



Land Legacy Committee (LLC) Meeting Agenda
East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District

(November 30, 2022)

Tuesday, December 6, 2022, 4:00 – 6:00 PM

To be held at Nadaka Nature Park (NE 176th Ave. & NE Glisan St, Portland, OR 97230) and
Four Points by Sheraton Portland East (1919 NE 181st Ave, Portland, OR 97230)

AGENDA

Item #	Time	Agenda Item	Purpose	Presenter	Packet
1	3:50 10 mins	Arrive at Nadaka Nature Park Parking Area: NE 176th Ave. & NE Glisan St, Portland, OR 97230	N/A	N/A	a) Directions to Nadaka Nature Park Parking lot
<u>Overview:</u> Allows for adequate time to park vehicles and be ready for a prompt 4pm tour start in order to capitalize on the limited daylight. During this time, folks can settle in and casually network.					
2	4:00 30 mins	Nadaka Nature Park Tour	Information	McAllister, Kent, Shearin	n/a
<u>Overview:</u> EMSWCD employees Kathy Shearin, Monica McAllister (former Nadaka Nature Park Coordinator) and Heather Nelson Kent (former Metro Parks and Nature Community Investment Manager) will offer a quick tour of the features made possible in part by EMSWCD's investment in this Urban Access to Nature project.					
3	4:30 15 mins	Transition to Indoor Meeting Space - Four Points by Sheraton Portland East Hotel	N/A	N/A	a) Directions to Four Points Hotel
<u>Overview:</u> All meeting participants will travel to indoor location for the remainder of the meeting.					
4	4:45 5 mins	Approval of October 17, 2022 meeting minutes	Decision	Zimmer-Stucky	a) 10/17/2022 LLC Meeting Minutes
<u>Overview:</u> LLC members will be asked to take a few minutes to review the October 17, 2022 minutes prior to considering a motion for approval.					
5	4:50 15 mins	Discussion of EMSWCD's role in Urban Access to Nature Projects – Past & Present	Information	Shipkey	a) EMSWCD Land Legacy Overview of Previous Non-Farmland Investments
<u>Overview:</u> Shipkey will review how EMSWCD investments in non-farmland conservation transactions supports EMSWCD's mission, the unique role EMSWCD plays, and the project evaluation criteria utilized by EMSWCD Staff in assessing potential opportunities.					
6	5:05 45 mins	Discussion of EMSWCD's role in Urban Access to Nature Projects – Future	Discussion	LLC	n/a
<u>Overview:</u> Zimmer-Stucky will lead the LLC in a discussion about the future role of EMSWCD in Urban Access to Nature projects. This dialogue will inform the January LLC meeting consideration of proposals (currently being developed by EMSWCD Staff) for EMSWCD investments in non-farmland conservation projects.					



Land Legacy Committee (LLC) Meeting Agenda
East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District

(November 30, 2022)

Tuesday, December 6, 2022, 4:00 – 6:00 PM

To be held at Nadaka Nature Park (NE 176th Ave. NE Glisan St, Portland, OR 97230)
 and Indoor Meeting Space TBD

7	5:50 10 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcements and Reminders • Action Items • Adjourn 	Information	Zimmer-Stucky	n/a
----------	------------------------	---	-------------	---------------	-----

EMSWCD Board Members, Officers and Meeting Dates:

EMSWCD Board			LLC	Year	FY22-23 Schedule	Board	LLC
Members	Positions	Officers		2022	July	6 th	25 th
Joe Rossi	Zone 1 Director		X		August	1 st	
Laura Masterson	Zone 2 Director	Secretary	X		September	x	x
Mike Guebert	Zone 3 Director	Chair	X		October	3 rd	17 th
Jim Carlson	At-Large 1 Director	Treasurer	X		November	7 th	21 st
Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky	At-Large 2 Director	Vice Chair	Chair		December	5 th	6 th
				2023	January	4 th	30 th
					February	6 th	
					March	6 th	27 th
					April	3 rd	
					May	1 st	22 nd
					June	5 th	

10/17/2022



East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District Land Legacy Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 17th, 2022

4:10pm - Call to Order

Zimmer-Stucky called to order the regular meeting of the EMSWCD Land Legacy Committee at 4:10pm on Monday, October 17, 2022 at EMSWCD's Office.

Introductions, Review/revise agenda, Review previous action items

Zimmer-Stucky conducted introductions for the record. The following persons were present:

Land Legacy Committee: Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky (At-Large Director 2), Laura Masterson (Zone 2 Director) (4:14pm by phone), Joe Rossi (Zone 1 Director), Mike Guebert (Zone 3 Director)

Absent: Jim Carlson (At-Large Director 1)

Staff: Nancy Hamilton (Executive Director), Dan Mitten (CFO), Matt Shipkey (Land Legacy Program Manager), Kathy Shearin (Urban Lands Program Manager), Julie DiLeone (Rural Lands Program Manager), Heather Nelson Kent (Grants Program Manager), Alex Woolery (IT and Analytic Specialist), Jeremy Baker (Senior Rural Conservationist) (5:00pm), Asianna Fernandez (Executive Assistant)

Guests: N/A

Changes to Agenda: N/A

Previous Action items: N/A

4:12pm – Introductions and Welcome Chat

MOTION: Guebert moved to approve the May 23, 2022, LLC Meeting minutes. Rossi 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (4-0, Carlson absent).

4:14 pm – Time Reserved for Public Comment: N/A

4:14pm – Round Table Discussion

Zimmer-Stucky began the discussion by addressing how fortunate she is to be on this committee, and how the strategic planning work in this committee might be difficult. It is not legally required for the Board to come to a consensus on anything tonight. Hopes the Board can make the best decisions for the District.

Hamilton This is part of the strategic planning process, will speak more on next steps later.

4:16 pm – Land Legacy Program Priorities and Beneficiaries

Zimmer-Stucky gave an overview of the background of working criteria and beneficiaries for today's work and invited any Board members to kick off the conversation. Soil and water health is the grand mission, with the priority lens of climate (mitigating impacts) and people (access and inclusion).

Hamilton The goal is to think about which criteria flows to the top of priorities, per program. Not which do we care about most, but which do we care about for each program, as a SWCD?

Guebert On the first 4 bullets (water quality, water conservation, soil quality, climate change impacts), are there any reason those wouldn't fall under this program?

Board No disagreements.

Rossi In RFQ's, the point is does the criteria affect a lot or a little bit? For water quality, this program affects it a lot.

Zimmer-Stucky suggested using process of elimination for the rest of the criteria besides the overarching top 4 criteria, as the Board did for the other programs. Some of these can be excluded.

10/17/2022



Guebert Ensuring access and inclusion, land access for farming, and economic resiliency for farmers rise to the top.

Carlson Ensuring access and inclusion and land access for farming rise to the top.

Rossi All could be applied but would rather rank them instead of excluding any of them.

Masterson Land access for farming, economic resiliency for farmers, food access, and ensuring access and inclusion.

Zimmer-Stucky agrees with what is rising to the top for everyone else, with emphasis on land access for farming.

Wants to preserve land access for parks as a criterion and is okay with omitting natural areas scope; energy put into parks serves urban constituents, with big impact and low long-term engagement (ex. Nadaka Nature Park, and Shaul). Suggested the Board amends "Land access for parks" (take out natural areas)- to be discussed later in the meeting.

Rossi Agrees, because costs later down the line are not borne by us. No more projects with carry-on expenses.

Guebert reminder to consider if we're getting value out of a project, it is worth the value spent, and so is comfortable with leaving the door for both "one and done" projects and "longer-term" projects

Rossi All of these criteria feel like by-products of what we do, nothing rises to the top. Recognizes that they're not direct benefits to soil and water health.

Zimmer-Stucky All projects are going to accomplish step 1: soil and water health, then step 2: climate and people priority lens, then we consider step 3: refined decision-making criteria.

Economic Resiliency

Guebert This goes with access to farmland and markets. Would be 3rd in his top 3, providing stability within the agriculture community and system in our district leads to economic resiliency. Ensuring the District has a viable farm community leads to resources farmers need, farm stores, equipment, etc. Ensuring farmers have equipment needed is important, but unsure if that's addressed by this program.

Carlson As everything is getting more expensive, we (farmers) are not making a huge profit off our crops. This would affect HIP grads, and other farmers who are starting out. Economic resiliency would come as a product of preserving the land for agricultural use.

Zimmer-Stucky The District has other programs that directly benefit economic resiliency. Economic resiliency is supported via our efforts to secure land access for farmers.

Food Access

Masterson Like Economic Resiliency, it's part of a whole package of protecting farmland. This addresses resource concerns, and it's part of climate change mitigation efforts. It isn't a primary driver, but it is important. It's what some of our farmers do, so it could help lead to community resiliency.

Guebert Sees it as another secondary criteria (under land access for farmers). Not a primary driver for decision making on projects.

Ensuring Access and Inclusion

Rossi Ownership of land isn't the biggest determinant of success for farmers. Renting land is cheap. E. Mult County land is more expensive to farm than other places in the state. Who are we subsidizing farmland for? How do we choose? Does our money here actually make a difference, especially in soil and water health? Land Legacy could be helping current farmers continue farming and being successful, bringing new ideas to them, learning from them. Suggested an outward focus for the LLP (e.g. like an extension agency that is sharing new ideas, breaking down internal "siloing").

Zimmer-Stucky If you look at each program individually, they might not each make a huge effect on soil and water but looking at them all collectively shows a big impact. Something we talked about for Rural Lands runs along the lines of what Rossi sees as an outward focus for helping current farmers.

Hamilton suggested the Board revisit what the LLC was originally about. The fund and program were for purchasing property, securing easements, resale of protected farms as well as improving natural land and natural areas.

Masterson We've done farm succession under the LLP before, which benefits existing farmers (and not just beginning farmers), as does our work with easement acquisition.

Beneficiaries

Zimmer Stucky gave an overview of the potential beneficiaries. The Board didn't get this far for some of the other program areas before. Feels that Native American Communities are an important one to consider for all programs.

10/17/2022



Hamilton Another reason staff have added Indigenous people as a beneficiary is because they have a way of working on the land and holding a relationship with the land that is inherently beneficial to land and water.

Caldwell Farmworkers was added at the last workshop as underserved. Students could also be on the list as a beneficiary, the Board could also add other potential beneficiaries.

Masterson The farmers who are currently on the land should be benefitting and successful in their current farming. We spend a lot of time on other groups (upcoming farmers, filling the pipeline), but we don't always look to benefit current farmers. Two underlying foundational beneficiaries: established producers and underserved producers. Isn't differentiating between underserved communities or underserved farmers. Would like to see them both have more access.

Hamilton Underserved communities was more about natural lands and parks. Underserved producers were more about working lands.

Guebert For Farm Workers specifically, they could benefit from this program, but is unsure how we could focus on them as a direct beneficiary.

Masterson Land ownership is not the end goal for many farmers. For those that it is, easements can reduce barriers to entry for farmers. Suggested the Board talk about the way the programs work together as well.

Guebert In seeing fallow land around the District, is there a role for us in helping facilitate use of these lands by current farmers? Would a simple easement be a way to encourage farming on that land?

Zimmer-Stucky Sees this list of beneficiaries as a mix of established producers and landowners. Is thinking about the urban growth boundary here in Multnomah County, and the Stafford Triangle which is now in the urban reserve (in Clackamas County). East Multnomah and Corbett doesn't have land in the urban reserve, but there is a lot of unused land that could be used for farming.

Masterson Land banking by folks following their land might unwittingly be part of the solution. Keep farmland protected. Supports buy, protect, sell or easements because it will protect land, which we can use in the future to farm when the demand for it is likely to increase. Corbett isn't as valuable farmland, and that is reflected in the amount of land farmed currently/recently.

Carlson Agrees with simple easements, may not always need to be in perpetuity. Has never heard an example of an easement that we've done in the past.

Guebert explained that a base level the easements that the District deals with are designed to ensure that the land is not developed in the future. Each easement may have different requirements and terms depending on the property and the landowner.

Shipkey also ensures that the land stays in active farm production. We also try to work in affordability and ownership by farmers, as well as the protection and enhancement of soil, water and habitat resources.

Hamilton In entering this agreement, you get paid to do so.

Carlson Does that affect the taxable value of the property as well?

Shipkey Typically it doesn't impact the taxable value, but it does affect the resale value.

Guebert Knows a few people in his area that have a lot of land but aren't farming it at the moment. Suggested the District can help make connections to get it back into active farm use.

Shipkey The USDA grant application we're working on is proposing an innovative PILOT program to address that issue.

Masterson How do we get that unused land into the iFarm program that already does that, using the available tools to get people to find land. How can an easement aid with succession?

Hamilton Laura's idea is similar to the one that is proposed in the USDA grant. Explained how easements are used to also protect soil and water health. The LLP has historically been used for land acquisition, not services to farmers.

Masterson feels it's important to put a placeholder in the easement conversation, so that the Board can understand what goes into an easement vs. an ag plan instead? And a high-level conversation about how to find the right balance between working farmland protection and resource conservation.

10/17/2022



Zimmer-Stucky believes farm workers are established producers.

Zimmer-Stucky Beneficiaries final decision: all established producers and underserved producers, landowners.

Masterson For farm workers who would like to own their own land/farm business, what barriers are they facing, and can we reduce those barriers? That feels like it should be part of LLP going forward.

Carlson How do we reach some of those landowners who want to rent out their land that is no longer being used for farming?

Rossi We're losing historical knowledge when we lose historic farmers. How do we focus a little more on keeping those farmers in business and ensuring that they know about the resources that are available?

5:23pm – Land Legacy Program Strategic Planning Questions

Zimmer-Stucky introduced the questions presented:

- 1) **All LLC Members** agreed yes – the principal focus should remain on working farmland protection to ensure farmland remains available for current and future farmers
- 2) **All LLC Members** agreed that we should pursue both simpler and more complex projects.

Guebert Have yet to arrive at a place where we needed to choose one option over the other. Would support keeping both options on the table.

Zimmer Stucky Doing both is how we address both beneficiary groups. It's also a function of how we meet folks where they are.

Masterson We have a core commitment to equity as well as to the natural resources. Less restrictive easements may have more of focus on the farmland resource. Buy protect sell projects can go deeper.

Guebert wants to retain the option for more complex, multiple outcome easements?

Hamilton Do we always want to sell? Or do we retain some properties for underserved communities to lease as well?

Masterson Imagines we would continue to do a little bit of both. We can sell more acreage than we can keep.

Zimmer-Stucky Imagining the District with a focus as a lease holder would be new to the LLP and would require additional discussion.

Guebert Suggested buy protect keep should not be our main focus due to upkeep and management implications.

Hamilton Does the District want to be the one to lease land if farmers aren't ready to buy?

Zimmer-Stucky That shouldn't be the main focus, but it could be an option.

Masterson We could split the program into preserving acreage as one goal and supporting underserved communities as another goal.

Masterson Would like to get to a place where it is possible for farmers who are ready to buy farmland to do so, instead of leasing. We can do that in part by facilitating connections with farm financing opportunities that exist (e.g. Farm Credit). Doesn't see the District leasing land as the primary role of the LLP.

Zimmer-Stucky Suggested we prioritize District properties for buy, protect, sell, and then as opportunities arise, we can reevaluate whether to vary from the B-P-S model. Being in the business of buying land with the purpose of leasing it in perpetuity feels like a whole new program.

Hamilton If we're looking at how to move forward with removing access barriers for underserved farmers, we have to think about what they might need (ex. Programs like what the USDA Grant would provide). In ensuring fewer barriers to leasing land instead, does this District want to respond to this barrier?

Zimmer-Stucky doesn't feel prepared to discuss or decide on that right now. Would rather address this topic by connecting farmers to services and legal help.

- 3) **All LLC members** agreed that our farm access projects should support both well-resourced farmers and those folks that are less well-resourced.

Masterson This is also a both type of situation.

Zimmer-Stucky Is willing to rethink this once Big Creek and Gordon Creek are successfully up and running.

Guebert Both feels like the right answer.

10/17/2022



- 4) **Zimmer-Stucky** Suggested supporting urban focused projects, provided we are not assuming primary responsibility. Nestwood wouldn't fit into this category, so might mean we re-think projects like that going forward. Heat islands and access to parks feels like something to keep if it's easy, responsive and doesn't break the bank (with partnerships).

Guebert Projects that might not happen without our support should be something we continue to look into. Some of these projects feel like grants projects. Can we set aside a smaller fund/budget within LCF to go towards parks projects?

Zimmer-Stucky and Carlson agreed.

Masterson Has always been conflicted with the access to nature part of this program, because the program started as a way to address land conservation gaps that others weren't working on. The projects we have done for parks doesn't feel as impactful as the ag work we've done. Can we leave the parks work to METRO and focus instead on supporting that work via grants and expertise?

Rossi would like to see the District being proactive/strategic instead of reactive to partner with METRO and others to ensure certain things get done. Wasn't supportive of the Shaull property acquisition because it didn't go towards anything tangible in terms of property improvements. Can we ask METRO where they need our help within the soil and water sectors instead?

Kathy Does it always have to be about access? Can we preserve natural spaces outside of urban spaces for climate change mitigation?

Zimmer-Stucky Was trying to propose a compromise between farmland only and preserving land for habitat. Can we contribute the money to those who want to manage and work on protecting those spaces instead of focusing our efforts on doing it ourselves? Don't want to entirely take the opportunity off the table since much of our tax base comes from within the urban growth boundary, and still would want to support them. **Guebert** agreed.

Masterson Some of those natural space projects feel like they were distracting from what the District's focus could be on ag land. Sees that most of the money could come from the City of Portland and METRO.

CWC suggested taking a vote or finding a compromise on what the District should do now.

Carlson What happens when there aren't any ag land projects coming up, but there might be some good natural parks projects that come up instead?

Masterson The Land Legacy Fund looks like a lot but when we look at how much properties would cost for buy, protect, sell/lease, it's not many farm purchases.

Hamilton This could be structured in the LLC fund while leaving the door open every fiscal year for various options. The staff is just looking for clarity on what the Board is okay with staff using the fund for.

Guebert Reminded that the District used to have the Strategic Conservation Investments: if a Board member was passionate about a project, there would be a fund set aside to get that pushed through.

Zimmer Stucky The Board agrees that ag land acquisition should be number 1, and then should something come up where we can put some money towards an urban area without being tied to it for management, that could be an idea to entertain. We can give this direction to staff, keeping parks purchases as an option.

Masterson Open to having staff come to Board with opportunities to fund others in their parks acquisition but is opposed to the District buying parks property (ex. like Nestwood or Shaull). Where else can we help in urban areas with parks within the urban lands program?

Rossi agreed with Masterson, is against high budget projects that takes away from investments in water and soil health for farmers.

Caldwell Reminded that if a vote is conducted, all Board members are agreeing to follow through with what was voted on even if it wasn't what they were hoping for/voted for.

Zimmer-Stucky conducted a temperature check on keeping the option open to use a small portion of the LLF for natural parks. A primary focus on ag with an opportunity to contribute to urban parks programs in a way where our financial contribution is our only contribution. Could the Board live with the decision on that proposal?

10/17/2022



Motion: Masterson moved to prioritize funding in the LLP for farmland acquisition, and that we strategically help urban areas and parks through other programs at the District, but not through acquisition. **Guebert 2nd** the motion. Motion retracted.

Carlson If there's a project where the property is already acquired, if the entity is asking for funding that is outside the funding limitations of some of our projects, then what happens?

Zimmer-Stucky When we made decisions on our Urban Lands program, did we give the staff clear direction to have that kind of jurisdiction?

[Rossi & Carlson left at 6:20pm]

Hamilton Staff would come back to Board with recommendations based on what this vote was.

Motion: Zimmer-Stucky moved to proceed with farm acquisition as the primary goal of the LLP, with the opportunity to support land acquisitions for parks in urban areas as long as EMSWCD is not the long-term lease holder or owner. Staff would come back with recommendations for more specificity around criteria to be approved by the Board. **Guebert 2nd** the motion. (2-1, Rossi and Carlson absent).

Guebert This is tricky to vote on because it's a little too open ended.

6:29pm - Closing items: announcements, reminders, and action items

Zimmer-Stucky reminder that there is a Special Board of Director Meeting with Jill Critchfield on Wednesday October 19th.

Hamilton to bring a framework of Strategic Plan to be voted on at the November Board Meeting. Prepare to dive in deeper on Headwaters Farm (HWF): Why do we have it, who should be at HWF, what's our responsibility around the pipeline before HWF and graduates of HWF?

Action Items

Action Item: Fernandez to schedule November LLC Meeting.

Action Item: Staff to bring recommendations based on the motion made today.

6:34pm - Adjournment

Zimmer-Stucky adjourned the meeting at 6:34pm.

Note for the record: Board committees cannot pass a binding motion. Committees can only make recommendations to the Board for consideration and/or a vote.

EMSWCD Land Legacy Overview of Previous Non-Farmland Investments

11/28/2022

How does the acquisition of Access to Nature properties support our mission and goals?

1. **Soil and water** benefits
2. Fish and wildlife **habitat** protection/enhancement
3. **Climate Resilience** - including tree canopy, carbon sequestration, heat island effect, etc.
4. **Equity** - Reduce disparities and/or fill gaps in access to nature for people

Why us? What funding gaps necessitate our support for these projects?

- **County** - No Multnomah County funding for conservation and no Parks Department
- **Cities** of Gresham, Wood Village, Troutdale – no official Parks Departments, very limited capital for conservation transactions
- **Regional - Special Districts** – no Park Districts (like Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District in Washington County)
- **Regional – Metro** - Parks and Nature bond funding has limitations:
 - “Local Share” amount per city is small. For example, Shauli comprised \$2.475M of Gresham’s \$5.4M total local share allocation from Metro’s 2019 Bond.
 - Nature in Neighborhoods grants competitive, require 1:1 funding match
 - Fluctuations in funding availability (as bonds expenditures tail off or ramp up)
 - Majority of Metro acquisitions focus on regional priorities – neighborhood projects do not rise to that level
- **Land Trusts** - No land trust focused on Multnomah County urban areas

How do staff evaluate opportunities for Access to Nature investments inside UGB?

Evaluation criteria developed in partnership with Board used as initial screen along with partnership capacity and availability.

Key criteria

- Is the property identified as a priority in plans or other documents?
- Is protection of the property in line with community priorities?
- Will acquisition advance or hinder Equity, Access & Inclusion efforts?
- The quality and quantity of the natural resources found on and impacted by the property
- If the property is sited within an area that has a deficit of accessible public protected land
- The capabilities of the lead project partner
- The strength of the management and programming plans
- Threats and the urgency therein – e.g., pending sale, development

Other factors

- Cost
- Property condition
- The extent to which EMSWCD involvement is pivotal to making the project happen
- Property size
- Proximity to other protected lands

See full detail of selection criteria in attached table

Project Highlights

To date: overall non-farm projects funded by EMSWCD = 974 acres, \$4.085M

Nadaka Nature Park (Gresham) - 2009

- \$210K to protect 2-acre addition to existing urban park in area with limited access to quality parks
- EMSWCD's Grant program helped fund park planning and development
- Partners – Gresham, Trust for Public Land

Grant Butte Wetlands (Gresham) - 2014

- \$1 million, 33 acres
- Important wetlands and uplands complex, underserved, low-income, highly diverse neighborhood
- Partners – Metro, Gresham

Colwood Natural Area (Northeast Portland) - 2014

- \$1 million, 85 acres
- Contribution targeted towards acreage along Columbia Slough, which was restored with native riparian plantings
- Partners – Trust for Public Land, City of Portland (Parks and BES)

Grant Butte Uplands (Gresham) - 2017

- \$175K, 15 acres
- Built on Grant Butte Wetland transaction, underserved, low-income, highly diverse neighborhood
- Partners – Metro

Native American Youth & Family Center (Northeast Portland) - 2019

- \$500K high-interest mortgage paydown, 10 acres
- Set stage for secure ownership, habitat enhancements for property of cultural significance
- Partners (for Canemah restoration project, not on mortgage paydown) – Multnomah County Drainage District, Columbia Slough Watershed Council, Verde, Portland Parks & Rec., Portland BES

Shauli (Gresham) - 2021

- \$200K, 8 acres
- Protected significant urban tree canopy on a site approved for development, created gateway access opportunity for adjoining park properties including Grant Butte
- Partners – Metro, Gresham

Nestwood (Corbett) – December 1, 2022

- \$1.2M, 787 acres
- Protected one of the largest private forestland parcels in our District; important carbon storage/climate mitigation, habitat and public access resources
- Partners – Columbia Land Trust

EMSWCD Acquisition of Natural Areas and Access to Nature Properties

Example Conservation/Community Benefits:

X=benefits now

F=future benefits

	Water Quality (stormwater, etc.)	Soil Health (erosion, less compaction, etc.)	Fish Habitat	Wildlife Habitat	Access to Nature for People (general)	Protection from urban development	Underserved Community	Forest or Urban canopy
Nadaka	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Grant Butte Wetlands	X	X	X	X	F	X	X	
Grant Butte Uplands	X	X		X	F	X	X	X
Colwood Natural Area	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	F
NAYA	X	X	X	F	X	X	X	
Shaul	X	X	X	X	F	X	X	X
Nestwood	X	X	X	X	F			X

Nadaka video: <https://vimeo.com/107305114>

EMSWCD Selection Criteria for the Acquisition of Access to Nature Properties

Access to Nature Lands West of UGB			
Criteria	Ideal Parcel	Acceptable Parcel	Unacceptable Parcel
1. Qualifying (Screening) Criteria			
1.1 Community distance from parks and natural areas	1 or more miles	½-mile to less than 1 mile	Less than ½-mile
1.2 Accessibility	Readily accessible	Easily made accessible	Not accessible without major investment
1.3 Proximity to water resources	Surface water resources on parcel or parcel is adjacent to surface water resources	Direct or indirect positive impacts to surface water resources	No positive surface water impacts
1.4 RCS/High Habitat Value	Priority habitats included on parcel	Direct or indirect positive impacts to priority habitats	Does not directly or indirectly support priority habitats
2. Determining features of the parcel-specific deal			
2.1. Type of purchase: fee or easement	Fee	Easement	No secure property rights
2.2. Type of sale	OR Bargain sale or donation	Appraised value	Over appraised value
2.3. Cost per acre and availability of matching funds	OR Better than agreed upon funding scenario TBD	As per agreed upon funding scenario	Outside of agreed upon funding scenario
2.4. Current condition of property	Good condition; no cleanup or restoration needed	Fair condition; minimal cleanup or restoration needed	Poor condition; extensive cleanup or restoration needed
2.5. Holder of property rights	“Partner” or capable NGO/govt. entity	District as temporary holder or only under exceptional circumstances	District permanently and/or under less than exceptional circumstances; private person, private business, or unestablished NGO/govt. entity
2.6. Stewardship responsibilities and costs	Responsibilities and costs assumed by or shared with “Partner” or capable NGO/govt. entity	Responsibilities and costs assumed by District	Private person, private business, or unestablished NGO/govt. entity
3. To be used when evaluating competing opportunities			
3.1. Identified as priority area for protection	Identified in plans by Metro, Parks, BES, others	Identified in other or emerging plans tbd	Not identified in any plan
3.2. Urgency of Sale &/or Threat of Development	Not urgent	Urgent, but time allows for appropriate deliberation	Urgent, no time for deliberation
3.3. Support from Local Communities	Evidence of full community support and engagement	Evidence community is at worst not opposed	Community not yet approached or evidence community is opposed
3.4. Size of Property	More than 5 acres	Between 1 and 5 acres	Less than one acre