

Recovery Potential Metrics **Summary Form**

Indicator Name: COMMUNITY IDENTITY/ICONIC VALUE

Type: Social Context

Rationale/Relevance to Recovery Potential: A large number of communities grew around a well-known water body and have come to identify with it heavily in their local culture and history. Others have come to recognize and appreciate the economic or recreational uses and positive impacts a prominent local water body may have on their community well-being and assets. In situations where the best-known and important water body has become impaired, this information can motivate communities very strongly to support restoration.

How Measured: There is no standard measure for how communities identify with specific water bodies, but it is easily recognized at local scales and sometimes at regional scales. Among the ways to address this factor are to recognize tributaries that can impact the iconic water body (such as, tributaries in the Chesapeake Bay drainage versus ones that are not) and raise their recovery potential scores. The metric can be measured as presence/absence of iconic-valued attribute.

Data Source: Varies with the state or area under study.

Indicator Status (check one or more)

- Developmental concept.
 Plausible relationship to recovery.
 Single documentation in literature or practice.
 Multiple documentation in literature or practice.
 Quantification.

Comments: Practitioners or a group of stakeholders might be able to assign high-medium-low scores to each water body as a scoring approach.

Supporting Literature (abbrev. citations and points made):

- (Grau et al., 2003) Consequently, most research on the ecological implications of LUCC in the tropics focuses on the dominant pattern of deforestation and fragmentation (e.g., Houghton 1999, Laurence et al. 2002) which is driven by the prevailing socioeconomic and demographic factors (1159).
- (T. Stiles, KS TMDL program 2009) The KS WRAPS program has frequently arisen around specific watersheds of major reservoirs that provide rallying points for restoration and protection support by their communities. This is one of the largest programs for KS waters.
- (Clewell and Aronson 2006) People are attached to wild areas in the same way farmers love their land. An angler may become attached to a favorite lake, or a small landholder may revere a patch of woods that provides fuel wood for the hearth. Others in the local community may share an attachment, and these wild places may become foci for cultural activities. The local community may fight to preserve and protect such places from external threats and may provide management to assure their integrity. Lacking this psychological attachment, natural areas are taken for granted, and the benefits that may accrue from them go unacknowledged. Little impetus exists to protect and preserve such underappreciated lands.

- (Clewell and Aronson 2006) We contend that well conceived and executed ecological restoration requires the melding of the technocratic and idealistic rationales. To achieve this, institutions that conduct technocratic restoration must relinquish some authority and actively work in partnership with stakeholders. Conversely, stakeholders—particularly local citizenry—must be motivated to assume responsibility in a partnership and inject restoration projects with idealism and cultural meaning. The attraction in such a marriage between the technocratic and idealistic rationales consists of the societal benefits accruing from the pragmatic rationale. Citizen stakeholders will not support restoration with enthusiasm unless they clearly understand and value its economic benefits. Without wide public support and participation, governments may be unable to generate political support to undertake pragmatic restoration projects.
- (Middleton 2001) After a major interstate highway was built directly adjacent to the creek, the creek started to receive increased runoff from the new road and began to widen and deepen to accommodate the extra water. As a result, some association homeowners started losing large sections of their property to the highly erosive flows of the creek. With the help of IWLA and other partners, these citizens started exploring options for restoring the creek
- (Milon et al. 1999) The purpose of this study was to develop and implement a public survey elicitation procedure that could be used to evaluate public perceptions of alternative ecological endpoints for what may well be the 'granddaddy' of all ecosystem restoration efforts, the Everglades/SouthFlorida region. The elicitation procedure would also provide estimates of individual's economic value (willingness to pay) for bundles of environmental goods that could result from alternative restoration plans. Results from the survey could then be used to rank alternative restoration plans and provide measures of the economic benefits (net willingness to pay) associated with alternative ecological endpoints. This study also contributes to the state-of-the-art in ecosystem valuation methodology by evaluating respondents' perceptions of alternative representations of environmental functions.
- (Briggs and Osterkamp 2003) Gaining strong community involvement in riparian recovery efforts is one of the most critical aspects toward realizing the project's long-term objectives and is probably the most challenging to achieve. A lack of local community involvement has kept many past riparian recovery efforts from realizing their potential (Briggs and Cornelius 1999; Briggs 1996).
- (Steelman and Carmin 2002) For years, whitewater paddlers, as well as other community members, witnessed the AMD-induced (acid mine drainage) degradation of the Cheat River. When the second blowout occurred, the whitewater community no longer was willing to sit back and watch the river continue to decline. A group of paddlers formed an organization called Friends of the Cheat (FOC) that was founded on two principles. The first was to "restore, protect and promote the outstanding natural qualities of the Cheat watershed" (FOC, 1999a). The second was to "foster a cooperative effort by state and federal agencies, private industry, academics, grassroots organizations and local landowners to address the severe AMD in the Cheat Canyon" (Bassage 1995b).
- (Steelman and Carmin 2002) Implicit in these attempts to promote understanding of AMD and watershed issues and trust among various members and partners are efforts to elicit and understand the *values* that are important to FOC's many constituent communities.
- (Steelman and Carmin 2002) Community members who had a deep concern for the river and the local community founded FOC as a bottom-up effort. Thus, the founder and initial member were known to the community. This helped the organization and its mandate to gain acceptance and legitimacy. While the group had to work to develop ties to government agencies, the high level of commitment and enthusiasm helped generate network affiliations that contributed to the organization's ability to secure financial and technical resources as well as cultivate further network ties and legitimacy.
- (McDonald, Lane, Haycock and Chalk 2004) Incorporation of individual and community goals into the decisionmaking process is crucial to the restoration process (Boon 1998). Pfadenhauer (2001) identifies four reasons why broader community goals have an

important influence: (1) goals are strongly influenced by public opinion and open to dispute through the decisionmaking processes that result in a particular project being adopted (Swart et al. 2001); (2) emotional and aesthetic factors may be especially important, such that 'identifying' with a component of a restoration project is necessary; (3) the popular acceptance of goals is required for a project to be socially relevant (Wissmar and Beschta 1998) and for public involvement (Goodwin 1998); and (4) the value of a unit of the landscape will be referenced to changing values such that even highly degraded systems (e.g. a canalized river in an urban environment) can acquire value (e.g. Adams 1997). Thus, restoration plays an important social role in mediating our relationship with valued places (e.g. Jordan 1994; Adams 1996; Higgs 1997; Eden et al. 2000).