

holes and routing of trails may help minimize conflict and safety problems and expand facility use. In other cases, time-of-day, day-of-week, or seasonal zoning may accomplish similar objectives in the sharing of resource use.

- By the same token, some managers saw a need and opportunity to expand the nature and wildlife benefits that golf courses and active use parks currently provide. The Forest Preserve District of Cook County, for example, is looking at ways in which the river edge along their golf course properties can be re-landscaped to enhance wildlife habitat, restore native plant communities, and reduce fertilizer and runoff into the river system. Similarly, municipal park managers are increasingly sensitive to water quality and native plant community issues, and are engaging in some small scale restoration projects in active use parks. Mentioned in the previous section, the Gompers Park Urban Resources Partnership/ChicagoRivers demonstration project is a prime example of a project that is attempting to expand nature-related benefits in the context of active recreational use.

PART V CONCLUSIONS

This chapter examined the supply of recreation and open space opportunities in the Chicago River corridor from three perspectives: who provides them, what they are and where they are located, and how they can be increased in the context of other values and uses. To address these perspectives, we spoke with resource experts representing diverse user and interest groups, and compiled relevant secondary materials from many different sources. The picture resulting from these efforts is very encouraging, yet significant challenges must be faced before many of the plans and proposals described in these pages can be successfully realized.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PROVIDERS

Study findings showed that the Chicago River corridor has a wide range of recreation and open space providers, as well as other landowners and lessees that contribute to its appeal and vitality. Public ownership of corridor lands is significant, and while the metropolitan area has benefited greatly from the foresight of the creators of the county forest preserve districts, perhaps the most significant opportunities for future recreation and open space enhancement can be found on the extensive land holdings of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. As the MWRD articulates its recently expanded policy of multiple use, particularly with respect to public access on leased properties, broad goals need to be addressed within the constraints and conditions of present land uses at particular sites. Our interviews with industrial land lessees showed significant reservations about public access across property for reasons of cost, safety, and security. These cautions extended to public agency lessees as well in terms of future lease conditions that call for removing fencing and regrading the banks to bring people closer to the river. As leases are renewed under the River Renaissance and North Shore Channel Criteria, the MWRD

should work closely with lessees to ensure an optimal mix of public access with other uses and considerations. Incentives, cost sharing with other units of government and the private sector, technical assistance, and other tools could be used to help implement these forward-looking policies.

Our findings also showed that a significant amount of public lands in the Chicago River corridor are the focus of intensive programs of ecological management and restoration. Public agencies, in cooperation with volunteer restoration and other stewardship groups, are helping make the corridor a model for urban ecosystem management through some of the most innovative programs in the nation. The lessons learned from managing suburban forest preserve properties are being applied in some urban parks and private open spaces, but surely more could be done. For example, restoration projects underway in the City of Chicago at Gompers Park and Beaubien Forest Preserve through the ChicagoRivers/Urban Resource Partnership demonstration projects are steps in this direction. They not only hold tremendous value for enhancing urban open space as functioning ecosystems, but can also provide essential nearby nature experiences for urban residents. Private open space, particularly in the northern headwater sections of the corridor, also plays a critical role in sustaining the overall system in terms of water quality, biological diversity, wildlife habitat, aesthetics, recreation, and other values. Innovative development projects such as the Techny site on the West Fork can be used as models for blending ecological management with private development, as well as for public access and use. Lessons learned from these public and private attempts at ecological management and restoration need to be applied on other public and private sites. In this respect, important opportunities exist for golf courses along the river, which account for significant acreage on the upper forks of the North Branch. Even if open space is not all publicly accessible for active recreational use, it can provide publicly valued ecological roles.

The importance of partnerships established between the public and not-for-profit sectors in accomplishing recreational and open space goals cannot be overstated. As identified in this report, the diverse activities of not-for-profit groups in the corridor range from hands-on land and water management to recreation, preservation, education, and economic development. As federal and state funds for public land acquisition and management programs continue to shrink, local and regional public agencies will no doubt have to rely increasingly on the not-for-profit sector to accomplish activities they once did on their own. Public agencies are fortunate to have a not-for-profit infrastructure already developed that functions in many parts of the corridor, and for agencies that don't, many models exist for transport to new locations. Public agencies can work to help organize constituencies, and regional not-for-profits can help develop local groups to address specific issues and concerns. Both sectors can increase volunteer participation by tailoring involvement activities to better meet the social, recreational, aesthetic, and other values that people seek in activity participation.

Study findings also showed that private sector companies not directly concerned with recreation and open space nonetheless can play an important role in providing corridor recreation and open space opportunities. Excellent models exist in the corridor of private industries who have improved the aesthetics of their riverbank property and some who have worked closely with local units of government to plan for and provide public access across their property for trails and riverwalks. Guidelines formulated for the downtown sections of the Chicago River have made a positive impact, and corresponding guidelines are now being developed for other inland waterways in the city. These guidelines hold the key to future recreation and open space development in the city, as vacant industrial parcels along the South Branch are converted to new uses, and as industrial areas along the North Branch are modernized. Similar opportunities to protect shoreland open space values now exist in the rapidly developing north suburban areas, and the many communities along these reaches can play a key role in guiding private development, from improving landscaping to dedicating riverwalks. As one current example, the Village of Glenview is improving the riverfront in its downtown area and is working with adjacent communities in developing a greenway riverwalk along the West Fork of the North Branch.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE OPPORTUNITIES

A major contribution of this study was a fairly comprehensive inventory of recreation and open space opportunities currently available in each reach of the corridor, as well as a sketch of opportunities planned or proposed in the future. The difficulty of assembling such an inventory taught us about the diversity of opportunities that exist, as well as the high level of ongoing activity to increase these opportunities. There is no doubt that inaccuracies exist in the inventory, and even more certainty that it will soon need to be updated. Nevertheless, the result of the effort demonstrates the value of taking a look at the broad spectrum of public and private opportunities across multiple jurisdictions.

The wealth of opportunities currently existing in the corridor include more than 50 miles of bicycle-grade trails, and many more miles of developed trails and footpaths. Plans and ongoing projects will greatly increase mileage, and not only provide connections to all reaches within the corridor but also link it together with greenways throughout the metropolitan region and beyond. Current boating and fishing opportunities are more modest, though as water quality continues to improve in the corridor additional resources will undoubtedly be channeled into further development of these opportunities. Skokie Lagoons on the East Fork and Flatfoot Lake just off the Calumet River are two current examples of restoration projects that will significantly increase boating and fishing opportunities in the corridor. Restoration projects in the river proper pose a different set of challenges, but are no less realizable as goals. Perhaps the least visible but most significant recreation and open space opportunities in the corridor are those we discussed under the heading of natural and cultural resource-based recreation and education.

These activities include a diverse amalgam of opportunities, from birding to hunting to restoration of historic buildings and ecologically significant landscapes. The Chicago River corridor contains some of the most significant opportunities of this kind in the metropolitan region, state, and in some cases, the nation. More importantly, as initiatives such as The Nature Conservancy's biodiversity initiative and the Lake Calumet Ecological Park are implemented, they can become national models of how we can ensure a more harmonious coexistence between people and nature in urban areas.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Although plenty of possibilities exist for increasing recreation and open space opportunities in the corridor, care must be taken to integrate them with other corridor values, including economic and environmental values. Most we spoke with showed a high level of enthusiasm for more trails, boating, fishing, and natural and cultural activities, but they were also concerned about user conflicts, limitations in access, safety and security, loss of economic livelihood, and potential damage to land and water resources. These issues and concerns were spelled out in detail by the resource experts, but so were many creative and workable recommendations and solutions for minimizing potential problems. Among such recommendations were informational campaigns to raise public awareness of the resource and responsibility for its protection; technological or environmental modifications to shoreline, land, and water areas that would minimize problems; coalitions of agencies and other groups who might act as "river authorities" to mediate conflicts and resolve issues among various river users; and improved programs of education, management, and regulation. Many of these potential solutions are readily available for implementation; in fact, some are already in place in some reaches of the corridor and only need to be exported elsewhere. As plans and programs aimed at recreation and open space development evolve in the years ahead, we hope that the ideas and recommendations documented here can help deal with the challenge of learning how to use and respect the Chicago River for all its values.

APPENDIX 4.1 INFORMATION SOURCES

INTERVIEWS

(Numbers next to names indicate separate interviews)

PUBLIC LAND MANAGERS

Formal interviews

1. George Kelly, Architect Planner, Environmental Design Section
David H. Bielenberg, Architect Planner, Environmental Design Section
Edward Smetana, Interactive Video Manager, Real Estate Department
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
2. David M. Eubanks, Greenway Planner
David Kircher, Chief Landscape Architect
Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois
3. Ralph Thornton, Land Manager
Anthony Ponziano, North Regional Superintendent
Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois
4. William Granberry, South Regional Superintendent
Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois
5. Michael Fenelon, Director of Planning, Conservation, and Development
Lake County Forest Preserves
6. Miriam Gusevitch, Architect, Design Division
Chicago Park District
7. Bob Kushnir, Superintendent, River Park
Chicago Park District
8. Mary Bak, Director of Development
Village of Glenview
9. Don Wirth, Director of Parks and Forestry
City of Evanston
10. Bill Banks, Naturalist, Lake Katherine Nature Center
City of Palos Heights

Informal interviews

11. Steve Pescitelli, Northeastern Illinois Streams Project Manager
Illinois Department of Natural Resources
12. Mike Jones, Fisheries Biologist, Cook County District
Illinois Department of Natural Resources
13. Scott Garrow
William Powers Conservation Area
Illinois Department of Natural Resources
14. Chris Merenowicz, Fish Biologist
Forest Preserve District of Cook County
15. Bob Porter, Superintendent
Lemont Park District

16. Walt Schamber
Lake Bluff Park District

NON-PROFIT GROUPS

Formal Interviews

17. Bill Koenig
Friends of the Chicago River and
Cook County Clean Streams Committee
18. Robert Lonsdorf, Land Steward
North Branch Restoration Project
19. Christine Lee
Audubon Society
20. Susan Urbas, Executive Director
Chicago River Aquatic Center
21. Hal Jensen, Executive Director
Chicago Riverwalk Corp.

Informal interviews

22. Laurel Ross, Director
Volunteer Stewardship Network
The Nature Conservancy
23. Gerald W. Adelman, Executive Director
Openlands Project
24. Emily Harris, Executive Director
Canal Corridor Association

PRIVATE COMMERCIAL RECREATION PROVIDERS

Formal interviews

25. Mike Borgstrom, Vice President
Wendela Boat Tours
26. Ralph Frese, Owner
Vic Hurtowy
Chicagoland Canoe Base, Inc.
27. Mark Berman, Manager
Marina Towers Marina
28. Nick Boudos, Owner
Kathy Agelson
Frank
Windjammer Marina
29. Ron Haskell, General Manager
North Pier Chicago

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL INTERESTS

Formal Interviews

30. William Cromwell, Planner
CSX Real Property, Inc.

31. William R. Lyon, Real Estate Representative
Tribune Properties, Inc.
Mike Debisch, Site Manager
Tribune Freedom Center
32. R. O. (Rudy) Wulf, Real Estate Manager
Mike, Real Estate Manager
Commonwealth Edison Co.
33. Mark Walbrun, Director Capital Projects
Kurt Weissheimer, Managing Director of Real Estate
Chicago Union Station Company
34. Todd Hudson and other members
Illinois River Carriers Association
35. Michael Gotkin, General Counsel
Farley Candy Co.

Informal interview

36. Charles Finkl, President
A. Finkl and Sons
Chicago, IL

MISCELLANEOUS

Formal interview

37. Peter Schurla, Deputy Chief
Special Functions Group
Lt. Earl Zuelke, Commanding Officer
Marine Unit – Special Functions Division
Chicago Police Department

Informal interview

38. John Husar, Outdoor Writer
Chicago Tribune

BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND REPORTS

Anonymous. (1994). Techny trail and greenway moves ahead. *The River Reporter: Newsletter of Friends of the Chicago River*, 7(1): 4.

Buck, R. L. (1983a). The Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois: an inlying forest with an outlying purpose. In Ffolliot, P. E., and Banzhaf, W. H. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Seminar on Management of Outlying Forests for Metropolitan Populations* (pp. 7-9). Milwaukee, WI: UNESCO Man and Biosphere Program.

Buck, R. L. (1983b). The Forest Preserve District of Cook County: the success story of a major forest recreation system. In Gangloff, D. J., and Moeller, G. H. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Second National Urban Forestry Conference* (pp. 157-161). Washington, DC: American Forestry Association.

Canal Corridor Association. (no date). *Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor: Illinois' National Treasure*. Chicago: Canal Corridor Association.

Canal Corridor Association. (1993). *Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor—Selected Projects, Legislator's Tour, November 12, 1993*. Chicago: Canal Corridor Association.

Canal Corridor Association. (1994). Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor expands trail system. *Canal Currents*, Summer, 1994: 1-4.

Canal Corridor Association. (1995). *Canal Corridor Association, 1994 Annual Report*. Chicago: Canal Corridor Association.

Chicago Dock and Canal Trust and Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. (1986). *Cityfront Center Internal Design Standards Section I*. Chicago, IL: The Chicago Dock and Canal Trust and Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Chicago Dock and Canal Trust and Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. (1987). *Cityfront Center Internal Design Standards Section II*. Chicago, IL: The Chicago Dock and Canal Trust and Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Chicago Park District. (1993). *Table of Parks and Facilities*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Park District.

Chicago Park District, Landscape Division. (1994a). *Chicago Park District Natural Areas Inventory*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Park District.

Chicago Park District, Landscape Division. (1994b). *An Ecological Approach to Landscape Management and Restoration in the Chicago Park District*. Presentation to the Environmental Network, July 14, 1994, Chicago Park District.

Chicago Riverwalk Corporation. (no date). *Chicago Riverwalk Overview*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Riverwalk Corporation.

Christy, S. (1986). *Open Space and Recreation in the Chicago Region*. Chicago, IL: Metropolitan Planning Council.

City of Chicago Department of Planning and Friends of the Chicago River. (1990). *Chicago River Urban Design Guidelines—Downtown Corridor*. Chicago: City of Chicago Department of Planning.

City of Evanston. (1983). *Public Parks in the City of Evanston, Illinois*. Evanston, IL: City of Evanston.

CitySpace Downtown Task Force. (1994). *Downtown Task Force Report to the Steering Committee (April 22)*. Chicago: Chicago Department of Planning and Development, CitySpace Program.

CitySpace Greenways and Waterways Task Force. (1994). *Summary of Greenways and Waterways Projects (May 11)*. Chicago: Chicago Department of Planning and Development, CitySpace Program.

CitySpace Lakefront Task Force. (1994). *Lakefront Task Force Report to the Steering Committee (April 22)*. Chicago: Chicago Department of Planning and Development, CitySpace Program.

- CitySpace Wetlands and Natural Areas Task Force, Subcommittee on Tier One and Two Sites. (1994). *Chicago Natural Areas of State, Regional, or City Significance (April 12)*. Chicago: Chicago Department of Planning and Development, CitySpace Program.
- Department of Landscape Architecture and the Natural Land Institute. (no date). *Illinois Natural Areas Inventory, Summary Report (for Illinois Department of Conservation)*. Champaign-Urbana, IL: Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Illinois.
- Doty, C. S. (1991). Ecology, community, and the prairie spirit. In: *Prairie in the City: Naturalism in Chicago's Parks, 1870-1940* (pp. 8-18). Chicago, IL: Chicago Historical Society.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1959). *Revised Report of Advisory Committee to the Cook County Forest Preserve Commissioners*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1962). *Land Policy*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1970). *Parks, Forests, and Recreation: Planning the Region of Chicago*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1994). *Forest Preserve District of Cook County Land Acquisition Plan*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County. (1994). *The DuPage Conservationist*, 29(5).
- Friends of the Chicago River, North River Commission, and Albany Park Planning Committee. (1990). *Chicago River North Branch Riverwalk*. Chicago: City of Chicago Department of Planning.
- Gaul, E. (1995). Industrial safety: Herons find sanctuary in Calumet. *Chicago Reader*, Jan. 20, 1995, Sec. 1, pp. 37-39.
- Gobster, P. (1990). *The Illinois Statewide Trail User Survey*. Springfield, IL: Rails to Trails Conservancy.
- Gobster, P. (1994). *Summary of CitySpace Focus Groups Dealing with Chicago Rivers Issues*. Unpublished report. Chicago, IL: USDA, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Gobster, P. (1995). Perception and use of a metropolitan greenway system for recreation. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 33: 401-413.
- Green, L. (1984). Troubled waters: the state of the Chicago River. *Chicago Tribune Sunday Magazine*, September 2, 1984, pp. 8-18.
- Gusevitch, M. (1992). *Chicago River-Existing Parks* (Fact sheet from a panel presentation on "Current and Future Uses of the River" given at the Conference on Assessment and Treatment of Contaminated Sediments in the North Branch Chicago River, Chicago Botanic Garden, October 19-20, 1992). Chicago, IL: Chicago Park District.
- Henderson, J. (1994). *Fact Sheet on River Parks Owned or Operated by the Chicago Park District* (Mimeo distributed in a May 6, 1994, presentation to the Inland Waterways Guideline Review Committee). Chicago, IL: Chicago Park District.
- Hey and Associates. (1994). *Natural Areas and Potential Natural Areas of Chicago: An Inventory Report* (for City of Chicago Department of Environment). Chicago: Hey and Associates.
- Husar, J. (1995a). Eager anglers lured by rehab of Skokie ponds. *Chicago Tribune*, July 5, 1995, Sec. 4, p. 6.
- Husar, J. (1995b). Psst! This secret spot teems with fish—pass it on. *Chicago Tribune*, August 6, 1995, Sec. 3, p. 4.
- Inland Waterway Guideline Review Committee. (1994). *Introductory Meeting Notes, April 15, 1994*. Chicago: City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development.
- Kovanich, K. (1992). Gateway to the West: The Chicago Portage National Historic Site. *Cache*, 2(2):17.
- Lake County Forest Preserves. (1992). *Horizons: A Quarterly Newsletter of the Lake County Forest Preserves*, Fall, 1992. Libertyville, IL: Lake County Forest Preserves.
- Lake County Forest Preserves. (1993). *Lake County Forest Preserves Attitudes and Interest Survey, Final Report* (Prepared by Becker Associates, Inc.) Libertyville, IL: Lake County Forest Preserves.
- Little, C. (1990). *Greenways for America*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Mann, R. (1964-5). *Origins of Names and Histories of Places, Including Major Forests and Holdings, Picnic Areas and Recreational Facilities, Nature Preserves, Aquatic Areas and Wildlife Refuges in the Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois.
- Mayer, A., et al. (1995). Real life problems turn students on to science. *Glenbrook North High School Community Newsletter*, Winter, 1995, pp. 1, 3.
- McBrien, J. P., (1991). *Chicago's Riverfront: Where the Present Meets the Past*. Chicago: Perspectives Press.
- McPherson, E. G., Nowak, D. J., Sacamano, P. L., Pritchard, S. E., and Makra, E. M. (1993). *Chicago's Evolving Urban Forest: Initial Report of the Chicago Urban Forest Climate Project* (Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-169, 55 p.). Radnor, PA: USDA, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station.
- Metro Chicago Information Center. (1994). *CitySpace Chicago Community Focus Group Report*. Chicago: Metro Chicago Information Center.
- Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. (1987). *River Edge Renaissance: Cal-Sag Channel Land Inventory and Analysis*. Chicago: Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

- Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. (1988). *Request for Policy Direction from the Board on the Implementation of North Shore Channel Lease Criteria*. Chicago: Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.
- Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. (1992). *Facilities Planning Study Update Supplement and Summary*. Chicago: Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago.
- The Nature Conservancy. (1994). *Chicago Wilderness Bioreserve—Strategic Plan*. Chicago: The Nature Conservancy.
- Niziol, C. (1995). Fish Reports. *Chicago Tribune*, Thursday, August 3, 1995, Sec. 4, p. 6.
- North Branch Prairie Project. (1990). *Twelfth Year Report 1985-1989*. Northbrook, IL: North Branch Prairie Project.
- North Branch Prairie Project. (1994). *Sixteenth Year Report 1990-1993*. Northbrook, IL: North Branch Prairie Project.
- Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. (1992). *Strategic Plan for Land Resource Management*. Chicago, IL: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.
- Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission and Openlands Project. (1992). *Northeastern Illinois Regional Greenways Plan*. Chicago, IL: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. (1995). *Traveling the Waters of the Chicago River: An Urban Recreation Resource for Canoeists, Kayakers, and Rowers* (Master's Thesis). Chicago, IL: Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Northeastern Illinois University.
- Phelps, J. (1995). *Chicago Tribune Golf Directory* (from Chicago On-Line). Chicago: Chicago Tribune Co.
- Pick, G. (1995). Navy Pier's rebirth. *Chicago Tribune Magazine*, May 21, 1995, Sec. 10, pp. 14-19.
- Redd, J. (1992). The Illinois & Michigan Canal, part II: "the portage." *Cache*, 2(2):15-16.
- Reinmuth, G. (1995). Lovely Harborside rises from the pits. *Chicago Tribune*, June 28, 1995, Sec. 4, pp. 1, 10.
- Robertson, R. A., and Burge, R. J. (1993). The interface between commercial and industrial development and recreational use in an urban river corridor. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(1): 53-69.
- Stoffel, K. (1991). Restoration history. *Palos Sag Acorn* (Newsletter of the Palos Restoration Project), 1(1): 4.
- Tardy, M. (1995). Gone fishin': Fish-along hooks area youngsters. *News-Star*, August 2, 1995, Sec. 1, pp. 1, 5, 8.
- Ullberg, D. (1993). *ChicagoRivers Demonstration Project: Potential Project Locations Site Descriptions and Ratings*. Unpublished report distributed to ChicagoRivers Site Selection Committee November 14, 1993. Barrington, IL: USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Chicago Metro Wetlands Office.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District. (1993). *Chicago River Demonstration Project: Study Reaches and Land Use*. Chicago: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District.
- Village of Glenview. (1990). *Village Comprehensive Plan*. Glenview, IL: Village of Glenview.
- Vinci, J., and Christy, S. (no date). *Inventory and Evaluation of the Historic Parks in the City of Chicago, Volume I*. Chicago, IL: City of Chicago Department of Planning.
- Wendling, R. C., Gabriel, S. J., Dwyer, J. E., and Buck, R. L. (1981). Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois. *Journal of Forestry*, 79(9): 602-605.
- Young, R. A., and Flowers, M. L. (1982). *Users of an Urban Natural Area: Their Characteristics, Use Patterns, Satisfactions, and Recommendations* (For. Res. Rep. 82-84, 5 p.). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Zielinski, D. (1981). *North Branch Trail Survey*. Unpublished paper, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Northeastern Illinois University.

MAPS AND BROCHURES

- Anonymous. (1993). *Illinois 1993 Highway Map*. Arlington Heights, IL: Dalan Publishing Corp.
- Anonymous. 1992. *Northshore (street map)*. Wood Dale, IL: Creative Sales, Inc.
- Calumet Ecological Park Association. (1994). *Calumet Ecological Park Association (brochure and map of project area)*. Chicago: Calumet Ecological Park Association.
- Canal Corridor Association. (1993). *Historical Map and Guide to the Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Chicago Audubon Society. (no date). Brochure. Chicago: Chicago Audubon Society.
- Chicago River Aquatic Center. (no date). Brochure. Chicago: Chicago River Aquatic Center.
- Chicagoland Canoe Base, Inc. (no date). *Chicagoland and Illinois Canoe Trails*. Chicago, IL: Chicagoland Canoe Base, Inc.
- CSX Real Property, Inc. *Franklin Point (realty brochure)*. Chicago: CSX Real Property, Inc.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (no date). *Chicago Portage Canoe Trail (map)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (no date). *Land Atlas*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (no date). *Nature Interpretive Facilities (brochure)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.

- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (no date). *North Branch Bicycle Trail (map)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (no date). *Salt Creek Bicycle Trail (map)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1988). *Thorn Creek Bicycle Trail (map)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1991a). *North Branch Division Picnic Areas and Trail Map*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1991b). *Recreational Facilities Map*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1991c). *The Chicago Portage National Historic Site: The Chicago Portage and Environs (map/brochure)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1992a). *Calumet Division Picnic Areas and Trail Map*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1992b). *I&M Canal Bicycle Trail (map)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1992c). *Salt Creek Division Picnic Areas and Trail Map*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1992d). *Skokie Division Picnic Areas and Trail Map*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1992e). *Thorn Creek Division Picnic Areas and Trail Map*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1993a). *Palos and Sag Valley Divisions Picnic Areas and Trail Map*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County. (1993b). *Tinley Creek Bicycle Trail (map)*. River Forest, IL: Forest Preserve District of Cook County.
- Friends of the Chicago River. (no date). *Chicago River Trail: A Walking Tour (North Branch Section from the Waterfall Upstream to Chicago City Limits)*. Chicago: Friends of the Chicago River.
- Friends of the Chicago River. (1993a). *Chicago River Trail: A Walking Tour—Downtown Section*. Chicago: Friends of the Chicago River.
- Friends of the Chicago River. (1993b). *Chicago River Trail: A Walking Tour—Near North Branch Section from the Waterfall (Foster Avenue) to Goose Island (Chicago Avenue)*. Chicago: Friends of the Chicago River.
- Friends of the Chicago River. (1993c). *Chicago River Trail: A Walking Tour—South Branch Section from Roosevelt Road to Damen Avenue*. Chicago: Friends of the Chicago River.
- Friends of the Chicago River. (1993d). *Chicago River Trail: A Walking Tour—The Sanitary and Ship Canal from Damen Avenue to Chicago Portage Woods (Harlem Avenue)*. Chicago: Friends of the Chicago River.
- Friends of the Chicago River. (1994). *Help Shape the Future of the Waterway that Shaped Chicago (brochure)*. Chicago: Friends of the Chicago River.
- Friends of the Illinois & Michigan National Heritage Corridor. (no date). *Friends of the Illinois & Michigan National Heritage Corridor (brochure)*. Downers Grove, IL: Friends of the Illinois & Michigan National Heritage Corridor.
- Heritage Corridor Visitors Bureau. (1990). *Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor (map/brochure)*. Joliet, IL: Heritage Corridor Visitors Bureau.
- Illinois Department of Conservation. (1982). *Illinois & Michigan Canal State Trail (map/brochure)*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Conservation.
- Illinois Department of Conservation. (1992). *Illinois Bicycling Guide (brochure)*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Conservation.
- Ives/Ryan Group, Inc. (1993). *Eastern Preserve—Lake Katherine Development (site plan)*. Prepared for Village of Palos Heights. Downers Grove, IL: Ives/Ryan Group, Inc.
- Lake County Forest Preserve District. (no date). *Lake County Forest Preserve District (map and key to facilities)*. Libertyville, IL: Lake County Forest Preserve District.
- Lake County Forest Preserves. (no date). 1:400 maps of Forest Preserve sites. Libertyville, IL: Lake County Forest Preserves.
- Lake County Forest Preserves. (1992). *Map and Calendar*. Libertyville, IL: Lake County Forest Preserves.
- Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. (1994). *Urban Waterfalls: Sidestream Elevated Pool Aeration (SEPA) (brochure)*. Chicago: Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (1990). Chicago and vicinity—1:10,000 scale maps for the North Shore Channel, North Branch (Reach 5B only), and South Branch of the Chicago River, including the South Fork of the South Branch.
- North Branch Prairie Project (no date). Brochure. Northbrook, IL: North Branch Prairie Project.
- Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission and Openlands Project. (1992). *Northeastern Illinois Regional Greenways Map*. Chicago: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.
- Rand McNally, Inc. (1991). *Chicago Streets (map)*. Chicago: Rand McNally, Inc.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District. (no date). *Navigation Maps of the Chicago River Waterway*. Chicago: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District.

USDI National Park Service. (no date). *Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor, Illinois (map/brochure)*. Lockport, IL: I&M Canal National Heritage Corridor.

Wendela Sightseeing Boats, Inc. (no date). *Wendela Sightseeing Boats: Chicago's Finest Guided Sightseeing Boat Rides (brochure)*. Chicago: Wendella Sightseeing Boats, Inc.

APPENDIX 4.2

DISCUSSION GUIDES FOR RESOURCE EXPERT INTERVIEWS

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PUBLIC LAND MANAGERS

Introductory comments:

1. *Model Urban Rivers Project—NPS/FOCR project: Assessment & Plan*
2. *USFS assessment of recreation user and interest group perceptions*
3. *“Chicago River Corridor” explanation and show on map—concerned with your parcels*
4. *Interview format is informal and open-ended (1-1½ hours); besides some general background questions will cover 3 major areas:*
 - *Agency ownership & management of lands along the river*
 - *recreation use of the river and river corridor on your lands*
 - *Your constituency groups and their images and perceptions of the river*
5. *Will record and take notes so we don’t miss anything*

A. General Introductory Questions

“First we’d like to get a little information about you and your position with the district...”

1. Position/title in the district? (*include name(s) of those interviewed*)
2. Number of years with the district?
3. Job duties now and over time? (*Ask about familiarity with specific lands owned by district*)

B. Ownership and Management

“In this first set of questions we want to focus on **ownership and management of district lands** to get an idea of the character of the lands owned by the district and how they are managed for various purposes.”

1. First, what section(s) of the river(s) are within your jurisdiction? (Use map and if possible obtain detailed map showing holdings).
 - a. Total acreage and/or number of river miles?
 - b. Contiguity of parcels? (scattered, consolidated)
2. Does your district have any policies or plans for increasing ownership/holdings along the river?
 - a. No/Yes —> If yes, When? Where? How?
3. “Next, we’d like to get an idea about the character of properties owned along the river corridor and the policies and programs for managing the river corridor.”

- a. First, how would you describe the **overall character of the river corridor** and the district’s philosophy for managing it (e.g., let-it-be, active management)? (*If appropriate, ask about the district’s mission and how river management policies are in keeping with that mission...*)
- b. How important of a role do the river corridors play in the district’s land holdings **overall**?
- c. What about the **immediate shoreline** area (river banks)? Can you describe the...
 - physical character? (e.g., steep sloped)
 - vegetation and how it’s managed? (e.g. upland woods, open areas, marshy)
 - what about management of the shoreline for various use objectives? Are things done to...
 - facilitate or discourage recreation (e.g., canoe access, fishing piers)?
 - enhance wildlife habitat?
- d. What about the **adjacent corridor** area (up to ¼ mile or so from the shoreline)? Can you describe the...
 - physical character? (upland, floodplain)
 - vegetation (natural communities and developed/mowed areas for recreation)
- e. What about the **river itself**? Can you describe...
 - its width, flow (seasonal change), and navigability?
 - management of in-stream materials? (e.g. are hanging branches for habitat or navigation obstructions?)
 - water quality?
- f. What about **adjacent land uses** including nearby roads and bridge crossings?
- g. What about any **in-stream (non-recreational) use** (e.g., barge traffic)?
 - how do these uses affect your ability to manage river for other management goals?

C. Actual Recreation Use of the River and River Corridor

“Our next set of questions aims at issues regarding actual recreation use of the river and river corridor..”

1. First, how important of a role do the river corridors play in the recreational use of the district’s land holdings **overall**? If possible, can you estimate the percent of total recreational use that is river oriented—either directly (e.g., fishing, boating) or indirectly (e.g., viewing, walking or sitting along)?

2. What about **direct uses** of the river, such as fishing and boating—(*Probe for important use areas, popular spots or features, estimates of numbers of users for activity/location. Also, get idea of change over the years...*)
 - a. Fishing—locations/facilities?
 - b. Canoeing/boating—locations/facilities?
3. What about **indirect uses** of the river corridor, such as biking, hiking, and nature activities—(*Probe for important use areas, popular spots or features, use levels for activity/location, changes over the years...*)
 - a. Paved trails—biking and walking?
 - b. Unpaved trails—hiking and mountain biking?
 - c. Nature observation—e.g., birdwatching/photography?
 - d. Other (e.g., nut and seed collecting)?
4. One relationship we'd like to get a better feel for is how management of the vegetation in the river corridor affects its recreational use. Thinking broadly about the mix of land uses in the corridor, can you characterize the type and numbers of users in the following areas...
 - a. Natural (wooded) areas—who uses them, how many, for what?
 - b. Mowed areas—who uses them, how many, for what?
 - c. Developed facilities (buildings, paved areas)—who uses them, how many, for what?
5. What kinds of information/programs/etc. does the district have that relate to the river (ask for specific examples)?
6. Does the district sponsor any river recreation activities or work with user groups (e.g., canoe trips)?
7. What are the prospects or district policies for increasing recreational use?
 - a. How does the district view the idea of increased recreational use? (specific activities)
 - b. Are changes (managerial, financial, environmental) needed to accommodate increased recreational use of the river and corridor?

D. People's Images and Perceptions of the River

"Our final set of questions focuses on the topic of people's images and perceptions of the river corridor on your district's lands...."

1. First, who do you feel your **major constituent groups** are? Who do you serve, both recreational and nonrecreational interests?

2. One major group we'd like to know about is **recreational visitors**. How do you think recreationists perceive the river in your holdings? (*Ask first generally, then probe for these specific dimensions...*)
 - a. **Aesthetics**— (*Probe for both positive (e.g., nature) and negative (e.g., odors) aspects; if possible, name specific locations, features, etc.*)
 - b. **Safety** (*probe for physical safety (e.g., drownings, water quality) and personal safety (e.g., crime, gangs, cults) aspects. If possible, name specific locations, features, etc.*)
 - c. As a **recreational resource**—
 - (1) direct (fishing, boating) and
 - (2) indirect (viewing, walking along, biking along)
 Do you think recreational visitors who use the trails see the river as a primary aesthetic feature? Do you think some are not even aware the river is there?
 - d. **Wildlife habitat**
 - e. **Water quality**
3. A second major interest group includes **adjacent landowners**. How do you think adjacent landowners perceive the river in your holdings? (*Ask first generally, then probe for these specific dimensions...*)
 - a. **Aesthetics** (*again, positive and negative aspects*)
 - b. **Safety** (*again, physical and personal safety, perceived vs. actual*)
 - c. As a **recreational resource**—how good is access from the neighborhoods?
 - (1) direct (fishing, boating) and
 - (2) indirect (viewing, walking along, biking along)
 - d. **Wildlife habitat and vegetation** (*positive and negative—deer invading yard and eating vegetation*)
 - e. **Water quality**
4. How do you think _____ (**name of other constituent group**) perceive the river in your holdings? (*Ask first generally, then probe for these specific dimensions as appropriate...*)
 - a. **Aesthetics** (*again, positive and negative aspects*)
 - b. **Safety** (*again, physical and personal safety, perceived vs. actual*)
 - c. As a **recreational resource**
 - (1) direct
 - (2) indirect
 - d. **Wildlife habitat and vegetation** (*positive and negative*)
 - e. **Water quality**

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PRIVATE NOT-FOR-PROFIT GROUPS

Introductory comments:

1. *Model Urban Rivers Project—NPS/FOCR projects: Assessment & plan*
2. *USFS assessment of recreation use and interest group perceptions*
3. *“Chicago River Corridor” explanation and show on map*
4. *Interview format is informal and open-ended (1 hour or so); besides some general background areas, we will cover three topics:*
 - a. *Group and member/clientele profile*
 - b. *How members/clientele think about and use the river corridor*
 - c. *River corridor enhancement for recreation and other values*
5. *We will record and take notes so that we don't miss anything.*

A. General Introductory Questions

“Before we begin the interview we'd like to get a little information about you and your group (or, confirm that the information we have is correct)”:

1. Name of group, years in existence.
2. Your title/position, number of years, have duties changed over time (if you are not the director, who directs the group)?

B. Group and Member Profile

“In this first section, we are interested in what your group does and who your members and/or clientele are.”

1. What is your group's purpose and how do you accomplish it (generally, and with respect to the Chicago River corridor)?
 - mission
 - programs
 - policies and guidelines
 - planning activities
 - partnerships/cooperation with public agencies, private groups
2. Has your focus with respect to the Chicago River changed in recent years?
3. Who are your members and/or clientele? Where do they come from? (Probe for specifics—e.g., demographic profile)

C. Perceptions and Use of the River Corridor

“In this section, we're interested in your thoughts and experience of how your members and/or clientele perceive and use the river and the corridor.”

1. What activities are your members and/or clientele involved in with respect to the river? What benefits do they get from being affiliated with your group (e.g., access to areas and activities, personal benefits, etc.)?
2. What areas of the corridor most concern your group? What is your knowledge of and level of involvement with these areas? What areas or places do you use or manage?
3. What do your members and/or clientele think about the river? What do they like or dislike about the river? What kinds of changes have they noticed?
 - water quality
 - cultural & historic features
 - natural areas
 - safety—
 - personal
 - physical
 - obstructions
 - user conflicts
4. Has the character of the river and its corridor changed over the past 5-10 years? How? (Probe: water quality, vegetation, etc.)
5. What about the “general public”? Do you think that their perception of the river corridor is different from your members/clientele?

D. River Corridor Enhancement for Recreation and Other Values

“In this section, we are interested in your thoughts about improving the river corridor for recreation and other values your group is interested in.

1. Would your group favor increased recreational use of the river corridor? Why (or why not)? What kinds of activities?
2. What improvements do you think are most needed to enhance the river corridor for recreation? Other values your group is interested in?
3. How do you think these changes should come about—public sector initiatives, private sector investments, partnerships? What would/could *your group's* role be in bringing about these changes? (Probe for changes in policy, laws, or management)?
4. Do you see increased user conflicts with increased recreational use? Would these user conflicts be a problem? How could they be prevented or minimized?
5. Do you think that your members and/or clientele would like or dislike increased recreational use of the river (crowding)?

E. Conclusion

Are there other people you recommend that we talk to?

Thanks for your time!

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR COMMERCIAL RECREATION PROVIDERS

Introductory comments:

1. *Model Urban Rivers Project—NPS/FOCR projects: Assessment & plan*
2. *USFS assessment of recreation use and interest group perceptions*
3. *“Chicago River Corridor” explanation and show on map—where are they on the map?*
4. *Interview format is informal and open-ended (1 hour or so); besides some general background areas, we will cover three topics:*
 - a. *recreation services provided*
 - b. *how people think about and use the river corridor*
 - c. *increased recreational use of the river corridor*
5. *We will record and take notes so that we don't miss anything.*

A. General Introductory Questions

“Before we begin the interview we'd like to get a little information about you and your business (or, confirm that the information we have is correct)”:

1. Name of company, years in business.
2. Your title/position, number of years, have duties changed over time? (if you are not the owner, who owns the business?)
3. Do you own the land where your facility is located, or do you rent? If you rent, who is the owner and what is the lease arrangement?

B. Services Provided and Customer Profile

“In this first section, we are interested in what services your business provides to river users and the level of interest in these services over time.”

1. What recreational services do you offer?

rental	sales	mooring
service	lessons	other
2. How many canoeists/boaters are there interested in boating the river? Is this a large market (boaters/week-end day)? How many boaters do you have *here* (per weekend day)? What percentage simply use the river as access to the Lake?
3. Has your level of business changed in the past year? Five years?
4. Do you anticipate increased use in the near future? Decreased?
5. Who are your customers? Where do they come from? (Probe for specifics—e.g., demographic profile)
6. What other river-related recreational activities do your customers pursue while boating (e.g., fishing, photography, birdwatching)?
7. Are there other corridor-related features that bring your customers to your marina (e.g., forest preserve, trails)?

8. Do you do anything to manage the river or its corridor (e.g., your landing areas) to enhance recreation opportunities (e.g., cut brush, dredge, plant trees).

C. Perceptions and Use of the River Corridor

“In this section, we're interested in your thoughts and experience of how people perceive and use the river and the corridor.”

1. Has the character of the river and its corridor changed over the past 5-10 years? How? (Probe: water quality, vegetation, etc.)
2. What do your customers think about the river? What do they like or dislike about the river? What kinds of changes have they noticed?
 - water quality
 - cultural & historic features
 - natural areas
 - safety:
 - personal (crime, gangs, etc.)
 - physical (drowning, water quality)
 - obstructions (trees, dams, garbage)
 - user conflicts (other boaters, commercial traffic, anglers)
3. What about the “general public”? Do you think that their perception of the river corridor is different from your customers?
4. Where do your customers go along the river (indicate on map)? What spots are favorite? Why are they favorite (Probe: good fishing, wildlife, aesthetics [what is appealing?])?
5. Where *can* they go? (in terms of physical barriers/obstructions, safety, etc.)
6. Are there specific places where your customers cannot go now, but they would like to?

D. River Corridor Enhancement for Recreation

“In this section, we are interested in your thoughts about improving the river corridor for recreation—we are interested in all kinds of recreational activities, not just boating.”

1. Would you favor increased recreational use of the river corridor? Why (or why not)? What kinds of activities?
2. What improvements do you think are most needed to enhance the river corridor for recreation?
3. How do you think these changes should come about—public sector initiatives, private sector investments, partnerships? What would/could *your* role be in bringing about these changes? (Probe for changes in policy, laws, or management)?
4. Do you see increased user conflicts with increased recreational use? Would these user conflicts be a problem? How could they be prevented or minimized?
5. Do you think that your customers would like or dislike increased recreational use of the river (crowding)?

E. Conclusion

Are there other people you recommend that we talk to?

Thanks for your time!

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR MANAGERS OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES ALONG THE CORRIDOR

Introductory Comments:

1. *Model Urban Rivers Project—NPS/FOCR projects: Assessment & plan*
2. *USFS assessment of recreation use and interest group perceptions*
3. *“Chicago River Corridor” explain and show on map—where are they on the map?*
4. *Interview format is informal and open-ended (1 hour or less); besides some general background areas, we will cover three topics:*
 - a. *our company’s use of the river*
 - b. *how people think about and use the river corridor in your area, including public access*
 - c. *increased recreational use of the river corridor*
5. *We will record and take notes so that we don’t miss anything.*

A. General questions about your company...

“Initially, we’d like to get a little information about you and your business (or, to confirm that the information we have is correct)”:

1. Name of company, number of years in business
2. Nature of business
3. Your title, position, number of years, duties over time
4. Location(s) along the river corridor
5. Do you own the land where your facility is located (on the river)? If not, from whom do you lease? What are the terms (length of lease, stipulations on type of use, access)?

B. Company Perceptions and Use of the River & Corridor

1. How does your company use the river & corridor?

Direct use—e.g., barge deliveries? Is the river essential to your business (e.g., switching to truck/train deliveries too expensive, use water for cooling, etc.) ?

Indirect use—e.g., lunchroom faces the river?
2. How has your company’s use of the river changed? Past use? Historic use in this area? Prospects for future use?
3. How does your company manage the shore area (landscaping, fencing, lighting, security patrol)? Does the building or facility incorporate the river (face it, etc.), or not?
4. What is the impact of water quality on your use of the river?

C. Public Use and Access to River & Corridor

1. Is there public access to the river at your site? Does the company view public access positively or negatively?
2. Is there public access at your shore area from people coming for up or down stream?
3. What recreational use is made of the river near your facility (*instream*: canoeing, fishing, motor boats; *shoreside*: riverwalks, etc.)? How does your company view this use? Problems, opportunities?

D. River Corridor Enhancement for Recreational Use

These next questions are about opportunities for recreational use of the river in general, and are not limited to the river at your site:

1. Do you see opportunities for increased recreational use of the river? *Shoreside? In-stream?*
2. Do you have concerns about increased recreational use?

These next questions are more directly concerned with increased recreational use of the river in your facility’s area:

3. What problems or opportunities might there be with increased recreational use of the river in your facility’s area? If you see problems with increased usage, how close can this use be before it interferes with your business?
4. Are there changes that could be made (managerial, legal, etc.) that would change your view of the opportunities/constraints with respect to public access to the river and/or increased recreational usage?
5. FOR MWRD LESSEES: What are your company’s thoughts on policies like the MWRD River Edge Renaissance? If a policy like this were applied to your river property, what would the impact be for your company? Would your company view these changes positively or negatively?

NOTES

This project was designed and implemented by the author and by the co-principal investigator Lynne Westphal. Some of the inventory information for Part III of this chapter was collected and verified by Andre Gaither of the National Park Service. This chapter benefited from the helpful comments of David Eubanks of the Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Michael Fenelon of Lake County Forest Preserves, Richard Lanyon of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, and John Dwyer and Lynne Westphal of the Forest Service.