

Conservation Makes \$ense at NACo Richmond VA



Opening day for our "Conservation Makes Sense" booth with Advisory Committee members Mike Murray of Lewis & Clark County MT and Brett Hulsey of Dane County WI.



Some of the attendees of the Conservation Leaders Network's working dinner with the Board of Directors and Advisory Committee. L to R: Advisory Committee member Robert Downing, Calhoun County AL; guest Tresi Houpt, Garfield County CO; Advisory Committee member Bob Rackleff, Leon County FL; Advisory Committee member Bob Jacobson, Hawaii County HI; Board Chair John Woolley, Humboldt County CA and guest Susan Adams, Marin County CA..



Board Chair John Woolley of Humboldt County CA working the booth with Mike Murray of Lewis & Clark County MT and Bob Rackleff of Leon County FL.

Thanks to the following county officials who worked our "Conservation Makes \$ense" booth with Executive Director Peg Reagan:

- Calhoun County AL Commissioner **Robert Downing**
- Lewis and Clark County MT Commissioner **Mike Murray**
- Hawaii County HI Commissioner **Bob Jacobson**
- Dane County WI Supervisor **Brett Hulsey**
- Humboldt County CA Supervisor **John Woolley**
- Leon County FL Supervisor **Bob Rackleff**.

This year's booth co-sponsors were **The Wilderness Society** and **American Forests**.

Commissioner of the Month Speaks— Will Toor, Boulder County CO



Boulder County has a decades-long history of implementing projects that protect our environment, natural resources, air quality and water. However, in 2005 the Board of County Commissioners and staff decided it was time to commit the County to a comprehensive strategy of creating a sustainable community.

The commissioners adopted both a zero waste and a sustainable energy resolution in 2005. These resolutions and their resulting action plans address issues such as energy efficiency, waste reduction, green building and use of renewable energy. Recognizing that is important to model the practices we would like the community to adopt, the plans call for both internal change and external outreach to the community at large.

Also in 2005, the Commissioners turned to the Boulder County community for the financial means to begin turning policy into practice. Voters approved a ballot issue al-

lowing the County to retain and spend tax revenues previously required to be refunded under state law. Boulder County earmarked a minimum of 6.67 percent of those new revenues to fund sustainability efforts - currently generating about \$1.5 million/year for sustainability programs.

Since adoption of the sustainability resolutions, Boulder County has implemented numerous programs and is in the planning stages of many other efforts. A new, full-time sustainability coordinator was hired to coordinate internal and external programs and to foster collaborations with community partners such as the municipalities within the county, the University of Colorado, and local power providers.

Some of Boulder County's programs include:

- A Greenhouse Gas Inventory that was completed to identify

the County's baseline emissions levels and sources and to set goals for reduction. A county-wide sustainable energy plan to reduce emissions is nearly complete.

- The County's new drug and alcohol detox facility, scheduled for completion this fall, is being constructed to attain LEED Gold Certification and all new facilities will be required to follow LEED standards. Additionally, the Architects Division is working to make several existing buildings meet LEED EB standards. Boulder County has attained the Energy Star label of energy efficiency for three buildings, and has a total of 12 buildings earmarked for Energy Star attainment.

- Boulder County's new transportation operations facility and Parks and Open Space headquarters feature a heating system that burns biomass obtained during tree-thinning projects for forest stand improvement and fire mitigation. The biomass heater has projected heating cost-savings of approximately \$30,000 per year and reduces the county's use of natural gas.

- In collaboration with the City of Boulder and the University of Colorado, the county conducted a Neighborhood Energy Efficiency Sweep Program project to target entire neighborhoods and public housing with free energy kits to reduce energy use and educate residents about energy and water conservation. In the first year of this new program we distributed 781 energy efficiency kits each containing

continued on page nine

Adopt Natural Landscaping Principles

From "Greening Cook County" by Commissioner Mike Quigley

With its heavy dependence on turf grass and other non-native ornamental plants, traditional landscaping has a profound environmental impact. According to the US EPA, five percent of US air pollution comes from gas-powered garden tools. In addition, the nation's forty million lawnmowers emit as much pollution as 440 million new cars and consume 200 million gallons of gasoline in the process. Furthermore, the 70 million pounds of pesticides applied to lawns every year in the US contaminate countless rivers and lakes, the groundwater supply, and endanger people and pets who may come into contact with the chemicals. Finally, the EPA estimates that 50 percent of water consumption in some urban areas is due to lawn irrigation alone.

In contrast, natural landscaping, which uses native plants, has a much more benign impact on the environment. According to the US EPA, "Native plants provide a beautiful, hardy, drought resistant, low maintenance landscape while benefiting the environment. Native plants, once established, save time and money by eliminating or significantly reducing the need for fertilizers, pesticides, water, and lawn maintenance equipment."

Specifically, natural landscaping has several advantages over traditional landscaping.

Natural landscaping:

- **Uses less water.** Because native plants have deeper root systems than ornamental species, they therefore require less frequent watering, resist droughts better, and absorb more runoff (thereby reducing flooding).
- **Does not require fertilizer.** In fact, native plants do not require fertilizers. They are already adapted to the conditions of their native habitat.
- **Uses fewer pesticides.** Unfavorable climate conditions may weaken non-native species, making them more susceptible to pest infestation. Native plants do not suffer from this problem.
- **Reduces air pollution.** Natural landscapes do not require mowing. Given that one gas-powered lawnmower emits 11 times the air pollution of a new car for each hour of operation, cutting back on mowing will help air quality.
- **Provides shelter and food for native animal species.**
- **Promotes biodiversity.** In many urban areas, few wild habitats remain. Natural landscaping provides the habitat needed to support native wildlife.
- **Saves money.** The EPA cites a study by Applied Ecological Services of Brodhead, Wisconsin, that found that 20-year maintenance of large properties landscaped with turf grass costs over six times more than maintenance of a prairie or

Wetland.

The County and FPD should begin converting their property to natural landscaping as soon as possible. Though turf grass may still be needed for specific uses—playing fields in [certain] recreation areas, for example—every other conventionally-landscaped area should be replaced with natural landscaping.

Reprinted with permission.

Applications Now Being Accepted for Watershed Restoration Projects

The Environmental Protection Agency is now accepting applications for the Targeted Watersheds Grant Program, a competitive grant program designed to support the protection and restoration of the country's water resources through a holistic watershed approach to water quality management.

The Targeted Watersheds Grant Program focuses on multi-faceted plans for protecting and restoring water resources that are developed using partnership efforts of diverse stakeholders. Hence, the goal of the Targeted Watersheds Grant Program is to advance successful partnerships and coalitions that have completed the necessary watershed assessments and have a technically sound watershed plan ready to implement.

Proposals must be received by EPA or electronically through Grants.gov by 5 p.m. EST on November 13, 2006. For further information, go to <http://www.epa.gov/twg/>.

Michigan Environmental Council



Photo credit: Michigan Environmental Council

In Michigan's most prosperous county, leaders embrace urban sprawl and dismiss "limousine liberal" environmentalists.

But behind that rhetoric, Oakland County has quietly established an aggressive outreach to help local governments identify, protect and enhance greenspaces ranging from picnic areas to ecologically irreplaceable wetlands. And its work is gaining traction and acclaim throughout the Metropolitan Detroit region.

Oakland is home to 1.2 million residents who enjoy the state's highest per-capita income (\$32,534). It's an incubator for a flock of Fortune 500 companies, and the province of hundreds of freshwater lakes and streams that contribute substantially to the quality of life for its residents.

Yet the county's top elected official has little patience for dogooders who would choke the county's growth with restrictions on development. He calls them "anti-American Dream doom-and-gloomers" And he doesn't hesitate to get in their faces.

"I love sprawl; I need it. I promote it. Can't get enough of it," County Executive L. Brooks Patterson has declared in speeches from a text perpetually on the county's web site.

But his seemingly anti-environment bluster belies an exceptional county-based effort to catalog, promote and protect important natural features that are critical to regional ecosystems as well as the county's continued economic prosperity.

Oakland County's Green Infrastructure project includes a vast array of efforts big and small to make sure that Patterson's vision of sprawl is executed with sensible protections. It encompasses projects as small as helping tiny townships link their hiking and biking paths to larger networks, and as large as working on multi-county visioning to protect watersheds that span multiple jurisdictions.

"The county as a whole is pursuing green space and water issues as a complement to promote good growth," said County Commissioner Jeff Potter. "It's a quality of life issue."

The work is spearheaded not by the county's parks department or some cadres of sanctimonious environmentalists, but by the Planning and Economic Development division. Seems the woods and waters aren't just for tree-huggers anymore.

"There is a real economic benefit for everyone in doing these things," said Jim Keglovitz, senior planner.

Inland lakes and streams – including the headwaters of four major river systems – are sprinkled throughout the county. The water resources add \$2.8 billion (yes, billion!) in value to the county's tax rolls, say county officials.

continued on page six

From the Director . . .

The Lands Council

continued



Executive Director Peg Reagan

It's good to be back from the National Association of Counties' annual conference.

It was a very successful event for the Conservation Leaders Network. We didn't see the Sunday rush we used to see but we actually gave away more literature this year than usual.

As you know, our "Conservation Makes \$ense" booth focuses on the economic benefits of natural resource conservation. Our "Money for Counties" handout was very popular.

Our website will soon have its NACo 2007 page up, complete with photos of county officials working our booth during the conference. You can also see the breadth of materials we distributed this year. If you are interested in any, give me a call as we may have extra copies.

This year the Conservation Leaders Network purchased carbon credits for the flight through terrapass.com. We recognize that carbon credits aren't going to solve global warming, but it's a

baby step every flier should take.

Thank you to all the members who made special contributions to help bring our "Conservation Makes \$ense" booth to this year's conference. Thank you to this year's booth co-sponsors—our long-time supporter, **The Wilderness Society**, and first-time co-sponsor, **American Forests**.

Thank you also to our many "Conservation Contacts," statewide groups who recognize the value in working with county officials to protect America's natural resources: Alaska Conservation Alliance; Sierra Club--Grand Canyon Chapter; California League of Conservation Voters; Rocky Mountain Chapter Sierra Club; Florida League of Conservation Voters/Sierra Club Florida Chapter; Environment Georgia; Hawaii's Thousand Friends; Conservation Voters for Idaho; Illinois Chapter of the Sierra Club; Iowa Environmental Council, Cumberland Chapter; Sierra Club, Michigan Environmental Council; Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy; Missouri Coalition for the Environment; Northern Plains Resource Council; Nevada Conservation League; Ohio League of Conservation Voters; Oregon Wild; Conservation Voters of South Carolina; Lone Star Chapter Sierra Club; Virginia Conservation Network; The Lands Council and the Wyoming Outdoor Council.

Peg Reagan

continued from page four
Wilderness.

Like all good ideas, seeking common ground has caught on in other Forests of our region. The Lands Council helped start a collaborative on the Kootenai National Forest in Montana, in which all three county commissioners are involved, as well as one on the Idaho Panhandle National Forest of north Idaho. As we tell people, ask us in five years how this all worked out, but for now it seems our connections to rural communities are going well and a record of successful collaboration is being built.

For more information about The Lands Council, go to:
www.landscouncil.org.

County Success Stories

Do you have a success story you'd like to share with your fellow members of the Conservation Leaders Network?

We'd like to print brief articles of your successful efforts to restore, conserve or protect natural resources in your county. And we would like to include a link for those who want more information. Our next deadline is November 1. Accompanying photos are also welcome.

Let your colleagues learn from your successes!

2007 Conservation Awards Winners

The Trust for Public Land honored the following counties with their Conservation Awards in 2007.

Small Category: Pitkin County, CO for the Pitkin County Open Space and Trails

Pitkin County is a rural, mountainous region and home to the resort communities of Aspen and Snowmass. Boasting some of the highest real estate prices in the country, development pressures are extreme, making land conservation both costly and daunting.

Pitkin County residents have not been deterred. In 1990, voters passed a ballot measure creating the Open Space and Trails (OST) program. Two subsequent ballot measures have extended a 3.75 mill property tax to 2020, and a total of \$38 million in General Obligation bonding authority has been authorized. Grants and partnerships have leveraged significant funds for the program (\$.43 for every OST dollar spent). To date, Pitkin County has preserved 14,000 acres of farmland, wildlife habitat, open space, recreational assets, and trails.

The county's success in preserving undeveloped land can be attributed to its strong partnerships with myriad public and private entities, a spectrum of conservation tools, and long-standing relationships of trust with local landowners.

Medium Category: Sonoma County, CA for the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District

In the late 1980s, Bay Area cities began to merge, losing their individuality and unique character. Fear of this and concern for significant growth patterns led Sonoma County to support an Open Space Element in the update of the County General Plan in 1989. That Open Space Element recommended the creation of the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District and the voters agreed a few months later.

In 1990, Sonoma County voters authorized a quarter-cent sales tax (for a 20-year period) to fund and create the District, one of the first sales tax-funded open space programs in the country to focus on the preservation of agricultural properties and open space lands. The District has spent \$212 million to protect more than 70,000 acres of farmland, open space, wildlife habitat, and recreational lands. The Sonoma County District has leveraged voter-approved funding with an additional \$26 million in local, state, federal, and private funds. In addition, the District has received generous endowments from landowners that total over \$1.6 million. District staff has saved some \$61.5 million in discounted purchase prices.

In November 2006, 75% of the

voters overwhelmingly approved an extension of the sales tax through 2031.

One particularly notable achievement the District claimed in 2005 was a partnership with The Trust for Public Land, State Coastal Conservancy and State Parks to protect the 3,373 acre Willow Creek property as an addition to Sonoma Coast State Beach, the third most-visited State Park unit in California. The District also recently completed a yearlong community process to update its Acquisition Plan, "Connecting Communities and the Land." This guiding document responds to changes in the community over time and has an additional focus, that of acquiring lands that connect urban dwellers to open spaces around them.

Large Category: Lake County, IL for the Lake County Forest Preserve District

Lake County is home to more endangered and threatened species than any other county in Illinois. It's also home to a diverse and growing population of nearly 700,000 people, including some of the most rapidly expanding communities in both the Chicago region and also the nation.

Since 1999, Lake County voters and the elected, 23-member Lake County Board of Forest Preserves Commissioners have made commitments to protecting open

continued on page seven

Protecting the Source: Land Conservation as a Drinking Water Protection Tool

This is a two-part article which will be completed in the next newsletter.

Over a century ago, many of America's fastest growing cities, such as Boston and New York, sought to provide lasting protection for the critical water resources that would sustain their growing populations in the future by purchasing the land in their source area. To this day, these cities, some of the largest in the country, have relatively clean source waters that require minimal treatment.

Advancements in science and technology have enabled us to effectively treat most known contaminants from drinking water sources, and to provide American citizens with some of the safest drinking water in the world. However, these advancements have often contributed to a movement away from protecting and managing our source areas and the unfortunate notion that the quality of our raw water supplies is less important.

Treatment alone, although critical to preventing disease, should not be the sole protection of our drinking water. Multiple barriers to disease agents need to be maintained if we are to provide the greatest protection to public health. A multiple-barrier approach to drinking water protection involves several consecutive and interrelated steps, including selection of high quality system management, and water quality monitoring. Current research on

the public health impacts of urban and agricultural runoff in raw water sources and a recognition of the high costs and limitations of technological fixes has led many water supply and watershed managers to revisit two principles that were taken for granted a century ago, 1) the public's water supply should be reasonably clean to begin with, and 2) forests and natural lands are critical to the quantity and quality of water supplies.

This article presents the results of a recent study on the relationship between forests and clean water, and the resulting impact on treatment costs, and explains how water suppliers and municipalities can build effective partnerships to conserve forested land in order to protect their source water.

Why Protect the Source?

One of the main reasons suppliers are revisiting the idea of source protection is the growing realization that allowing raw water quality to degrade, in addition to threatening public health, also increases treatment and capital costs.

According to a recent report produced by the World Wildlife Fund and the World Bank, *Running Pure*, protecting forests – which reduce erosion and sediment, improve water purity, and in some cases capture and store water – is a cost-effective way to provide clean drinking water. “For many cities, time is running out,” said David Cassells, a World Bank forest specialist.

“Protecting forests around water catchment areas is no longer a luxury but a necessity. When they are gone, the costs of providing clean and safe drinking water to urban areas will increase dramatically.”

Although little research has been done on this issue, a study of 27 water suppliers conducted by the Trust for Public Land (TPL; a national non-profit land conservation organization) and the American Water Works Association's Source Water Protection Committee in 2002 found that costs of water treatment for utilities using primarily surface water supplies varied depending on the amount of forest cover in the watershed. Approximately 40 water suppliers were asked to complete a written survey describing their watershed, treatment system, and treatment costs; 33 responses were received, of which 27 were included in the analysis. The water utilities were not selected totally randomly, as some were solicited to provide a diverse range of watershed types. The survey results indicated that operating treatment costs decreased as forest cover in a source area increased.

For a copy of this report and more information on using land conservation as a drinking water protection strategy, go to the publications page of TPL's website – www.tpl.org, or call Caryn Ernst at (202) 543-7552. Reprinted with permission.

The Economic Value of Golden Trout Fishing

There is no mistaking the California golden trout. Its brilliant red and gold hues have long fascinated anglers in California's southern Sierra Nevada region. But populations of the golden trout California's state fish are declining, even in the Golden Trout Wilderness on the Inyo and Sequoia national forests. The primary causes are predation by brown trout, hybridization with non-native rainbow trout, and habitat degradation brought about by livestock grazing. Both the State of California and the Forest Service list the golden trout as a species of special concern, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is considering whether to list the subspecies under the federal Endangered Species Act.

This report describes the economic value of recreational fishing for golden trout and two related species in the Golden Trout Wilderness. The report also compares those values with livestock grazing, the other major economic activity in the wilderness area.

The Golden Trout Wilderness was chosen for this study because it provides most of the golden trout's remaining, relatively intact native habitat. The study area includes the Kern Plateau, containing Golden Trout Creek and the North and South forks of the Kern River in Tulare and Inyo counties (Figure 1). Of particular interest are 26 miles of native habitat along the South Fork Kern River, from the headwaters to Kennedy Meadow, in the Inyo and Sequoia national forests.

Maintenance of golden trout populations in Golden Trout Creek and South Fork Kern River will require active management, including elimination of competing non-native trout and elimination of grazing along the streams (Moyle et. al 1996). Documented impacts of livestock grazing in the wilderness area include fecal contamination, erosion of stream banks (which results in large amount of stream sedimentation that fill in many pools important to fish survival over the winter), channelization of shallow stream, trampling of spawning beds, and loss of vegetation and hiding cover.

In a recent study, Knapp and Matthews (1996) found that grazed portions of the Golden Trout Wilderness were in poorer condition than ungrazed portions of the wilderness area and that grazing-induced habitat degradation was harmful to the remaining populations of California golden trout. The study suggested "resting" of grazing allotments or reductions in livestock numbers to lessen the impacts of grazing on stream and riparian ecosystems in the Golden Trout Wilderness. This method of restoration is both easier to implement and more cost-effective than previous stream habitat rehabilitation efforts, which relied primarily on structural remedies such as bank stabilization and demonstrated only



Photo credit: Valentine Atkinson

limited success. In 2001, the Forest Service decided to rest two grazing allotments in the Inyo National Forest for 10 years. Approximately 88,000 acres of those allotments are in the Golden Trout Wilderness (USDA Forest Service 2001).

According to the Knapp and Matthews study, restoration of the stream and riparian ecosystems would increase meadow stability, improve habitat for native California golden trout, and enhance conditions for a wide range of other riparian-dependent species. In addition to ecological benefits, Knapp and Matthews conclude that preventing the extinction of California golden trout through measures such as habitat restoration will yield substantial economic benefits tied to recreational fishing.

continued on page nine

Wilderness

continued

continued from page eight

In several pieces of recent legislation, we have seen wilderness bundled with some kind of economic development – not because wilderness has an adverse economic impact that must be mitigated, but because wilderness provides a political opportunity for economic development, just as economic development provides a political opportunity for wilderness.

I believe that wilderness is uniquely American, and it's as American as apple pie. Wilderness reflects Americans' core values and interests in conservation as an important legacy for future generations which poll after poll, nationwide, state-level, and county-level show to be important to American voters.

Like every other political debate, there will never be total consensus in our society about wilderness and so it will be discussed and debated, which is how things get done in America, but wilderness can provide a political opportunity for economic growth if we can establish a dialogue and forge creative solutions.

Campaign for America's Wilderness would like to partner with counties to help commissioners to better understand what wilderness is and what is and is not allowed in wilderness. We are happy to facilitate meetings with local wilderness groups so there is a better understanding of the wilderness potential in your regions. We are also here to help you understand the economics of protection.

For more information about wilderness, please visit www.leaveitwild.org, or contact Ken Rait, Campaigns Director, at (503) 460-9453 or krait@leaveitwild.org.

Boulder County CO Commissioner Will Toor

continued from page two

four compact fluorescent light bulbs and educational materials.

- We have implemented a composting pilot in County offices, enabling employees to compost materials that would otherwise end up in landfills. The program will expand to a zero waste program at all county facilities in 2008. Custodial staff will reduce barriers to zero waste practices by collecting recycling and composting for staff and providing recycling and composting bins within easy reach of lobbies, meeting rooms, restrooms, staff offices, and kitchens.

- We have implemented purchasing policies and systems that require the purchase of higher recycled content products, with some exceptions; set requirements for bidders to follow sustainable practices such as printing double-sided; and began to purchase fuel efficient hybrid electric vehicles. We also purchase B-20 (20 % biodiesel) for all of our diesel vehicles and 100% biodiesel for many of them during summer months.

- We have just installed a 10kw solar photovoltaic on the county courthouse that will partially power four plug-in hybrid vehicles. The vehicles will get approximately 100 miles to the

gallon.

- In perhaps our most far-reaching effort to date, the county is revising the building code to require that new residential construction and major remodels be far greener than current code. While the public process is still underway, the current proposal calls for a new energy code that would reduce energy use by about 50% compared to current code for houses under 2500 square feet, and would require that larger houses use no more energy than a 2500 square foot home. In addition, very large homes (over 6,000 square feet) would have to be designed to be net zero energy users, producing as much energy from solar, wind or geothermal as they consume.

While the challenge of moving towards sustainability is enormous, we are excited to have started down this path. More information can be found online at www.co.boulder.co.us/.sustain.

Volunteers needed!

Can you give us a few hours of your time???

We need your help and you can choose what you want to help us with—online research, phone calls, typing articles for our newsletter, fundraising or help with mailings.

Call Peg at 541 247-8079 or email us at: info@conservationleaders.org.



Marine Reserves: Progress at Last!

With the release of the June 1, 2007, “Marine Reserves Process Coordination Meeting—Key Points, Decisions and Immediate Actions (Taken and Needed)” to the Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC), the Governor has laid out his expectations and made it clear that “OPAC is an advisory body. Actual siting and designation decisions are made by agency commissions/boards, with input from the Governor’s office.”

As the chair of the Marine Reserves Working Group (MRWG) wrote in a message to the MRWG and Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC), “the Governor’s Office has instructed OPAC and the MRWG to immediately move ahead with establishing a relatively new concept in marine reserves for Oregon.” We can quibble over whether it’s a new concept or not (many of us would say it was the idea all along—only the MRWG complicated the issue by talking about “research” reserves and reserves for fisheries management purposes); the important thing is that they are finally getting the message to stop dithering and make significant headway.

He goes on to say, “Specifically, the reserves will be called Marine Heritage Reserves and may be established through a nomination process by members of the public, community organizations or NGOs once we have completed drafting the nomination criteria. . .

The MRWG will be dedicating all of its time during the next two meetings, June 29th and July 16th, to draft criteria for the nomination process. This task will be challenging and require the MRWG to focus our efforts far more than we have in the past, given a very short proposed timeline.” Again, we can argue that the timeline is not, in fact, so short—they’ve been discussing marine reserves for two years now.

He goes on to say, “Hopefully we can meet this challenge by demonstrating a willingness to work cooperatively in order to achieve a reasonable level of compromise from our respective former positions on the issue of marine reserves.”

The Governor’s Office made the following commitments:

- The Governor is eager to establish marine protected areas such as marine reserves. He sees ocean protection as a part of his environmental legacy.
- Governor will seek funding for marine reserves in the 2009-11 budget and will investigate opportunities to seek funding for the Feb. 2008 session as well.

The Governor’s Office outlined the Governor’s intended goal for marine reserves:

- Based on OPAC discussions, he believes the goal of marine

reserves (no-take areas) should be for preserving our ocean heritage for future generations.

- This goal means two things: One, establishing reserves to permanently protect the habitat and biodiversity of specific places in Oregon’s Territorial Sea; and two, establishing more than one reserve for each of the major types of bottom habitat in our Territorial Sea.

- It was noted that the idea of establishing marine heritage reserves is similar to designation of wilderness areas on land.

The Governor’s Office also laid out the Initial Process Discussion for Nominating Heritage Reserves:

- Scientists and policymakers need to define sideboards (criteria) for how a site could qualify as a marine heritage reserve. Examples of criteria: habitat types, size of reserve, distance apart, proximity to ports, enforcement requirements. Key Actors: STAC and other scientists, OPAC MRWG Marine Cabinet.
- Initial decisions such as determining a “total percent” of Territorial Sea to be designated as reserves could help frame the process.
- Once ecological and socio-economic criteria are established, begin a public 6-month nomination process. Public will be asked to use the criteria during nomination process.
- With STAC assistance, OPAC’s MRWG would review

continued on Oregon Insert page two

Marine Reserves

continued

continued from Oregon Insert page one
nomination applications to determine whether the criteria were met.

- OPAC would review and comment on the combined nominations, and forward to the Governor's office.
- Governor's office would work with Marine Cabinet to confirm nominations meet the conservation goals and criteria.
- Governor's office would forward proposals to the appropriate agency commissions for action (ex: Fish and Wildlife Commission, State Land Board).
- Sometime in 2008, commissions will conduct rulemaking, which involves public comment, economic and social analyses, etc. [All commission processes will preferably take place at the same time, in order to schedule joint public hearings, etc. Process will be coordinated by the Marine Cabinet.]

The second bullet regarding a total percent may be problematic. In the 2002 OPAC effort, the fishing industry tried to get a total percent—and that total was no more than 1 or 2%—but that failed. The conversation among scientists reportedly runs from 30 to 50%.

The next-to-the-last bullet is also important—it is good that the Governor's Office and Marine Cabinet will confirm nominations meet conservation goals and that it won't be left up to OPAC or the MWRG.

This process does give the MRWG a lot of influence as they will—with STAC assistance—“review nomination applications to determine whether the criteria were met.” They will also be one of three “key actors” on establishing the criteria for “how a site could qualify as a marine heritage reserve” along with the STAC and other scientists and the marine cabinet.

The memo makes it clear that OPAC is not expected to approve the criteria but only to review and comment on it. OPAC will be expected to produce “a comprehensive map showing compiled sites that meet overall goals.”

This effort is important because it has helped put OPAC and its role in perspective and should prevent it from continuing to hold marine reserves hostage.

In addition, both the State Land Board and the Parks and Recreation Commissioner were addressed, the latter directing the Parks and Recreation Department to “begin a ‘marine parks’ plan, whereby a Task Force will be established to recommend places for designation . . . adjacent to select existing land-based state parks.”

The next 18 months will be critical—we will see the development of the criteria and the public nomination process, the end of Kulongoski's term with an effort to achieve the natural heri-

tage reserves before he leaves office and the appointment of a new OPAC next June.

The Marine Reserves Working Group has taken the Governor's directive to heart and is developing criteria for selecting marine reserves now. They are also creating the nomination form that the public can use to nominate potential reserves sites.

Their next meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 22nd, at the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology (OIMB) Boathouse Auditorium in Charleston, Oregon from 10 AM-4 PM.

Although the agenda has not yet been released, there has always been a short public comment period. Your input is needed on the type of information and style of the nomination form. For example, should they require the person submitting the form to include scientific data to support their claims? Should each person be required to answer every question in order for their suggestion to be considered? Should each person be required to provide their name and contact information? These are some of the considerations that could exclude information from both the general public and fishing interests.

Your input is also needed on the criteria for selecting marine reserves.



Conservation Leaders Network
PO Box 46
Wedderburn OR 97491

YES! I want to join the Conservation Leaders Network, the only nonprofit organization in the country which focuses on providing support to and forging ties between county commissioners and environmental leaders to protect America's natural resources. Together we must work to encourage ethically and economically responsible decisions that will help protect the natural treasures that complement and complete our communities. *Individual and county memberships are now available. Individual memberships start at \$45/year; county memberships start at \$250/yr.*

With my membership, I will get:

- * four issues of the Conservation Leaders Network's quarterly newsletter "Networker"
- * access to the Network's email discussion list, where I can discuss environmental issues with other county leaders and environmental advocates
- * priority access to the Conservation Leaders Staff for information and support
- * email notification of conservation and restoration funding opportunities for counties.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State: _____ Zip code: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email address: _____

Membership contribution

Please make your check payable to the \$45

**Conservation
Leaders
Network** \$100

PO Box 46 \$250
Wedderburn OR 97491