

The Urban Restoration Experience*

Paul H. Gobster[†]

Back in January when Margaret Goodale and Jake Sigg first invited me to speak tonight as part of the Natural History Series, I replied back that while the date was good for me, didn't they realize that April 22 was Earth Day, and wouldn't they want a speaker with a more entertaining and uplifting topic than one addressing a drawn-out and emotionally draining conflict over urban natural areas restoration?

For when I think of Earth Day, I conjure up memories of children rolling around on a giant earth ball, and as a US Forest Service employee, I've spent past Earth Days helping families plant trees at the local nature center near where I worked. Yet, looking back into the history of the first Earth Day in 1970, I was reminded that its origins were rooted in more than the "feel-good" celebration that today's Earth Day events have become. Senator Gaylord Nelson from my home state of Wisconsin founded Earth Day to call attention to the environmental crises facing the nation. His hopes were to tap into the grassroots energy of the anti-Vietnam protest movement that was sweeping college campuses, in order to force environmental issues onto the political agenda.¹

So now that my perception of Earth Day has been "corrected," I feel more comfortable in my role tonight as a speaker on Earth Day 2004 talking about protest and political turmoil over environmental issues.

Observations

As I mentioned three weeks ago at the San Francisco Ecological Restoration Conference here at the Randall Museum, I was invited to UC-Berkeley this semester as a Visiting Professor. And I've been using part of my time here to study the social conflicts over natural areas restoration in San Francisco, and compare and contrast the situation here with what Chicago experienced six years ago and what I helped write about in our book, Restoring Nature.² At the Restoration conference I presented some preliminary observations about the controversy, based on my early impressions of what I saw going on here and my own knowledge and experience.³ To briefly recap those observations:

- **Multiple values in nature-** I pointed to the reality that there are multiple values in nature; that people look to parks and other open spaces for beauty, naturalness,

* Unpublished talk presented at the San Francisco Natural History Lecture Series, Randall Museum, San Francisco, CA, April 22, 2004.

[†] Research Social Scientist, USDA Forest Service, North Central Research Station, 1033 University Pl., Suite 360, Evanston, IL 60201, pgobster@fs.fed.us. At the time of this talk, the author was on sabbatical as the Farrand Distinguished Visiting Professor, Department of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning, University of California at Berkeley. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and not necessarily of the institutions he represents.

access, and other qualities, and especially in urban areas it's simplistic to think that everyone perceives and experiences these places the same way.

- **Whose habitat?**- I also observed that while species and ecosystem rarity lend a moral responsibility toward protecting habitat for ecological reasons, that parks and open space also serve as critical human habitat—fulfilling people's physical and psychological needs for nearby nature, and that enhancing the human livability of cities may be the best overall strategy for species and ecosystem protection at the regional level.
- **Holding on to what we can-** Along with that observation I also hypothesized that it's precisely because nearby nature is so important to people why conflicts can reach the level that they have in Chicago and San Francisco—these are the places where people live, work and play, that they feel the strongest attachment to, and thus are most willing to fight for.
- **“Wicked” natural resource conflicts-** My observations about this scarcity and place attachment just mentioned fit within a broader framework of what policy analysts have described as “wicked” natural resource conflicts, and these and other drivers such as disputes among scientists who operate from different conceptual bases and the media who add fuel to the conflict by painting issues in black and white, make San Francisco a poster child of wicked restoration conflict.
- **Rhetoric of the conflict-** Finally, I observed that while the open flow of information related to the natural areas conflict has helped promote healthy debate, the warlike metaphors often used by restoration practitioners and scientists and the bombastic rhetoric of discourse between disagreeing groups and individuals has likely led to increased divisiveness and mistrust.

At the restoration conference I promised to follow up these observations tonight with a second set of preliminary thoughts that were more in the realm of suggestions on how some of the conflicting issues might be worked on. As I warned last time, these thoughts are based on my personal reflections and experiences, with just enough actual data collection and analysis to be dangerous, and I welcome the opportunity to debate and discuss these afterwards.

Borrowing tactics from the motivational seminar people, my top suggestion of course should be for you to purchase and read Restoring Nature (call now, operators are on duty). Seriously, I'm amazed and delighted that so many people who have stakes in the conflict here have read or are even aware of the book—I got a sales update last week from Island Press and we've sold just over 1,800 copies since it was published in October 2000, and while that's really not a number I'd want to brag about, it's good to know from your feedback that it's not just gathering dust on the shelves of the academic libraries.

Like I said last time, I'm also pleased that people on both sides of the conflict have read and found value in the book, but I'm also a bit perturbed when they misinterpret or take

information from the book out of context to support their viewpoint without looking at the broader messages we hoped to get across. So this first suggestion is really a set of suggestions culled from Restoring Nature and related work stemming from the Chicago experience that I think has relevance for the dealing with restoration conflicts in San Francisco.

Suggestions

Plan for restoration in a landscape context

The first of these is to plan for restoration in a landscape context. San Francisco's planning with respect to natural areas seems far ahead of where Chicago was when our controversy broke out: there's a broad policy directive for it in the city's General Plan and Sustainability Plan, and the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan process, while cut short in the development of site specific issues and recommendations, appears to have accomplished a thorough inventory of the 30 sites that it identified. Yet despite the bewildering array of natural areas planning, strategic planning, operations planning, master planning, and district planning that is happening with respect to parks in the city,⁴ there doesn't seem to be a planning initiative that addresses the Natural Areas Program (NAP) within the scope and purposes of the overall mission and activities of the Recreation and Parks Department (RPD). The "majority report" of the Natural Areas Program Citizens Advisory Committee (NAPCAC) calls for a system-wide portfolio plan,⁵ but even this doesn't provide for the examination of how natural areas are to fit within the scope of RPD's other duties and functions. What do the people of San Francisco want from their parks? How should natural areas be balanced and coordinated with other park programs and activities with respect to size, management, funding, staffing, and other considerations?

Although you probably feel planned to death already, I think an overall framework plan could help answer a lot of questions dealing with access and the compatibility of other uses within natural area zones, and reduce the need and ambiguity of having ad hoc and simultaneous planning processes going on for natural areas, dogs, playgrounds, and what-not.⁶ On an even broader scale, the RPD's Natural Areas Program and other programs should also be looked at within the scope of open space activities, opportunities, and constraints that exist within other city departments, on private lands, and through other entities such as Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA).⁷ It's likely that such coordination already is happening, but making it explicit within the context of the city's natural areas planning activities could improve the effectiveness of the overall program.

Design restoration sites with people in mind

A second suggestion is to design restoration sites with people in mind. Although I was trained mainly as a social scientist, my professional home base is in landscape architecture, and thus I can't get through a talk on this subject without underscoring the importance of design and aesthetics in urban restoration projects. Restorationists often do a good job at getting the ecological science right, but in doing so frequently ignore or think it unimportant to implement a project in a way that most people find attractive and appropriate in settings like urban parks. It's no wonder that restoration critics here have

given derogatory nicknames such as “the corral” and “the sandbox” to local projects. One factor I surmised that may have led to the controversy in the Chicago forest preserves was the organizational culture of landscape management there, where those concerned with forestry and restoration issues were housed within a separate division from those who dealt with landscape design. The landscape designers were charged only with tasks involving recreation areas—picnic grounds, trails, and the like—while restoration areas received no attention to how they might look to the public. And while I don’t know what the management structure is like here, I’ll bet it follows a similar formula.

Better design can help reveal the beauty and intent of restorations that might otherwise seem messy and neglected. Landscape architect Robert Ryan’s chapter in our book gives some good tips on designing restoration sites for people, as does work by other landscape architects such as Joan Nassauer and Rob Thayer.⁸ Mowed edges, the planting of showy native perennials and interesting trees or shrubs at key locations, fencing, and other design elements can improve the appearance of restorations and demonstrate signs of care.

Siting and scale are two other design elements that should also be considered in urban restoration projects. While one can’t usually dictate where natural areas should be sited, many significant areas in San Francisco seem to be located on steep hillsides where there are obvious constraints for locating other park activities. Natural separations such as this might be used advantageously to focus more intensive, larger scale restoration activity, especially on sites that are located away from other park activity areas or residential areas. For other more visually sensitive sites or places where there are competing uses, a more appropriate strategy might be to keep restoration activities smaller in scale and more closely tied to the aesthetic and activity characteristics now present. This might mean leaving trees and other existing features that would otherwise be removed in more complete restorations.

Promote “two-way” communication

A third suggestion is to promote “two-way” communication. And as I mentioned in my earlier observations, there’s a lot of information out there related to natural areas planning and issues related to the conflict, with much of it accessible with the click of a mouse. But how much real listening is happening between the stakeholders involved? As an outsider trying to understand the issues and process, depending on what I read and who I talk to I alternately see the situation as polarized and intractable or not that far apart and with people willing to move toward a resolution. The two NAPCAC reports, for example, I think each have substantial merit to them, as do the two methods they advocate for moving contentious issues through to resolution.⁹ I’m not qualified to judge whether a mediated process is better than a program review committee, although it seems that each could be useful in certain aspects of resolution.

Scott McCreary, Principal of CONCUR, Inc., a Berkeley-based group that specializes in negotiating complex, multi-party natural resource and environmental disputes, advocates a stepwise process to determine what types of participatory models are suited to building effective agreements in different situations. He’s found that mediation and an advisory

group process he calls “joint fact-finding” can be an effective combination when deployed at different stages of dispute resolutions. It’s a process suited to the scale and complexity at issue here in San Francisco, and thus might be worth checking out.¹⁰ But whatever course is taken, people have to be motivated to work together to arrive at common ground.

And like the restorations that are the focus of this debate, the parties engaged in resolving issues need to realize that the process will continue to evolve over time and thus demand continued communication. I’ve been reading Hal Rothman’s new book on the history of Golden Gate National Recreation Area,¹¹ and see that the debate over dogs there goes back at least 25 years. I’ve also read Terence Young’s fine book on the building of Golden Gate Park, where he shows that the debate over tree cutting in that park goes back to 1886, and with the Sierra Club as recently as 1996 arguing “not to remove any trees unless it’s essential.”¹² So those of you who are committed to your local parks be prepared to stick with this until old age.

Work toward the integration of values

One last suggestion from our book that I’d like to highlight relates directly to the dialogue over dispute resolution that I just talked about, and that’s while much of the debate here seems to be focused on specific issues about what species of plant or animal is being replaced with what other species, or which area is being restricted to which set of uses for how long, there seems to be little recognition of the values underlying these issues.¹³ In my observations in San Francisco thus far I’m finding that restoration “opponents” and “proponents” have more in common than one might think. Both share a strong concern for the protection of nature, and even the most vocal opponents have an appreciation for biologically diverse ecosystems and the need for some types of management.

The values people hold for nature are diverse, they sometimes interact in strange ways, and they may not always be compatible. This may especially be true in urban settings like San Francisco, where the population is culturally diverse and where natural areas take on special importance because they are limited in extent. Some restorationists argue that biodiversity is a “higher” value and therefore should receive higher priority in public land management, while those who view restoration critically feel that removing trees to promote biodiversity is no less arbitrary than preserving trees to maintain air quality. Those who live near parks with natural areas often feel they should have a greater say in how those places should be managed, while others feel that San Francisco natural areas go beyond neighborhood significance and thus should be managed as part of a system-wide strategy. Instead of arguing whose values are better or more salient, perhaps a more constructive way to proceed is to respect the legitimacy of these multiple values and attachments and work together in order to achieve the common goal of protecting nature.

Yet more suggestions

This of course is a task easier said than done, and in this second part of my talk I’d like to throw out another set of suggestions that go beyond the ones I just recycled from our

book, ones that address how the discourse here in San Francisco might be refocused toward the integration of multiple values and bring together the multiple constituencies for nature and open space in the city. These suggestions are more speculative and open to debate, and I hope they'll generate questions and discussion here tonight.

Appreciating diversity

Restoration is in many ways about the appreciation of diversity, and it's the appreciation of native diversity that move people like Jake Sigg to spend countless hours focused on protecting the flora and fauna that are a part of San Francisco's heritage. Yet restorationists (here and elsewhere) have been accused of being ecofacists on a crusade of ethnic cleansing. And while as I said last time it's unfortunate that the language and practices of restoration activities lend themselves to drawing false comparisons to human populations,¹⁴ I can't also help but feel there's a grain of truth to charges of the uncompromising, dictatorial positions that some restorationists take with respect to introduced species.

As a graduate student in landscape architecture at the University of Wisconsin, one of the few non social science courses I took was a summer field course on native plant communities. Our instructor would routinely take us on hikes throughout the state, distinguishing the "goood" plants from the "baaad" plants. After two weeks of touring I gained a heightened appreciation for the native diversity of bogs, oak savannas, and other plant communities, but I couldn't help but feel a little sorry for the uniformly bad rap some introduced species had gotten. My brother-in-law represents the Wisconsin Nurserymen's Association in that state's invasive species task force, and has told me of similar feelings he's gotten arguing to keep various non-aggressive introduced varieties of trees and shrubs off the list of banned plants, which seem to have been placed there for no other reason than guilt-by-association.

While it's true that some introduced species do have aggressive habits and can lessen the overall diversity of plant communities, does appreciating native diversity as a "good" value mean that we have to label as bad all that is non-native? In the Chicago restoration conflict, some birders split from the restoration camp to criticize the wholesale removal of European Buckthorn from forest preserve sites, for in its absence there was little if any mid-story nesting and cover habitat for several native bird species. Some restorationists now advocate a program of gradual removal of buckthorn and replacement with native shrubs such as hazelnut to avoid such impacts.¹⁵ A similar type of relationship has been cited here between the introduced Sweet Fennel plant and the native Anise Swallowtail butterfly.

It seems that if we focus on the overall diversity of natural areas and on what functions for particular species of interest, the goals of urban restoration programs could be met in a more inclusive way that emphasizes the good and de-emphasizes the bad connotations inherent in restoration concepts and practices.

I think this same idea of appreciating diversity might be applied to issues of human diversity in the urban restoration experience. My family, who has stayed back in Chicago

while I'm here at Berkeley this semester, came to celebrate a Valentine's Day weekend with me in San Francisco, where we unexpectedly witnessed the historic first weekend of same-sex marriages. Over the following days and weeks as I studied the restoration conflict here while gay marriage dominated the local and national news, I couldn't help but think about the two issues together. On one hand I saw a city renowned for embracing cultural diversity further expanding the frontiers of inclusiveness, while on the other hand I saw a divided group of people who in the main could all be called environmentalists, yet were intolerant of each other's diversity of viewpoints.

While some civil rights leaders have been resistant to associating same-sex marriages with the civil rights struggle, the historic progression of thought about both issues seems to be following similar pathways. With civil rights, we as a nation are moving from racial segregation and intolerance to concepts of tolerance, acceptance, and finally, appreciation. As a resident of a diverse Chicago neighborhood and as a federal worker who's been through a number of civil rights and workforce diversity training sessions, the implications of this progression are clear—appreciating diversity in our lives and workplaces can enrich our experience as human beings, help us arrive at new and creative ways of looking at things, and lead to more effective and long-lasting solutions to problems.

I think these same benefits could accrue to natural areas management by appreciating human diversity as well as the diversity that exists in our landscapes. But how can we infuse this same progression of thought into a situation that is still largely stuck in the "intolerant" phase? Methods of facilitated dialogue and joint fact finding as I've mentioned earlier might help break down some of the preconceptions and mutual mistrust that now exist, and while it may never get to the point where stakeholders will appreciate the sight of dogs frolicking on a hillside blossoming with wildflowers under a stand of girdled eucalyptus trees, there is a good chance that open-minded and sincerely motivated people can come to tolerate each other's views and work toward mutually acceptable directions.

Seeing urban restorations as "middle landscapes"

My next suggestion borrows ideas that others have discussed in relation to rural landscapes and designed parks and applies them to the urban restoration experience. In his often-cited 1964 book, The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America, Historian Leo Marx describes Americans' landscape preferences as oriented toward the "middle landscape," that is "a middle state between primitive nature and an over-refined civilization." More recently, garden essayist Michael Pollan has used the concept of middle landscape to argue for protecting traditional farm fields from succession by second growth forests in New England, and environmental historian Bill Cronon has used it to argue against the removal of cultural mining and farming artifacts from the newly designated Apostle Islands wilderness in Wisconsin.¹⁶

Pollan sees the middle landscape as a place "where humans and nature reach some sort of accommodation," where wild nature is shaped to reflect the human ideals and uses of landscape, an in-between or hybrid nature that provides both ecological and human

habitat. In urban areas, there is often a great deal of ambiguity about how restoration should proceed: pre-European settlement conditions are often sketchy or unknown; historical land use activities have changed environmental conditions such as soil structure and chemical composition; and contemporary fragmentation and adjacent land uses place severe constraints on how well a restoration can be done or maintained by management. This leaves the traditional concept of “authenticity” as a primary restoration goal very much open to question. On the other hand, the concept of middle landscape seems one that is well suited to the urban restoration experience, especially for some areas where there are conflicts over how areas are currently being used, or that existing trees and other plants don’t conform to the traditional restoration prescription but nonetheless remain highly valued by some people. Stewardship of the landscape would allow for control of aggressive plants to attain ecological goals for the protection of favored plant and animal species, but while aiming for ecological function, the structure of the landscape might take on a different look and feel than a restoration where authenticity was of central concern.

More than a century ago, Midwestern landscape architects such as Jens Jensen and Ossian Simonds pioneered a new paradigm of naturalistic park design inspired by the regional landscape mosaic of prairie, savanna, and woodland.¹⁷ But while these “prairie style” designs used primarily native plant palettes to emulate the structural qualities of the native landscape, they were human creations intended foremost for aesthetic appreciation and passive recreational use. Deviating from his own prairie style philosophy, Jensen sometimes included favorite non-native plants such as lilac trees in his designs, stating that some plants have such close ties to people that they might be regarded as “pets” to be included as companions in the landscape. These park creations, with their eccentricities and accommodations for both people and nature, could also be called middle landscapes, and might serve as historical models for contemporary urban park restoration efforts.

Implementing restoration projects on “green time”

In a chapter in Restoring Nature, I wrote about Montrose Point in Chicago’s Lincoln Park, where ecological restorationists, birders, historic preservationists, and other stakeholders worked to negotiate a hybrid restoration that blended contemporary ecological, habitat, and recreation concerns into a prairie-style site design through a participatory process that may be a good example for stakeholders here in San Francisco to look at.¹⁸

One of the main points of conflict was between historic preservationists, who wanted to restore a key scenic vista on the land, and birders, who wanted to retain a hedgerow of dying, non-native honeysuckle that lay smack dab in the middle of the scenic vista. The hedgerow, you see, for years had been the only noteworthy vegetation feature on the point, and as such had become a magnet for many species of birds migrating along the lakefront, so much so that birders named it “the Magic Hedge.” No matter to the birders that the restoration design for Montrose Point would in effect create the equivalent of ten new magic hedges around the point; their original Magic Hedge had attained an iconic, even sacred, status.

The birders prevailed, and today the Magic Hedge remains as one of many deviations from the pure design that each of the stakeholder groups had originally envisioned. For the historic preservationists, the prairie style design for the site had never been fully realized since it was first proposed in 1938, so what was the rush to achieve this detail now? Perhaps in 10, 20, or more years the importance of the Magic Hedge would fade, and with it the memories of its symbolic status.

Time will tell whether this historic preservationist strategy will prove correct, but patience might be a virtue in dealing with landscapes as well as with people. Bob Grese, a friend and landscape historian who teaches at the University of Michigan, has grouched about how homeowners frequently expect instant landscapes when they move into a newly built home, and spend lots of money planting big trees and shrubs that not only face a lessened chance of survival compared with smaller plants, but cut short the human experience of watching the landscape evolve.

The reason why I tell these stories is because I think they hold an important lesson for how we implement restoration projects on the land. Ecological restorationists might benefit from a similar learning experience, appreciating the constraints and opportunities of dealing with features they feel are discordant but provide benefits to other people, wildlife, or have their own intrinsic value. In some cases this may not be possible if certain species of interest are in imminent danger, but in other cases will it really matter if some large trees or other valued plants and animals are allowed to live out their natural lives?

In an essay on environmental themes in J.R.R. Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*, environmental philosopher Andrew Light talks about the concept of "green time" in reference to the ents, Tom Bombadil and other "primordial inhabitants" of Middle-earth. Compared with the other characters in the story, they seem to operate on a different time scale, one that's more in tune with the rhythms of the natural world.¹⁹ Perhaps we, too, could benefit by thinking of restoration on a slower time scale than the instant landscape we sometimes expect to create.

In some ways, green time is embodied in some of the principles we've come to call adaptive management; certainly the maxim of "go slow if you don't know." In other ways, however, it gives space and respect to that which exists in the here and now, while continuing to set goals and plan for desired future conditions. Some restorationists in Chicago have found this strategy working to their benefit, although they wouldn't call it that. Experiments where prairie seed was simply raked into the existing sod versus those where the soil bed was cleared then seeded showed that while the raking method took longer for results to appear, the overall long-term diversity of species present was higher and more like the distribution found in natural prairies.²⁰ While "experiments" often carry a negative connotation to public groups, who have come to expect definitive answers from land managers and scientists, the notion of introducing gradual change over time may be one that would find acceptance from both camps.

Building community for urban nature

My final suggestion relates to the building of community for urban nature. One of the hallmarks of the landscape architecture department where I teach at UC-Berkeley is its emphasis on community planning and participation—Marcia McNally, Randy Hester, and Clare Cooper Marcus (emerita) are a few of the folks there that have established national and international reputations for their work in this area.²¹ But this type of planning, where a group of residents who share a common geographic concern work together to establish mutual goals and directions, seems to have fallen out of favor in many places as our ideas of community evolve. Increasingly, the communities that drive change seem to be less place-based and more issue- or philosophy-based, and San Francisco I think is a good example of this. As I mentioned last time, there seems to be a group and associated web site for every stakeholder interest, and these are often tightly defined with respect to the issues and position they stand for. While this has in many cases given power and representation to a broader cross-section of individuals, it has also tended to promote a fractionated and “react first, think later” pattern of response that can heighten conflict rather than working through it as a place-based community might be forced to do.

In Chicago, issues of process—over how restoration took place and who was included in decision making—may help explain why conflicts over restoration reached the level they did. Restorationists in the Chicago area often talk about themselves as a community, but while their concern is place-based, as a community representing the whole of interests in forest preserve management issues they seem rather narrowly defined. Moreover, it’s been said that leadership within the restoration community is fairly centralized and dominated by a small group of individuals with particular ideas on how things should be managed. This tends to promote a uniformity of thought, for those who have a diversity of opinion often end up leaving the group or are closed out of the decision making process. This kind of “self-pruning” can build effective consensus within a community, but at the cost of shutting out broader views and the benefits of diversity that I mentioned earlier.²² It can also lead to getting blind-sighted, which is how restorationists felt when the controversy broke loose and a moratorium was placed on their activities in the forest preserves.

I found out recently this scenario has a technical term, as it’s a well-known phenomenon in military and political communities. It’s called “incestuous amplification,” which is defined by Jane's Defense Weekly as "a condition in warfare where one only listens to those who are already in lock-step agreement, reinforcing set beliefs and creating a situation ripe for miscalculation."

Whether such a scenario has or will play out in San Francisco I can’t say, but the community of those concerned about urban nature, both issue- and place-based versions of it, seems to have become a factionalized set of special interests fighting for narrowly defined single issues rather than looking toward the greater good. Is it possible to re-connect these factions into a broader coalition, a community for urban nature? With

tighter park budgets, a finite amount of park space, and increasing demands for activities and programs, I think that to be effective over the long run it's not only the right thing to do, it's necessary for survival. Will review panels help? Mediation? Group therapy? I think that anything that gets people looking for common ground, understanding each others' view, dropping their guard, and looking for solutions is a step in the right direction.

So there you have my first and likely last invited Earth Day talk. Thank you for sitting through my ramblings and anecdotes, and I'd be happy to entertain any questions or discussion.

Endnotes

¹ Nelson, G. no date. How the first Earth Day came about. <http://earthday.envirolink.org/history.html>, Accessed 4-30-04.

² Gobster, P.H., and Hull, R.B., Editors. 2000. Restoring Nature: Perspectives from the Social Science and Humanities. Washington, DC: Island Press. For related work, also see: Gobster, P.H. 1997. The Chicago Wilderness and its Critics. III. The Other Side- A Survey of the Arguments. Restoration & Management Notes 15(1): 32-37; Gobster, P.H. and Hull, R.B. 2001. Restoring Nature: Continuing the Conversation. Ecological Restoration 19(4): 225-226; Hull, R.B., and Gobster, P.H. 2000. Restoring Forest Ecosystems: The Human Dimension. Journal of Forestry 98(8): 32-36.

³ Gobster, P.H. 2004. Urban Park Restoration: Understanding the Ties between People and Place. Unpublished keynote talk presented at the 5th Biennial San Francisco Ecological Restoration Conference, Randall Museum, San Francisco, CA, April 3, 2004. Copy of text available from the author.

⁴ Some of the key planning documents referred to include: San Francisco General Plan, Recreation and Open Space Element Policy 2.13: Preserve and protect significant natural resource areas (1991); The Sustainability Plan for the City of San Francisco (1996); Assessment Study 1998-1999: Findings and Recommendations (1999); 2000 Capital Plan; Strategic Plan (2002). Many of these are available on the website of the City and County of San Francisco's Recreation and Park Department (RPD), http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_index.asp. Master planning is also an important activity as applied to individual parks. See, for example: Royston Hanamoto Alley & Abey with DKS Associates ... [et al.]. 1995. Golden Gate Park Master Plan. San Francisco: San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. Finally, district park planning is an activity happening in collaboration with RPD and the non-profit Neighborhood Parks Council. See <http://www.sfneighborhoodparks.org/dpp/index.html>.

⁵ At the time of this writing, resolution of conflicts between stakeholder groups is awaiting the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisor's (BOS) decision on the recommendations of NAPCAC, a committee of environmental, recreation, and at-large members appointed by the Board (10 seats) and RPD (2 seats) in December 2002 to resolve issues of planning, process, and implementation of RPD's Natural Areas Program (NAP) identified in BOS resolution 653-02 (September 24, 2002). NAPCAC's 1-year mission was to review these issues and develop a management plan. The committee, whose members were to be selected to provide a balance in stakeholder group interests, has been characterized by NAP proponents as dominated by off-leash dog interests. Thus when the NAPCAC management plan was delivered to the BOS in November 2003, it was followed a month later by a "minority report" plan prepared by those who felt more sympathetic to the NAP. For these and related documents, see: http://sfgov.org/site/recpark_meeting.asp?id=15312.

⁶ Like the name implies, a framework plan establishes a framework or set of guiding principles around which acquisition, design, management and/or program initiatives can be made. One example I am familiar with is the framework plan developed for Lincoln Park, Chicago, that city's largest lakefront park. The plan used a community-driven planning process to take a "comprehensive view of the interrelationships of individual components and systems within the park. The Framework Plan provides an assessment of the impact of each proposed change before any commitments are made, resulting in a more efficient and effective use of limited resources." Chicago Park District and Lincoln Park Steering Committee. 1995. Lincoln Park Framework Plan: A Plan for Restoration and Management. Chicago: Chicago Park District and Lincoln Park Steering Committee.

⁷ While RPD holds approximately 3,000 acres of land within the 49 sq. mi. city and county of San Francisco, the National Park Service's Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) also has significant holdings there. RPD, GGNRA, and other entities also have significant holdings in adjacent San Mateo and Marin counties. Evolving policies for natural areas restoration and off-leash dogs within the GGNRA, in particular at sites such as Ft. Funston and Ocean Beach within the city-county limits, have also been identified as partly responsible for the conflict between stakeholder groups.

⁸ See Ryan, R.L. 2000. A People-Centered Approach to Designing and Managing Restoration Projects: Insights from Understanding Attachment to Urban Natural Areas. In: Restoring Nature (note 2), pp. 209-228. See also Nassauer, J.I. 1988. The aesthetics of horticulture: Neatness as a form of care. HortScience, 23(6), 973-977; Nassauer, J.I. 1995. Messy Ecosystems, Orderly Frames. Landscape Journal 14(2): 161-170; Nassauer, J.I. 1993. Ecological Function and the Perception of Suburban Residential Landscapes. In P.H. Gobster (Ed.), Managing Urban and High Use Recreation Settings (General Technical Report NC-163, pp. 55-60). St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station; Thayer, R., Jr. 1989. The Experience of Sustainable Landscapes. Landscape Journal 8(2): 101-110.

⁹ The original NAPCAC ("majority") report called for a Natural Areas Program Review Committee composed of 12 BOS-appointed citizens with science, city-wide, and local park advocacy credentials plus the NAP director who would serve in an ex-officio capacity. The minority report called for a three-step process of mediated conflict, independent scientific review, and community review. See web link, note 5.

¹⁰ McCreary, S. T.; Gamman, J. K.; Brooks, B. 2001. Refining and Testing Joint Fact-Finding for Environmental Dispute Resolution: Ten Years of Success. Mediation Quarterly 18(4): 329-348. See also <http://www.concurinc.com/>

¹¹ Rothman, H.K. 2004. The New Urban Park: Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Civic Environmentalism. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

¹² Young, T. 2004. Building San Francisco's Parks, 1850-1930. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press; Kay, J. 1997. Plan to Cut Tallest Park Trees Comes under Fire: Sierra Club Tries to Save 21 Set to Fall in Golden Gate Park. San Francisco Examiner December 4, 1997, p. A-1.

¹³ Restoring Nature, note 2.

¹⁴ The so-called "Nazi connection" linking contemporary efforts at native plant community restoration to xenophobia and earlier efforts of German landscape architects working under National Socialism became a lively topic of academic debate about a decade ago. See, for example, Groening, G., and Wolschke-Bulmahn, J. 1992. Some Notes on the Mania for Native Plants in Germany. Landscape Journal 11: 116-126; Sorvig, K. 1994. Natives and Nazis: An Imaginary Conspiracy in Ecological Design. Landscape Journal 13(1): 58-61. While the dimensions of this debate have largely been exhausted by academicians, its sensitive and controversial nature lends itself well to use in public forums and by the media. For example, in the San Francisco conflict, BOS Leland Yee (now on the State Assembly), wrote an often-cited editorial in a community newspaper in 2002 drawing this parallel: "Plants and trees without the proper papers to show their pre-Mayflower lineage are called 'invasive exotics' and are wrenched from the soil to die. How many of us are 'invasive exotics' who have taken root in the San Francisco soil, have thrived and

flourished?" (quoted in Brown, P.L. 2003. *By the Bay, Old Dunes Vie With Exotic Trees*. New York Times, May 6, 2003).

In a forthcoming paper on the aesthetics of ecological restorations, UC-Berkeley landscape historian Louise Mozingo sees the current debate over native plant community restoration in the U.S. as one rooted in disagreement over the definition of what is natural. If there is an ideological basis behind restorationists' defining nature only as that which existed prior to European settlement, Mozingo feels it is one "enmeshed in liberal politics and the condemnation of the Western imperialism that destroyed the imagined prelapsarian idyll of Native America." This ideology seems much more plausible to me (particularly in liberal San Francisco), and contrary to one based on xenophobia. See Mozingo, L.A. in press. *Constructing Ecologies: Nature, Aesthetics, Sites and Systems*. In France, R. (Ed.), Healing Natures, Repairing Relationships: New Voices on Restoring Ecological Spaces and Consciousness. Cambridge: MIT Press.

This should not discount, however, the impact that the rhetoric of restoration might have on those from ethnic minority groups, especially in San Francisco with its large population of Asian Americans as well as Hispanic and African American residents. In his role as a BOS, Yee was one of the chief critics of the Natural Areas Program and authored the BOS resolution to establish the NAPCAC discussed in note 8, and while he likely had multiple issues with the program, he is also a Chinese American representing a city with a notorious legacy of discrimination toward that group. Two individuals of Asian descent that I interviewed during my research in San Francisco, one a critic and the other a proponent of restoration, said they feel the same kind of hurt expressed by Yee when restorationists speak disparagingly about introduced species. Clearly we need a better language to talk about these issues.

¹⁵ See for example, Bowles, M. 1996. What are we trying to restore? A primer on the Northeastern Illinois landscape. In: Managing public lands for biodiversity protection: A forum on ecological restoration in Northeastern Illinois, October 9, 1996. Chicago, IL: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.

¹⁶ For information on the middle landscape, see Marx, L. 1964. The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Idea of Nature. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Pollan, M. 1998. Preserving a View: Should People 'Garden' a Nature Area in Order to Retain a Farm Look? New York Times New Service, April 25, 1998; Pollan, M. 1994. Against Nativism. New York Times May 15, 1994, Sec. 6, p. 52; Pollan, M. 1991. *Second Nature: A Gardener's Education*. New York: Dell; Cronon, W. 2003. *The Riddle of the Apostle Islands: How do you Manage a Wilderness Full of Human Stories?* Orion, May-June.

¹⁷ Grese, R.E. 1992. Jens Jensen: Maker of Parks and Gardens. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; Simonds, O.C. 1920/2000. Landscape-Gardening (with an Introduction by Robert Grese). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

¹⁸ Gobster, P.H., and Barro, S.C. 2000. Negotiating Nature: Making Restoration Happen in an Urban Park Context. In Restoring Nature, note 2.

¹⁹ Light, A. 2003. Tolkien's Green Time: Environmental Themes in The Lord of the Ring. In Bassham, G., and Bronson, E. (Eds.) The Lord of the Rings and Philosophy. Chicago: Open Court, pp. 150-163.

²⁰ Packard, S. 1997. Interseeding. In Packard, S., and Mutel, C.F. (Eds.), The Tallgrass Restoration Handbook: For Prairies, Savannas, and Woodlands. Covelo, CA: Island Press, pp. 163-192.

²¹ See, for example, Hester, R.T. 1975. Neighborhood Space. Stroudsburg, PA: Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross; Hester, R.T. 1990. Community Design Primer. Mendocino, CA: Ridge Times.

²² William R. Jordan III, personal communication. For an in-depth discussion on the benefits and challenges of community in an ecological restoration context, see Jordan, W.R. 2003. The Sunflower Forest: Ecological Restoration and the New Communion with Nature. Berkeley: University of California Press.