

**URBAN AND COMMUNITY FISHERIES PROGRAMS:
DEVELOPMENT, MANAGEMENT, AND EVALUATION.**

Based on a symposium held in San Francisco, California, 3–5 September 2007. American Fisheries Society Symposium, Volume 67.

Edited by Richard T. Eades, Wesley Neal, Thomas J. Lang, Kevin M. Hunt, and Paul Pajak. Bethesda (Maryland): American Fisheries Society. \$69.00. xx + 463 p.; ill.; no index. ISBN: 978-1-934874-04-2. 2008.

Institutional recognition of urban fishing as a discrete phenomenon is a mere quarter-century old. But urban fishing has already grown into a mature

and highly interdisciplinary branch of fisheries science, with the 2007 symposium that this volume is based on having gathered 150 individuals from academia and all levels of government.

The volume's 41 chapters are separated among three main parts, the first being Considerations for Program Development. A variety of pragmatic topics are covered here, including where to obtain funding, the role of law enforcement, and the dangers of contaminants, as well as others that look at social issues, such as understanding motivations and constraints of urban anglers, racial and ethnic attitudes, and the differences between organized and nonorganized anglers. The second part, Program Management—Past, Present, and Future, includes the results of a national survey of urban fishing programs, but is mainly a large collection of case studies that range from Idaho to Texas to New York. Part III, Evaluating and Improving Programs, provides hard-won recommendations from practice on optimizing urban fishing programs.

This book would have benefited from more synthesis, although two of the editors did provide a summary. They note that “[m]ost traditional fishing opportunities are located in rural areas, . . . yet most Americans reside in urban areas” (p. 455). Practitioners of this nontraditional urban fishing must temper their expectations for the quality of angling against the backdrop of sheer accessibility and convenience.

Despite any possible shortcomings in the nature of the experience, I believe these programs should be viewed as being highly progressive—as testimony to new forms of societal awareness. It is likely that some of the evolutionary drive for urban fishing programs in the U.S. was spurred by the positive results of the 1972 Clean Water Act, which rendered many city waters attractive again to both the fishes and the local populace. This new opportunity is now being used proactively in many programs to connect urban youth with natural resources—even if it is in their own backyards.

JOHN WALDMAN, *Biology, Queens College, City University of New York, Flushing, New York*