Council of Governments](#)

The Lane Council of Governments

Participants: Lane County; all 12 incorporated cities in the county; 4 school districts: 4J, 19, 52, and 68; Lane Community College; 2 public utilities: Eugene Water and Electric Board, and Emerald People's Utility District; and 5 special districts: Port of Siuslaw, Lane Education Service District, Western Lane Ambulance District, Willamalane Park & Recreation District, and Siuslaw Public Library District.

Objectives: LCOG facilitates cooperation and joint ventures among local governments. LCOG provides planning, coordination, and direct services to its member agencies, in the areas of community and regional planning, transportation planning, natural resources planning, telecommunications, hearings officials, economic development and small business loans, general research and analysis, geographic information systems, and metropolitan television services. LCOG provides direct services to the senior and disabled populations of Lane County.

Institutional

Framework: Founded in 1945 to provide interagency planning and coordination.

Scale/Region: Lane County, Oregon. 4,620 square miles (slightly smaller than Connecticut), stretching from the crest of the high Cascade mountains, to the Pacific Ocean.

Contact: George Kloepfel, Executive Director
Lane Council of Governments
99 E. Broadway, Suite 400
Eugene, OR 97401
541-682-4395 (p)
541-682-4099 (f)
gkloepfel@lane.cog.or.us
www.lcog.org

[Rogue Valley Council of Governments \(RVCOG\)](#)

Participants: [15 local governments and six other jurisdictions](#) (such as special districts) in southwestern Oregon's Jackson and Josephine Counties.

Objectives: RVCOG's job is to support local and regional problem solving. The council is a resource for [technical expertise and project management](#). It acts in the interests of its member jurisdictions as a collective voice for the region when working with the state or federal government.

Institutional

Framework: RVCOG was created in 1968 as a voluntary association. Its services and programs are funded through [grants, contracts, and member fees](#). It has no legislative or enforcement authority.

Scale/Region: Jackson and Josephine Counties.

Contact: Michael Cavallaro, Executive Director

Rogue Valley Council of Governments
P.O. Box 3275
Central Point, OR 97502
541-664-6674 (p)
541-664-7927 (f)
mcavallaro@rvcog.org

Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council

Participants: 23-member Advisory Council composed of representatives from the forest industry, public and non-profit land managers, environmental groups, local governments, tribal organizations, community development groups, emergency management agencies, and state and Congressional representatives.

Objectives: Through broad-based community participation, this project will develop a strategy to implement ecologically sustainable, economically viable, market-driven methods to remove hazardous fuel and utilize non-sawtimber biomass from Central Oregon's public and private lands. The focus of this strategy will be the development of the partnerships necessary to remove hazardous fuel and cultivate markets using non-sawtimber biomass.

Institutional

Framework: COIC was founded in 1972, initially to serve Central Oregon by providing employment and training services. Today, COIC has evolved into a diverse organization tackling a variety of issues facing Central Oregonians. COIC provides both technical expertise and a cooperative structure for the region to come together, discuss, and tackle many of its challenges.

Scale/Region: 7,856 square miles

Contact: Scott Aycock, CED Program Coordinator
2363 SW Glacier Place
Redmond, OR 97756
541-548-9525 (p)
saycock@coic.org

Utah

Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG)

Participants: Box Elder, Cache, and Rich Counties and associated cities.

Objectives: BRAG was formed to facilitate intergovernmental cooperation and to insure the orderly and harmonious coordination of federal, state, and local programs for the solution of mutual problems of the region. BRAG's goal is to serve as a multi-purpose organization, utilizing their combined total resources, to provide a more effective means for planning and development of the physical, economic, and human resources of the region.

Institutional

Framework: BRAG is a voluntary organization of local governments formed in 1971.

Scale/Region: Box Elder, Cache, and Rich Counties

Contact: Roger C. Jones, Executive Director
245 W. 1100 S.
Brigham City, UT 84302
435-723-1111 (p)
435-723-1117 (f)
jeffg@brag.dst.ut.us

Southwest Utah Planning Authorities Council

Participants: Washington, Iron, Kane, and Garfield Counties along with local and federal government partners including, USFS, BLM, BIA, NPS, USFWS, ACOE, and the Paiute Tribe.

Objectives: To enhance intergovernmental cooperation and public participation in addressing issues which relate to or affect the stewardships of more than one participant, is one of SUPAC's goals.

Institutional

Framework: SUPAC is a council [established by the Governor of Utah in October 1993](#).

Scale/Region: SUPAC area of interest is all of Washington County, and those areas of Iron and Kane counties within the Colorado River drainage. In 1997 Garfield was added to the area of interest because of the designation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument.

Contact: Scott Truman, Vice Chairman
SUPAC
801-586-7852
truman@suu.edu

Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO)

Participants: Cache County, and the cities of [Logan](#), [North Logan](#), Nibley, Millville, [Smithfield](#), Providence, River Heights, and [Hyde Park](#).

Objectives: (CMPO) is a regional planning agency composed of city and county governments in the Logan Urbanized Area that conduct intermodal transportation planning in order to provide a comprehensive, coordinated, and continuing approach to planning all transportation modes.

Institutional

Framework: The CMPO was formed in 1992 to carry out the federally mandated metropolitan planning process so that the Logan Urbanized Area could receive federal funds for improving transportation facilities and services.

Scale/Region: Cache County

Contact: Tom Fisher, CMPO Transportation Planner
160 North Main Street
Logan, Utah 84321
435-716-7154
cachmpo@n1.net

Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC)

Participants: Weber, Morgan, Davis, Salt Lake, and Tooele counties and associated cities.
Objectives: Consistent with our general purpose to provide cooperation and coordination among member entities, our principle functions are related to area-wide planning. WFRC is the MPO for the Ogden-Salt Lake urban area, and conducts an extensive inter-modal transportation planning process. In addition to its role in transportation planning, WFRC is involved in a full range of local government issues including revenue and taxation, solid waste management, protection of open space and air quality, annexation and incorporation, and relations with federal, state, and local governments.

Institutional

Framework: WFRC was organized as a volunteer organization in March 1969, among Davis, Salt Lake, and Weber Counties and the cities within, to obtain federal grants and loans, and to address the solutions of regional problems. In June 1969, Tooele County and the municipalities within, and in 1972 Morgan County and the municipalities within joined the regional council. The WFRC is a voluntary organization of governments dedicated to fostering a cooperative effort in resolving problems, and developing policies and plans that are common to two or more counties or are regional in nature.

Scale/Region: Weber, Morgan, Davis, Salt Lake, and Tooele Counties

Contact: Wasatch Front Regional Council
295 North Jimmy Doolittle Road
Salt Lake City, UT 84116
wfrc@wfrc.org

Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)

Participants: Utah, Wasatch and Summit Counties and associated cities.
Objectives: MAG is a voluntary organization of governments to facilitate inter-governmental cooperation and insure the orderly and harmonious coordination of federal, state, and local programs for the mutual problems of the region and to serve as a multi-purpose organization to provide a more effective means for planning and development of the physical, economic, and human resources of the region.

Institutional

Framework: The association was formed in 1971 to address problems which extend beyond traditional jurisdictional boundaries and affect the entire three-county region. MAG is a voluntary association of local governments.

Scale/Region: Utah, Wasatch and Summit Counties.

Contact: Darrell Cook, Executive Director
586 East 800 North
Stratford Park
Orem, UT 84097
801-229-3800 (p)
801-229-3801 (f)
dcook@mountainland.org

- [Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments](#)

Five County Association of Governments

Participants: Five County Association of Governments - Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane and Washington Counties (southwestern Utah) and 36 incorporated municipalities.

Objectives: Provide a forum to discuss and resolve issues that transcend jurisdictional boundaries. Provide a shared staff resource for local governments that cannot afford to provide staff on their own.

Institutional

Framework: The Association was formed in 1972 under the provisions of the Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act; but the five county governments had been cooperating in industrial and tourism development since the late 1950's.

Scale/Region: 17,500 square miles covering five counties in southwestern Utah.

Contact: John S. Williams, Executive Director
906 North 1400 West
St. George, Utah 84770
435-673-3548 (p)
435-673-3540 (f)
www.fcaog.state.ut.us

The Six County Association of Governments

Participants: Juab, Millard, Sevier, Sanpete, Piute, and Wayne counties and associated cities.

Objectives: The purpose of the Six County AOG is to serve cities, counties, and the general population as directed by the Governing Board.

Institutional

Framework: The Six County Association of Governments was originally established in 1967 as the Six County Commissioners' Organization. Recently, the organization

was renamed an “Association of Governments” as it expanded to include mayors.

Scale/Region: Juab, Millard, Sevier, Sanpete, Piute, and Wayne counties.

Contact: Emory Polelonema
250 North Main,
Richfield, Utah 84701
435-896-9222 (p)

Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG)

Participants: Dagget, Dushesne, and Uintah Counties, and associated cities.

Objectives: UBAG’s goal is to serve as a multi-purpose organization utilizing their combined total resources to provide a more effective means for planning and development of the physical, economic, and human resources of the region.

Institutional

Framework: The Uintah Basin Association of Governments was established in 1973.

Scale/Region: Dagget, Dushesne, and Uintah Counties.

Contact: Laurie Brummond, Executive Director
855 E. 200 North
Roosevelt, UT 84066
435-722-4518 (p)

Washington

Benton-Franklin Council of Governments

Participants: Benton County, Franklin County, Cities of Kennewick, Pasco, Richland,

West Richland, Benton City, Prosser, Connell, Mesa and Kahlotus; Ports of Benton, Kennewick, and Pasco; Ben Franklin Transit and Benton PUD.

Objectives: Provide a regional forum for multi-jurisdictional decision-making. Serves as the Economic Development District for the region, as a regional planning entity, and as a lead agency for the development of multi-jurisdictional programs.

Institutional

Framework: The COG originated in the late 1960s and currently serves as the MPO and the EDD for the bi-county area.

Scale/Region: 2,945 square miles

Contact: Gwen Rasmussen, Executive Director
P. O. Box 217
Richland, WA 99352

509-943-9185
bfcog2@owt.com
www.wa.gov/bfcog

Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (CWCOG)

Participants: [Cowlitz County](#), [Wahkiakum County](#), and the cities of [Longview](#), [Kelso](#), [Woodland](#), [Castle Rock](#), [Kalama](#), and [Cathlamet](#).

Objectives: Provide a regional forum to address issues of mutual interest and concern, develop recommendations, and provide a variety of technical and contractual services. CWCOG's goal is to efficiently use resources to yield long-term benefits that enhance the quality of life for our communities.

Institutional

Framework: The CWCOG is a voluntary association of general and special purpose governments and agencies in the lower Columbia region.

Scale/Region: [Cowlitz County](#) and [Wahkiakum County](#).

Contact: Steve Harvey, Director
207 4th Avenue North
Kelso, WA 98626
360-577-3041 (p)
360-425-7760 (f)
cwcog@cwcog.org

- [Grays Harbor Regional Planning Commission](#)

Puget Sound Regional Council

Participants: King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish Counties and 68 cities and towns in the region, three ports, and two state agencies.

Objectives: The Puget Sound Regional Council is an association of cities, towns, counties, ports, and state agencies that serves as a forum for developing policies and making decisions about regional growth and transportation issues in the four-county central Puget Sound region.

Institutional

Framework: The Council is designated under federal law as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and under state law as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO), for King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. The Council provides creative, pragmatic regional planning and research to address current issues, and to explore future needs and options that could benefit the region.

Scale/Region: King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties.

Contact: Mary McCumber, Executive Director
1011 Western Avenue, #500
Seattle, Washington 98104-1035
206-464-7090 (p)
206-587-4825 (f)
mmccumber@psrc.org

Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC)

Participants: Thurston County and associated local government agencies.

Objectives: The Council develops regional plans and policies for transportation, growth management, environmental quality, and other topics. TRPC also acts as a regional clearinghouse for planning and demographic information and data.

Institutional

Framework: TRPC is an intergovernmental board made up of local government jurisdictions within Thurston County in Washington State. TRPC was established in 1967 under RCW 36.70.060, which authorized creation of regional planning councils in Washington State.

Scale/Region: Thurston County.

Contact: Lon Wyrick, Executive Director
2404 Heritage Court #B
Olympia, WA 98502
360-786-5480 (p)
360-754-4413 (f)
info@trpc.org

Whatcom Council of Governments (WCOG)

Participants: Whatcom County and associated local governments.

Objectives: The mission of the Whatcom Council of Governments is to provide general and special governments with an organized means of providing a more unified response to significant issues of this regional Whatcom County community

Institutional

Framework: The Whatcom Council of Governments was established in 1966 as a multi-jurisdictional body representing local governments in Whatcom County. WCOG serves as a regional planning organization enabled by Washington State law and WCOG is also the state-designated [Regional Transportation Planning Organization](#) (RTPO) and [Metropolitan Planning Organization](#) (MPO).

Scale/Region: Whatcom County

Contact: Jim Miller, Executive Director
Whatcom Council of Governments
314 E. Champion Street

Bellingham, WA 98225
360-676-6974 (p)
360-738-6232 (f)
wcog@wcog.org

Yakima Valley Conference of Governments (YVCOG)

Participants: Yakima County and associated local governments.

Objectives: To provide a reliable conduit for information and social exchange, common problem solving, and sharing amongst valley communities; meet the planning and technical needs of YVCOG members in a cost-effective, professional manner; develop an organization directed by its members, insuring the work agenda remains responsive to changing membership needs; and maintain strong fiscal management capabilities to insure responsible stewardship of funds.

Institutional

Framework: Established in 1966 under RCW 36.70.060, YVCOG has detailed [bylaws](#) and articles of association. The valley's community leaders saw the need to create a forum to address an ever growing list of regional concerns. YVCOG has grown to be a key player in the research for studies and plans to address these issues.

Scale/Region: Yakima County.

Contact: Don S. Skone, Executive Director
Yakima Valley Conference of Governments
6 South 2nd Street, Suite 605
Yakima, Washington 98901
509-574-1550 (p)
509-574-1551 (f)
skoned@yvcog.org