

 **Metro** | *Agenda*

**Meeting:** Natural Areas Program Performance Oversight Committee  
**Date:** September 10, 2009  
**Time:** 7:30 to 10 a.m.  
**Location:** Metro Regional Center, Rooms 370A/B

---

7:30 to 7:35	Welcome (Peter Krainock)
7:35 to 8:00	Natural Areas Program updates (Kathleen Brennan-Hunter)
8:00 to 8:15	Review of last year's expenses – FY ending 6/30/09 (Kathleen Brennan-Hunter)
8:15 to 8:30	Capital Grants overview (Kathleen Brennan-Hunter)
8:30 to 8:40	Break
8:40 to 10:00	Capital Grants discussion (Sue Marshall, capital grants committee chair)
10:00	Adjourn

Coffee, pastries and fruit will be provided

Validated parking is available in parking structure accessed from Northeast Irving Street Please have parking ticket validated at Metro reception desk as you leave



## Natural Areas Program Performance Oversight Committee

September 10, 2009

---

**Committee members in attendance:** Dean Alterman, Bridget Cooke, Rocky Dixon, John Esler, Dave Evans, Helena Huang, Kay Hutchinson, Don Jones, Peter Krainock (committee chair), Anil Krishnamurthy, Cindy Maher, Tricia Martin, Jacquenette McIntire, Segeni Mungai, Steve Yarosh

**Committee members excused:** Linda Craig, Christine Dupres, Norman Penner, David Pollock, Dietra Stivahtis

**Guest:** Sue Marshall, Chair, Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants Review Committee

**Metro management:** Council President David Bragdon, Kathleen Brennan-Hunter, Jim Desmond

**Metro staff:** Tim Collier, Paul Garrahan, Marybeth Haliski, Heather Kent, Jonathan Soll, Craig Stroud

---

### Welcome

Committee Chair Peter Krainock welcomed the committee and thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

### Program updates

**Staffing.** Kathleen Brennan-Hunter introduced several new members of the natural areas team: Leif Anderson, trails negotiator; Jonathan Soll, science and stewardship manager; and Tim Collier, finance manager. She also reported that Heather Kent, who has been the program's communications coordinator will now be overseeing the Nature in Neighborhoods program. Kathleen is currently recruiting to fill the communications coordinator position.

**Acquisitions.** Kathleen noted that four properties have been acquired since the last committee meeting, one in the Johnson Creek Watershed target area (in partnership with the City of Portland and North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District), two in the Lower Tualatin River Headwaters target area (including the program's first conservation easement) and one in the Stafford Basin target area. She anticipates closing on a property in the Rock Creek target area within the next week.

Peter discussed performance measures related to the closing memos and noted that the committee had asked to be provided with a "snapshot" showing how the purchase made sense, as they felt that an acreage count was not an accurate representation of value. Discussion was held about the various criteria used for the performance measures; Kathleen will send the criteria definitions to the committee.

Peter asked if it will be difficult to meet the refinement objectives for each target area. Kathleen responded that she expects to achieve the overall acreage goals and anticipated being able to provide a more comprehensive answer as to each specific target area in another year.

Peter asked, of the four acquisitions since the last meeting, how many did Metro or the seller walk away from? Kathleen answered that there were only a handful since the beginning of the year, and perhaps only one since the last meeting. She indicated that several property owners walked away due to lack of agreement on price, one because their goals were incompatible with Metro's and one fell through due to discoveries found during the due diligence process. Jim noted that the term "walk away" is not absolutely accurate, as most unsuccessful sales are actually just put on hold for a later opportunity. Peter suggested and Kathleen agreed

that the negotiators will come to the October meeting to discuss some of the challenges they have encountered.

Rocky Dixon noted that members used to have a map of the various target areas so they know where their particular area of focus is. Kathleen will send a target area map to the committee.

Cooper Mountain Nature Park. Kathleen reported that the Cooper Mountain Nature Park opened at the end of June and that construction was accomplished with bond funds. Metro is very excited, as park use since its opening has been beyond expectations. If committee members have not been there yet she encouraged them to get out and see it. David Bragdon acknowledged Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District's partnership in managing the site.

The Intertwine. Jim Desmond discussed The Intertwine, the region's new initiative promoting the area's parks and natural areas. Formerly called Connecting Green, the launch date for the brand is September 18. Jim also noted that a number of business partners have been engaged in the Intertwine conversation. September 18 is also Park(ing) Day, a national event to promote parks in the community where various groups will take over parking spots and turn them into a park for a day. Eighteen area parking sites will have Intertwine branding with information for the public.

Financial update. Kathleen reviewed recent financial documents (attached). Extensive discussion was held about the cost allocation process. Peter noted that reviewing budget and spending issues is part of the committee's purpose and felt the committee owed it to the voters to look at the cost allocation formula and determine how it impacts the bond measure. David Bragdon suggested Metro's CFO attend the next committee meeting to address the budget and cost allocation issues. Dave Evans asked for a list of names attached to the actual FTEs, and that information will be included on the back of the next financial summary. Segeni Mungai requested a pie chart showing the bond funds spent to date.

### **Capital Grants program update**

Capital Grants Review Committee chair Sue Marshall discussed the capital grants portion of the Natural Areas program and the unique challenges in administering the program. Kathleen distributed a brief overview of the program (attached). Peter inquired about the intent behind adding the capital grants portion to the 2006 bond measure. David Bragdon replied that the overriding thought was that during the course of the bond there might be opportunities that came up that were not within the acquisition resolution determined during the refinement process and the program would hold money in reserve for these opportunities. In addition, the program would assist nonprofit organizations, watershed councils, friends groups, conservation districts and schools that may lack access to the capital necessary to fund their projects. Kathleen noted that her staff and the capital grants committee are working hard to be fair and consistent, and yet different groups have varying expectations of the program.

Sue reported that the committee has just completed the second round of grants awards. She noted that the committee has diverse perspectives and a good working relationship. Councilors Robert Liberty and Carl Hosticka are committee members but do not vote on grant recommendations. The committee is focusing on targeted outreach and hopes to see some projects coming from some of the more underserved areas. She acknowledged the program's high expectations pertaining to the application criteria, but feels it is appropriate. Sue also noted that with any new grant program there is always a ramp up period. The first several awards set a precedent and show the community what we are looking for.

Discussion was held about the 2:1 match and whether a 1:1 match would better suit the program, and what the follow up process is to ensure the match is met. Kathleen indicated that all grants are approved by the Metro Council and the grantee enters into a contract with Metro. Invoices are submitted by the grantee, and Metro has benchmarks that must be met. The grantees do not receive the funds until they provide the match.

Peter asked committee members to share their comments, questions and concerns about the capital grants program:

*John Esler* – Citizens are watching the first year and the community who looks for grant money talk all the time. He feels confident the number and quality of applications will increase, both east and west side. He asked if a group that has been awarded a grant can apply for another at a later date. Sue indicated that the committee has not yet been approached with this issue and would weigh the new project against the other projects in the pool. Kathleen said the committee would consider the applicant's performance in the first project when considering a second grant.

*Sindy Maher* – What is the ideal project? Sue said that was difficult to answer because the committee is trying to encourage innovation and provide some equity for areas that do not have many opportunities for people to interact with nature. Restoration or easement that gives the public access to natural areas where there previously was none are priorities. The program allows for a very diverse set of projects.

*Kay Hutchinson* – Does the committee hear about the applications that were not selected for consideration? Sue replied that while this has not happened in the past, she had planned on suggesting it at the next capital grants committee meeting.

*Dean Alterman* – Will Metro and the committee review the awards five years from now? Sue replied that the committee will also be discussing this at their upcoming meeting. Kathleen noted that program evaluation has been discussed at the staff level, including formulating performance measures.

*Peter Krainock* – Wondered about the effectiveness of the costs of administering the program versus the program's benefits. Would a 1:1 match compromise the program? Jim replied that one objective of the program is to get nonprofits engaged and a 2:1 match is one way to force a serious commitment and ongoing involvement. Heather Kent noted that Metro's non-capital restoration grant program leverage is 4:1, so relatively speaking 2:1 is not as high a bar as it may sound. Sue indicated the committee will keep the match ratio in mind as discussions with the community continue.

*Dave Evans* – Is staffing adequate for the program? Kathleen noted that Mary Rose Navarro spends 50% of her time on the local share program and 50% on the grants program, and a portion of Heather Kent's time is allocated for grants as well. Both Sue and Kathleen felt staffing is adequate at this time. Helena Huang suggested it would be more cost effective if there was some external funding source where foundations could play a role in assisting applicants with their inquiries.

*Dave Evans* – What are the program's goals and how are they measured? Are they meeting the objectives? Is it too early to tell? Sue acknowledged the need for an evaluative tool and indicated the criteria is there to create one. Peter noted that a subgroup of the Oversight Committee met with staff to determine the performance measures for acquisitions and perhaps they would agree to meet to create performance measures for the capital grants program as well.

Jacquenette – Feels the program is on track for now, but would like to meet with capital grant committee members in another year to determine if any changes need to be made.

### **Next Meetings**

The next two meetings of the Natural Areas Program Performance Oversight Committee will be **Thursday, October 15** and **Tuesday, December 8**. Both meetings will be held **7:30 to 10:30 a.m. in the Council Chambers**.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

**2006 Natural Areas Bond Fund**Summary of Resources, Requirements and Changes in Fund Balance  
(Unaudited)

	FY07		FY08		FY09 YTD as of 6/30/2009		Program Total
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount
Beginning Fund Balance	0		122,299,467		93,975,794		0
<b>Resources</b>							
Bond Proceeds	130,678,369		0		0		130,678,369
Interest Earnings	1,301,230		5,600,503		2,538,906		9,440,640
Other Resources	10,000		27,380		5,322,056		5,359,436
<b>Subtotal Resources</b>	<b>131,989,599</b>		<b>5,627,883</b>		<b>7,860,962</b>		<b>145,478,444</b>
<b>Requirements</b>							
<b>Land Acquisition</b>							
Staff Costs	117,956	4.50	206,692	5.50	425,072		749,730
Materials & Services	6,786		2,599		334,980		344,365
Land Costs	7,596,372		25,224,753		14,517,159		47,338,284
<b>Due Diligence</b>							
Staff Costs	0	5.00	412,029	5.00	492,589		904,628
Materials & Services	96,539		199,756		183,474		479,769
<b>Stabilization</b>							
Staff Costs	19,578	3.40	116,534	3.40	190,606		326,724
Materials & Services	667		181,088		349,130		530,885
<b>Local Share</b>							
Staff Costs	0	0.63	36,269	0.63	43,872		80,143
Materials & Services	0		25		188		212
Payments to Jurisdictions	400,000		4,798,366		4,316,165		9,514,531
<b>Capital Grants</b>							
Staff Costs	0	0.87	63,831	0.87	89,352		153,185
Materials & Services	0		1,400		1,363		2,763
Grant Payments	0		0		49,750		49,750
<b>Capital Construction</b>							
Staff Costs	0	0.80	84,071	0.80	113,921		197,993
Capital	455,072		1,513,347		2,503,147		4,471,566
<b>Administration</b>							
Bond Issuance Costs	295,889		0		0		295,889
Refinement							
Staff Costs	1,477		5,426		0		6,903
Materials & Services	382,030		85,882		0		467,912
Direct Admin Costs							
Staff Costs	230,815	4.83	527,644	4.83	490,722		1,249,190
Materials & Services	25,980		152,422		51,490		229,892
Indirect Admin Costs*	60,971		339,422		635,788		1,036,181
<b>Other Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Subtotal Requirements</b>	<b>9,690,132</b>	<b>20.03</b>	<b>33,951,556</b>	<b>21.03</b>	<b>24,788,767</b>		<b>68,430,496</b>
Ending Fund Balance	122,299,467		93,975,794		77,047,989		77,047,989
	<b>FY07</b>		<b>FY08</b>		<b>FY09 YTD</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>Administration as % of Total Expenditures</b>	10.29%		3.27%		4.75%		4.80%

\* Indirect Administrative Expenses are those charged through internal allocation, and include services such as Human Resources, risk management, payroll, building rents, etc.

Note: Due Diligence staff costs have been removed from "Indirect Admin Costs" and the FTE for these positions is shown as a direct expense.

# Natural Area Acquisition Report by Target Areas - Including Stabilization Costs

File #	Seller	Date	Acres	Purchase Price	Stabilization Costs	City/ Jurisdiction	Total Stream Frontage (ft)	% Metro Ownership	% Other Ownership	Mgmt. By	% in Tier 1
<b><u>95 Bond Target Areas</u></b>											
<b>Goal:</b> 850 acres											
<b>Dairy and McKay Creeks Confluence</b>											
07.039	Wetter Trust	4/13/2007	93.3	\$700,000	\$9,403	Unincorporated	5,280	100		Metro	100.00%
07.042	Saxton	1/22/2009	6.7	\$105,700	\$7,858	Cornelius	673	100		Metro	100.00%
			<b>100</b>	<b>\$805,700</b>							
<b>East Buttes</b>											
02.097	Miller	6/30/2008	20.99	\$3,000,000	\$12,827	Happy Valley	1,404	97	3	NCPRD	100.00%
02.125	Darby Ridge/Gabbert Hill	6/6/2007	37.3	\$3,600,000	\$20,100	Gresham	0	75	25	Gresham	0.00%
02.135	Persimmon	7/20/2007	70	\$3,454,920	\$20,668	Gresham	0	100		Metro	100.00%
02.136	Persimmon	7/20/2007	8	\$198,250	\$819	Gresham	0	100		Metro	100.00%
02.137	McMorihara, Inc	10/14/2008	15	\$379,500	\$8	Gresham	0	100			
			<b>151.29</b>	<b>\$10,632,670</b>							
<b>Forest Park Connections</b>											
06.058	Margolis	3/27/2007	57.5	\$1,790,000	\$49,922	Unincorporated	0	100		Metro	100.00%
06.063	Multnomah Co. Foreclosure	9/25/2008	2.8	\$0	\$0	Portland	0	100			0.00%
06.065	OPF - Audubon Lease	11/20/2008	86.5	\$86,450	\$13,325	Portland	9,876	100		Metro	0.00%
			<b>146.8</b>	<b>\$1,876,450</b>							
<b>Killin Wetlands</b>											
56.001	Williams	12/11/2008	3.58	\$10,000			560	100		Metro	100.00%
			<b>3.58</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>							
<b>Tonquin Geologic</b>											
08.024	Dammasch DAS	7/25/2008	19.76	\$186,300	\$40,781	Wilsonville	718	100		Metro	0.00%
			<b>19.76</b>	<b>\$186,300</b>							
<b>Tualatin River Greenway</b>											
11.031	Kapaun	9/28/2007	0.41	\$275,000	\$6,539	Unincorporated	410	100		Metro	0.00%
11.033	Icon	10/24/2008	1.5	\$300,000	\$6,161	Tualatin	75	100	0	Metro	100.00%
			<b>1.91</b>	<b>\$575,000</b>							
<b>Willamette Narrows and Canemah Bluff</b>											
21.007	Davis	3/11/2009	24.34	\$690,000	\$2,834	Oregon City	0	100		Metro	100.00%
22.025	Kahre	3/25/2009	13.29	\$795,000		West Linn	0	100		Metro	100.00%
			<b>37.63</b>	<b>\$1,485,000</b>							
<b># of Transactions: 16</b>		<b>Acres: 460.97</b>		<b>\$15,571,120</b>	<b>\$191,245</b>	<b>18,996</b>		<b>Total % Tier 1 Acres: 64.91%</b>			

## Abernethy and Newell Creeks

**Goal:** 150 acres

File #	Seller	Date	Acres	Purchase Price	Stabilization Costs	City/ Jurisdiction	Total Stream Frontage (ft)	% Metro Ownership	% Other Ownership	Mgmt. By	% in Tier 1
03.053	Evanson/TPL	8/13/2007	106.66	\$1,140,000	\$4,336	Unincorporated	0	100		Metro	100.00%
<b># of Transactions: 1</b>		<b>Date:</b>	<b>Acres: 106.66</b>	<b>Purchase Price: \$1,140,000</b>	<b>Stabilization Costs: \$4,336</b>		<b>Total Stream Frontage (ft): 0</b>			<b>Total % Tier 1 Acres:</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Chehalem Ridgtop to Refuge**

**Goal:** 400 acres

48.001	Berry (Hamacher/Ponzi)	2/11/2008	36.3	\$1,146,500	\$23,720	Unincorporated	0	100		Metro	100.00%
48.001A	Berry (Hamacher/Ponzi)	12/31/2007	4.2	\$0		Unincorporated	0	100		Metro	0.00%
<b># of Transactions: 2</b>		<b>Date:</b>	<b>Acres: 40.5</b>	<b>Purchase Price: \$1,146,500</b>	<b>Stabilization Costs: \$23,720</b>		<b>Total Stream Frontage (ft): 0</b>			<b>Total % Tier 1 Acres:</b>	<b>89.63%</b>

**Clackamas River Bluffs and Green**

**Goal:** 450 acres

18.030	Anderson	2/26/2008	0.689	\$5,000		Unincorporated	0	100		Metro	100.00%
18.033	Thompson	2/27/2008	0.344	\$5,000		Unincorporated	0	100		Metro	100.00%
18.041	ODOT Carver Curves	5/28/2008	16.25	\$335,000		Unincorporated	2,000	0	100	Clackamas	100.00%
<b># of Transactions: 3</b>		<b>Date:</b>	<b>Acres: 17.283</b>	<b>Purchase Price: \$345,000</b>			<b>Total Stream Frontage (ft): 2,000</b>			<b>Total % Tier 1 Acres:</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Columbia Slough**

**Goal:** 50 acres

28.003	Multnomah C Tax Transfer	10/25/2007	2	\$0		Portland	0	100		Metro	100.00%
28.004	OR Parks Donation	12/10/2007	0	\$0		Portland	1,450	75	25	Metro	0.00%
<b># of Transactions: 2</b>		<b>Date:</b>	<b>Acres: 2</b>	<b>Purchase Price: \$0</b>			<b>Total Stream Frontage (ft): 1,450</b>			<b>Total % Tier 1 Acres:</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Johnson Creek and Watershed**

**Goal:** 200 acres

29.001	Wong/Gilberts Ridge	6/22/2007	10	\$525,000	\$4,137	Portland	0	100		Portland	100.00%
29.002	Spani/Seely	12/29/2006	1.02	\$240,000	\$9,820	Portland	150	100		Metro	100.00%
29.004	Telford	11/27/2007	20	\$1,200,000	\$70,551	Gresham	3,600	100		Metro	100.00%
29.005	Allesina	7/31/2007	1.28	\$450,000	\$16,880	Gresham	766	100		Metro	100.00%
29.006	Clatsop Buttes	7/13/2007	49	\$5,148,750	\$16,335	Portland	900	100		Portland	100.00%
29.007	Clatsop Buttes 2	1/7/2008	1.54	\$260,000	\$1,555	Portland	0	100		Portland	100.00%
29.008	Reeves	11/30/2007	52.68	\$5,850,000	\$4,670	Portland	0	100		Portland	100.00%
29.009	Emmert Lents 2	6/30/2009	10	\$1,135,000		Portland	1,300	0	100	NCPRD	100.00%

File #	Seller	Date	Acres	Purchase Price	Stabilization Costs	City/ Jurisdiction	Total Stream Frontage (ft)	% Metro Ownership	% Other Ownership	Mgmt. By	% in Tier 1
29.011	Emmert Clatsop	5/30/2008	11.32	\$1,600,000		Portland	350	25	75	Portland	100.00%
29.012	Stickney	7/14/2008	1.98	\$400,000	\$17,887	Gresham	1,485	100		Gresham	100.00%
29.015	Jones	10/7/2008	0.5	\$350,000	\$16,275	Gresham	30	100		Metro	100.00%
29.017	Gonzales	12/23/2008	0.38	\$25,000	\$1,618	Gresham	0	100		Metro	100.00%

**# of Transactions: 12      Acres: 159.7      \$17,183,750      \$159,729      8,581      Total % Tier 1 Acres: 100.00%**

**Local Share**

**Goal: 0**

53312	Knight's Bridge	3/20/2008	17.1	\$289,919		Unincorporated	0		100	Clackamas	0.00%
53344	Lamb	3/6/2008	20.18	\$4,040,000			0		100	NCPRD	0.00%
53501	O'Malley	1/17/2008	0.79	\$325,000		Milwaukie	0		100	Milwaukie	100.00%
53687	Copranis	11/30/2007	0.71	\$401,658		Beaverton	0		100	THPRD	100.00%
53792	Stites	7/23/2007	3.94	\$700,000		Forest Grove	0		100	Forest Gro	100.00%
53872	Schaltz	12/18/2007	1.11	\$580,000		Tigard	275		100	Tigard	0.00%
54211	Waterleaf	2/26/2008	26.85	\$4,000,000		Portland	0		100	Portland	0.00%

**# of Transactions: 7      Acres: 70.68      \$10,336,577      275      Total % Tier 1 Acres: 7.70%**

**Lower Tualatin River Headwaters**

**Goal: 400 acres**

54.001	Burge Trust	5/2/2007	52.93	\$808,500	\$8,467	Unincorporated	9,240	100		Metro	100.00%
54.003	Holmes	10/17/2008	38.6	\$1,050,000	\$7,555	Sherwood	3,400	100		Metro	100.00%
54.004	Cole	6/8/2009	5	\$325,000		Sherwood	1,550	100		Metro	100.00%
54.005	Streeter	6/8/2009	23.2	\$680,528	\$23	Sherwood	0	100		Metro	99.96%
54.006	Brown	4/30/2007	44.19	\$244,000	\$5,394	Hillsboro	0	100		Metro	100.00%

**# of Transactions: 5      Acres: 163.92      \$3,108,028      \$21,439      14,190      Total % Tier 1 Acres: 99.99%**

**Stafford Basin**

**Goal: 200 acres**

55.002	Stevens	6/20/2008	24.7	\$1,800,000	\$19,317	Lake Oswego	4,550	100		Metro	100.00%
55.003	Landover Properties, LLC	6/8/2009	63.91	\$4,473,000	\$9,097	West Linn	0	100		Metro	100.00%

**# of Transactions: 2      Acres: 88.61      \$6,273,000      \$28,414      4,550      Total % Tier 1 Acres: 100.00%**



File #	Seller	Date	Acres	Purchase Price	Stabilization Costs	City/ Jurisdiction	Total Stream Frontage (ft)	% Metro Ownership	% Other Ownership	Mgmt. By	% in Tier 1
<b>Total Acres Acquired:</b>		<b>1,110.32</b>	<b>Total Purchase Price:</b>		<b>\$55,103,975</b>		<b>Total Stream Frontage: 50,042 Feet / 9.48 Miles</b>				
<b>Total Number of Acquisitions</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>Total Stabilization Costs:</b>		<b>\$428,884</b>						

# **Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grant Program**

## **Program Review**

**September 2009**

### **Overview of program**

The Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants Program is funded by the Natural Areas Bond Measure, approved by voters in 2006. The measure provided \$15 million to fund a Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants Program to provide opportunities for the community to actively protect fish and wildlife habitat and water quality near where people live and work. The program can provide funding for projects that recover or create additional plant and animal habitats to help ensure that every community enjoys clean water and embraces nature as a fundamental element of its character and livability. The program can also provide funds to purchase lands or easements that increase the presence of natural features and their ecological functions in neighborhoods throughout the region. Projects must be capital and must be on land owned by a public agency.

The Capital Grants Program was first announced in September 2007. Since then staff have developed program materials, an application process and conducted outreach activities.

A Capital Grants Review Committee was confirmed by the Metro Council in November of 2007. Sue Marshall is the chair of the committee. This committee reviews applications and recommends projects to the Metro Council.

To date the program has reviewed 35 letters of interest for 30 different projects. Twelve of these projects have been invited to submit full applications. To date seven projects have been awarded funding totaling \$1,392,500.

### **Administrative goals and program set-up**

The first year of the program the primary focus was on establishing administrative procedures. With the goals of transparency and program accessibility, staff accomplished the following:

- Created the program handbook and revised it in Fall 2008 to make it more readable and accessible in response to feedback received after the first round.
- Created a workshop presentation and materials to support potential applicants.
- Created, implemented and revised outreach strategies.
- Oriented and supported the Grant Review Committee.
- Documented business processes.
- Established a review process and created related scoring forms, staff report and recommendation summary templates.
- Established award procedures and contract standards that include benchmarks and performance measures.

### **Grant review process**

The application review process includes the following steps:

1. Applicants submit Letter of Interest.
2. Metro staff review these letters, determine eligibility, and decide if projects should be invited to submit a full application.
3. Grant Review Committee meets for initial review to identify concerns and questions for clarification.

4. Staff provides feedback and questions to applicants in advance of site visits.
5. Site visits with staff and at least one member of the Grant Review Committee.
6. Staff reports with information and analysis are sent to the Grant Review Committee.
7. Second review meeting for the Grant Review Committee to make a final recommendation.

The Grant Review Committee has provided positive feedback about the process. Staff has not yet surveyed applicants to solicit their feedback about the process in any formal way, but would like to do so.

Staff plans to explore the possibility of engaging input from the Grant Review Committee at the Letter of Interest phase. At this point, only staff reviews the Letters of Interest for eligibility and gives feedback to the applicant on how to submit the strongest possible full application.

## **Outreach**

*Year One:* In addition to the extensive outreach associated with the program launch, additional outreach conducted the first year included:

1. Public agencies that own land, since they would have to be partners in any grant application
  - Approximately 100 people attended presentations in six separate meetings; at least one meeting was held in each county
2. Natural Resources NGOs, “Friends” groups, CPOs and neighborhood associations
  - At least nine meetings with over 110 people attending
3. School districts
  - Letters sent to principals of every school in the region
  - Councilor Liberty presentation to all Multnomah County school superintendents
4. Workshops
  - Four separate workshops were conducted attracting 43 people
5. Press
  - Article in Clackamas County newsletter that is delivered to every household
  - Articles in each Metro Councilor newsletter

*Year Two:* A new outreach strategy was developed to better focus staff time with help from an ad hoc committee which included Metro staff, Grant Review Committee members and interested partners. There are three elements of the strategy that staff has implemented over the past year.

1. Geographically targeted outreach – focused in specific areas that were identified as nature deficient and where Metro staff support could catalyze projects. This approach allows staff to invest in a focused way and then move to new areas and apply the same approach.
2. Strategic partnership development – Concentrate on public agencies and NGOs that are engaged in the types of efforts that may yield project opportunities (natural resource focused NGOs, developers, schools, affordable housing developers, architects, planners and other consultants).
3. General outreach – Ongoing communication with local jurisdictions, delivery of grant workshops, general presentations for community groups.

## Lessons Learned and Applied

- Staff keeps a list of projects discussed with potential applicants. This list includes all project inquiries including those that are not eligible for the Capital Grants Program. This list is maintained in order to give some indication of the level of interest in the program as well as some indicator of the effectiveness of the outreach. In addition, it indicates the amount of time spent talking to potential applicants. As of September 1, 2009 there are 138 projects on the list.
- There was feedback from potential applicants that the first edition of the Grant Handbook was not specific enough about types of projects that could be considered. Using the awards from the first two rounds of funding as a guide, staff is now better able to articulate characteristics of successful projects.
  - Projects that improve access to nature.
  - Projects that have benefits beyond the project itself.
  - A variety of partners engaged in the successful outcome of the project
- In addition, more clarity has developed regarding the type of projects that are eligible for the program.
  - Typical stormwater projects are not eligible.
  - Community garden elements cannot be funded with capital grant funding. However, a project can use community garden elements to meet the matching requirements as long as the community garden use is incidental to the overall project goals.
  - School sites may seem like good locations; however, community access, engaged partners and maintenance are issues that an applicant must address.
- The program handbook was extensively rewritten after the first round of funding to make the program more approachable. Handbook changes clarified application procedures and eligibility requirements. It included a new budget section and information on prevailing wage.

## Projects awarded funding

### 2008

Project: Conservation Corner

Recipient: East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

Grant Amount: \$99,500

Transform a neglected historic property into a neighborhood asset by installing demonstration projects that will help re-nature and re-green this low-income neighborhood.

Project: Crystal Springs Enhancements

Recipient: Portland Parks & Recreation

Grant Amount: \$150,000

Restore a 2,100-foot section of Crystal Springs Creek by removing a concrete channel that currently lines the creek and also removing an existing playground from the floodplain and installing native plants. The project includes the development of a nature-based play area that connects users to the site using creative elements that encourages free-form play.

Project: Hawthorne Grove Park

Recipient: Clackamas County Development Agency

Grant Amount: \$140,000

Acquire and develop a small neighborhood park within the North Clackamas Revitalization Area, a park deficient, low-income community.

### 2009

Project: Nadaka Nature Park Expansion

Recipient: City of Gresham

Applicant: East Wilkes Neighborhood Association

Grant Amount: \$220,000

This project entails acquisition of a 1.9 acre site that will improve public access to the existing 10-acre Nadaka Nature Park from NE Glisan. The nature park is a mostly forested site with a small meadow on the south side. It is the only natural area for the East Wilkes Neighborhood as well as for Rockwood Neighborhood, which is south of the acquired site.

Project: Greening the I-205 Corridor

Recipient: Friends of Trees

Grant Amount: \$415, 436

This project includes the planting of 1,300 native trees and 16,000 native shrubs in treated mulch beds in the I-205 right-of-way over the next three planting seasons using 2,400 volunteers giving 9,600 hours of time. Planting will begin in the fall of 2009 and conclude in spring 2011. Establishment, the watering and care of the plantings until they can survive without on-going attention, will occur each summer and run through 2012. Friends of Trees will continue establishment until the end of the summer 2015.

This project will demonstrate the value of volunteer tree planting and the use of native trees and shrubs along transportation corridors. Evaluation and documentation of this effort – from environmental benefits to maintenance costs – will be used by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 1 to frame a statewide discussion regarding policies associated with the agency's landscaping standards.

Project: White Oak Savanna Acquisition

Recipient: City of West Linn

Grant Amount: \$334,000

This project entails a contribution of one-third of the purchase price to acquire approximately 14 acres of significant Oregon white oak savanna in West Linn to protect, restore and manage as a natural area. This project will also initiate a restoration effort to include invasive species removal. Access to the site will be enhanced through the creation of a soft surface trail.

Project: Humboldt Learning Garden

Recipient: Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership

Grant Amount: \$33,686

This project will transform a vacant lot adjacent to Humboldt School into a Learning Garden that will be used by both Humboldt students and residents of the Housing Authority of Portland's Humboldt Garden Housing Project. The project will collect and re-use stormwater from the school roof and incorporate native plant materials throughout the site.