

REPORT

on

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE URBAN NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

July 1999

by

**Raymond L. (Joe) Davis
for**

1999 TEAM LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

**Prepared For:
U. S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
OREGON STATE OFFICE
2600 SE 98th Avenue, Suite 100
Portland, Oregon 97216**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Project Overview:	
Objective and Scope	1
Methods	1
II. Background:	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Mission	2
Overview of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Programs	2
Potential Benefits of Working in Urban Areas	4
III. Case Studies: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Urban Natural Resources Programs:	
Chicago, IL - Chicago Region Ecological Services Field Office	5
San Diego County, CA - Multiple Species Conservation Plan	7
Portland, OR/Vancouver, WA - Metropolitan Greenspaces Program	8
IV. Case Studies: Other Federal Urban Natural Resources Programs:	
Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance - National Park Service	9
Wetlands Grant Programs - Environmental Protection Agency	10
Urban Resources Partnership - U.S. Department of Agriculture	11
V. Findings	11
VI. Recommendations	13
VII. Conclusion	16
VIII. Next Steps	17
Appendix I: Stakeholders Interviewed	
Appendix II: Record of Interviews	

Disclaimer: The opinions and views presented in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the US. Fish and Wildlife Service or any other agency or organization. The “Record of Interview” section summarizes interviews with stakeholders as interpreted and documented by the author.

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

This assignment was a 60-day detail from my agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The assignment is in partial fulfillment for the 1999 Department of the Interior Team Leadership Program (TLP), which I am one of the participants. In February 1999, I contacted Mr. Russell Peterson, State Supervisor, Oregon State Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) for a possible TLP assignment with the Service. Mr. Peterson briefed me on what he thought was an extremely worthwhile project that could have ramifications for the Service's future efforts. He asked if I would be interested in reviewing the current role, and the potential need for an expanded role, of the Service in urban natural resource conservation programs.

The 60-day assignment went by all too quickly and limited more in-depth research of the subject. In particular, I reviewed three urban Service programs, and then did a very limited research of other federal agency urban natural resources programs. Additional research in this latter area would provide the Service more information regarding potential partnerships and the need for an expanded Service role. I have indicated this in the "Next Steps" section of the report.

I would like to acknowledge the tremendous support and guidance by Mr. Peterson and his staff for allowing me to work on this extremely interesting and, I hope, creditable, project. As a System Accountant from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, it opened my eyes to a new arena. As for the report, I thank all who gave me time from their busy schedules for interviews and the Service staff that provided critical comments and corrections to the report. I apologize for any mistakes and accept responsibility for any errors or omissions.

Objective and Scope

The objective of this project was to review the Service's current role in urban natural resource conservation programs and identify, if any, a need for an expanded Service role. To accomplish the objective, I selected programs to review in three metropolitan areas where the Service has been actively involved in urban conservation efforts. These efforts are centered in the metropolitan regions around Chicago, Illinois; Portland, Oregon; and San Diego, California. I also selected three urban conservation programs to review that are administered or funded by the National Park Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Methods

To review the programs, I obtained written information about each one and conducted interviews with program administrators, partners and stakeholders. Service staff from the Oregon State Office provided me with an initial list of recommended stakeholders for interviews and assisted with developing an interview format. I modified and added to the interview list based on discussions with the interviewees. In total, I interviewed twenty-eight selected stakeholders from the three metropolitan areas and four from three federal agencies that offered other urban related programs. See Appendix I, "Urban Natural Resources Program Assignment, Stakeholders Interviewed" and Appendix II, "Urban

Natural Resources Program Assignment, Record of Interviews”. Also, I reviewed brochures, reports, and other program documents from each of the three metropolitan areas and from the three federal agencies.

II. BACKGROUND

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Mission

The mission of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. The Service fulfills its mission by providing consultative and regulatory services to other federal agencies, state and local governments, Tribes, and the private sector. Such services include ecological services (providing technical assistance in the areas of endangered species and habitat conservation) and law enforcement. Other services include management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, supporting fisheries restoration efforts, monitoring and conservation efforts for migratory birds, and providing international assistance. The Service’s goals are (1) Sustainability of Fish and Wildlife Populations, (2) Habitat Conservation, and (3) Public Use and Enjoyment.

Overview of U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Programs

The following is a brief summary of the Service’s major activities:

Endangered Species: The Service administers the Endangered Species Act (ESA). More than 700 native species are currently on the endangered list. The Service has put increased emphasis on two provisions of the ESA in recent years -- Habitat Conservation Plans and Special 4(d) Rules. These provisions are tools used to recover species and are designed to avoid or resolve conflicts between private development projects and the protection of an endangered species.

National Wildlife Refuge System: The Refuge System includes 516 national wildlife refuges which encompasses more than 92 million acres of the nation's wildlife habitats. The mission of the Refuge System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.

Migratory Birds: The Service is responsible for leading migratory bird conservation under several laws and international treaties with Canada, Mexico, Japan, and the former Soviet Union. This includes the conservation of more than 800 species of migratory birds.

Fisheries Restoration: Another major effort of the Fish and Wildlife Service is the restoration of nationally significant fisheries that have been depleted by overfishing, pollution, or other habitat damage. Its mission is to provide the Federal leadership to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. As part of this program, nearly 80

national fish hatcheries produce some 60 species of fish. The Service stocks more than 200 million fish annually.

Habitat Conservation and Restoration: The Service provides expert biological advice to other federal agencies, states, industry, and members of the public concerning the conservation of fish and wildlife habitat that may be affected by development activities. Service personnel assess the potential effects of projects that require federal funding or permits, such as dredge and fill activities, dams and reservoirs, oil leasing, energy projects, and federal highways. Other, non-regulatory programs include technical and financial assistance to various state and local governments, conservation organizations, and private landowners. These programs assist the partnering entities to conserve and restore federally significant fish and wildlife habitat on public and private lands.

Service personnel also assess the effects of contaminants on fish and wildlife. Field biologists assist other federal agencies in evaluating contaminant impacts to fish and wildlife resources in connection with the cleanup of abandoned, inactive, or hazardous waste sites; identify and correct contaminant situations affecting national wildlife refuges; and respond to spills of oil and hazardous substances to help minimize harm to fish and wildlife resources.

Law Enforcement: The Service enforces federal wildlife laws that protect endangered species, migratory birds, certain marine mammals, and fisheries. The Service also carries out U.S. enforcement obligations under international agreements, e.g., the Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain, Mexico, Japan, and the Soviet Union.

International Conservation Programs: The Service is working with other countries to preserve their native wildlife through the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), an international treaty aimed at preventing over exploitation of rare wildlife from commercial trade. In addition, the Service has a variety of international responsibilities to help cooperating countries develop their conservation capabilities in order to meet their own environmental goals and needs on a sustainable basis.

The Service's priorities, as reflected in President's Year 2000 budget, focuses attention on:

- ▶ The National Wildlife Refuge System (\$265.3 million): operation and maintenance funding to improve the biological integrity, diversity, and health of the 516 national wildlife refuges;
- ▶ The Endangered Species Act (\$114.9 million): support for implementation of the Endangered Species Act, including the Cooperative Endangered Species Fund and state funding for Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs);
- ▶ Construction funding (\$43.6 million): projects include improving refuges, hatcheries, law enforcement facilities, and dam and bridge safety;
- ▶ Land acquisition (\$73.6 million): land purchases in the New England states, Missouri and the Columbia River basin;

- ▶ Habitat Conservation Programs (\$73.6 million): to support Partners for Fish and Wildlife restoration projects nationwide and establishment of coastal program offices in Alaska, Hawaii, Texas, and the Great Lakes regions.
- ▶ Migratory birds (\$21.9 million): projects include expanding conservation and monitoring actions for declining migratory bird species, expansion of Southwest Ecosystem Restoration and Mississippi River Basin Partnership.

Potential Benefits of Working in Urban Areas

Stakeholders identified several benefits from an increased Service presence in urban areas. Potential Service involvement includes providing technical and planning assistance to cities, local governments, municipalities, etc., in identifying and mitigating for sensitive and/or endangered species and habitat. Another role for the Service is in environmental education and outreach. For example, in the Chicago field office, the Service provides classroom instruction in ecological principles, wetlands, endangered species, migratory birds, etc. Media outreach is another function the Service has initiated but can explore more thoroughly. Potential benefits include not only a better awareness of the Service's role, but a better educated citizenry on Threatened & Endangered species, urban wildlife, importance of urban wildlife habitat, etc., and thus a stronger urban constituency for fish and wildlife habitat issues.

Potential benefits include:

- ▶ reduction in listings of threatened/endangered species; by being involved in local planning processes, the Service can work with the entity(ies) to minimize threatened or endangered species listings and mitigate loss of habitat.
- ▶ increased number of habitat restoration projects; by providing more technical assistance or serving as project manager local organizations/governments could initiate additional habitat restoration projects.
- ▶ increased public awareness of the Service's role in the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife and their habitats. By having high visibility, the community would have a better understanding of the Service's expertise, and possibly engage the Service's assistance more frequently.

Other benefits are:

- ▶ to build more environmentally conscience communities
- ▶ urban greenspaces/open spaces provide habitat for fish, wildlife, and plants, contributing to the livability of the metropolitan area
- ▶ natural areas help control air and water pollution; for example, wetlands cleanse polluted waters and reduce flooding
- ▶ Service assistance to other metropolitan areas/regions to develop comprehensive urban conservation plans similar to Chicago, IL, Portland, OR, and San Diego, CA

III. CASE STUDIES: U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAMS

Chicago, IL - Chicago Region Ecological Services Field Office

The Service received initial funding in 1991 to set up an Ecological Services Field Office for the Chicago area. The Chicago field office encompasses the six counties in the Chicago region: Cook, Kane, McHenry, DuPage, Will, and Lake counties. The impetus for establishing the office was the large concentration of wetlands in northeastern Illinois and associated development pressures, requiring a significant work effort in reviewing Corps of Engineers' wetland permits and mitigation plans. The office quickly developed capabilities in all of the traditional Ecological Services program areas, including federal activities review, endangered species consultation and recovery, technical and financial support for habitat restorations, and environmental contaminants. A major non-traditional function of the Chicago Office is environmental education and outreach, performed by a dedicated staff educator who works primarily with teachers and other regional environmental educators, and by other staff who engage in outreach through various activities, including extensive public speaking.

The Chicago Region Biodiversity Council had its beginnings in February 1993. The meeting of the Northeastern Illinois Biodiversity Leaders (the Forest Preserve Districts, Department of Natural Resources, EPA, Morton Arboretum, and the Service) met to test the waters to see if there was enough interest to form a biodiversity-conservation coalition. One project that was an important factor in the development of this conservation coalition was a two-year grant of nearly \$1.8 million, through the U.S. Forest Service, to restore and manage the Forest Preserve District of Cook County. This initial partnership of a few agencies lead the way to the creation of the "Chicago Wilderness" initiative.¹

In 1994, several federal agencies with related conservation efforts, including the Service, had several meetings and developed a Memorandum of Understanding and chose the name Chicago Region Biodiversity Council (Council). The Council formed a steering committee and selected Benjamin Tuggle, PhD., from the Service, as chairman of the steering committee. At the same meeting, the Council came up with the name of "Chicago Wilderness" for this effort. Several agencies have contributed funding to the "Chicago Wilderness" initiative. In the past three years, the Service has provided \$1.8 million in pass-through funding for projects and administrative support for "Chicago Wilderness".² Other public funding sources include the U.S. Forest Service through their State and Private Forestry program, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Great Lakes National Program Office, and the state of Illinois Conservation 2000 Program. The 1997 budget was over \$1.5 million with in-kind contributions coming from all "Chicago Wilderness" partners, of which there were 34 at

¹ Article in *Restoration & Management Notes*, Summer 1997, "The Chicago Wilderness, A Coalition for Urban Conservation", by Laurel M. Ross

² Phone call with Mr. John Rogner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Chicago Field Office

that time.³ As of February 1999, 90 organizations in and around the Chicago area had become members of Chicago Wilderness. The coalition's membership includes local governments, state, and federal agencies, research and educational centers, and conservation organizations.

Council members collectively recognized that the region has a high diversity of species and a rich mosaic of native biological communities. Although these natural resources have shown a steady decline in the highly urbanized Chicago region, nearly all of the original species still exist and have potential for long term viability. To reverse the downward trend, the coalition has undertaken the development of a Biodiversity Recovery Plan. A working draft was released to member organizations in February 1999.

As with many other metropolitan areas, the Chicago region is expecting substantial growth in the coming years. By the year 2020, the region's population is expected to increase 24%. One of the main concerns of the continuing expansion is the paving of open space areas by new development. As a result of this paving, the region has experienced increased flooding, more contamination and degradation of streams due to urban runoff, and loss of wetlands and other natural habitats.

The working draft of the Biodiversity Recovery Plan outlines the steps to protect the natural communities of the Chicago region and restore them to long-term viability in order to enrich the quality of life of its citizens and to contribute to the preservation of global biodiversity. The Plan contains a number of recommendations:

- ▶ Local and regional development policies should reflect the need to restore and maintain biodiversity.
- ▶ More land must be preserved with existing or potential biodiversity benefits.
- ▶ More land must be managed to protect and restore biodiversity.
- ▶ Improved water resource management is a necessity.
- ▶ A broad research agenda must be pursued in support of better management for biodiversity.
- ▶ Both public and private resources must be more extensively and effectively applied to informing the region's citizens of their natural heritage and what must be done to protect it, and to engage citizen scientists and other volunteers in actual restoration, management, and monitoring of regional biodiversity.

³ Article in *Restoration & Management Notes*, Summer 1997, "The Chicago Wilderness, A Coalition for Urban Conservation", by Laurel M. Ross

In April 1999, the Chicago Wilderness coalition convened to review and take comments on the working draft. The Council is expecting a final draft to be complete in July 1999, at which time it will be submitted to the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission for public input and adoption.

San Diego County, CA - Multiple Species Conservation Plan

Many native plant communities in the San Diego metropolitan region are considered to be sensitive because they have been greatly reduced in distribution by development. San Diego County contains over 200 plant and animal species that are federally and/or state listed as endangered, threatened, or rare; proposed or candidates for listing; or otherwise are considered sensitive. The Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) is a cooperative effort by participating jurisdictions and special districts in partnership with the Service, California's Department of Fish and Game, property owners, and representatives of the development industry and environmental groups to protect habitat for over 1000 species and more than 380 species of fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals.

Several factors contributed to the conception of Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). There was interest in protecting the many rare and sensitive plant and animal species, and there were concerns about using a fragmented method of dealing with habitat conservation while trying to accommodate land development. A significant factor exacerbating the need for a comprehensive approach was the current and forecasted population growth of the region. Current census data indicate that the region supports a population of 2.7 million population, with growth estimates by the year 2020 increasing by 44%, up to 3.9 million.⁴ Another event that supported the MSCP was the Service's listing of the California gnatcatcher as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act in 1991. The Service then began developing guidance through Habitat Conservation Plans under Section 10(a) and the special 4(d) rule of the Endangered Species Act. Early in the development of the MSCP, the Service participated in a technical advisory role on the MSCP steering committee.⁵

Approved in July 1997, the MSCP is a 50-year comprehensive habitat conservation planning program for southwestern San Diego County. The MSCP covers approximately 900 square miles (582,243 acres) and includes the City of San Diego, portions of the unincorporated County of San Diego, ten additional city jurisdictions, and several independent districts. The plan is a comprehensive approach to preserve functional native habitat that meets the needs of multiple species, rather than focusing on preservation efforts that address one species at a time. Goals of the program are to recover Federal and state listed species, provide performance measures to allow for and guide development activities, and conserve natural habitats before additional species decline to the point that protection under the Federal and/or state Endangered Species Acts is deemed necessary. The key component to the MSCP is a 171,917 acre preserve: 27,000 acres of private lands targeted for acquisition; 81,750 acres of public lands (Bureau of Land Management lands, Service National Wildlife Refuges, and state

⁴ Census figures from website: www.sandag.cog.ca.us

⁵ Phone call with Sherry Barrett, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad, CA

and local passive recreation parks and open spaces) and 63,170 to be conserved through the development process (through land use regulations and off-site mitigation). As of May 1999, approximately 2,400 acres have been acquired.

Local jurisdictions and special districts implement their portions of the MSCP Plan through subarea plans, which describe specific implementing mechanisms. The MSCP Plan, with its attached subarea plans, serve as: (1) a multiple species Habitat Conservation Plan pursuant to Section 10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act; and, (2) a Natural Community Conservation Program (NCCP) Plan pursuant to the California NCCP Act of 1991 and the state Endangered Species Act. Stakeholders state that the MSCP will provide an economic benefit by reducing constraints on future development, provide relative certainty about allowable land uses, and decrease the costs of compliance with federal and state laws protecting biological resources. The MSCP is in its second year of a 50-year time horizon, and, although discussions with City of San Diego officials indicate that the approval of the MSCP was a significant achievement, they said the true test of success will lie in the acquisition of property for preservation.

Portland, OR/Vancouver, WA - Metropolitan Greenspaces Program

In 1991, the Congress provided funding for the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program (Program). The Program was one of two national demonstration projects for the Service to work with other partners to conserve natural resources in urban environments. The Program is a cooperative effort among governmental and non-governmental organizations to establish an interconnected system of natural areas, open space, trails and greenways for wildlife and people throughout Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties in Oregon and Clark county in Washington. It focuses on environmental education, habitat restoration, public outreach, and regional planning. The Service's primary partner is Metro, a regional governmental entity responsible for growth management and land use planning. Metro's jurisdiction encompasses portions of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties in Oregon and 24 incorporated cities. Metro coordinates planning efforts with Clark County, Washington. In addition, the Federal funding is used throughout the bi-state region, further encouraging bi-state partnerships in the metropolitan area.

During the first two years of the Program, the Service contributed to inventories and mapping of the region's natural areas, and to the development of a plan that outlines strategies for the protection of a regional network of trails and greenspaces for fish, wildlife and people. A landmark step occurred in 1995, when citizens voted to support a \$135.6 million bond measure to implement the plan by acquiring an extensive network of public lands. Since that time, Metro has been working with advisory committees to develop regulatory and non-regulatory mechanisms designed to protect water quality, floodplains, fish and wildlife habitat, and other natural resources. Program funding of \$300,000 annually has allowed the Service to provide funding and technical assistance to participate in these regional planning and policy development efforts, and to support three grant programs.

The grant programs support habitat restoration and environmental education programs and projects.

They have been a major focus of the Program since its inception, enabling local governments, schools, businesses, special districts, nonprofit organizations, and others to restore, enhance, and learn about urban natural resources. Metro takes a lead role in administering the grant programs, which have contributed to the efforts of numerous local partners and involved thousands of citizens. The grants have also served to leverage Federal funding with partner contributions more than three fold. Since 1991, 187 grants have been awarded, totaling over \$1.3 million in federal funds and leveraging over \$4.7 million for habitat restoration, environmental education, and salmonid education and enhancement projects.

IV. CASE STUDIES: OTHER FEDERAL URBAN NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAMS

Much of this report is focused on the three case studies of the Service's role in urban natural resources programs. However, there are several other federal agencies that offer similar, or related urban programs. Due primarily to time constraints, I include discussions of only three other federal agency urban natural resource programs. Given such a brief listing, and the importance of identifying other partners and sharing of information, I recommend that further work be conducted in this area. I have indicated this in the "Next Steps" section of the report.

Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance - National Park Service⁶

The Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA) program is a technical assistance program offered by the National Park Service (NPS) to assist communities with protection of places or resources the communities value, focusing on rivers, trails, greenways, open spaces, and historic places. Started in 1988, the RTCA has collaborated with over 1,000 local groups to work on 700 conservation projects in all 50 states. The RTCA currently supports 209 local groups working on conservation projects. The program encompasses rural areas and small cities, with a smaller percentage of NPS's technical assistance going to urban areas.⁷ Although the program does not provide financial assistance, NPS's technical assistance includes facilitation, planning, developing funding alternatives, increasing the support base, and promoting public awareness. Nationally, NPS receives about \$7 million for the RTCA program.⁸ The RTCA program's 80 staff are located in 25 offices around the country.

In the past five years, RTCA has expanded its work to include local groups that are developing

⁶ See website: www.nps.gov; search of RTCA

⁷ Phone call with Michael Linde, NPS, Seattle Support Office

⁸ Ibid

greenways, scenic byways and heritage areas. However, RTCA's core business remains supporting rivers and trails groups. For example, in 1998, RTCA helped:

- ▶ the Buffalo Bayou Partnership develop the Houston East End Trail, an 8-mile rails-to-trails project that connects a predominantly Hispanic neighborhood with downtown Houston;
- ▶ the San Miguel Watershed Coalition restore 80 miles of the San Miguel River through a watershed plan adopted by 8 communities and 7 government agencies; and,
- ▶ the non-profit group, the Providence Plan, breathe new life into the Woonasquatucket River Greenway, by organizing interpretive walks and the first Greenway Festival, and by bringing other cooperators like the Trust for Public Land, the Lila Wallace Readers Digest Fund, and numerous other supporting organizations together.

Wetlands Grant Programs - Environmental Protection Agency

Since 1990, a federal grant program has supported state and tribal efforts to protect wetlands by providing funds to enhance existing programs or develop new programs. In 1990, the State Wetlands Protection Grant Program had an initial appropriation of \$1 million. In fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated \$15 million. This grants program has supported development of State Wetland Conservation Plans, Watershed Protection Approach Demonstration Projects on state and tribal lands, and wetland water quality standards as well as other projects. However, many of these projects are in non urban areas.

EPA also, has a National Coastal Wetlands Grant Program for projects in the Great Lakes and coastal States and Trust Territories that restore, acquire, manage, or enhance coastal lands and waters. Again, most of these projects are in non urban areas. Projects must provide for the long-term conservation of such lands and waters and the fish and wildlife dependent on them. This Coastal Grants Program gives priority to the restoration of barrier islands and associated maritime forest, coastal wetlands ecosystems, endangered species, anadromous and inter-jurisdictional fish species and to the building of financial and cooperative, private and governmental partnerships.

Wetlands protection is important since the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) indicate that about 75% of all wetlands are in private ownership and over half of all wetlands in the lower 48 states have already been lost. Estimates of current losses are as high as 300,000 acres per year. Wetlands in their natural condition render many benefits; food and habitat for fish and wildlife, water quality improvement, flood protection, shoreline erosion control, food for human use, recreational opportunities, and aesthetic appreciation. EPA's involvement in wetlands protection comes from Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, jointly administered by EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Urban Resources Partnership - U.S. Department of Agriculture

The Urban Resources Partnership (URP) is a partnership of seven key federal agencies working with local and state governments, community organizations, and private and non-profit organizations to protect, improve, and rehabilitate urban environments. URP provides urban areas with both financial and technical support. URP is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). URP and its projects are partially funded through USDA grants of \$500,000 to each participating city. Additional funds come from the USDA, other federal, state, and city agencies. Communities match each dollar of federal funding with labor, in-kind donations, and local funding. The participating federal agencies are:

- ▶ Environmental Protection Agency
- ▶ USDA Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service
- ▶ U.S. Forest Service
- ▶ Natural Resources Conservation Service
- ▶ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- ▶ National Park Service
- ▶ Housing and Urban Development

URP started during Earth Week in 1994, with four cities as pilots: Seattle, Chicago, Atlanta, and New York. The partnership has expanded to thirteen cities: Los Angeles, San Francisco, Las Vegas, Denver, East St. Louis, South Florida, Philadelphia, Buffalo, and Boston. One tenet of URP is to make more efficient use of the limited federal resources through an integrated, coordinated, cooperative effort by the participating federal agencies.

Over the URP's first two years, federal funding of \$6 million leveraged an additional \$14 million in funding and community labor. Federal and local agencies provided 26,000 hours of technical assistance for 310 environmental restoration, enhancement and educational projects. Projects range in size and complexity, from inner city cleanup efforts, neighborhood community gardens and outdoor classrooms to ecosystem restoration.

V. FINDINGS

I conducted twenty-eight in-person interviews and one phone interview with selected stakeholders from various federal, state, and local governments, and non-profit/conservation organizations from the Chicago, Portland, and San Diego areas. In addition, I interviewed three staff from the National Park Service and Environmental Protection Agency in Seattle, Washington by telephone. The following is a summary of their comments on the Service's current role and potential for an expanded role in urban natural resource programs:

- (1) Stakeholders expressed an interest and need for more Service involvement in urban areas for:

- ▶ Technical assistance on a wide variety of projects, programs, planning efforts, etc.
 - ▶ Land acquisition; targeting funding of properties for both local and federal acquisition
 - ▶ Grants for habitat and species restoration projects, including long-term maintenance
 - ▶ Public outreach and environmental education efforts
 - ▶ An increased agency presence to work with other partners to achieve mutual objectives
- (2) Stakeholders want the Service to be more pro-active in urban conservation efforts by assuming more of a presence and leadership role in urban planning and conservation issues by:
- ▶ Getting involved in conservation early-on by participating in land use planning
 - ▶ Providing more technical assistance on restoration projects, project planning, etc.
 - ▶ Attending watershed council meetings and other key meeting forums
 - ▶ Designating Service staff for Individual Personnel Assignments to support other agencies and organizations
- (3) Recurrent Comments:
- ▶ Urban areas are as important as non-urban areas; endangered species and habitat is as much a factor in urban areas as in non-urban areas
 - ▶ Need new funding; don't have urban areas compete with non-urban areas for funding
 - ▶ There's a lack of vision/explicit mission regarding urban natural resources conservation programs; comments referred to both the federal and local level
 - ▶ Clone or model successful programs (Chicago, Portland, San Diego) to create a national urban program with Service involvement
 - ▶ Offer tax and/or other incentives for habitat conservation

In the San Diego area, both City of San Diego officials and Service personnel stated that tax incentives (tax credits, tax deductions) or special funding (federal, bond issuance, etc.) provide a viable, publicly supported solution for setting aside private land for habitat conservation. This type of "carrot" encourages the building industry to negotiate/compromise on private land development.

- (4) Other Comments:
- ▶ Broaden the mission and funding of Urban Resources Partnership (URP) to include an expanded role for the Service; URP has learned valuable lessons which could serve well in having an expanded urban initiative
 - ▶ Make it simple to work with other partners on collaborative efforts; i.e., minimize the Federal bureaucracy

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on my interviews and research of the existing urban natural resources programs, I found that there is a significant demand for an expanded Service role in urban programs. This is due to several factors. One factor relates to the traditional role and funding of the Service. The broad mission of the Service, “... to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats ...” has historically been in rural areas. This is where the Service has focused and achieved success as the premier conservation agency of the federal government. One need only look at the National Wildlife Refuge System that includes 92 million acres which are some of the nation’s best wildlife habitats, the fisheries and habitat restoration programs, etc. Service involvement in urban areas has been relatively limited. Development of habitat conservation plans in response to species listings under the Endangered Species Act have been on the rise in urban areas due to the inherent conflicts between urbanization and species recovery. Important habitats for federal trust resources such as endangered species, migratory birds, and interjurisdictional fish, as well as important hot spots of biodiversity such as are found in the Chicago region and southern California, are as prevalent in and around metropolitan areas as in rural areas. The difference is that the conflicts between development and conservation are much more complex, requiring federal leadership. The Service’s Chicago Office, for example, worked as a partner with the Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in crafting a local agreement on wetland mitigation banking which streamlines the permitting process for private interests and creates wetlands of higher value for fish and wildlife. Regional mitigation planning is an important function that the Service could integrate into a larger conservation land use planning function.

Another factor for the need of an expanded Service role is the urban growth and sprawl of U. S. cities. As cities have expanded, fish and wildlife species and their habitats have been detrimentally affected. For example, the greater Atlanta area is already 110 miles across and adding another 500 acres of field and farmland every week.⁹ In metro Kansas City, between 1990 and 1996, the city spread 70% even though its population only increased by 5%.¹⁰ In the Chicago region, the population grew by 4% but urbanized area increased by 50%.¹¹ Michigan's population is projected to grow by 12% between 1990 and 2020, but the urbanized areas in that state are expected to increase between 63% and 87%.¹²

Associated with sprawl is a growing discontent among urban residents with related problems such as

⁹ *Time Magazine*, “The Brawl Over Sprawl”, March 22, 1999, Vol. 153 No. 11

¹⁰ *Ibid*

¹¹ Michael Houck, Audubon Society of Portland; Speech entitled, “At The Water’s Edge, The Endangered Species Act and the Metropolitan Region”, June 23, 1998

¹² *Ibid*

flooding, traffic congestion, loss of open space, and excessive property taxes necessary to support development infrastructure. This has manifested itself in a growing demand for more open space and the passage of many local referenda for open space acquisition in metropolitan areas. It is essential that the Service provide input into local land acquisition initiatives to best ensure that federal conservation priorities are considered in acquisition planning (see IX. Selected References, Bruce Babbitt (1999) "Noah's Mandate and the Birth of Urban Bioplanning", *Conservation Biology* 13(3): 677-678). In light of the public interest in open space acquisition in urban areas, it would also be appropriate for the Service to take advantage of local support for refuge land acquisition and to devote resources to implementing its urban refuge policy.

Many communities have recognized the loss of natural resources. In the metropolitan areas interviewed, stakeholders want the Service to have a pro-active presence. Similarly, stakeholders and Service staff recognize the value of an increased Service presence. Unfortunately, funding directed to urban issues is lacking in most of the nation's cities, and there is a need for an explicit Service objectives/goals statement regarding urban program(s). There may be significant political support to be gained through pro-active programs in urban areas, through refuge establishment, technical and financial assistance for restoration and planning, education programs, etc.

Recommendation #1

A first step is for the Service to review its strategic plan/position relative to urban issues and programs with the knowledge that urban areas will play an increasingly larger part in the conservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife and their habitats.

Now may be an opportune time for the Service to evaluate its efforts and strategy in urban areas. The Administration is attentive to the protection of our nation's natural resources. The "Lands Legacy Initiative", a component of the President's Year 2000 budget, proposes the largest one year investment in the protection of our nation's land resources. The initiative includes \$579 million for Department of the Interior programs: Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants (\$200 million), Federal LWCF land acquisition (\$295 million), Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund (\$80 million), and an Urban Parks and Recreation Fund (\$4 million). This is an increase of \$84.5 million from 1999.

In a similar vein, Vice President Gore recently announced his "Livability Initiative" to preserve open space and enhance the quality of life in communities across the country. The agenda's proposals are incorporated in the Lands Legacy Initiative. The "Livability Initiative" focuses on sharing the federal government's expertise and resources with local communities. In this way, the local communities can make more informed decisions for the protection of green space for wildlife and recreation, ease traffic congestion and other "smart growth" strategies. Specifically, the Livability Agenda includes proposals for making U.S. Geological Survey and Service data on land use, water quality, wetlands, and watersheds more accessible to local communities. As indicated in the prior Lands Legacy discussion, the agenda allows the Department of the Interior to provide matching grants and other support to local

communities. And, the agenda utilizes existing programs, such as Habitat Conservation Plans where the Service works with local governments and communities and the Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA) program, offered by the National Park Service, to assist communities in protecting open space for plant and wildlife habitat and recreation.¹³

Recommendation #2

The Service should reaffirm its commitment to establishing refuges in urban areas as part of its overall urban strategy. The Service established an Urban Refuge Policy on December 23, 1991, which commits the Service to acquiring lands and waters in or adjacent to metropolitan areas for the primary purpose of fostering environmental awareness and outreach programs. Stakeholders also identified land acquisition as an important role for the Service in urban areas.

Recommendation #3

In the process of evaluating the potential for urban programs, Service managers should seek to establish partnerships with other federal agencies or enter into agreements to achieve multiple objectives, conserve resources and capitalize on the missions and expertise of the various agencies. For example, examine the possibility of expanding mission of the Urban Resources Partnership to incorporate an expanded role by the Service. Or, review urban programs in Chicago, Portland, and San Diego to develop a palette of urban natural resources program proto-types that can be used by other metropolitan centers with varying capabilities, needs and interests.

Recommendation #4

Establish a Federal agency working group to communicate and, when appropriate, coordinate the various agencies' urban natural resources efforts. In addition, the Departmental working group could address streamlining or simplifying the federal bureaucracy.

Recommendation #5

Seek new funding to pursue an urban initiative to:

- ▶ Be more pro-active in urban natural resources programs by attending watershed council and other key meetings; providing technical assistance to partners on a variety of conservation issues; and designating or assigning Service staff to oversee local projects.
- ▶ Provide more funding at the local level for habitat and species restoration projects, including long term maintenance and land acquisition.
- ▶ Perform more outreach efforts to educate the public about fish and wildlife and their habitats, and Service programs, expertise and technical assistance capabilities.

¹³ See website: www.doi.gov/onepage.htm

Without additional, or new funding, any reprogramming of existing funds to urban issues will come at the expense of current programs. Although eager to address/develop an urban program, Service managers and staff are concerned that any urban program will take away from the already limited dollars to carry out their existing trust responsibilities. This is a dilemma that has no easy solution, and in the challenging words of Jamie Clark, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director, "... we need to continue to look for new and innovative ways to achieve species and habitat conservation." Assuredly, new funding for urban programs would be an answer. But, as with any new funding initiative, the decision of any funding resides with the Congress. Yet it is incumbent upon the Service, as the nation's premier Federal fish and wildlife conservation agency, to ensure that habitat and species conservation is properly addressed in urban as well as non-urban areas.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Service has a ubiquitous mission when it comes to the conservation, protection, and enhancement of fish and wildlife and their habitats. Historically, and properly so, the Service has focused on rural or non urban areas in carrying out its mission. With the emergence of the 21st century virtually upon us, our nation's urban centers have experienced tremendous population growth. At the same time, there is growing recognition that urban areas provide significant fish and wildlife habitat. Given the ever increasing attention to urban issues by the nation's communities, the Administration, and the Congress, it is possible that a significant amount of Federal funding will be directed to urban areas. The Service, as the responsible federal agency to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats, will undoubtedly have a role with the emergence of this new funding. In its role, the Service can educate and engage the public, and offer pro-active conservation opportunities through land use planning that can aid in preventing the decline of fish, wildlife and plants. The extent to which the Service will be involved in urban issues will depend on the level of internal and external leadership.

This fact was poignantly stated by Michael C. Houck, Urban Naturalist of the Audubon Society of Portland, in a roundtable discussion with other concerned citizens to explore responses from a recent steelhead listing in the lower Columbia River, including the Willamette and its tributaries, "... the resultant urban sprawl has consumed vast acreages of prime farm land and productive forest land; fragmented fish and wildlife habitat; destroyed a sense of community; created expanding areas of concentrated poverty in inner cities; significantly increased the cost of infrastructure, and the loss of ... our Urban Greenstructure---the wetlands, stream corridors, other Greenspaces, and steelhead and other salmonid habitat."¹⁴ Mr. Houck, and certainly many others, recognize what the consequences of urbanization will be if we don't pursue smart growth. The Service can, and should, be an instrumental player in assuring that urban regions include Greenstructure for fish, wildlife and people.

¹⁴ Ibid

In closing, and to reiterate the words of Jamie Clark’s confirmation hearing testimony, “...written on our hearts is the knowledge that some things are priceless, the knowledge that there are many things we can live without, but wild creatures and wild places are not among them....” This holds true in our vision of what a livable city should be: a vibrant, healthy urban area that includes an interconnected system of streams, open spaces, wetlands, and wildlife.

VIII. NEXT STEPS

- ▶ Share this report’s findings and recommendations with Service management. The Service management can then review and discuss the findings and recommendations in greater detail.
- ▶ Conduct further research to expand upon the report’s findings and recommendations. Due to time limitations, the research I conducted provides only a cursory review of urban programs. Although I believe the report’s findings and recommendations accurately represent my research, review of additional case studies would provide a broader view of urban programs as well as additional information and clarification.
- ▶ Assuming the Service wishes to pursue a more explicit urban initiative, the Service should develop or revise its strategic and/or action plans. A collaborative, comprehensive, and iterative process among key Service staff, other federal agency managers, and selected stakeholders should produce significant benefits for the advancement of an urban natural resource initiative.

APPENDIX 1:

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED**

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED**

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Name & Organization</u>
Mon.	March 15 th	AM	Sue Abbott, National Park Service (phone interview)
Wed.	March 17 th	9:00 PM	Greg Robart, Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife
Wed.	March 17 th	4:00 PM	Neil Schulman, SOLV
Thurs.	March 18 th	9:00 AM	Bob Roth, Coordinator, Johnson Cr. Watershed Council
Thurs.	March 18 th	3:00 PM	Mel Waggy, Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation District
Fri.	March 19 th	9:30 AM	Charlie Ciecko, Lynn Wilson, & Mel Huie, Metro
Fri.	March 19 th	1:00 PM	Jay Mower, Columbia Slough Watershed Council
Mon.	March 22 nd	9:00 AM	Pat Willis, Jackson Bottom Wetland Preserve
Mon.	March 22 nd	11:00 AM	Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland
Mon.	March 22 nd	2:00 PM	Jennifer Budhabhatti, Metro
Tues.	March 23 rd	2:00 PM	Linda Robinson, Naturescaping for Clean Rivers
Tues.	March 23 rd	3:30 PM	Emily Roth, Metro (phone interview)
Wed.	March 24 th	2:30 PM	Karen Scarborough, City of San Diego
Thurs.	March 25 th	8:30 AM	Keith Greer, City of San Diego
Thurs.	March 25 th	1:00 PM	Sherry Barrett, FWS, San Diego
Sat.	March 27 th	5:00 PM	Selected Members of "Chicago Wilderness" Congress
Mon.	March 29 th	8:30 AM	Avery Patillo, Urban Resources Partnership
Mon.	March 29 th	10:00 AM	Gerald Adleman, Openlands Project

Mon.	March 29 th	1:30 PM	Kent Sims, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Svc
Fri.	April 2 nd	3:00 PM	John Jackson, Unified Sewerage Agency
Tues.	April 13 th	9:30 AM	Carey Smith, FWS - Pacific Joint Venture
Tues.	April 13 th	1:30 PM	Ralph Rogers, EPA (phone interview)
Thurs.	April 29 th	9:00 AM	Christine Egan, Congressman Earl Blumenhauer's office

APPENDIX II:

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEWS**

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 22, 1999

Agency/Organization: Audubon Society of Portland

Name: Mike Houck

Address: 5151 NW Cornell Road, Portland, OR 97210

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503)292-6855 ext. 111 e-mail: houckm@telport.com

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

(Mike to mail me brochures and other information in one or two days.)

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

ODFW, FWS, Metro, neighborhood communities, local friends groups, surface water storm agencies (City of Portland -Environmental Services, Unified Sewerage Agency)

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS acts as a conduit for funds, i.e., funds passed through to Metro. Without FWS's role the Portland Metropolitan Greenspaces Plan would not have happened. Also, technical assistance. Though current involvement has decreased.

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Formulation and successes of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Plan. (Also, cite from info and brochures Mike is sending me.) Having Jennifer Thompson and John Marshall to bounce ideas off of very beneficial. Also, 404 permits very valuable.

- 6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?**

What is done is not enough. There are too many urban habitat areas being over-looked and/or inadequately protected and poorly managed. The reason is a lack of resources dedicated to urban issues by all agencies. And, the issues are much more complex and require additional expertise, such as an urban eco-system specialist. Currently, there is no explicit mission for these agencies re: urban conservation issues. 80% of citizens live in urban communities. Endangered species and habitats

relate as much to urban areas as non-urban areas.

7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

In the recent grant program it was a 4:1 ratio. Mike didn't have statistics for other programs but felt that it could be between 5 to 10 times, possibly more. This was, in part, due to multiple objectives achieved by an agency/organization. For instance, the success of one specific program of improving water has positive affects in many other areas in the affected wetlands. Agencies have to leverage off of each other in their regional work.

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Yes, without question.

9. What additional resources would be needed:

a) Financial resources channeled to non-profits. A lot of non-profits do a significant amount of pro-bono work. b) technical assistance to regional planning agencies and local jurisdictions to develop and implement policies. c) active involvement by FWS and other federal agencies to promote restoration and management of natural resources in urban areas.

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

No, just make "pie" bigger.

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

In the area of restoration management and urban refuges. There has been a real reluctance by all agencies to have a presence in urban issues.

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS?

Set up a Individual Personnel Assignment or loan a FWS employee to Metro. This person would assist them in developing key policies. Also, enhance what they are doing now.

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

See attached list.

All agencies, including FWS, need to exert more of a presence in this area. FWS management can and should attend Metro and other key meetings. Having someone like Russ Peterson or the Regional Director attend these meetings would indicate FWS's commitment and provide immeasurable benefits to the resolution of urban issues.

Mike felt that urban natural resources issues have been inadequately funded and over-looked by all agencies, including FWS. FWS, in coordination with other agencies, needs to be pro-active and more involved. There is no explicit mission or goals by most agencies (federal and local) re: urban natural resources issues, which ultimately reflects in the absence or low level funding. (Mike seemed to agree with me that FWS needs to have an explicit goals and objectives in this area and, of course, significantly more funding. As Mike stated, endangered species and habitat is as much a factor in urban areas as in non-urban areas. In addition, with 80% of America living in an urban communities we must take more aggressive steps in mitigating and restoring those species and habitats.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 25, 1999

Agency: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad, CA

Name: Sherry Barrett

Address: 2730 Loker Avenue West, Carlsbad CA 92008

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (760) 431-9440 fax: (760) 431-5901/9624

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Regulatory as well as partnerships with other groups/entities to promote conservation programs. For instance, within the MSCP framework, FWS established a wildlife refuge preserve as a component to the MSCP. FWS is also a partner in land acquisition and management, purchasing 5,000 acres at an approximate cost of \$15 million (Sherry was uncertain of the accuracy of this amount).

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

The Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act. FWS also, reviews permits under Section 10 of the MSCP and state documents under the California Environmental Quality Act.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

Other federal, state, and local governments, environmental groups, the building industry/developers. With respect to the MSCP, the County of San Diego, cities of San Diego, Poway, Santee, El Cajon, La Mesa, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, the County of San Diego, and Otay Water District in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Game and the Farm Bureau.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS participated in the development and MSCP and is involved in land acquisition and management of the MSCP.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Prior to the MSCP a lot of mitigation resulted in fragmentation of land. Now land is put in preserves for multiple species - a comprehensive preserve configuration. This has allowed partners to achieve more conservation in various areas. Working together with the building communities and the environmentalists has resulted in synergistic benefits. The environmentalists and building industry now lobby together in D.C. — a sense of unity.

- 6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?**

Don't know of any failures.

- 7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:**

Groups are now working together and improving wetlands conservation and areas for preserves. This went beyond the original scope.

- 8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:**

Yes, money to buy land in the refuge. Need approximately 45,000 acres to purchase. Need to do prior to increasing land pressures - increasing population and increasing cost of land values.

- 9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)**

No specific comments.

- 10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?**

Yes.

- 11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?**

Provide federal dollars for planning to cities and local governments and funding for land acquisition. Doing outreach and educating public. Need to do much more.

- 12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.**

Expanding wetlands conservation - working with COE and EPA.

- 13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:**

Didn't ask.

Sherry had the following additional comments:

Conservation should be elevated to the same planning level as transportation, corridors, parks, and schools. It's just another public amenity. But there is a significant cost to partner habitat conservation plans. Individuals and building industry won't undertake unless there are incentives. As

far as the MSCP, there was a carrot, to assure certainty with regard to land development. If you don't have this element you can't get the building industry to the table. Examples of some incentives: tax credits/deductions and special funding. Federal acquisition of key lands allows easements.

FWS has no land use planning authority. The ESA is not a land use planning regulation. We have no regs for open space planning. Sherry agreed that the FWS should be more pro-active in open space/natural resources conservation habitat planning. But there is no authority. However, FWS could play a key partner in assisting, advising, and planning with states and local governments in habitat conservation planning/land use planning.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: May 11, 1999

Organization: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Chicago Field Office

Name: John Rogner

Address: 1000 Hart Road, Suite 180, Barrington, Illinois 60010

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (847) 381-2253; fax: (847) 381-2285

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW:

Note: The purpose of this telephone conversation was to get additional clarification re: the Service's funding for the Chicago Wilderness and to ask Mr. Rogner if he had any information on the history of the Chicago Wilderness.

Mr. Rogner stated that, in the past three years, the Service has provided \$600 thousand annually, in pass-through funding, for projects and administrative support for "Chicago Wilderness".

Mr. Rogner also faxed me an article written by Laurel M. Ross, of The Nature Conservancy, on the history of the Chicago Wilderness. The article was an excerpt from *Restoration & Management Notes*, Summer 1997, entitled; "The Chicago Wilderness, A Coalition for Urban Conservation".

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 27, 1999

Organizations: The Field Museum - Debbie Moskovits and Carol Fielkowski, Brookfield Zoo - Tim Sullivan, National Audubon Society - Steven Packard, The Nature Conservancy - Laurel Ross, and FWS (Chicago) - John Rogner

Address/Phone: The Field Museum, Roosevelt Road at Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, IL 60605, (312)922-9410, Brookfield Zoo, 3300 Golf Road, Brookfield, IL 60513 (708) 485-0263, National Audubon Society, 5801-C N. Pulaski Road, Chicago, IL 60646, (713) 539-6793, The Nature Conservancy, 8 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 900, Chicago, IL 60603, (312) 346-8166, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1000 Hart Road, Suite 180, Barrington, IL 60010, (847) 381-2253 x212

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organizations in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Field Museum: research and education projects, Brookfield Zoo: environmental education, The Nature Conservancy: on the ground conservation, partnering and leadership

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None, except for FWS; ESA and CWA

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

See attached listing of Chicago Wilderness Members.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS provided central leadership and major funding, also was critical for bringing in counties and state. Brought leadership and legitimacy. FWS is good at promoting partnerships; great facilitators, especially with the diverse groups. It was a key to the success. Other federal agencies don't have that.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Growth of member organization (now at 88), over 100 funded projects, much more materials and resources than before. There is a lot of individual commitment in this field working on these issues; 10-12 hour a day workshops where key people attended. Ernst & Young's upcoming session.

- 6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?**
- Challenges: Influencing public policy and reaching public. Just more and better of everything. Because species are declining and need to reverse it. (Also, refer to working draft of the Chicago Wilderness Biodiversity Recovery Plan, Chapter III “The Biodiversity Challenge In An Expanding Region” and Chapter IV, “Status, Needs, And Goals For Natural Communities And Species Of The Region”.)
- 7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:**
- No specifics.
- 8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:**
- Need more trained volunteers. Have 100's, need tens of thousands. Next two comments are from John Rogner - FWS; need more staff and line item in budget for urban program.
- Get birders involved in monitoring bird populations; this involves understanding and supporting work of the Chicago Wilderness. It's leveraging a few dollars to have a big impact.
- Train leaders to be grassroots leaders.
- Need to affect decisions re: infrastructure; have more ability to influence activities to succeed in the long term; need the political will; need to change ways we educate public.
- 9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)**
- Need to allocate some public dollars to urban areas so average voter can see benefits. For environmental education priorities, need better coordination between federal agencies instead of each spinning their wheels; need Urban Resources Partnership, EPA, and FWS grant programs to coordinate and rally behind overall goals.
- 10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?**
- Yes
- 11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?**
- Funding for more staff to assist Chicago Wilderness work teams. Establish a national urban program.
- 12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.**

Environmental education efforts - NCTC has been very instrumental; helping to promote biodiversity; to bring issue to a national level. But we don't want urban areas competing for funds; need new funds. Education in urban areas is key role. Maybe can use this to get new additional funding for urban areas.

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

See attached Chicago Wilderness member list.

Other comments: Washington D.C. Congress wants to funnel federal dollars through state and not federal agencies, but the Chicago Wilderness wants federal involvement, partly because of politics with the state of IL. They should encourage innovate federal programs rather than funnel federal dollars through state. Partnership is better with feds than with the state; a unique relationship.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 19, 1999

Organization: Columbia Slough Watershed Council Name: Jay Mower

Address: 7040 NE 47th Avenue, Portland, OR

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503)281-1132

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Mission - foster action, enhance, protect, restore, and re-vitalize Columbia Slough and its watershed. Raise awareness to Columbia Slough. Programs: "Tour the Slough", "Slough 101"; a once a year class. Local community planting of native species.

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None, Council operates by consensus.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

governments: Metro, City of Portland, City of Gresham, Port of Portland, Multnomah County Drainage District #1.

various businesses, environmental groups (Audubon Society of Portland), lay people, groups such as "Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes" and DEQ.

Most of the above are in a partnership role with the exception of the City of Portland - Environmental Services, which often takes the lead.

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS serves as a technical advisor and resource.

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Public awareness campaign, Slough is on the "map" now. There is a lot more re-vegetation around the Slough thanks to all the volunteer and partners' efforts. The Council has finally been able to get together to talk and debate issue officially. This wasn't always the case.

- 6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?**

Haven't yet been able to put up "Columbia Slough" signs. Probably due to non-agreement of sign content and design.

7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Jay recently calculated a two year plan and based on past experience he is projecting a 2 to 1 leverage of cash (\$280,000 of value with \$140,000 of funding).

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Yes.

9. What additional resources would be needed:

Need more environmental centers like Whitaker Pond as well as funds for maintenance and planting of native species. These centers don't have to be extravagant, in fact, modest structures are best.

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

More of budget should be redirected to funding urban environmental education.

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Technical service for restoration efforts. Need skill and knowledge of FWS to re-educate people. Educating urbanites as an important role of FWS.

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS?

Land use development review. FWS should be pro-active. Also, Jay thinks that the FWS should be more assertive in the acquisition of urban greenspaces.

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Ethan Seltzer - PSU

George Kral - City of Portland - Environmental Services; 823-7116

Pam Wilie, Consultant; 238-8093

Jay stated that the traditional perception of FWS is of a rural nature, the rural environment. But in today's society, FWS should emphasize the urban environment. This is where the growth and loss of habitat and species is happening.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: April 29, 1999

Organization: U.S. Congressman Earl Blumenauer, 3rd District, Oregon Name: Christine Egan

Address: 516 S. E. Morrison, Suite 250, Portland, OR 97214

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503)231-2300; CHRISTINE.EGAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV

Attendee(s): Russ Peterson, State Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon State Office

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW:

Russ Peterson gave a brief introduction of my project and the Service's involvement in urban natural resources programs. I then gave a brief background of the assignment and of the three metropolitan areas with urban programs included in the report. I stated to both Russ and Christine that I had conducted interviews with about 30 selected stakeholders in the three metropolitan areas. I summarized for Russ and Christine the findings:

- S All stakeholders said there was a need for additional funding for urban programs; for land acquisition, grants for habitat and species restoration, Service technical assistance, public outreach, and to perform recurring maintenance
- S Stakeholders wanted the Service to have more of a presence (be pro-active rather than reactive)

A recurrent theme by stakeholders was; urban areas are as important as non-urban areas. But we still need fund the rural (non-urban programs. What is needed is new funding and not have urban areas compete with non-urban areas for funding.

Christine stated that Congressman Blumenauer has a strong interest in urban natural resources programs and if there is a way for federal agencies to be more involved, Congressman Blumenauer will promote. She asked for an executive summary of my report for the Congressman when it is available.

Christine also cited two newspaper articles of interest re: urban natural resource programs:

- (1) *Statesman's Journal*, April 25, 1999
- (2) *Cascade Times*; April 1999 issue, re: the Johnson Creek Watershed

Russ stated the following:

- S Urban areas contain most of our constituency, and therefore, support. So, in this regard, there is value in working in urban areas.
- S The Service should have more focus on population centers.

- S Probably a 3% increase in the Service's total budget could begin an urban program (Russ came up with the 3% by, estimating that 1/3 of the Service's total budget is ecological services; and that 10% of this 1/3 amount could support an urban program).
- S The Service cannot neglect rural areas but it should encompass urban areas as well.
- S If the President's Budget is approved, (in particular, the "Lands Legacy Initiative") is there a possibility of having language in the bill to include the Service where appropriate. For instance, where there are multiple objectives. (Currently, the National Park Service is the key agency in this initiative.)

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: April 13, 1999

Agency/Organization: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Name: Ralph Rogers

Address: 20803 Nachant Dr. NE Indianola, WA 98342

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (360) 297-1787 e-mail: ROGERS.RALPH@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

EPA's focus is not really in the protection of wildlife (wildlife experts). However, EPA does get involved in habitat issues when wetlands are affected. This is through the Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 404 - permits. In addition, EPA participates in a technical advisory role in various planning committees and councils (i.e., Metro). Also, EPA has a wetlands grant program; habitat enhancement and restoration. Most of these grants are in urban settings. And, EPA has public outreach programs - EPA employees are required to commit 52 hours per year.

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

Section 401, 402, and 404 of CWA. Section 401 deals with water quality certification and Section 402 deals with storm water discharge.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

Various federal, state, and local governments (FWS, ODFW, Metro, city governments in both Oregon and Washington), Audubon Society of Portland, The Nature Conservancy, and other conservation/non-profit organizations.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS reviews Section 404 permits and has public outreach programs. FWS is involved in endangered species (the Endangered Species Act (ESA)) and serves in a technical advisory role similar to EPA in various committees and councils - i.e., Metro in Goal V.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

There has been success in public outreach programs and interagency efforts in regards to pre-planning stages and working with local governments as technical advisories.

6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

The Section 404 permit process has not been successful. Corps of Engineers (COE) has not made environmentally sound decisions. The COE has been influenced by developers and politicians. They haven't been as effective as they could be.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Planning efforts by EPA have resulted in funding for wetlands inventories which has leveraged additional resources or lead to other natural conservation efforts.

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

Yes, money. Parallel Metro's Greenspaces Plan. Need funding for land acquisitions, protecting and enhancing wetlands. There is no lack of things to do.

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Hard to answer question. Urban areas are as important as non-urban areas. All areas are important in the broader landscape.

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes. Public outreach, advance planning (serving a technical advisory role to local projects and issues), less of a focus on regulatory side with exception on large projects, attend council and other important meetings (i.e., more visibility). Educate politicians.

11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

See above.

12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.

See Items 10 and 11 above. Also, continue cooperation, especially with endangered species because water quality issues are habitat issues and hence, EPA needs to be at the table. Can be an ally to FWS.

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Yvonne Vallette - (503) 326-2716

Ester Lev
Holly Michael - ODFW
Emily Roth, Rosemary Furfey - Metro

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 22, 1999

Agency/Organization: Jackson Bottom Wetlands Preserve Name: Pat Willis

Address: 123 West Main Street, Hillsboro, OR 97123

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 681-6206, e-mail: www.ci.hillsboro.or.us

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Mission: Connecting water, wildlife, and people. There are 5 goals, improve: 1) habitat, 2) water quality, 3) provide education, 4) research opportunities, and 5) passive recreation.

Programs: restoration projects involving entire community, including schools, experts, etc., outreach classes, biodiversity field program, teacher training, and tours.

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

City of Hillsboro and Chamber of Commerce, Unified Sewerage Agency, Jackson Wetlands Preserve Board, ODFW, Metro, FWS, Soil and Water Conservation District, Oregon Graduate Institute, PSU, OSU, Lewis and Clark College, Marylhurst, OMSI, Audubon Society Portland, USGS.

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS participates in the steering committee and also, technical advisory role, but currently very small role.

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Restoration projects at Jackson Bottom Wetlands Preserve (JBWP). This has increased wildlife diversity and public awareness through volunteer groups and various programs. Last year JBWP has about 20,000 visitors and 11,000 of these visitors are from organized groups.

- 6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?**

Invasive species and dealing with urban growth - has a direct impact on urban natural resource habitat. This emphasizes the need for good planning.

7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

For grant writing, about a 2::1 ratio. For concessions from the annual air show in Hillsboro, about a 4::1 ratio.

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Yes.

9. What additional resources would be needed:

Additional funding. Currently, there is a lot of red tape in the grant program. Grant paperwork is overwhelming. Can FWS streamline process? Also, is there a better way to share resources?

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Pat didn't respond directly to this question. Pat stated that the relationship between Metro and FWS is very important. Currently, the support system for urban habitat conservation and community involvement is not there, with the exception of the Portland Metropolitan Greenspaces Plan. There is an need for urban areas to establish critical ecological preserves, not to have preserves too distant and remote from communities.

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Being a resource leader and establishing a partnership with local governments and communities for interconnected habitat areas. Also, technical advisory position with streamlined implementation requirements

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS?

Future restoration efforts in the areas of: 1) advisory, 2) technical expertise, 3) grants, and increasing partnerships.

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Mary Ordal

Jim Martin -PSU

Vanessa ???????? - Principal, Deer Creek Elementary School

Pat asked if the FWS has established criteria on whether urban natural resources conservation programs are successful or not, i.e., does FWS have explicit criteria to say if an urban natural resources conservation program is successful or not successful. But he also stated that it is not appropriate for the FWS to write the “perfect” guide on restoration. This involves all partners. He said that he wished that there were more programs like the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program. This would increase the opportunities for citizens to build a stronger connection to the natural world.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 18,1999

Organization: Johnson Creek Watershed Council Name: Bob Roth, Watershed Coordinator

Address: P.O. Box 82584 Portland, OR 97282

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 239-3932 e-mail: jcwc@ix.netcom.com

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Johnson Creek Watershed Council is limited to the Johnson Creek Watershed, seeking to successfully reconcile comprehensive watershed management with sustainable communities. Programs include; restoration, site development maintenance, watershed policy development, outreach and education activities, and interagency partnership coordination and development.

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

No, non regulatory. Relies on volunteer support and participation.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

City of Portland & Gresham - Environmental Services
Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board
Local schools and universities
neighborhoods and businesses
various council organizations, i.e., Friends of Trees

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

Not directly, but with other partners and related programs, i.e., Metro

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Bob, stated that the key indicators (water quality indicator, number of fish returning to spawn, loss of habitat, and additional listings of endangered species are all negative. Not much to be optimistic about. The Johnson Creek Watershed is the second worst in the region.

- 6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?**

See above. This is directly attributable to increased urbanization and development.

7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Bob, didn't have any figures readily available. However, Bob mentioned that Johnson Creek Watershed Council co-hosted an event last year that resulted in FEMA awarding \$150,000 to Multnomah County to deal with flood efforts.

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Yes.

9. What additional resources would be needed:

Funding and technical expertise, staff assistance to assist in developing problem solving strategies - optimization strategy

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

(Note: I included this question after my interview with Bob Roth.)

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Help them assess in-kind and financial resources. Technical expertise to improve project design and implementation. Make sure local organizations are aware of FWS resources.

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS?

Yes, definitely. But what is the capacity of FWS to participate? Also, how can FWS's role complement ODFW?

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Jacqueline Dingfelder, "For the Sake of the Salmon"

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: April 13, 1999

Agency/Organization: Pacific Coast Joint Venture (FWS) Name: Carey Smith

Address: 9317 NE Highway 99 - Suite D, Vancouver, WA 98665

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (360) 696-7630

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

The Pacific Coast Joint Venture (PCJV) is an international partnership to help ensure the long term maintenance of coastal wetland ecosystems. PCJV works with Metro and Clark County in the urban natural resources conservation area. In January 1998, Clark County Commissioners approved \$17.1 million for habitat and open space acquisitions. PCJV participates in several grant programs; National Coastal Wetlands Conservation grants and North American Wetlands Conservation Act grants. PCJV also has education outreach programs; workshops and provider of computer equipment, etc. to schools. See brochures for more information.

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

Metro, Clark County, other federal, state, and local agencies, numerous conservation organizations, industry and private individuals. See back page of "The Pacific Coast Joint Venture, The First Five Years, 1991-1995" for a more complete list of partners.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS's role is one of partnership.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Yes, over 180 projects. The first five years overall contributions exceeded \$150 million and secured almost 100,000 acres; for the 1997 North American Waterfowl Management Plan total partner contributions were \$94 million (cumulative to-date \$1.16 billion) and total habitat accomplishments for 1997 was 270,769 acres (cumulative, to-date 2,119,617 acres).

- 6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?**

One that came to Carey was a project in Reedsport, OR which involved the acquisition of 400 acres for wetlands. The locals weren't behind the project and it was stopped.

- 7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:**

Carey had no explicit numbers.

- 8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:**

Funding for the administration for the venture. Carey stated that there were "Friends" groups lobbying in congress for \$400,000 for administration of PCJV.

- 9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)**

Didn't ask.

- 10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?**

Yes, PCJV started in the waterfowl arena (recover and safeguard waterfowl populations) but has expanded. PCJV, and FWS, could/should expand more geographically (Alaska and possibly Southern California and Mexico) and to include more species (shore line and neo-tropic migrants).

- 11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?**

See above.

- 12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.**

See Item # 10 above.

- 13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:**

Bruce Taylor, FWS (more information on Reedsport project)

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 19, 1999

Organization: Metro Regional Government Name: Charlie Ciecko, Mel Huie, Lynn Wilson

Address: 600 Northeast Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232-2736

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 797-1781 e-mail: wilson@metro.dst.or.us huie@metro.dst.or.us

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Mission: Metro is responsible for growth management, transportation and land use planning; solid waste management, operation of the Oregon Zoo; regional parks and greenspaces programs; and providing technical services to local governments in the Portland metropolitan area. About 4,100 acres of regional parks, focusing on natural resources recreation. Land acquisition program \$135.6 million, about half of funds have been spent to date. 100 local projects identified and about ½ have been completed. Also, see attached brochures for more information on specific programs.

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

No. However, Metro does have authority over local governments under Title III, Flood Plain and Conservation Authority.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

Local, city, state, and federal governments, businesses, environmental organizations, schools, communities, etc. Refer to Appendix Two, of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan for a more complete listing.

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

Advisory on grant selection committees

Technical reviews re: NEPA compliance, , SHPO, contaminants, ESA

Technical advisory on greenspaces

WARPC, Goal V, Title III

Provides special assistance to grant recipients

Review Metro documents pertaining to funding received from FWS and local governments, but need to minimize red tape for approval of all grants. This is particularly true for the small grants. Keep It Simple Stupid - KISS

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Charlie cited several awards and recognition for the excellence in its Metro Greenspaces program. Also, see attached brochures. Some specifics: for restoration, completed about 187 projects and our partnerships have served as catalysts in this process.

6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?

Seen decrease in level of demand for restoration grants. This is probably due to the feeling that there is too much bureaucracy (application process); that for the effort spent they don't get the sufficient benefits. Current level of funding (\$300,000, which FWS retains \$75,000) has been the same for several years. The amount that this can accomplish has been eroded due to inflation. If Metro had to compete each year for the funding, Charlie stated that he would have some concerns.

7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Yes but they don't have a number

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Absolutely.

9. What additional resources would be needed:

Charlie stated that \$500,000/year of **STABLE** funding to expand efforts on privately-owned lands and assist them in restoration. Need stable funding level otherwise, uncertainty would hinder its effectiveness. This effort is in high demand. Increase education funding. Lynn sees this as a major demand for upcoming funding requests.

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Didn't address.

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes, additional financial support, but avoid too many providers. A better approach is one of partnership.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Streamline grant process.

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization

and the FWS?

See below.

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Justin Patterson, City of Tualatin; 692-2000 ext. 936

Tom Kaffun, North Clackamas Parks; 794-8002

Mary Ordal, City of Hillsboro; 681-6225

What is needed is a strong partnership approach. One size doesn't fit all. A national effort would of necessity involve a partnership. One agency overseeing programs wouldn't be effective. In this national concept, the FWS would have involvement to ensure compliance of federal laws and to serve in a technical advisory role.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 22, 1999

Agency/Organization: Metro Name: Jennifer Budhabbatti

Address: 600 Northeast Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232-2736

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 797-1731

(This Interview Questionnaire should be reviewed/read in conjunction with a previous Interview Questionnaire with Metro staff; Charlie Ciecko, Mel Huie, Lynn Wilson.)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Generally speaking, Metro's role is planning, policy, and sometimes implementation.

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None, except under Title III.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

24 cities and 3 counties, 2 park districts, FWS, ODFW, and non-profits. Also, see cited Interview Questionnaire.

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

Advocates.

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Restoration program - it has received numerous awards but Jennifer didn't know the specifics or reasons why.

- 6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?**

See Metro Interview Questionnaire.

- 7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:**

See Metro Interview Questionnaire.

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Yes.

9. What additional resources would be needed:

A lead biologist with land use planning background. See Questions 12 and 13 below.

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Did not respond.

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Need to be highly visible. Specifically, land use planning at a state-wide level.

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS?

Currently, there is a lack of focus, no vision by agencies (local and federal) re: urban and land use issues, including FWS. Jennifer believes that the FWS should be the lead agency in urban conservation planning. The FWS needs to establish a vision, a focus on urban natural resources planning. FWS also, should set the standards for states and local governments to follow. Current urban natural resources programs are more of an art rather than a science now. But they shouldn't be. We have the knowledge to approach and solve these issues scientifically. And, FWS is the one agency with the appropriate science background. That is why she believes that the FWS should be at the forefront of all this; land use planning, developing a "greenspaces" plan before urban sprawl takes over. In essence, a natural resources planning based on endangered species and habitat. Jennifer understands that currently there is no explicit mechanism (no regulatory authority) that provides an avenue for FWS to step into this role prior to an endangered species listing. Nonetheless, it is critical that FWS do this. Right now, states and local governments are either doing nothing, or don't have a comprehensive solution to urban conservation planning. Finally, for the most part, FWS is apolitical entity, while the same is not true for the various entities involved in urban conservation planning.

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?

Mary Abrams - City of Portland- Environmental Services

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 23, 1999

Agency: Metro Regional Government

Name: Emily Roth

Address: 600 Northeast Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232-2736

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 797-1781

(This Interview Questionnaire should be reviewed/read in conjunction with a previous Interview Questionnaire with Metro staff; Charlie Ciecko, Mel Huie, Lynn Wilson.)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Emily works on the Smith and Bybee Lakes and Beggar's Tick Projects. (For a more complete mission and list of programs refer to previous Interview Questionnaire.) Metro serves as an educational role and she organizes work parties and works on restoration projects.

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes, Port of Portland, ODFW, the Audubon Society of Portland, City of Portland - Parks and Environmental Services.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

Technical assistance at Smith and Bybee Lakes and provide informational literature. FWS's role is the preservation of wildlife and enhancement of habitat

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Metro partnered a restoration project of about 22 acres with the City of Portland - Environmental Services and the Army Corps of Engineers. It was a good partnership and cost sharing. FWS was very helpful reviewing projects in and around the lakes. FWS could get more involved with watershed councils in the form of technical assistance.

- 6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the**

activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

Beggar's Tick Project hasn't gotten the strong support yet. Just haven't done much due to lack of funds and no staff. FWS could help coordinate and be a Project Manager.

- 7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:**

Didn't know.

- 8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:**

Yes, at Beggar's Tick. In the form of planning, hiring crews, organizing, materials, etc. But there's always more projects than money.

- 9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)**

A larger pie. FWS is stretched thin. They need a beefed up presence.

- 10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?**

Yes.

- 11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?**

Need an urban project manager to oversee projects and attend council meetings; also to provide planning, and other technical assistance to non-technical people.

- 12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.**

See above.

- 13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:**

Susan Bartel, City of Portland - Environmental Services 823-7268

Ester Lev

Andrew Mason - The CORP 285-0508 ext. 25

Emily had the following closing statements: Currently, FWS has a good urban presence. The current mission is applicable to urban as well as non-urban areas. Just need a re-focus., not a new mission statement. Currently, FWS is only in an advisory capacity, while the Corps of Engineers, is the decision maker. In order for FWS to be in a new decision making role, a change in the Clean Water

Act and ESA must occur. Now, FWS can only serve in a consultation role. But FWS needs more authority because of current significant, and key issues re: endangered species and habitat issues. There should be more of a presence by FWS, but the FWS can't do it all.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 23, 1999

Organization: Naturescaping for Clean Rivers, East Multnomah SWCD Name: Linda Robinson

Address: East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District 2115 SE Morrison St

Portland, OR 97214

Phone/Fax/E-mail: 503-261-9566(Tel) 503-261-9577(Fax) lrobins@pacifier.com

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Naturescaping for Clean Rivers (NCR) is an outreach program to urban residents with a focus on storm water. NCR's message to urban residents is that what they do in their yards impacts streams; fertilizers, pesticides, etc. NCR's purpose is to reduce the quantity and rate of urban water pollution and improve urban runoff water in yards. NCR's main approach is a free ½ day workshop for community residents. They also sponsor/partner various events and provide information on native plants, erosion control and other site planning workshops.

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

City of Portland; Environmental Services, Metro, National Wildlife Federation, Portland Water Bureau, NRCS, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Forestry, Portland Parks, Community Gardens, Friends of Trees

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

It is a collaborative effort; trying to get people information and to the action stage.

- 5. Have FWS urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Yes, NCR is going into its 5th year. 1,200 people have been through their workshops. NCR did a phone survey a couple of years ago and about 70% of the people that went through the workshops actually did something; i.e., planting native plants. 80% of those surveyed shared their new information with their friends. Also have some before and after photos of some projects.

6. Have FWS urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

The early efforts weren't too successful. There were too many meetings and there wasn't a good turn out of people. NCR found that timing is critical; late September - November and mid-March to May are the best times.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Linda didn't have this type of information and said that NCR was struggling on how to determine measures.

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

More funding. Currently, the City of Portland provides ½ of the funding and the other ½ comes from EPA which grant expires this summer. Plus the city is under pressure to cut funding for this program. Currently receive about \$40,000/year, need about \$100,000/year for 2 ½ FTE.

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Need a bigger pie, but also need to rethink on how pie is parceled out. Revenues are coming from urban areas. Maybe government decision-makers need to redirect more of these revenues to urban issues.

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes. More funding and more involvement by FWS at watershed council activities. FWS should provide more timely input (technical/advisory) into significant local projects. Linda stated that she understands that the FWS is already spread thin and recommended more staff to do all of this.

11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

See above.

12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.

Linda stated that she works with FWS quite well. But could be a distribution source if she had a better idea of the various informational brochures, etc. the FWS has available.

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Steve Fidje - NRCS: 231-2270

Ken Bierly - Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board (GWEB)

Ken Bierly, Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board (GWEB) (503) 378-3589, ext 831;

<Ken.Bierly@state.or.us>

[If you can't reach Ken, I'd contact Vivienne Torgeson at extension 825; she's the primary contact for GWEB projects in the Portland area.]

Beth Stout, National Wildlife Federation (503) 230-0421; <stout@nwf.org>

I knew I would think of some folks as soon as I left. Here are the ones that came to mind as I was driving home:

Erik Sten, Portland City Council

(503) 823-3589; <erik@ci.portland.or.us>

[Erik is an elected official. He was the Commissioner in charge of the Bureau of Environmental Services until recently. He is still the one responsible for the City's response to the listing of the fish. He is young and very articulate, and seems to have a good grasp of the importance of the urban folks cleaning up their own act before pointing fingers at what others need to do.]

Mary Abrams, Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) (503) 823-7032;

<marya@bes.ci.portland.or.us>

[Mary is heading up the City of Portland's response to the listing of the fish as endangered species. Before that, she was the city's "watershed manager" for the Columbia Slough. She has a very strong science background, which would add another perspective.]

Joe Poracsky, Portland State University and Urban Forestry Commission (503) 236-4227 (home);

<poracskyj@pdx.edu>

[Joe is a professor in the Geography Department at PSU; he is also the current chair of Portland's Urban Forestry Commission, with a special interest in the role of trees in both upland and riparian habitats. He has a strong GIS background (he and his students did much of the early mapping work for the Metropolitan Greenspaces program. He might also have some good insights on the role USF&WS might play in higher education, as we train future urban planners and other professionals. I listed his home number because he has been on sabbatical this year so he can focus on his role as Chair of the Urban Forestry Commission.]

David Yamashita, Portland Parks

(503) 823-????; <dyamash@ci.portland.or.us>

[David has been trying to develop an environmental education program within the Park Bureau. He has been working with low income and minority kids in the inner city. He's also been working with inner city neighborhoods to convert vacant lots into pocket parks -- and involved with "brown fields" issues in the city. In addition, he has encouraging the Park Bureau to change its maintenance practices -- aiming for less reliance on chemicals, the addition of native plants, the creation of small patches of habitat in less used portions of some of the active parks.]

Roger Yerke or Jane Hartline, the Oregon Zoo

(503) 226-1561; <yerker@metro.dst.or.us> or <hartlinej@metro.dst.or.us> [The zoo has been working on new landscaping and new exhibits, to relate their exhibits of exotic species to the issues of endangered species, in general, to wildlife issues in the local urban area. Roger is in the education dept at the zoo and Jane is in charge of public affairs.]

Bill Hastie, retired from Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (503) 563-5456 (home); (503) 872-5264 (work?)

[Bill has been involved in Information & Education at ODFW for many years, both in the headquarters office in Portland and at the Oregon Coast. It's my understanding that he retired about three weeks ago, but may still be doing some work on a contract basis. I know he was involved with wildlife issues during the New Carissa incident this winter. He is very knowledgeable about urban wildlife habitat issues.]

Sara Vickerman, Defenders of Wildlife (503) 697-3222; <svickerman@defenders.org>

[Involved with habitat conservation issues state-wide]

Jeanne & Dick Roy, Northwest Earth Institute

(503) 227-2807 or (503) 244-0026; <jeanner@nwei.org>

[Involved with "deep ecology" and lifestyle simplification issues]

Llyn Peabody, Global Action Plan's Eco-Team Program (503) 331-7144; <gappdx@pacifier.com>

[A neighborhood approach to helping folks make life-style changes]

Susan Foster, Chair of Oregon Fish & Wildlife Commission (503) 665-2076

[Retired biology professor; taught at Mt Hood Community College]

Paul Fishman, Fishman Environmental Services (503) 224-0333; <pfishman@fishenserv.com>

[Perspective from the private sector; his firm works with erosion control and all sorts of other issues in the urban area.]

Mr Bruce Taylor, Oregon Wetlands Joint Venture (503) 697-3889; <btaylorwet@aol.com>

Paul Sunderland, OSU Extension Office (503) 725-2050; <Paul.Sunderland@orst.edu>

[The extension office now includes volunteer programs like Wildlife Stewards, Master Recyclers and more, all excellent outreach programs and many related to fish and wildlife issues in the urban area.]

One final comment that Linda mentioned; This is an urban issue as well as an agricultural issue and thought it was proper that FWS be proactively involved in these types of issues.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 15, 1999 and April 30, 1999

Agency: National Park Service

Name: Sue Abbott, Michael Linde

Address: Seattle Support Office, 909 First Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (206) 220-4116 e-mail: sue_abbott@nps.gov; Michael_Linde@nps.gov

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS:

March 15, 1999:

Sue Abbott said that she had sent Russ Peterson (State Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon State Office) a 3-ring binder (about 180 pages) entitled, "Building Gateway Partnerships", a self-help book. Sue stated that the above cited book should provide useful information on their partnerships.

The National Park Service (NPS) has a partnership program called "Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA). The RTCA program is a technical assistance program by NPS assisting communities to protect places or resources the communities value. As the program name states, this includes rivers, trails, greenways, open spaces, and historic places. The program does not provide financial assistance, however, NPS's technical assistance includes; facilitation, planning, developing funding alternatives, increasing support base, and enhancing public awareness.

Sue gave me Curtis Tanner as the Fish and Wildlife Service's liaison. Curtis's telephone number is: (360) 753-4326.

April 30, 1999:

Michael Linde returned my phone call and provide me the following information re: the RTCA program:

- S Nationally, NPS receives about \$7 million annually for RTCA. This funding is for NPS salaries and overhead since RTCA does not provide financial assistance to program participants.
- S Only a small percentage goes to urban areas; most of the assistance is to small cities and rural communities.
- S Michael had no dollar figures for the amount of "leveraged" dollars RTCA produces. But he did refer me to contact their Washington, D.C. office; Allen Turnbull at (202) 565-1191 or Charles Stockman.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 29, 1999

Agency: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
Address: 603 East Diehl Road Suite 131, Naperville, IL 60563
Phone/Fax/E-mail: (630) 505-7808 fax: (630) 505-7992

Name: Kent Sims

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

When requested, NRCS provides planning and technical assistance to land managers, local units of government, and organized groups and communities in the area of soils and soils related issues. NRCS performs services mostly to private land owners but does partner with other entities in urban areas. NRCS helped: build a wetland at Chicago's Brookfield Zoo; put together along with FWS a Native Plant Guide; Illinois Urban Manual for protecting and enhancing natural resources in communities. Also see NRCS's attached brochure, "NRCS Urban & Community Assistance".

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None. Again, NRCS only provides assistance when requested.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

State and local governments, watershed groups, citizen groups related to storm water watershed management efforts; county governments in GIS soils and wetlands. Digitize and interpret data.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS is an integral partner in most of NRCS's projects. Probably the closest relationship than any other partner, particularly with on-the-ground wetlands.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Yes. Gompers Park, Prairie Wolf Slough. "Life Underground" at the Field Museum. NRCS is widely known for its technical expertise. Also, "Illinois Urban Manual" has been approved to establish minimum standards for land development in communities. It may be unique to Chicago but we have a tremendous partnership with the various federal agencies and local agencies.

- 6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the**

activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

Maybe, progress could have been happened quicker. Due to staff turnover, soil, erosion, sediment control ordinances could have been more effectively implemented. Again, not really a failure but there is room for improvement.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Partnerships and cost sharing have leveraged dollars many times but don't have a specific number. With NRCS's technical expertise, others are more willing to be motivated and do the projects.

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

Yes, in additional staffing, improved technology (computers are behind the state-of-the-art). NRCS doesn't have the people power to provide the level of assistance needed.

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Yes, more for urban natural resource conservation. Currently there is no checks and balances. Now, local jurisdictions and municipalities set their own land use planning regulations. Should state initiate land use planning???

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Look to Chicago as a model:

- S Well-trained, dedicated staff and first to determine what specific needs of the area
- S the best and the brightest (have to be top-notch)
- S strong regulatory component and excellent technical assistance in eco-system restoration
- S education program

12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.

Not in Chicago area, because it's there. But maybe it's needed in other urban areas; fostering an improved partnership between FWS and NRCS.

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Lue Walters, NRCS, Assistant State Conservationist for Community Assistance

Jim Martin, NRCS, Assistant State Conservationist, Field Office District #3

Harry Slawter, NRCS, Madison Regional Office

Kent closed by saying he would like to see FWS expand its efforts around the country like what's in the Chicago area now.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: Wednesday, March 17, 1999; 9:00 AM

Agency/Organization: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Northwest Region

Name: Greg Robart, Biologist

Address: 17330 SE Evelyn Street, Clackamas, OR 97015

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 657-2200 ext. 241, e-mail: greg@qcsn.com

Urban Natural Resource Conservation Program(s) agency is involved in:

Two major areas; (1) assisting Metro with its Goal 5 (Land Use Planning) re: policy and planning; and, (2) reviewing permits (i.e., land use permits - Corp of Engineers, under Section 404).

Description of Regulatory Authority/Program Directives/Funding Source:

Largely, the Endangered Species Act

Key Partners and their Roles:

EPA; with wetlands; FWS,
Division of State Lands and DEQ, and State parks (State level)

Role of FWS:

Basically, Greg sees the role of FWS as a partner, a co-advisor, someone to consult with. Gives the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) a federal entrance.

What aspects of your program(s) are successful? Why?

Also see "Future opportunities for expansion of current efforts". ODFW has been successful but not completely. There is not enough staff to give due consideration or attention to.

Amount of economic benefit in leveraged dollars?:

N/A. However, Greg stated that there definitely needed to be more matching funds to do the needed

projects. The matching concept is very persuasive mechanism too.

Future opportunities for expansion of current efforts:

Yes, but need more staff, 3 or 4 more to more properly address issues. As stated earlier, currently Greg doesn't have enough time to do a comprehensive review of permits/actions. Similarly, ODFW's assistance with Metro should expand, but can't because of staff limitations.

Are there unfulfilled needs that could be addressed if resources were available?

See above. Also more education of stakeholders.

What aspects of your program(s) are not successful? Why?

Just stated that due to limited resources/funding, Greg is unable to do a more of a comprehensive review of permits/actions and assistance with the Metro plan.

Funding needs/issues:

Increased staffing to address all issues. Funding for training and education of stakeholders and local community.

Are you familiar with the role and mission of the FWS?

Yes. ODFW has similar mission.

Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in local natural resource efforts? Explain.

Yes. FWS needs to "insert" itself into urban natural resources planning processes. Also, need to establish local presence by increasing field offices. FWS staff should be very accessible to stakeholders to assist or advise them. (Greg commended efforts by Jennifer Thompson, FWS employee, who has worked with Greg on a number of projects.)

If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by a Federal partnership with the FWS?

More training re: laws, procedures, and guidelines. Also, recommended that the State and FWS initiate an Inter Personnel Transfer (IPT) program that would transfer staff from each agency to the other agency for cross training and developing a stronger coalition between each agency.

Other contacts:

Ben Meyer (230-5425) and Michelle Day (231-6938) NMFS
Holly Michael (657-2000 ext. 230) ODFW
Nina Bell (295-0490) Northwest Environmental Advocates

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 29, 1999

Organization: Openlands Project

Name: Gerald Adlemann

Address: 25 East Washington Street, Suite 150, Chicago, IL 60602-1708

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (312) 427-4256 ext. 235 fax: (312) 427-6251

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Openlands Project's (OP) urban work is in three major areas, sponsoring and partnering: (i) a new generation of parks and gardens in the city. 55 are deficient in many respects. OP pulls together all stakeholders - community based planning. OP is their technical support staff. Additionally, OP has a "Green Street" program; planting trees in the city. Also, has "Tree-Keepers" - a premier effort to sustain trees; has been an exemplary effort. (ii) network of green ways in the city; natural landscape corridors linking human communities and varied open spaces, and (iii) looking for large reserves that remain. For more specific programs/projects, refer to; "Openlands Project, 1997 Annual Report", "Northeastern Illinois Regional Greenways Plan", "Building Greener Neighborhoods", and "Caring for the Urban Forest".

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

No. Only as a 501C non-profit educational advocate.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

State and local governments, neighborhood communities, environmental groups. Also, see Chicago Wilderness membership list. Gerald stated that building community and farm interests are a small part and are getting nervous by OP and other advocates discussions of "smart growth". See brochure entitled, "Under Pressure". These two groups are not supporting OP. Also, although Chicago Wilderness is big movement, it plays a relatively small role for OP's sponsoring/partnering of greenspace systems.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS's role is limited but they provided early leadership. This was very important, particularly, Ben Tuggle, being an up-front advocate. The Chicago Wilderness success wouldn't have happened so quickly.

FWS also plays an important role on regulatory issues. And they participate by providing funding,

leadership, and technical advice on site specific projects.

5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?

The greenways plan has been a success; created attitudinal changes and removed some of the parochial boundaries; now thinking region as a region, regional stewardship, creating relationships. Rallied support state-wide for the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. This symbolized another dimension of a different scale that didn't exist before. Everybody got on board. Also, "Tree-Keeper" and "Green Street" projects. See brochures for additional projects.

6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

Haven't been successful in engaging, in a meaningful way, the business community. They have been on the periphery at best. Unsuccessful because of limited dollars and lack of sponsor. Also reaching the general public. We have a long way to go. We also need to think of the region more broadly. There was no representatives at the Chicago Wilderness event from Wisconsin and only 2 from Indiana. There's almost no dialogue between states.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Yes, as a facilitator and catalyst. Relationships develop and continue to tackle other issues in broader arenas; within varying economic levels and sociological classes.

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

Yes, funding for additional land acquisitions and projects.

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

No specifics.

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Funding for continued technical assistance and being there and participating in coalitions. Also, providing support to property owners and educational opportunities, i.e., outreach.

Federal agencies can very helpful fostering/establishing, for instance, a tri-state task force; to facilitate crossing state boundaries to deal with these issues more globally.

- 12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.**

Becoming one of the property owners

- 13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:**

Jack Darin - Sierra Club

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 24, 1999

Agency/Organization: City of San Diego, CA Name: Karen Scarborough

Address: 202 C Street, MS 5A, San Diego, CA 92101-3864

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (619) 236-6479; fax (619) 236-6478

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Karen is the Mayor's Director of Strategic Planning and lead staff person for the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Plan. The City of San Diego is the lead agency responsible for implementing the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan. The MSCP is a comprehensive habitat conservation planning program for southwestern San Diego County that creates a comprehensive preserve system that safeguards habitat values while allowing compatible land development to proceed. (Also, refer to attached "Multiple Species Conservation Program, MSCP Plan, Executive Summary" and "What You Need to Know About the Multiple Species Conservation Program".)

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

The City has the Environment Sensitive Land Ordinance - these are local regulations. There are also biological guidelines that Keith Greer can discuss when I meet with him later.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

The building industry and environmental community. Other partners are; County of San Diego, cities of San Diego, Poway, Santee, El Cajon, La Mesa, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, the County of San Diego, and Otay Water District in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS was and is a key partner. Secretary Babbitt and Mark Evans were essential ingredients to the initial start-up and success of MSCP. FWS sat on the initial working groups to develop policies.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Plan was just approved in July 1997. So it's a bit premature. Just now determining the degree of success. However, there has been \$17 million in land acquisition - 2,400 acres. The City and the

Feds have contributed funds as well. Also, public policy is being implemented and approved. This is the way permits are now processed; within an integrated, comprehensive habitat conservation plan.

6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

One negative aspect is that an environmental group(s) has just initiated a lawsuit against the City re: a specific set of species pertaining to vernal pools. This is only one element of the MSCP being challenged.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

(Karen had no specific numbers. She asked that I refer to the 1997 Annual Report which, in summary, pointed out that the cumulative loss is 242.7 acres and the associated cumulative conservation is 323.23 acres.)

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

Money, to buy land and perform maintenance of recurring items, and scientific expertise. Land and Conservation funds have dwindled over the years.

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

No specific comments.

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes. FWS should take pro-active approach and sponsor/partner initiatives like the MSCP in San Diego County.

11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

See Question Number 8 above.

12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.

No, just maintain existing role. The City has experience.

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Michael Beck, environmental activist (619) 846-3003

Jim Whalen, Builder/Developer (619) 222-5856
Ron Rempel, State Fish and Game (916) 654-9980

Karen's closing statements: It's a balancing act; expediting development and practicing conservation. For success, need key pieces in place. Establish working group early for all stakeholders. Also need a leader. Like the Mayor and Babbitt. Need fortitude to continue to work the day-to-day problems and endure of the long term. And need scientific input. Money is still a challenge in planning and buying land and monitoring. Need to do more public outreach.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 25, 1999

Organization: City of San Diego, CA Name: Keith Greer

Address: 202 C Street, MS 5A, San Diego, CA 92101-3864

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (619) 236-6479 fax: (619) 236-6478

(Note: Please refer to Karen Scarborough Interview Questionnaire also.)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Keith is a Biologist for the City of San Diego. The City of San Diego is the lead agency responsible for implementing the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan. The MSCP is a comprehensive habitat conservation planning program for southwestern San Diego County that creates a comprehensive preserve system that safeguards habitat values while allowing compatible land development to proceed. (Also, refer to attached "Multiple Species Conservation Program, MSCP Plan, Executive Summary" and "What You Need to Know About the Multiple Species Conservation Program".) MSCP was adopted for protection; integrating endangered species and biodiversity. The San Diego area is the largest and first area to take an integrated approach.

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

The City has the Environment Sensitive Land Ordinance - these are local regulations. There is also the California Environmental Quality Act but it's purpose is for disclosure only. Keith said that the MSCP is the framework on how cities and governments and others will comply with the Endangered Species Act (ESA)

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

The building industry and environmental community. Other partners are; County of San Diego, cities of San Diego, Poway, Santee, El Cajon, La Mesa, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, the County of San Diego, and Otay Water District in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Partners developed a consensus process but still very fragile.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

The FWS is primarily regulatory. FWS started off very dogmatic but has evolved. Nevertheless, FWS still very regulatory re: ESA; to see whether the City and stakeholders are implementing MSCP.

5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?

This is the second year in a 50 year program. We're just getting the plan implemented - a bit too early to measure many things. One thing to note that it took 7 years to get everybody in one room together. That in and of itself, was a major undertaking and can be viewed as a success. Now, there is a process. Also, the Feds have contributed funding; approximately 1/2 for planning.

6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

Implementation of the MSCP - a challenge will be developing a regional funding source. Just getting voters to accept this. Also, the Army Corp of Engineers (COE) and EPA are trying to require additional regulations beyond the MSCP because they didn't buy into the MSCP. (regulations pertaining to integrating of wetlands) The COE and EPA weren't involved in the initial planning stages. According the Keith, the MSCP lacks a wetlands integration. Now trying to develop a comprehensive wetlands plan with the COE and EPA.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Leveraged federal dollars. Never had federal dollars before. Now have \$800,000 for implementation of the Plan.

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

Funding for land acquisition.

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Existing allocation makes sense and is fair. Just trying to get more funding to meet allocation.

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

A shift in focus. So focused on endangered species. Need to be on habitat conservation. A very difficult move for FWS. Also, need a change in roles and mind set - to open spaces; in both urban and non-urban areas. FWS should not be regulatory because locals will rebel. Instead, it should be

incentive based; a cooperative approach which is an alternative to regulations. Maybe an MOA type or a state initiative. But it shouldn't be another unfunded mandate or regulation. If so, nothing will happen. People haven't developed a value for "open spaces" what's behind their house. Need to make them aware of the intrinsic biological value of habitat. This is probably more of a policy issue - urban open spaces have habitat value.

12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.

Currently, the City has a pretty good partnership with FWS. But again, need the have FWS staff changing away from the regulatory mind set.

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Bob Asher and Tom Oberhaure - City of San Diego
Duane Bazzel - City of Chula Vista
Jim Nestle - City of Poway

Keith expressed the point of politics in the whole MSCP process: What does it politically take to establish and maintain working relationships when an administration changes? He doesn't know, but will find out when the current administration changes in a couple of years.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 17, 1999

Agency/Organization: SOLV

Name: Neil Schulman

Address: P.O. Box 1235 Hillsboro, OR 97123

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 844-9571 E-mail: neil@solv.org

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 14. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Mission is to build community through volunteer action to preserve the natural resources and beauty of the state. This includes restoring watersheds and habitat for salmon and steelhead. Specific programs: Oregon-Adopt-A-River, Down By The Riverside, Make The Town Clean. (For more programs, see attached brochures.)

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

SOLV has no regulatory authority. SOLV's by-laws prohibit taking any political stance.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

PGE, Intel: both financial supports and partners in many of the programs.
Metro, Unified Sewerage Agency, and Watershed Councils across the region
neighborhood associations, State Marine Board, Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS sponsored Adopt-A-River and has funded workshops.

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Volunteer base is over 60,000 people. People want to get involved in a positive way. Results of programs such as Beach Cleanups, and recently, 4000 volunteers out at various riparian sites around the Willamette River. Also, able to build support from businesses and finding innovative ways to volunteer. And, building a natural resource conservation ethic. If we don't get involved then the outcome is an endangered species listing.

- 6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?**

A shortage of native plants for some of SOLV's restoration projects.

7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

In 1998, value provided by 63,648 volunteers to the state was \$5,999,832.

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Yes

9. What additional resources would be needed:

There is a real shortage of technical expertise on restoration ecology

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

(Note: I included this question after my interview with Neil Schulman.)

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Definitely. There needs to a big push to increase presence of FWS and technical expertise.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Technical expertise, habitat restoration training (either partnering or supporting SOLV.

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS?

Yes, in habitat restoration training. See above.

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Nancy Spieler, SOLV Program Coordinator (also w/Tualatin Watershed Council)

Ron Klein, Emily Roth, Metro

Jim Sjulín, Portland Parks and Recreation

Ester, Lev, Wetlands Conservancy Restoration Coordinator

Jim Desmond, Metro- Land Acquisition

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 18, 1999

Organization: Tualatin Parks Recreation District

Name: Mel Waggy & Ralph Cook

Address: 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, OR 97006

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (503) 645-3539; e-mail: nature@thprd.com

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

The mission of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD) provide natural areas, high quality park and recreation facilities, services, and programs that meet the needs of the diverse communities it serves. THPRD has about 1000 acres of natural area parks -mainly concerned with issues in their parks. Programs: Wildlife Habitat Enhancement, Wetland Restoration, and various other volunteer efforts. Trying to acquire new properties and provide education information to interested community members.

- 2. Describe the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None, with the exception of having park rules; they are sanctuaries for plant and wildlife and Washington County Sheriff's office and the City of Beaverton Police have pledged to support rules.

- 3. Describe the key partners and their roles:**

Metro - through various grants
Friends of Rock/Bronson/Willow Creek
Fans of Fanno Creek

THPRD plays both a supporting and coordinating role.

- 4. What is the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

Limited. Only in so far as migratory water fowl and greenspaces programs/issues.

- 5. What aspects of these conservation efforts are successful? Why?**

Ralph sees THPRD's efforts have had success but to see significant results in the areas of restoration and enhancement will take years. Also, through their continual involvement in the schools and communities, Beaverton School District has been very supportive and positive.

6. What aspects of these efforts are not successful? Why?

Greatest degree of failure is working with the residential/commercial community. It often time appears that the focus is maximization of profits, and adhering to the bear minimum standards. Also, the state of the art in restoration and enhancement is low which means more costs and/or avoidance. Another area the is a challenge is once THPRD finishes a project then it is difficult to obtain funding and volunteer base to maintain the project.

7. How have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Ralph gave a qualitative response. THPRD generally spends time at the onset to orient the group to higher level needs as well as what the specific project work will entail. By having the group see the big picture and having more of an awareness of the underlying issues/problems, later on, project individuals come back with more projects.

8. Do you feel more could be done to address urban conservation issues if additional resources were available?

Yes. More eradication of invasive species. And, development of a better relational data base on the web for getting technical information.

9. What additional resources would be needed:

More grant funding while keeping application paperwork to a minimum. In particular, more greenspaces grant funding to maintain areas that have had enhancement/restoration done. Also acquisition of land.

10. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Educational grants don't go a long way to solving conservation problems as of right now.

11. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Definitely YES.

12. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

More technical personnel available.
Provide publications on current environmental issues.

13. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS?

Yes, but depending on role of FWS. Also, serving to complement ODFW.

14. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

Kendra Smith, Mark Jackson, Unified Sewerage Agency
Rand Fisher, Soil Water Conservation District (503) 681-0953; Hillsboro

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: March 29, 1999

Agency: Urban Resources Partnership (URP) Name: Avery Patillo

Address: 77 West Jackson, Chicago, IL 60604

Phone/Fax/E-mail: (312) 353-2473

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

The Urban Resources Partnership (URP) initiative in Chicago combines seven key federal agencies in a partnership directed toward natural resources projects in underserved urban areas in the Chicagoland area. The Partnership provides partial funding and technical assistance to community-driven environmental restoration, enhancement, and educational projects. See attached "Project Guide" for specific projects.

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

None specifically, but there are two relate acts that Mr. Patillo cited: the Soil Conservation Act (SCA) of 1932 and the Cooperative Forestry Act. SCA allows them to prevent soil erosion and addresses water quality, etc.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

Local communities, environmental groups, local governments, and seven federal agencies (EPA, USDA Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Forest Service, NRCS, FWS, NPS, and HUD). Roles: volunteer work crews, funding, technical assistance, planning

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

FWS is a strong partner - providing technical assistance and some funding for administrative support. A big proponent for wetlands and prairies. All of the actual project funding comes from USDA. URP and FWS works very closely and have common goals.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

Most are successful: Prairie Wolf Slough Wetlands, Gompers Park Wetlands, Illinois and Michigan Canal Origins Park to name a few. Also, see "Project Guide" referred to above.

6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

Activities are unsuccessful when local project sponsor doesn't follow through. And there are a handful. Of the approximately 65 projects URP has sponsored all but 4 or 5 have not taken off.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

Mr. Patillo estimated about a 5::1 leverage of dollars. In many projects the original scope was expanded. Also, see "Project Guide".

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

Yes, more person hours for technical assistance from the agencies. Also, more project dollars would help. Currently, all funds come from USDA. Is there a way to have other federal agency funds for the URP projects?

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Yes. Need to shift attitude of agencies to urban needs. Try to preserve natural spaces. If we improve conditions in urban areas then urban sprawl will be less.

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts?

Yes.

11. If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Provide project funding at a national level.

12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.

Yes, could expand mission of URP - and serve more people. FWS doesn't really need to create a new urban natural resources initiative. Don't re-invent the wheel. URP exists and has learned valuable lessons. Just incorporate FWS into an expanded URP initiative. URP has a proven track record and has established working relationship with key members of Congress. (FWS should take advantage of this existing framework and relationship.)

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

See attached list of Steering Committee.

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
URBAN NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT
RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Date: April 2, 1999

Agency/Organization: Unified Sewerage Agency

Name: John Jackson

Address: 155 N. First Avenue, Suite 270, Hillsboro, OR 97124

(503) 648-8621

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the role of your organization/agency in urban natural resource conservation efforts (list specific programs/request written information, if applicable):**

Mission: Unified Sewerage Agency (USA) protects and conserves the waters of the Tualatin River Basin, providing cost effective, environmentally sensitive management of wastewater and surface water for our customers. USA serves an indirect role; surface water management and water quality (water control for urban run-off water). USA comments on permits; Section 404-Clean Water Act. These usually pertain to wetlands/fill and removal type activities. USA also reviews buffer widths around wetlands and intermittent streams which are included in development codes; has a stream corridor restoration program (new effort by USA); and is a partner in the Jackson Bottom Wetlands Preserve and Fern Hill Wetlands. USA has participated in the small grants program (member various "Friends" groups), interacts with Metro and Goal V, land use laws.

- 2. What are the regulatory authority/program directives/funding source/sponsors that guide your involvement in the above efforts:**

Yes, Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 451 deals with construction standards regarding buffers and wetlands.

- 3. Who are your key partners and what are their roles:**

Tualatin River Watershed Council, various "Friends" groups, Jackson Bottom and Fern Hill Wetlands Preserves, planning departments with 12 member cities, Metro, Oregon State Forestry, DEQ, Oregon Water Resources Water Districts, ODFW, FWS.

- 4. Please describe the role of FWS in these efforts (if any)?:**

USA has a limited role with FWS, primarily on corridor 404 permit applications.

- 5. Have your urban conservation activities been successful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was successful?**

USA's urban conservation activities are a qualified success. The majority of the success has been in the protection of buffers, asking for setbacks for water quality purposes. Secondary benefits - this has provided an incentive to restore riparian areas. Of marginal success is to establish (increase) buffers where there exists corridors presently. Also, the stream corridor restoration program holds lot of

promise. There has been a tremendous volume of volunteer energy in this effort.

6. Have your urban conservation activities been unsuccessful? If yes, please describe what the activities were, what it achieved and why you think it was unsuccessful?

Major unsuccessful effort pertains to dealing with Oregon Federal Highways and in particular, Northwest Natural Gas Company's recent pipeline in this area. NW Natural Gas didn't have to apply for any permits for the pipeline. Nor did NW Natural Gas ask USA to comment on the pipeline.

7. Please describe how have the efforts you described leveraged additional resources and/or lead to other natural resource conservation efforts?:

In USA's stream restoration effort, the use of volunteers resulted in about a 3::1 leverage of expenditures; \$50,000 with additional value of \$150,000, by using volunteers in one particular project (Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District). The Tualatin Basin Public Awareness Committee have combined their limited resources to get several projects done.

8. Are additional resources needed to accomplish goals? If so, what would you suggest?:

Yes, money. As an example, the 8/14/98 Tualatin River Watershed Action Plan, has numerous actions/projects but no funding to complete any of the projects. Need technical staff time, stream ecologist to lay out stream planning, and material for projects.

9. Do you see the need for reallocating the existing resources for urban natural resource conservation? (Describe which resources: private, local, state, Federal, other)

Prefer to see more (new) money. But don't make it so onerous as in the Metro Greenspaces small grants program. Currently, USA absolutely refuses to apply. It's just too much paperwork. Need to streamline process. According to John Jackson, there are a lot of volunteers chomping on the bit to do work but there's too much paperwork. They need a big agency to do the paperwork for grants.

10. Do you think there is potential for the FWS to expand its involvement in urban natural resource conservation efforts? #11: If so, what are the key needs that could be addressed by the FWS?

Yes. In the area of permitting staff. FWS needs to be more aware; e.g., applying same attitudes and regulations to restore fish habitat is not working. FWS needs a new "religion" or paradigm; one that recognizes that what they were doing before wasn't working (on the permitting side), allowing innovation. Note: John was referring to the application and interpretation of the rules for issuance of permits. FWS (and for that matter, all federal agencies) have had a regulatory role but they need be a collaborative partner and get in the restoration mode. The feds haven't done a good job in protection; they need to stop that slide and get in the restoration mode. FWS should carry a higher profile and be more pro-active at watershed meetings and councils. FWS has the expertise but need an attitude change.

Note: In a follow-up telephone call, I asked John what he meant by the FWS needs a new “religion” or paradigm. He provided the following comment: The current Section 404 regulations, as interpreted by Service and other federal agencies, are intended to keep activity away from corridors. This was done for good reason, to protect the corridors. But as corridors have continued to be detrimentally affected, the Service should encourage stream/habitat restoration and approve permits that benefit stream/corridor restoration.

12. Do you see potential for a new or expanded partnership between your agency/organization and the FWS? If so, please describe.

See above.

13. Do you know of other contacts that might have valuable input for this project?:

City of Portland - Environmental Services and Tualatin, Jim Jacks, Planning Director

