



**AN INVENTORY OF CONSERVATION
DISTRICTS' URBAN AND COMMUNITY
CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES
APRIL 2008**

Prepared by the
National Association of Conservation Districts
with support from the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February 2007, the NACD Board of Directors adopted a national strategy to guide the Association in helping member districts address the challenges of natural resource management on developed and developing lands, including the emerging clientele of new landowners. The Strategy was based on first gathering a 'snapshot' of what conservation districts and their partners across the nation are currently doing in developed and developing areas including their work with new landowners, and what they need in order to be successful. A key goal was to learn what resource materials and tools districts are now being used, and what more they would find useful.

An inventory form was created and distributed to all conservation district offices. Members had from early October 2007 through mid-December 2007 to complete and submit it. A total of 767 districts from 46 states and two territories responded to the Inventory, giving a statistically supportive response of 26%.

The Inventory responses indicate that districts are active in all realms of urban and community conservation, especially soils management, water quality, and small acreage/farmland protection. Most work with individual homeowners, municipal offices/departments, developers/contractors, planning/zoning boards and homeowner associations.

They rely on technical resources from NRCS such as the Web Soil Survey, Electronic Field Office Technical Guide and National Conservation Practice Standards as well as EPA and state resources. They expect NRCS to maintain its leadership in technical standards and specifications, and want to see more made available for urban and community areas. They also want technical training and certification, funding and cost-share, staffing and equipment, information exchange, state and federal authority changes, state and national leadership, expanded partnering, visibility, and resource tools. Districts' activities in these areas are funded primarily by state and county government, product sales and fees for services.

The occupations of district board members have broadened, with 52% farming/ranching, 9% retired, 9% business owner/manager, and the rest spread throughout other professions. This is compared to 90% farmers/ranchers in 1967 and 71% in 1973.

District staffing has also expanded from primarily clerical/administrative to resource conservationist/technician, manager/administrator/director, and other professional positions. A small portion are certified in a variety of areas.

The NACD Urban and Community Resource Policy Group compared the data and findings with the National Strategy. They made recommendations for the highest priority actions, including developing public awareness materials for districts; providing information exchange through the website, publications and NACD meetings; organizing training and certification opportunities for district employees; seeking needed technical assistance; and working with NRCS to update the FOTG.

BACKGROUND

In February 2007, the NACD Board of Directors adopted a national strategy to guide the Association in helping member districts address the challenges of natural resource management on developed and developing lands, including the emerging clientele of new landowners. This strategy was designed and presented to the Board by the NACD Urban, Community and Coastal Resources (UC&CR) Committee in response to a charge from the NACD Officers.

The Urban, Community and Coastal Conservation (U&CC) Strategy recommends actions under each of NACD's Strategic Goals: Public Awareness and Public Relations; Support for State Association and Conservation District Members; and Grassroots Advocacy. It calls for increasing district visibility in urban, community and coastal areas; strengthening district capabilities and funding; and showcasing and networking districts' work on water quality/quantity, urban-rural interface, and coastal/estuarine resource issues. It also calls for 'stepping up' districts' support of NACD's efforts to increase conservation technical assistance funds along with obtaining technical and financial resources through other sources.

While discussing many proposed actions for the Strategy, the UC&CR Committee members frequently questioned whether or not they were on target with districts today, particularly what services they are providing and what resources and tools they want. This consistently asked question underscored the need for a more current and accurate understanding of districts' U&CC activities and expectations.

PURPOSE

As a result, the entire Strategy was based on first gathering a 'snapshot' of what conservation districts and their partners are currently doing in developed and developing areas including their work with new landowners, and what they need in order to be successful. A key goal was to learn what resource materials and tools districts are now being used, and what more they would find useful. It was agreed the information would be gathered through a local level inventory. Every district in the nation would be invited and encouraged to participate.

KEY FINDINGS

A total of 767 districts responded to the Inventory, giving a statistically supportive response of 26%. The data and written input can be summarized into a number of key findings about conservation districts as follows.

- They and their partners are involved in many aspects of natural resource management in urban and community areas, with over 50% doing soil interpretation/protection, urban erosion/sediment control, tree planting/management, wildlife habitat protection, stream restoration, farmland/open space preservation, invasive species management, stormwater management, and small acreage farming.

- Their customer base has expanded from primarily farmers and ranchers to also include individual homeowners (including new landowners), municipal offices and departments, developers and contractors, planning and zoning boards, and homeowner and lake associations.
- They rely extensively on NRCS technical resources for their work in urban and community areas, especially NRCS Web Soil Survey, eFOTG, and the National Conservation Practice Standards. Districts expect NRCS to strengthen its technical resources to ensure their value and acceptance by state and municipal professionals.
- In lieu of adequate NRCS technical materials for urban and community areas, they are seeking resources from other agencies such as EPA and/or developing their own.
- They are using higher levels of technology and expect access to state and federal data resources as well as easy-to-use technical tools.
- They use a wide array of partnerships, and seek to further expand relationships with federal agencies and national organizations.
- They want easy-to-access publications and materials to share with urban and community decision-makers and citizens.
- They want information exchange opportunities, especially easy-to-access examples of what other districts are doing in urban and community areas.
- They need more authorities, resources, and funding to adequately address the resource concerns. Their current primary funding sources for urban and community conservation are state and county government, followed by product sales and service fees.
- A little over 50% of the board members are farmers/ranchers and the rest come from a variety of occupations.
- They employ many more managerial and technical employees. A small percentage, though, are certified for urban and community conservation work.
- They want their employees to be technically skilled and certified in conservation practices, e.g. erosion control, stormwater management, LID, as well as in current technology e.g. GIS, CAD, GPS, and more.
- They want NACD to provide more leadership in encouraging all districts to address urban and community conservation issues, all state associations to support them, and federal agencies, especially NRCS, to provide assistance.

DEVELOPMENT

The Inventory form was created over a several month period by UC&CR Committee members and staff. It was designed to be brief enough to draw participation, yet provide adequate detail for follow-up action. It requested information on resource issues and district activities; customers; resource materials/tools/funding used and needed; funding sources; district board members' professions; district staff positions and certification/training.

The majority of the form asked for simple input through check-off, with several categories allowing for more detail through written comments. An Adobe program was used to allow members to complete the form electronically and have the data compiled automatically. As an alternative response method, a fax number was provided. Those inventories, approximately 10-15%, were input by NACD staff.

The draft form was reviewed by UC&CR Committee members and advisors, NACD staff and contractors, and NACD Officers. It was then tested on selected districts in nine states: MD, NJ, PA, VA, MN, MO, NM, ID, NV. Revisions were made based on the pilot participants' input.

The initial distribution of the inventory form was done through state associations. An email was sent to state association executive directors and contacts on October 2, 2007. It asked that the association forward the request and attached inventory form to all district offices in their state. The inventory form was then posted on the NACD website and regular reminders were included in the NACD eNotes, a weekly electronic newsletter, and NACD News & Views, a bimonthly print publication.

Originally, responses were going to be accepted until November 14, 2007, which provided a six-week period. Due to initial complications with the Adobe program compilation, the response time was extended until December 14, 2007.

RESPONSES

In the final compilation, 767 conservation districts from 46 states, District of Columbia, and Guam submitted completed inventories. Members in Rhode Island, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada failed to respond. The chart below shows the number of districts in each state and territory, the number that responded, and thus the percentage of the state, organized by NACD regions.

State	Total CDs	Responses	Percent
Northeastern Region			
Connecticut	5	4	80%
Delaware	3	3	100%
District of Columbia	1	1	100%
Maine	16	11	69%

Maryland	24	11	46%
Massachusetts	14	4	29%
New Hampshire	10	3	30%
New Jersey	15	11	73%
New York	59	30	51%
Pennsylvania	66	30	45%
Rhode Island	3	0	0%
Vermont	13	5	38%
West Virginia	14	8	57%
<i>Region Total</i>	<i>243</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>50%</i>
Southeastern Region			
Alabama	68	17	25%
Florida	63	15	24%
Georgia	41	15	37%
Kentucky	123	45	37%
Mississippi	82	27	33%
North Carolina	97	28	29%
Puerto Rico	17	0	0%
South Carolina	46	20	43%
Tennessee	94	4	4%
Virginia	47	10	21%
Virgin Islands	2	0	0%
<i>Region Total</i>	<i>680</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>27%</i>
North Central Region			
Illinois	98	41	42%
Indiana	92	38	41%
Iowa	100	6	6%
Michigan	79	5	6%
Minnesota	91	39	43%
Missouri	115	25	22%
Ohio	88	31	35%
Wisconsin	72	14	19%
<i>Region Total</i>	<i>735</i>	<i>199</i>	<i>27%</i>
Northern Plains Region			
Kansas	105	42	40%
Montana	58	5	9%
Nebraska	23	11	48%
North Dakota	56	2	4%
South Dakota	69	17	25%
<i>Region Total</i>	<i>311</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>25%</i>

South Central Region			
Arkansas	76	11	14%
Louisiana	44	29	66%
Oklahoma	88	1	1%
Texas	218	54	25%
<i>Region Total</i>	426	95	22%
Southwestern Region			
Arizona	41	0	0%
Colorado	77	8	10%
Nevada	31	0	0%
New Mexico	49	6	12%
Utah	40	0	0%
Wyoming	34	17	50%
<i>Region Total</i>	272	31	11%
Pacific Region			
Alaska	11	2	18%
California	99	10	10%
Hawaii	17	4	24%
Idaho	51	28	55%
Oregon	45	4	9%
Pacific Basin*	1	1	100%
Washington	46	14	30%
<i>Region Total</i>	270	63	23%
NATIONAL TOTAL	2937	767	26%

* NOTE: Separated into five entities at the NACD February 2008 Annual Meeting, after Inventory was completed: Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Republic of Palau, Federated States of Micronesia, and American Samoa.

According to Custom Insight, a company that provides web-based survey software, tools, and assessments, a good rule of thumb in surveys is to aim for 95% confidence with a 5% error level. These results provide a 95% confidence with a 3% error level.

RESULTS

Resource Issues and District Activities

The first set of information that districts were asked to provide is which of the following natural resource issues they are addressing in urban and community areas: air quality; coastal management; land reclamation and restoration; resource planning and growth management; transportation; urban forestry and green infrastructure; urban-rural interface; urban-wildland interface; waste management; and water quality and quantity. They were also asked to indicate which services they provide under each issue. The chart below lists both the issues and activities along with the number and percentage of districts that noted them. These are shown in order of greatest participation to least.

RESOURCE ISSUE	DISTRICT ACTIVITY	#	%
RESOURCE PLANNING	Soil Interpretation/Soil Protection	528	68.8%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Urban Erosion and Sediment Control	484	63.1%
URBAN FORESTRY	Tree Planting and Management	461	60.1%
URB-WILD INTERFACE	Wildlife Habitat Protection	448	58.4%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Stream Restoration	436	56.8%
URB-RUR INTERFACE	Farmland and Open Space Preservation	410	53.5%
RECLAMATION	Invasive Species Management	400	52.2%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Stormwater Management	392	51.1%
URB-RUR INTERFACE	Small Acreage Farming	386	50.3%
RESOURCE PLANNING	Planning/Zoning/Ordinance Guidance	365	47.6%
RESOURCE PLANNING	Community Collaboration/Planning	363	47.3%
RESOURCE PLANNING	Conservation Easement Management	295	38.5%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Floodplain Management	281	36.6%
WASTE MANAGEMENT	Recycling	275	35.9%
AIR QUALITY	Wind Erosion Control	242	31.6%
COASTAL	Wetland Protection	242	31.6%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Urban Water Conservation	239	31.2%
AIR QUALITY	Agricultural Odor	230	30.0%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Urban Chemical/Pesticide/Nutrient Use	215	28.0%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Low Impact Development	203	26.5%
URBAN FORESTRY	Community Collaboration/Planning	202	26.3%
RECLAMATION	Natural Disaster Emergency Planning	172	22.4%
TRANSPORTATION	Alternative Fuels	165	21.5%
URB-RUR INTERFACE	Watershed Dam Rehabilitation	163	21.3%
URB-WILD INTERFACE	Wildfire Prevention	156	20.3%
WASTE MANAGEMENT	Household Hazardous Waste Collection	140	18.3%
TRANSPORTATION	Alternative Modes	128	16.7%
COASTAL	Beach/Shore/Bank Stabilization	121	15.8%
URB-WILD INTERFACE	Wildfire Area Rehabilitation	112	14.6%
WATER QUAL & QUANTITY	Other	76	9.9%
WASTE MANAGEMENT	Green Waste Recycling/Disposal	74	9.6%
COASTAL	Marine/Estuary Habitat Protection	56	7.3%
RECLAMATION	Brownfield or Greyfield	48	6.3%
WASTE MANAGEMENT	Other	44	5.7%
RECLAMATION	Other	40	5.2%
URBAN FORESTRY	Other	31	4.0%
RESOURCE PLANNING	Other	29	3.8%
AIR QUALITY	Other	27	3.5%
URB-RUR INTERFACE	Other	26	3.4%
URB-WILD INTERFACE	Other	24	3.1%
COASTAL	Other	18	2.3%
TRANSPORTATION	Other	12	1.6%

Written comments were shared under the Other categories, providing more specific information as shown in the sampling below.

- Air Quality - agricultural and forest slash burning, auto and commercial emissions, construction and agricultural wind erosion and dust control, pesticide drift
- Coastal Management – biodiversity assessment and evaluation, erosion and sediment control, stormwater management, shoreline erosion and stabilization, hurricane protection, invasive plant control, shoreline area flooding
- Land Reclamation and Restoration – abandoned mineland, invasive species, coal mined land, detention basin retrofit, Emergency Watershed Protection, facility reuse and deconstruction, flooding, hazard mitigation planning, oil and gas well pad reclamation, sand and gravel pit reclamation, schoolyard transformation, stream channel restoration, Superfund site, town revitalization planning, wetland restoration, wildfire restoration
- Resource Planning and Growth Management – conservation easement planning and management, county comprehensive plan, drainage problems, farm/forest/open space preservation, federal land management agency plans, natural resource inventories, riparian buffer ordinance, subdivision reviews, sustainability committee
- Transportation – greenway planning, canoe ramp, dirt and gravel road maintenance, ethanol and biodiesel, federal land management transportation plans, railroad projects sediment control, reduction of T bus emissions effects, siting and project review, multiple use trails
- Urban Forestry and Green Infrastructure – assist county parks department with land management, consultation with area forest preserves and parks, fire planning, Forest Stewardship Planning, gypsy moth suppression, hazard tree management, living snow fences, open space/county greenways plan, salt cedar treatment and restoration, tree and shrub sales, urban street tree beautification, native plants in urban landscapes
- Urban-Rural Interface – county land planning, ag-urban connection, buy local initiatives, land trust, small acreage farming/vineyard diversity, urban-ag interface issues, watershed dam rehabilitation and removal,
- Urban-Wildland Interface – backyard habitat establishment and conservation, green space establishment and protection, nuisance wildlife problems, riparian area enhancements, wetland habitat protection, wildlife area rehabilitation
- Waste Management – agricultural plastic recycling, animal waste and nutrient management, clean up projects along the interface, composting, container recycling, watershed clean up, countywide tire clean up, e-waste collection, household non-hazardous waste collection, illegal dumpsite clean up, litter control, pesticide collection and disposal, septic systems, recycling, sludge application, spent mushroom soil recycling, wastewater treatment
- Water Quality and Quantity – 319 projects, aquatic invasives, elimination of fish barriers, groundwater protection, irrigation water management, lake and stream water quality monitoring, drainage maintenance, septic system, rainwater harvesting, riparian restoration, source water protection, springshed protection, urban drainage, water shortage

Customers

Districts were asked to identify who they provided services to in urban and community areas.

CATEGORY	#	%
Individual Homeowners (incl new landowners)	672	88%
Municipal Offices, Departments	544	71%
Developers, Contractors, Etc	518	68%
Planning/Zoning, Etc Boards	484	63%
Homeowner, Lake, Etc Associations	428	56%
Other	85	11%

Additional customers were listed under the Other category, providing more specific information, including: agricultural producers, ALL landowners, anyone who walks through our doors, business community, chamber of commerce, consultants, engineering firms, health department, land trusts, nonprofits, realtors, school districts, tribal offices, watershed associations.

Resource Tools, Materials, Websites, Training, Etc That Are Currently Being Used

District were asked to check off with of the following federal resource tools they are now using, and to write in any that were not listed.

RESOURCE	#	%
NRCS Web Soil Survey	627	82%
Electronic Field Office Technical Guide (eFOTG)	591	77%
National Conservation Practice Standards (NCPS)	437	57%
National Planning Procedures Handbook	322	42%
Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds (TR-55)	242	32%
Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA)	212	28%
Other	110	14%
National Catalog of Erosion and Sediment Control	77	10%
Illinois Urban Manual	45	6%

Additional resources were listed under the Other category, providing more specific information, including: NC Community Conservation Assistance Program draft manual, AgLearn, ArcView GIS, county highway standards and specs, state E&S guides, EPA STEPL, EPA Outreach Toolbox, Mobile Irrigation Lab evaluation software, NRCS Engineering Manual, state low impact development and stormwater management manuals, Toolkit.

Resource Tools, Materials, Websites, Training, Etc That Are Still Needed

This section was left as an open box to prevent guided responses and to encourage an open forum. Not all inventories contained input but those that did offered a wide array of

needs. These have been combined with the How Can NACD Help section and sorted into specific categories, shown with the highlights below.

- Certification – CPESC, CPSWQ, stream monitoring, TSP
- Training, General – technical, PR, planning, soils, septic system maintenance, parks, waste reduction
- Training, Management – ‘selling and closing deals’, grant writing, computer, financial, employment guidelines, meeting/public involvement facilitation, strategic planning, partnership programs, social marketing, alternative funding, website
- Training, Technical – CADD, GIS, urban hydrologic computations, urban BMP designs, LID designs, water quality monitoring, land use and management planning, Toolkit, GPS, soil survey, RUSLE, plat, Rule 5, stormwater management, urban-related issues, surveying, conservation planning
- Cost-share – urban erosion and water quality, stormwater, streambank, urban BMP
- Funding – dedicated sources, services that provide revenue, urban grants, non-governmental funding, NRCS CTA, contribution agreements
- Staffing – engineering and technical, more NRCS assistance, slow down turnover
- Equipment – access to state or federal vehicles, ArcGIS, Auto CADD, surveying equipment, GIS data layers, LAN internet, Toolkit, computers and printers, software
- Information, Education – materials for schools and general public
- Information, Exchange – regional and national conference, U&CC newsletter, resource directory of mentors, website
- Information, Resource – better access to federal information, budget conscious products, compilation of resource tools, cost/benefit analyses for BMPs, guidance on EOA and Army Corps permitting processes and procedures, land trust standards and practices
- Information, Technical – hydrologic information for urban/suburban flood modules, water use policies, LID guidebook, NRCS standards and specs for urban conservation practices, enlarged web soil survey, upgraded WIN TR-55
- Authority, District – stormwater program, collect fees for services
- Legislative – USDA assistance, federal funding for urban conservation, 319
- Leadership – encourage all districts to include residents of settlements in their programming, convince state leaders that urban conservation issues are important, raise the profile/status of community conservation, regional emphasis on urban conservation
- Partnering – better sharing of information, intergovernmental GIS data collection and sharing, agreements with non-traditional federal partners like EPA, FS, Army Corps, F&WS, NOAA, OSM, Energy; work on relationships with National Chamber of Commerce, NHBA, NACo, League of Cities, Urban League, Habitat for Humanity
- Public Relations – continue to work with districts on marketing and outreach, presentation for towns, public information geared toward urban conservation, presentations to local government officials
- Publication – water conservation practices for homeowners, low impact development brochure, small landowners brochure, community conservation practices brochures, ‘fill in the details’ fact sheets on relevant topics, pictorial literature, new landowners materials

- Website – urban community assistance projects listed under specific headings, funding opportunities, web-based warehousing for volunteer monitoring data, annual tree seedling promoter
- Unknown – any and all

All of the responses in this section in particular were used as the basis for the NACD Urban and Community Resource Policy Group’s (former NACD UC&CR Committee) recommendations to the NACD Board.

Funding Sources

This category sought information on how districts are funding their projects and staff for urban and community conservation.

SOURCE	#	%
State Government	610	80%
County Government	546	71%
Product Sales	316	41%
District Fees for Services	291	38%
Municipal Government	163	21%
Other	120	16%

Some of the Other write-ins were: ‘friends’ program, 319, parcel special assessment, affiliate member program, donations, equipment rental, foundation grants, local tax, mill levy, corporate contributions, private landowner donations, property management

Conservation District Board

Information was requested on the professional background of the elected and appointed members of the district boards. A list of common professions was provided along with space for write ins. The great majority are still farm or ranch background.

PROFESSION	#	%
Farm/Ranch Operator or Manager	2479.5	52.92%
Retiree	444	9.48%
Business Owner or Manager	429	9.16%
Educator	221	4.72%
Government	221	4.72%
Other	210	4.48%
Forester or Forest Manager	149	3.18%
Contractor/Developer/Construction	126	2.69%
Environmental Consultant	76	1.62%
Sales	73	1.56%
Engineering	71	1.52%
Accounting/Bookkeeping	69	1.47%
Public Relations/Marketing	48	1.02%

Law/Legal	36	0.77%
Information/Computer Specialist	22	0.47%
Media	10	0.21%

Retirees were the second largest response, detailed as past educators, bankers, business owners, county employees, farmers, NRCS, FSA, Extension and more. Many of the Government were described as county commissioners, county legislators, town supervisors, and Extension. Some of the Other write ins that did not fit other categories included airlines, banking, citizen activist, cook, health care, nonprofit, veterinary.

This data shows a broadening of conservation district board backgrounds compared to that collected in 1967 and 1973 as shown below.

OCCUPATION	1967*	1973**
Farmer or rancher	90.0%	71.1%
Business or industry	4.3%	14.6%
Professional	-	5.3%
Public agency	1.2%	4.3%
Other	4.5%	4.7%

*Survey by Conservation Districts Foundation Inc

**CDs in the Decade Ahead 1975-1985: Second Report of the Special Committee on District Outlook

Conservation District Staff

Questions were also asked about overall district staff positions. A list of known positions was given and space to write in. The Resource Conservationist/Technician, District Manager/Administrator/Executive Director, and Administrative/Office Assistant were the three most common positions.

POSITION	#	%
Resource Conservationist/Technician	587.75	21.13%
District Manager/Administrator/Executive Director	520.25	18.70%
Administrative/Office Assistant	491.75	17.68%
Other	204	7.33%
Watershed Conservationist/Technician	184.5	6.63%
Education Specialist	169.25	6.08%
Accountant/Bookkeeper	154	5.54%
Urban Conservationist/Technician	111.5	4.01%
Planner	111	3.99%
District Forester/Technician	94	3.38%
Engineer - licensed, in training	63.5	2.28%
Public Information Specialist	53.25	1.91%
Information Technology Specialist	29.5	1.06%
Landscape Architect	7.5	0.27%

In the Other category, districts listed agricultural, buffer, coastal zone, equipment operator, Farm Bill, GIS, ombudsman, parks, soils science, and wildlife.

The data also shows an expansion of district staff positions when compared with a 1984 survey conducted by the NACD District Outlook Committee as follows.

POSITION	#	%
Clerical/Administrative	1845	57.7%
Conservation Technicians	629	19.7%
District Managers	378	11.8%
Professional Conservationists	175	5.5%
Equipment Operators	169	5.3%

Districts were also asked to provide information on the current certification and training of presently employed staff. Most were either CPESC or Other.

CERTIFICATION AND TRAINING	#	%
Other	298	39.11%
Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control	223	29.27%
Certified Crop Advisor	60	7.87%
Certified Professional in Storm Water Quality	51	6.69%
Low Impact Development	50	6.56%
Urban Planning	28	3.67%
Urban Forestry eg Municipal Forester, Arborist	24	3.15%
Green Infrastructure/Strategic Conservation	15	1.97%
Certified in Flood Plain Management	13	1.71%

The Other included Advanced Master Gardener, Ag in the Classroom, college degrees, Army Corps Wetland Delineation Certification, Certified CNMP, Certified Conservation Planner, Certified Environmental Educator, Certified Logger, Certified Pesticide Management, Cultural Resources Certification, Professional Engineers, OSHA, Water Quality Monitoring, and more.

NEXT STEPS

The Inventory was conducted as a first step for implementation of the NACD Board-approved national Urban, Community and Coastal Conservation Strategy. Its purpose was to establish a current understanding of districts' activities in developed and developing areas, including their work with the emerging clientele of new landowners. It was also done to identify what districts need to support their efforts in these areas.

The excellent response and resulting data provide a solid foundation for the NACD Urban and Community RPG to affirm and, where needed, revise the Strategy actions, and to prioritize them for implementation as approved by the NACD Natural Resource Policy Committee and Officers.