

Purchase of Development Rights

Conserving Lands, Preserving Western Livelihoods



a publication from the
Western Governors' Association,
Trust for Public Land, and
National Cattlemen's Beef Association

January 17, 2001

Dear Friend:

The Western Governors' Association, Trust for Public Land, and National Cattlemen's Beef Association are pleased to jointly publish *Purchase of Development Rights: Conserving Lands, Preserving Western Livelihoods*.

There are few concerns more central to the West than the protection of our traditional agricultural economy and our glorious natural landscapes. Our organizations, and many people across the region, are dedicated to finding and using effective, cooperative means to prevent the loss of prime farm and ranch lands, and the fragmentation of the open spaces we love.

The purchase of development rights (PDR) is one such tool. PDR transactions allow private landowners to conserve working landscapes using market- and incentive-based, non-regulatory techniques. PDR programs are voluntary, cooperative, public-private partnerships that help realize the permanent protection of lands that define many communities across the West.

This publication is designed to answer the *what*, the *where*, and the *how* of PDR. Please read this short document and then pass it along to a rancher, a legislator, or a friend who also cares deeply about the future of the Western landscape.

We welcome your comments and invite requests for more information about putting PDR to work in your community.

Sincerely,



Governor Dirk Kempthorne, Idaho
Chairman
Western Governors' Association



Will Rogers, California
President
Trust for Public Land



Lynn Cornwell, Montana
President-Elect
National Cattlemen's
Beef Association



Purchase of Development Rights

Conserving Lands, Preserving Western Livelihoods

**A publication from the
Western Governors' Association,
Trust for Public Land, and
National Cattlemen's Beef Association**

Project Leaders

Ellen R. Stein, Western Governors' Association
Andrew H. McLeod, Trust for Public Land
Myra Hyde, National Cattlemen's Beef Association

Developed in collaboration with

Mette Brogden, Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

January 2001

This publication was made possible by a generous grant from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation

Acknowledgments

The Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy provides neutral facilitation services for collaborative, multi-stakeholder policy development efforts. The Center was pleased to provide its staff to facilitate this collaborative effort and assist in the writing, research, editing, and layout of this publication. As part of its ongoing neutral role, the Udall Center and its staff take no position on the substantive issues and recommendations presented in this report.

This publication truly represents a cooperative effort with a number of individuals and organizations. We are especially grateful to Lynne Sherrod of the Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust and Susan Otis of the Yampa Valley Land Trust (YVLT) for their time and assistance to help us "get it right." Josh Schachter of the Sonoran Institute allowed us access to their photo collection and was very helpful with photographer contacts. Susan Otis also contributed photos from the YVLT files. And staff members from Governors' offices across the West were most generous in giving us their time for reviews and comments. We are also grateful to American Farmland Trust, the Land Trust Alliance, the Natural Resource Conservation Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Sonoran Institute, and The Nature Conservancy for the information that we used in this publication.

We wish to thank the following individuals for giving their assistance by providing information, editorial comments, research time, stories and photos for this publication:

Ben Alexander (Sonoran Institute), Heidi Anderson (Town of Breckenridge, CO), George Ascott (State of Alaska), Maria Baier (State of Arizona), Brad Barber (State of Utah), Mike and Lisa Bay (ranchers from Montana), Ray Beck (State of Montana), Linda Beethe (Nebraska Environmental Trust), Alicia Sanchez Bristow (Udall Center), Kirby Brown (State of Texas), G. Reeves Brown (rancher from Colorado) and cousin Reeves Brown (rancher from Montana and Colorado), Bill Bunce (State of Wyoming), Wally Cameron (City of Boulder, CO), Clare Carlson (State of North Dakota), Lisa Keala Carter (TPL), Jon Chatburn (State of Idaho), Matt Chen (State of Arizona), David Cline (Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council), Engeli Cole (City of Austin), Arlan Colton (State of Arizona), Paul Conry (State of Hawaii), Ernest Cook (TPL), John Cross (Town of Queen Creek, AZ), Cal Cumin (Mid-Yellowstone Land Trust, MT), Debbie Deagan (Gallatin Valley Land Trust, MT), Karen Deike (WGA), Debbie Dils (State of Montana), Julia Doermann (State of Oregon), Stefan Douglas (GOCO), Kate Drahm (TPL), Jerry Dubacker (Prickly Pear Land Trust, MT), Frank Dubois (State of New Mexico), Gene Duvernoy (King County, WA), Adam Eichberg (TPL), John Erickson (State of Nebraska), Lori Faeth (TNC), Jay Fetcher (CCALT), Constance Foster (TPL), Deb Frye (TPL), Dave Genter (TPL), Sylvia Gillen (WGA), Pam Gouse (Bitter Root Land Trust, MT), Colleen Hanlon (City of Gunnison, CO), Charlene Hernandez (Gunnison Ranchland Conservation Legacy), Lauren Hill (State of Nebraska), Jeff Jones (AFT), Matt Jones (State of Wyoming), Brian Kahn (Artemis Common Ground, MT), Craig Lee (TPL), Larry Lewis (State of Utah), Susan Lohr (Gunnison Ranchland Conservation Legacy), Bill Long (Montana Land Reliance), Colleen Loomis (Udall Center), Grant MacFarlane (Utah Rancher), Chris Mann (TPL), Teresa McHugh (TPL), Matt McKinney (Montana Consensus Council), Joseph Milan (Gunnison Ranchland Conservation Legacy), Bill Miller (Malpai Borderlands Group), Larry Morandi (National Conference of State Legislatures), Dennis Moroney (rancher from Arizona), Brent Morris (Montana), CJ Mucklow (Routt County Extension), Wendy Muzzy (TPL), Wendy Ninteman and Allie Duvall Jonkel (Five Valleys Land Trust, MT), Helen O'Shea (TPL), Lori Pellegrino (Jefferson County, CO), Luther Propst (Sonoran Institute), Brad Pruitt (State of Washington), Miles Rademann (Park City, UT), Ray Rasker (Sonoran Institute), Jim Reidhead (Larimer County, CO), Pam Roberts (State of South Dakota), Doug Robotham (TPL), Bob Rose (Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland), Bruce Runnels (TNC), Eric and Jean Schwennesen (ranchers from Arizona), Bob Sharp (rancher from Arizona), John Sisk (State of Alaska), Toby Sprunk (Douglas County, CO), Ron Stewart (Boulder County, CO), Grant Stumbough (State of Wyoming), Jim Schwartz (State of Wyoming), Carl Vail (Routt County PDR Program), Erik Vink (State of California), Carolyn Vogel (Texas Land Trust Council), Mike Volesky (State of Montana), Ben Way (AFT), Chris West (Douglas County Land Conservancy), Britt Weygandt (State of Colorado), Steve Williams (State of Kansas), John Wilson (Montana Land Reliance), Rick Yarde (Udall Center), Darryl Young (State of California), Marty Zeller (Land Conservation Consultant, Denver).

Editor: Kathleen Veslany

Layout and Design: Kimi Eisele

Cover photographs: Front: (top left) Bob Sharp, (top right) Kathe McCoy, (bottom) Josh Schachter. **Back:** Merv Coleman

By permission

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
I. How PDR is Helping Western Landowners Achieve Personal and Financial Goals	6
How an Individual PDR Transaction Works	
The Relationship between PDR and Conservation Easements	
How a PDR Transaction is Conducted	
If the Landowner Later Decides to Sell the Tract of Land	
Are there Buyers for Land with Existing Conservation Easements?	
Creating a PDR Transaction that is a Partial Sale and Partial Donation of the Development Rights	
How Landowners can Evaluate Whether PDR Might Be a Useful Tool for Them	
II. PDR Programs: Landowners Partner with the Public to Achieve Common Goals	11
How PDR Programs Work	
How PDR Programs are Funded	
A Key Strategy: Leveraging of Funds	
How Leveraging Works	
III. Development of PDR Programs in the West	15
The First Program in the West	
The Colorado Experience	
Other Efforts Around the West	
IV. How Might PDR Get Started in Other Communities and States?	17
PDR Programs Develop and Succeed in the West Largely Through the Efforts of Rural Landowners and Local Governments	
State-level Leadership is Crucial	
Partnership Opportunities with Private Organizations	
V. Appendices	19
PDR Programs and Private Land Trusts in Western States	
Land Conservation Organizations	
National and Regional Organizations	
Agricultural Land Trusts Formed by Producers in Western States	

Executive Summary

Agriculture is a way of life in the West. Ranching and farming are at the heart of Western culture and tradition. Working the vast, open landscapes of the West is both what brought the first wave of settlers into this region and how our communities and states came to flourish.

Today, change is evident throughout the West. In recent years, people have moved to Western states in record numbers, attracted to the stunning vistas, wide open spaces, and rural lifestyles. This trend is undercutting the very qualities that newcomers seek and that Westerners have long prized, as sprawling development consumes the unique character of Western landscapes and rural communities. The demand for rural homesites is increasing land prices, but is also threatening to fragment the large landscapes required to support agricultural livelihoods, healthy watersheds, and native plants and animals. In the last two decades alone, over one million acres of rangeland in the Greater Yellowstone area have been split into plots of 200 acres or less.¹

Westerners are finding that they must be highly innovative in conserving working landscapes and private lands while the opportunity still exists. Landowners need flexible tools that can help protect the landscapes on which their livelihoods depend.

It is the purpose of this paper to explain one such tool—purchase of development rights (PDR) transactions—and to describe the programs that are being developed to make this tool more widely available to Western landowners.

A well-established tool. PDR programs² began in the 1970s when communities in the eastern United States, alarmed at the loss of the farms that supplied food and fiber locally, decided to do something to protect their remaining farmland and open space from sprawl. They instituted public finance measures that could fund the acquisition and retirement of development rights in order to preserve agricultural lands in perpetuity. Community members worked with their elected officials to establish municipal, county, state, federal, and privately-sponsored PDR programs that enabled private landowners to partner with the public in the preservation of farms for agriculture as well as to preserve scenic beauty, wildlife habitat, watershed functions, and recreational opportunities. Through PDR programs, the public provides a cash payment to a landowner for the value of the development rights associated with a land parcel. The owner still owns the land, but is compensated for relinquishing the right to develop it as real estate. Agriculture and other uses of the land continue. For the public, PDR programs enable land conservation at a much-reduced expense, as the cost of PDR is less than outright purchase of land, and costs associated with subsequent management of the land remain the responsibility of the landowner.

A flexible tool that meets the unique needs of Western lands and communities.

The open and semi-arid landscapes in the West are quite different from those in the East, and this has resulted in two major differences in land ownership patterns among Western states, with important implications for land conservation.

- **Much larger tracts of working land are required to support a single family.** In this drought-prone region, ranchers needed to acquire access to large tracts of land in order to feed and water enough cattle to establish economically-viable operations. Consequently, a mixed-tenure system developed in the West that tied private lands to public. Many ranchers coupled the purchase of a base property—typically fertile bottomlands with important riparian corridors and wetlands—with forage-leasing arrangements on federal and state lands to create a single ranch operation.
 - ◆ One important implication of this practice is that deeded base properties border public lands and serve as important buffers. However, the base



Bob Sharp

In the decade from 1982 to 1992, more than one million acres per year of agricultural land across the greater United States were converted to residential and other development, one-third of which were classified as prime and unique farmland. From 1992 to 1997, the conversion rate doubled, with 11.2 million acres converted into developed lands.

*-The Natural Resources Conservation Service
"National Resources Inventory"
December, 2000*

¹ Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Bozeman, MT

² Often called PACE programs in the East (for purchase of agricultural conservation easements). "PACE" is sometimes used interchangeably with "PDR," but PACE programs focus exclusively on protection of agricultural lands for agricultural purposes, while PDR is not solely restricted to agricultural lands. PACE programs are also used to preclude the possibility of future development even if current agricultural zoning does not allow development.

properties also become very desirable for real estate development because of their proximity to beautiful landscapes that will not be developed. And these properties that *may* be developed contain areas of great importance to species diversity and healthy watershed functioning.

- ◆ A second implication is that the deeded portion of the ranch is usually considerably larger than individual agricultural land holdings in other areas of the United States with more rainfall. Certainly this is true for ranches that are entirely privately-owned. As a result, outright purchase of land for conservation can be prohibitively expensive in the West. A recent PDR transaction in Arizona, for example, involved a 22,000-acre ranch in the San Rafael Valley. A transaction in Utah involved 7,300 acres.
- **The West boasts an abundance of majestic landscapes that already have been protected from development as national parks, forests, and other lands under federal government ownership.** With a significant amount of land in the region already owned by the government, Westerners are looking for land protection alternatives that leave private lands in private hands. Many question the level of stewardship that agencies are able to provide as their budgets shrink, and outright purchase by the government takes land out of county tax bases. Putting ever more land into public ownership undermines the ability of communities to pay for needed infrastructure and schools.

PDR makes economic sense in the West: It is a compensatory approach to conservation that protects land from development pressure at prices that are more affordable for the public than outright purchase, and it helps keep farmers and ranchers on the land, providing essential stewardship and contributing to the tax base.



PDR transactions and PDR programs can serve the unique needs of the West by creating voluntary, market-based private land conservation options. PDR enables landowners to exercise their personal choices, and gain the satisfaction that they have made financially advantageous decisions while preserving an important legacy for future generations.



Dan Dagggett

I. How PDR is Helping Western Landowners Achieve Personal and Financial Goals

A large portion of private land in the West is owned by farmers and ranchers. Much of that land is expected to pass from one generation to the next, or to new owners, during the next 20 years. Decisions that will be made about these lands are long-term if not permanent, and will require thoughtful planning by both landowners and communities.

*—Reeves Brown,
Brown Ranch
Sand Springs, Montana*

Owners of working landscapes in the West find themselves pivoting between two interests. They want to work and live on the land, and in many cases have spent a lifetime protecting its natural and productive values. At the same time, they have invested in land and may want or need to realize a reasonable return on their investment through its development value.³

The good news for private landowners in many parts of the West is that the increasing demand for ranchettes and other real-estate development is increasing the economic value of their land. But this also leads to an uncomfortable dilemma for ranchers and farmers because often their preferred economic use is incompatible with development. However, as staying on the land becomes more expensive, private landowners feel increasing pressure to sell to developers.

PDR transactions provide one way out of this dilemma by giving private landowners a way to realize the development value of their land without having to develop it. Landowners can sell part or all of the development rights on their property and use the proceeds for a variety of individual needs to keep their family on the land. Ranchers have reduced debt and property taxes, expanded or modernized operations, invested for retirement, and/or settled estates with their PDR proceeds.

How an Individual PDR Transaction Works

PDR transactions are completely voluntary for landowners. They are undertaken only when a landowner believes it is in his or her best interest. The purpose of a PDR transaction is to help private landowners shield working and other privately-owned landscapes from development pressures through compensatory approaches to conservation.

Just as water rights attached to a parcel of land have long been bought and sold in the West, the right to subdivide and develop a piece of property can be bought and sold. A willing landowner can sell the development rights of a property to a qualified conservation entity, such as a non-profit land trust, public agency, or historic preservation organization. Development rights are sold and extinguished as part of a PDR transaction that places a conservation easement on the parcel. The landowner retains full ownership and use of the property for purposes other than real-estate development.

The value of the development rights on a parcel is determined by subtracting the estimated sale price of the property with a conservation easement in place from the current market value of the property with its development rights intact, taking into consideration any reserved rights. Since the value of the property is typically reduced by 40-75% when the development rights have been extinguished, landowners are finding that PDR can provide a helpful solution to inheritance tax dilemmas.



Merv Coleman

³ Ranching and farming investments in the land include not only the initial purchase price but also the agricultural improvements, management, and opportunity costs.

The Relationship between PDR and Conservation Easements

The relationship between PDR and conservation easements has been a source of confusion. Often the terms are used interchangeably. But conservation easements can be both sold and donated, and they can be used for purposes other than retiring development rights.

Owning a piece of property may be thought of as owning a bundle of sticks. Each stick represents a particular right that the property owner possesses, such as the right to minerals and water, and the right to construct buildings, subdivide the property, harvest timber, hunt, fish, and to exclude trespassers.

If one stick in the bundle is sold to allow someone else a particular use of the property, that sale is usually called an “easement.” Typically, easements are given or sold for road or utility access across private property to other private property. “Conservation easement” is the general term for an easement that results in the conservation of some natural resource by restricting or prohibiting a specific type of land use. Unlike access easements, conservation easements do not require provision of access, though a willing landowner may grant access for specific purposes as part of their agreement.

In a PDR transaction, a qualified conservation entity may purchase and extinguish the development rights from a property owner by purchasing a conservation easement that restricts homesite and commercial building development while continuing to allow agricultural, recreational, and other uses. The conservation easement is the legal instrument by which the development rights are conveyed to the qualified conservation entity. When people refer to “PDR,” they are referring to the purchase and restriction of development rights using a conservation easement, and they are specifying that the development rights are to be paid for rather than donated.

The conservation easement need not hamper the future economic viability of working landscapes. Indeed, the PDR transaction can help secure the operation with the cash realized from the sale of development rights.

Keeping the Ranch in the Family

Bob and Bunny Patterson knew that more than anything else they wanted to keep the family ranch intact. While wading through a morass of estate planning issues, their challenge at the end of the day was to be able to ranch for profit while ensuring that the next generation would be in place to benefit from their planning. After reaching consensus through a series of family meetings, they met with the Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust (CCALT) about the potential of selling the development rights on their three adjoining family ranches in southeastern Colorado. Bob and Bunny note, “We are very proud of the easement on our family ranch. Our family goal is to keep the ranch in the family and in production agriculture. PDR has let us capitalize on a value that we will never use. This has made it possible for two of our children to be in the operation now and it will make it easier to pass it on to future generations. We feel we have preserved the future of our land and we still have full ownership and control.” All this family gave up is the right to develop this property in the future, while retaining several future homesites on the ranch to accommodate their growing family. Because of significant natural features and the wildlife habitat on their ranches, CCALT was able to secure funding and support from Great Outdoors Colorado, the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation, the Gates Family Foundation, the Conservation Fund and Colorado Open Lands, and the transaction is now in the final phase of completion.

Private Decisions to Save Land

Through PDR, the landowner can raise some money without losing control or ownership of the land itself. If farmers or ranchers can get full value for their land by selling the development rights into a public program, the continued highest value for the land will be agriculture or timber. That stems the loss of open space and suburban sprawl. Plus, purchasing development rights is a way to achieve widespread permanent protection of the landscape without the kind of controversy that regulation brings with it.

*—Ernest Cook,
Trust for Public Land*

How a PDR Transaction is Conducted

The specific development rights that the landowner will forego or restrict in a PDR sale are fully negotiable between the landowner and qualified conservation entity, allowing terms to be tailored to meet the needs of the landowner and to preserve the property. For example, while generally restricting subdivision, landowners may want to reserve the right to develop a limited number of homesites for their children or to sell to buyers looking for rural homesites. Or landowners may want to list a set of activities that they feel must be allowed to continue in order to keep the land economically viable—usually these include farming or ranching. The purchaser will require the right to monitor the property periodically to ensure that the landowners are meeting the terms of the easement. All of this is negotiated as part of the PDR transaction, allowing flexibility to meet the unique needs of individual landowners.

If the Landowner Later Decides to Sell the Tract of Land

In the case of a sale, easements go with the land, not the landowner. The current—and all future—owners are bound by the terms of the conservation easement, as with other kinds of easements. Easements are recorded in county or town records offices so that future buyers and lenders will know about the easement when a title report is consulted.

Are there Buyers for Land with Existing Conservation Easements?

Among buyers for land with existing conservation easements are young ranchers who cannot afford to pay for ranchland at its developable price—the next generation of ranchers. And as the demand for rural property and lifestyles has risen with the increasing population in the West, “conservation buyers” looking for tracts of land with intact natural values find land with existing conservation easements especially attractive. In the future, the price of these properties can still rise as the supply of large, undeveloped tracts of land in the West shrinks and the demand stays constant or increases.

Land Made Affordable by PDR

Eric and Jean Schwennesen actively looked for land that they could buy with an existing conservation easement in place because it was the only affordable alternative acceptable to them. When they purchased their Double Check Ranch in Arizona, The Nature Conservancy purchased a conservation easement from the seller at the same time and held it until the Bureau of Land Management could complete the requirements to receive the easement as part of its riparian area protection program along the San Pedro River. Jean notes, “Normally you have to pay for the development rights whether you intend to use them or not. You can end up forced to develop or to shoulder the financial burden of maintaining the open space that the public values.” With the conservation easement in place, the purchase of the property became a ranch business decision rather than a real-estate decision. The seller in this transaction received the full market value of the land with development rights intact at the point of sale. The PDR part of the transaction was initiated by the buyer, so that, in effect, there were two buyers in this single land transaction.

PDR is a tool that can also be used by willing buyers.

Creating a PDR Transaction that is a Partial Sale and Partial Donation of the Development Rights

Many landowners are finding the right mix of desired tax benefits and cash proceeds by creating a PDR transaction that is a partial sale and a partial donation of the development rights. When a landowner sells the development rights for less than their full value it is called a “bargain sale,” and the difference becomes a tax-deductible charitable donation.⁴ Bargain sales can reduce inheritance taxes while providing cash to settle the estate and keep the ranch intact. PDR, donation of conservation easements, or a mix of these options can provide many different avenues of tax relief. Tax advisors who are familiar with these instruments can explain the options in detail.

How Can Landowners Evaluate Whether PDR Might Be a Useful Tool for Them?

The first step is for families to identify and write down goals for their family and their land. They are then in a position to seek expert advice to help them decide whether PDR might be the right tool to help them achieve those goals.⁵ PDR is not for everyone, but it has proved invaluable for many landowners across the United States.

⁴ Not to exceed 30 % of adjusted gross income in the year of donation and for five years thereafter if all the benefit is not captured in the first year.

⁵ A partial listing of organizations with expertise in land protection tools is included in Appendix B.



Bob Sharp

Tailoring PDR to Meet Individual Needs

Mike and Lisa Bay were purchasing the family ranch in Wolf Creek, Montana, and they needed cash to capitalize their ranching operation. They heard about the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks' *Habitat Montana Program*, which purchases conservation easements from private landowners. They decided to sell the development rights on their ranch to the program, and received a cash payment of 40% of the appraised value of the ranch. Lisa says, "We had no intention of subdividing our property because we strongly believe in open space preservation, and we wanted to provide a model in our area for keeping agricultural lands in agricultural use." They also think that the transaction will help ease the transition from one generation to the next, because with the development rights retired, the estate value is lowered. As part of their PDR transaction with the *Habitat Montana Program*, they also agreed to allow a certain number of hunting days per year on their ranch and to maintain a rest/rotation management plan. The transaction was completed in 1995, and they remain pleased about it. They report that another rancher up the creek from them has also sold the development rights on his property.

PDR Provides a Solution for a 50-member Family-owned Corporation

The Peaceful Valley Ranch outside Salt Lake City, Utah, has significant historic, cultural, and natural values. The Donner-Red Trail, Mormon Pioneer Trail, California Trail, Overland Stage Trail, and the Pony Express all pass through the ranch. The ranch also contains a large portion of the watershed for the East Canyon Reservoir.

The ranch is owned by a family corporation with over 50 shareholders. One side of the family lives and works the 7300-acre ranch, and the other side lives in the eastern United States and has been less connected to the land in recent years. Financial difficulties on the eastern side created pressure for sale of the ranch, and the family was looking for a solution. PDR looked promising, but the amount of funds required to purchase the development rights at full value was prohibitive.

Many of the family members retain close ties to the ranch, and the ranch company agreed to donate a significant part of the development rights in order to keep it intact. The transaction was assisted by the Trust for Public Land, and occurred in two phases. In the first, a conservation easement was sold on 1,790 acres. The federal government's U.S.D.A. Forest Legacy Program provided \$900,000 to pay for the easement. In the second phase, a conservation easement was sold on the remaining 5,510 acres for \$1.6 million. The full value of the easements was appraised at \$6.4 million, of which the ranch company donated \$3.9 million. This ranch-preservation project was the first to receive funding from the Utah Quality Growth Act, which provided \$750,000. The remaining amount was raised through efforts by the Trust for Public Land, Utah Open Lands, the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, and several private foundations.

You can read the full story on their Web site at: www.savetheranch.com

PDR is a flexible tool and useful in a variety of unique situations faced by land-owners in the West. However, finding qualified conservation entities with enough money to purchase development rights at full value as the need appears is nearly impossible in Western states currently. If Westerners want to protect properties with significant agricultural, historic, cultural, natural, recreational and other open space values, they will need to find ways to develop dedicated, substantial funding mechanisms and to make purchasing priorities.

And that's how PDR programs can help.



II. PDR Programs: Landowners Partnering with the Public to Achieve Common Goals

PDR programs provide funds and develop procedures that help landowners and the public complete PDR transactions to achieve mutually desired goals.

- *PDR programs provide comprehensive assistance to landowners.* When a landowner realizes a financial need that could be solved using PDR, the existence of a PDR program means that the capacity to complete the transaction is already in place. The landowner does not have to do the time-consuming tasks of locating or even creating a funding source and a qualified conservation entity to hold the easement, as did the early PDR pioneers.
- *PDR programs with public financing provide a way for private landowners to partner with neighbors and their communities to protect land from development.* The public has a stake in the preservation of working landscapes for a variety of reasons, including keeping locally-grown food and fiber available; maintaining scenic and historic landscapes; and protecting watersheds, wildlife habitat, and recreational opportunities. It would be unfair to expect landowners to bear the full cost and responsibility for open space protection in the West by voluntarily forgoing the development value of their land. PDR programs allow the costs of conserving private lands for agricultural and open space values to be shared by all the beneficiaries—landowners, their communities, and the public as a whole. Furthermore, PDR programs can increase public understanding and support for the many benefits that farms and ranches bring to both urban and rural communities.
- *PDR programs may actually save money for communities in the long run.*⁶ American Farmland Trust (AFT) has noted that Montgomery County, Maryland, saved nearly half-a-billion dollars in infrastructure costs by spending \$50 million to purchase conservation easements on blocks of contiguous farmland. A 2000 survey of studies that examined the cost of community services in 70 communities across the United States found that for every tax dollar collected from residential land uses, local governments spent \$1.15 on average for provision of services. In contrast, for each tax dollar received from agricultural land uses, local governments spent only 37 cents for services.⁷

Across the United States, a wide variety of municipal, county, state, and private PDR programs exist, and are tailored by local communities and individual states to meet unique local and regional needs. Generally, state, county, or municipal levels of government administer the programs. In some cases, counties may have independent programs where no state program exists, or the state may also have a program to purchase development rights that is independent of local programs. In other cases, state and local programs may work together to leverage a mix of public funds and/or create the right combination of local self-determination and regional-planning capability.

Public PDR programs may receive and hold the conservation easement conveyed in a PDR transaction, but they often partner with private organizations to accomplish their protection goals. Private, non-profit land trusts and land conservation organizations are local, regional, statewide, or national organizations⁸ that work with landowners to protect important landscapes. These organizations serve many functions in a community, including providing technical assistance and information, and facilitating purchases. Land trusts typically receive and hold conservation easements in perpetuity. Many have relied on donation of easements, but

⁶ From the Sonoran Institute's 1997 publication, "Preserving Working Ranches in the West."

⁷ Costs vary by community. For example, in Gallatin County, Montana, \$1.45 is spent for residential services, while 25 cents is spent for ranch and farmlands per dollar of property tax revenue. A full report is available on AFT's Web site.

⁸ The Land Trust Alliance maintains a comprehensive listing of land conservation organizations on their Web site.

Contact information for these organizations is given in Appendix B.



Josh Schachter

increasingly, as public money is becoming available for PDR programs, purchased easements will constitute a portion of their holdings.

How PDR Programs Work

PDR programs are completely voluntary. Landowners decide for themselves whether to take advantage of a program in order to meet their individual needs. Willing landowners may apply to a program to sell the development rights on all or part of their property.

Every program that exists today has many more applicants than funding, making it necessary for landowners and community members to work together to address how applications should be prioritized. They determine the criteria for evaluating landowner applications and often develop a standardized scorecard that typically rates:

- the cost of the easement,
- development pressures on the land,
- productivity for agricultural and other economic uses,
- the condition of the land in general,
- environmental and cultural benefits of preservation,
- proximity to other preserved lands,
- amount of landowner donation of the value of the easement, and
- leverage of matching funds coming from other funding entities.

Programs have tended to favor protection of agriculturally-based communities, watersheds, and habitat corridors rather than creating small islands of individually conserved properties that can be surrounded by subdivision. This practice helps to preserve ranching and farming infrastructure as well as intact ecological systems that support wildlife and recreational opportunities, including hunting and fishing.

How Programs are Funded

PDR programs report that their biggest challenge is meeting the demand for PDR. Even the most active programs are not able to keep up with landowner applications to sell development rights. American Farmland Trust reports that for every landowner who sold easements to state or local programs in 1995, six others were turned away for lack of funding. The dire need to create substantial, dedicated funding sources for state and local PDR programs can hardly be overstated.

States and localities have created PDR programs and used a wide variety of means to fund them. Voters in both local and state elections have proved very willing to tax themselves to support land conservation measures.

Roundup Programs

Funding mechanisms can be quite creative. Miles Rademann of Park City, Utah suggests an intriguing approach called "roundup." This practice joins state, county, and local governments with special service districts, corporations, utilities, and other entities and organizations that bill a large number of customers on a regular basis. Each organization asks their customers if they would permit their monthly, quarterly, or yearly bills to be "rounded up" to the next higher dollar amount, with the money earmarked for PDR programs.

The most common financing mechanisms at the state level across the United States have been annual appropriations, dedicated lottery revenues, and bonds directly authorized by the legislature or by voter referendum. Often funding for programs at both state and local levels has been achieved through a combination of several financing mechanisms, some quite innovative.¹⁰ For example:

- Montana established a rancher-friendly program funded with fishing and hunting license fees, and voters in Missoula and Helena each approved \$5 million in bonds backed by property tax increases to fund parks, recreation, and open space programs. In 1999, the Montana Agricultural Heritage Program was created with an initial general fund allocation of \$1 million.
- Douglas County, Colorado, the country's fastest growing county, approved a \$25-million revenue bond backed by a sales/use tax to preserve open space in 1996.
- In Davis, California, developers pay for PDR programs through a unique farmland mitigation program. They are allowed to develop properties in appropriate areas if they help pay for open space mitigation through funding PDR on properties in other areas.
- In Bernalillo County, New Mexico, voters approved a two-year, 1/2 of 1% sales tax increase to fund open space preservation in 1998.
- In Carson City, Nevada, voters passed a 1/2 of 1% "quality of life" sales/use tax for parks, trails, and open space acquisition in 1996.
- Kentucky allows urban counties to fund their PDR programs by: an ad valorem tax; a license fee on franchises, trades and professions; room taxes; or a combination of these options, chosen in a local referendum.
- Several counties in Maryland use local real-estate transfer taxes supplemented by general fund appropriations to finance their PDR programs.
- Pennsylvania levies a cigarette tax.
- Maine has a state-sponsored credit card that raises money to acquire important natural resource lands, including farmland.
- Virginia Beach, Virginia, raises money for its PDR program from a cellular phone tax, a dedicated 1.5% increase in local property taxes, and county appropriations.

The wide variety of programs and their funding packages testify to the compelling story of these efforts: They are locally grown programs that develop as a result of private landowners, elected officials, and community members having conversations about the unique values they would like to preserve and finding creative ways to realize their vision.

¹⁰ Many of these programs are described in *Holding Our Ground: Protecting America's Farms and Farmland*, by Tom Daniels and Deborah Bowers, published by Island Press (1997). A more complete listing of programs and funding sources in the West is included as Appendix A.

A Key Strategy: Leveraging of Funds

Landowners and their communities face a seemingly daunting task in developing adequate levels of funding to meet their program goals. But while communities may think that they cannot accomplish their land protection goals unless they raise large amounts of money locally, the experience of Routt County, Colorado, proves otherwise. Established in 1996, this county's PDR program currently raises \$450,000 per year with a one-mil property-tax increase,¹¹ but this relatively small amount has leveraged an additional \$3.2 million in start-up funds and matching grants from a state-wide lottery-funded program called Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO), the Colorado Division of Wildlife, the USDA Farmland Protection Program, The Nature Conservancy, and the Yampa Valley Land Trust.

How Leveraging Works

State PDR programs and private funders may offer challenge grants to encourage local communities to create new funding sources in order to secure matching dollars for conservation. Local PDR programs may also find matching funds through federal easement programs such as the Farmland Protection Program, the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, and the Forest Legacy Program. Funding from one source "leverages" funding from others, and the result is more money to protect working landscapes.



Josh Schachter

¹¹ A "mil" is one tenth of a penny per dollar of property value, e.g. \$10 per \$10,000 of property value.

III. PDR Programs in the West

Soon after the creation of the country's first PDR programs in the eastern United States, communities across the West began to develop PDR programs as an effective, landowner-friendly means to preserve working landscapes.

The First PDR Program in the West

The Farmland Preservation Program in King County, Washington, was initiated by concerned landowners in 1978. It was designed to leave ownership of land in private hands and to ensure the availability of locally-grown agricultural products. Through a voter-approved bond of \$50 million, development rights for 13,000 acres have been acquired. Farmers have benefited from their proximity to markets in surrounding cities, and as a result, business within the farming community is thriving. The program stopped acquiring easements in 1987 when the funds were fully spent, but it continues to monitor its existing easements.

The Colorado Experience

A very popular tourist and recreation destination, Colorado experienced the effects of sprawl and landscape fragmentation probably earlier than any other Western state. In response, its residents have worked to create policy tools and programs that will help preserve its magnificent landscapes and rural heritage. The diversity of efforts is instructive.

Colorado voters approved the establishment of a trust fund in 1992, called Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO). It receives a portion of Colorado Lottery proceeds—approximately \$35-40 million per year—and awards grants for outdoor recreation, wildlife, and open space acquisition. Since its inception, it has helped to conserve over 156,000 acres of open space, including over 73,800 acres of agricultural land. PDR has been a prominent tool for conservation. The program requires matching funds from applicants.

Some of the earliest local efforts to use PDR occurred in Routt County (which includes Steamboat Springs) as it faced increasing development pressure and a proposal for a huge new ski resort in the area.

- In 1990, citizens started holding a series of meetings about the future direction of Routt County. The meetings were between ranchers, farmers and other business owners, environmentalists, and conservationists who realized that they wanted the same thing: a community that treasured its open space and valued its agricultural and ranching traditions. These meetings led to the 1992 establishment of the Yampa Valley Land Trust (YVLT), and several citizen-driven open lands protection efforts in the county. The 1992-93 local government-endorsed Vision 2020 planning process made several recommendations through its Open Space Committee. These led to the Routt County Open Lands Plan, completed in 1993-95, that includes protection options for rangeland, and the establishment of a countywide PDR program in 1996.

- In 1993, neighbors in the county's Upper Elk River Valley began to use conservation easements as a tool to maintain the rural and agricultural nature of their community. This versatile tool met individual needs in various ways. Jay and Gael Fetcher were facing a massive estate tax problem because of escalating land values, and reduced the problem by donating an easement on 1300 acres. Steve Stranahan and Ken Jones, partners in a 500-acre guest ranch operation, recognized that housing development would threaten their business since the beautiful surroundings and natural setting were what attracted clientele. They bought an agricultural buffer around their ranch, but soon realized that strategy would only take them so far. They worked with Jay Fetcher and Marty Zeller, a land-conservation consultant from Denver, to interest other neighbors in using conservation easements and, as a good faith gesture, donated an easement on their property. Mary Mosher then donated an easement on her 800 acres because she wanted to leave intact the character of the landscape for her children to enjoy. Another set of neighbors preferred to sell their development rights and initiated a search for grant funding.

We are the stewards of Colorado's future. For the sake of our children and grandchildren, we must preserve Colorado's natural beauty and provide opportunities for future generations to pursue their own dreams. Our task is to protect our special Colorado way of life.

*—Governor Bill Owens,
Colorado*



John Covert - YVLT File

- In 1995, a coalition of ranchers, builders, business leaders, conservationists, and local government officials spearheaded a countywide PDR campaign. As noted previously, in 1996 local residents passed a one-mil property tax increase to finance the PDR program, of which more than 55% will come from out-of-state residents and corporations. The criteria used to evaluate applications to the PDR program include: the amount of owner contribution; quality of land resource; economic viability; multiple community values; and, circumstances affecting continued agricultural operation. YVLT and The Nature Conservancy have been the sponsoring land conservation organizations of the projects reviewed for consideration and, with County Extension, have been invaluable ongoing partners, lending knowledge, connections, and direction to the program.

In 1995, the Colorado Cattlemen’s Agricultural Land Trust (CCALT) was created by the Colorado Cattlemen’s Association—the first agricultural land trust in the country formed by mainstream producers. They created CCALT to provide a local, agriculturally-focused conservation partner for Colorado ranchers who were faced with growing development and economic pressures, and to encourage continued agricultural production for the benefit of everyone. CCALT’s primary emphasis is to increase awareness among agricultural landowners about the use of conservation easements as a means of protecting land and facilitating the inter-generational transfer of productive lands. Of over 30 land trusts in Colorado, only CCALT specifically serves the needs of the broader agricultural community. CCALT is completing its first PDR projects protecting 21,500 acres with funding from GOCO, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Gates Family Foundation, the Conservation Fund, Colorado Department of Wildlife, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the U.S.D.A. Forest Service.

In Gunnison County, a biologist and a local rancher founded the Gunnison Ranchland Conservation Legacy program. They developed a local PDR program after mapping agricultural lands in production in Tomichi Creek Valley, Ohio Creek Valley, and East River Valley from the town of Sargents to Crested Butte, noting lands at greatest risk for development. The pair traveled the county explaining the possibilities of a PDR program to local ranchers, and 74 of the 75 ranchers in the valleys were interested in developing a program. The program received a grant of \$1-2 million from GOCO to fund the first phase, dependent on \$125,000 in local matching funds. A proposal to use a fraction of the local sales tax to back a bond issue for the matching funds was supported by the towns of Crested Butte and Mount Crested Butte but rejected by the Gunnison City Council. In response, Gunnison County put an issue on the November 1997 ballot to establish a land conservation fund using part of the Gunnison County towns’ share of sales tax revenues. County voters approved the measure, and the Ranchland Conservation Legacy program applies for grants from that fund. As of October 2000, there are 15 easements protecting 6,032 acres, and 35 ranchers are on the waiting list for funding. The ranchers all agreed that the program should operate on a first-come, first-served basis, each landowner donates 25% of the development rights, and landowners should choose the land trust that will hold their easement. CCALT holds almost all of the easements.

Other Efforts in the West

The past three years have seen a lot of PDR activity in other Western states. Montana and Utah now have state-level programs with funding. The Arizona Legislature passed enabling legislation in 2000. And local land trust organizations are being created in virtually every Western state, two of which have been formed by producers—the California Rangeland Trust and the Wyoming Stock Growers Agricultural Land Trust. Descriptions of existing PDR programs by state and lists of land trusts and land conservation organizations are included in the appendices.



¹² From the booklet, “Keeping the Family in the Family Ranch,” published by the Colorado Cattlemen’s Agricultural Land Trust (1997)



Bob Sharp

We will have to help people who are on the land feel good about stewardship, and that they are in control of their own choices so they can pass something along to their children that is better than what they received.

—Governor Jim Geringer, Wyoming

IV. How Might PDR Get Started in Other Communities and States?

PDR Programs Develop and Succeed in the West Largely through the Efforts of Rural Landowners and Local Governments

The needs of landowners motivate the search for effective conservation tools. In a number of places, rural residents have been able to complete their individual PDR transactions with the help of real estate experts and private land-conservation organizations familiar with PDR. These partners help secure funds and facilitate complicated transactions.

As the profound implications of sprawl dawn on communities in the West, the public is becoming more receptive to funding the protection of open space through the conservation of farm and ranch lands. Many groups and individuals who were previously at odds are recognizing that they want many of the same things and are working together to achieve common goals. They are collaborating with local governments to build on the success of individual transactions by creating PDR programs.

State-level Leadership is Crucial

The most significant step that state-level policymakers can take is to sponsor legislation to create a statewide PDR program with a substantial, dedicated source of funding. The state program can then be used to help counties and municipalities develop and fund locally-tailored programs. States that do not currently allow counties and municipalities to levy additional taxes to fund open space preservation need to consider passing enabling legislation so that voters can make that choice.

Partnership Opportunities with Private Organizations are Key

Private land conservation organizations can work with communities to help establish programs in new areas, using a challenge grant approach. These groups can provide expertise in partnership and funding development.

In 1998, for example, the Trust for Public Land (TPL) assisted two New Mexico counties—Bernalillo and Santa Fe—in utilizing new state constitutional authority to pass general obligation bonds, raising \$20 million for PDR and other land protection efforts. During that same year, TPL provided assistance to Utah Governor Mike Leavitt and others in passing the Utah Quality Growth Act, which provided \$3 million for land conservation.

Ranchers are in a prominent position to make a difference. The future of your land, your neighborhood, and your agricultural community is being decided day-by-day, parcel-by-parcel, by landowners like you. The future of each ranch is important to the future of all others. How you and your neighbors exercise your private property rights will determine the future of agriculture and rural landscapes.

—from CCALT's
*Keeping the Family in
the Family Ranch,*
1997



Bob Sharp



In 1999, TPL assisted local leaders in gaining the passage of a \$256-million open space bond measure in Phoenix, Arizona, and ballot measures in four Colorado counties, including a \$170-million measure in Larimer County and a \$35-million measure, primarily for farmland protection, in Adams County.

In the November 2000 elections, TPL assisted communities with the passage of six separate finance measures in four Western states, amounting to a total of \$237 million in new funding for PDR programs. These measures were among the 40 that TPL supported and that were approved by voters across the country on November 7, 2000. The amount of new funding dedicated for open space in all categories across the United States, including the \$237 million for PDR in the Western states, reached approximately \$3.3 billion.



We get one shot at this in the American West. When its all paved over and covered with convenience stores, the opportunity is gone. This is an obligation of a generation. . .to make certain that the heritage we receive becomes the legacy we leave as well.

*—Governor Mike Leavitt,
Utah*

Landowners and communities are facing an enormous challenge, and the clock is ticking. In the next 20 years, many ranches and farms in the West will be passed on to children or new buyers. Landowners and the public will need flexible tools like PDR to help them secure landscapes and communities they'd like to inhabit and pass on to future generations.



Tyra Lynne Monger, fifth-generation rancher in Colorado.

Appendix A

PDR Programs and Local Land Trusts by State

Note: we have made every effort to be comprehensive in the following information. If we have inadvertently left out any measures, programs, or local land trusts, our sincerest apologies...and we would like to hear from you! In addition, we have not listed local offices of regional or national land conservation organizations that operate in many, if not all, of the states below. Please see Appendix B for a list of these organizations, all of which are excellent resources to consult for PDR programs in local areas, as well as general information and technical assistance with PDR transactions. In addition, an electronic database of state incentive-based growth management laws may be found at; www.ncsl.org/programs/esnr/growthdata.htm.

ALASKA

State Program: The state received \$400 million as a result of an out-of-court settlement with Exxon for the 1989 oil spill, and set up the *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council* to manage the funds as an endowment. A portion of proceeds is used to protect lands through conservation easements. The Council has protected 640,000 acres of land, using conservation easements on a third of them.

Private Land Trusts: Great Land Trust (Anchorage), Interior Alaska Land Trust (Fairbanks), Kachemak Heritage Land Trust (Homer), Kodiak Brown Bear Trust (Anchorage), Nushagak/Mulchatna-Wood/Tikchik Land Trust (Dillingham), Southeast Alaska Land Trust (Juneau).

ARIZONA

State Programs: The *State Parks Board* administers two programs that can be used for PDR. The **Natural Areas Program** was created with the passage of the Arizona Heritage Initiative (ARS 41501) in 1990. It receives a percentage of Arizona Lottery proceeds each year for land acquisition, including conservation easements, to conserve unique natural values. Voters established the **Arizona Growing Smarter Grant Program** in 1998 with the passage of Proposition 303, the Growing Smarter Act. It allocates \$220 million over 11 years from the general fund for acquisition or lease of State Trust lands within or near urban areas. The funds can also be used to purchase development rights on Trust lands.

Beginning in 1997, the *Arizona Common Ground Roundtable* sponsored discussions among a diverse group of ranchers, conservationists, scientists, public-agency representatives, and sports enthusiasts to understand the challenges to conservation in the state. The group sent recommendations regarding development of a statewide PDR program to *Governor Hull's Growing Smarter Commission*, convened in 1998 as part of the Growing Smarter Act. Based on the Commission's recommendations, the legislature passed the Growing Smarter Plus legislative package in 2000, which included the creation of a statewide PDR program, the **Development Rights Retirement Fund**. This Fund will also be administered through the State Parks Board, but funding mechanisms have yet to be developed.

Local Programs: The *Town of Queen Creek* will implement the first local PDR program in the state. Funded with development fees collected on every new home built in Queen Creek, revenues are projected to be \$11 million per year for the next 10 years. *PENDING:* *Pima County* is currently developing its Sonoran Desert [Habitat] Conservation Plan and considering creation of a PDR program as part of its implementation plan.

Private Land Trusts: Arizona Open Land Trust (Tucson), Black Mountain Conservancy (Cave Creek), Cascabel Hermitage Association (Tucson), Central Arizona Land Trust (Prescott), Desert Foothills Land Trust (Cave Creek), Grand Canyon Trust (Flagstaff), Keep Sedona Beautiful (Sedona), Malpai Borderlands Group (Douglas), McDowell-Sonoran Land Trust (Scottsdale), Oracle Land Trust (Oracle), Prescott Creeks Preservation Association (Prescott), Rincon Institute (Tucson), Southeast Arizona Land Trust (Tucson), Superstition Area Land Trust (Apache Junction).

CALIFORNIA

State Program: The **California Farmland Conservancy Program** was established in 1996. It is administered through the *Department of Conservation's Division of Land Resource Protection* and funded with annual appropriations. The Program provides grants to local governments, resource conservation districts, non-profit organizations, and regional open-space districts for projects that use conservation easements to protect agricultural land. Voters approved Proposition 12 in March 2000, providing another \$25 million for grants over the next few years. For 2000-01, a total of \$5 million in bond funds and \$1.5 million in additional funds are available for grants.

Local Programs: The **Marin County Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program** was established in 1980 and protects approximately 27,000 acres. Funds result from general fund appropriation, foundation grants, state bonds, and the California Coastal Conservancy. *Sonoma County's* PACE program was established in 1990 and protects approximately 24,756 acres. Funding results from sales tax and state bonds. *The City of Davis* passed a 30-year open space protection tax for acquisition, improvements, and maintenance of open space on November 7, 2000. The estimated \$17.5 million can be used for PDR. *Marin, San Joaquin, and Solano Counties* have also used special taxation districts, in which landowners and homebuyers pay extra tax to fund farmland preservation. The tax pays off revenue bonds that have been sold to raise money for PDR.

Private Land Trusts: There are over 160 local land trusts in California—too many to list here. They are listed with contact information (as are local land trusts in the other states) on the Land Trust Alliance's Web site (see Appendix B).

COLORADO

Note: Several programs in Colorado are described on pages 15 and 16 of this publication, including the state trust fund—Great Outdoors Colorado—that provides matching funds for PDR. In addition, the following local PDR programs and land trusts are operating in Colorado:

Local Programs: In 1984 *Boulder County* established a PDR program with funds from a city sales tax. *Douglas County's* PDR program was established in 1994 and is funded by county bonds and sales and use taxes. The *Town of Breckenridge* receives .5% sales tax to fund its open space program, which includes use of PDR. Three ballot measures passed on November 7, 2000 that will support local PDR programs. *Boulder County* passed a \$1 million sales and use tax renewal and a bond issue of \$80.8 million, for a total of \$119.2 million over 8 years. Longmont also passed two similar measures totaling \$60 million over 20 years. And *Thornton* passed a bond issue for \$22.4 million, a portion of which can be used for PDR. Finally, numerous other municipal open space protection programs throughout Colorado are publicly funded from property and sales taxes, and are using PDR as a conservation tool in addition to outright purchase.

Private Land Trusts: Animas Conservancy (Durango), Aspen Valley Land Trust (Aspen), Centennial Land Trust (Orchard), Clear Creek Land Conservancy (Golden), Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust (Arvada), Colorado Open Lands (Denver), Colorado Wildlife Heritage Foundation (Denver), Continental Divide Land Trust (Frisco), Crested Butte Land Trust (Crested Butte), Douglas County Land Conservancy (Castle Rock), Eagle Valley Land Trust (Eagle), Estes Valley Land Trust (Estes Park), Grand County Land Conservancy (Granby), Gunnison Ranchland Conservation Legacy (Gunnison), Lake Fork Land Trust (Lake City), La Plata Open Space Conservancy (Durango), Larimer Land Trust (Fort Collins), Manitou Institute/Crestone Baca Land Institute (Crestone), Mesa County Land Conservancy (Palisade), Montezuma Land Conservancy (Cortez), Mountain Area Land Trust (Evergreen), The Palmer Foundation (Colorado Springs), Rio Grande Headwaters Land Trust (Monte Vista), Roaring Fork Conservancy (Basalt), Rocky Mountain Land Trust (Longmont), San Isabel Foundation (Westcliffe), San Miguel Conservation Foundation (Telluride), South Metro Land Conservancy (Littleton), Southern Plains Land Trust (Pritchett), Southwest Land Alliance (Pagosa Springs), Three Rivers Land Trust (Delta), Valley Land Conservancy (Montrose), Yampa Valley Land Trust (Steamboat Springs).

HAWAII

State Program: The *State of Hawaii* established its **Natural Areas Partnership and Forest Stewardship Program** in 1991 to provide state funding for the long-term protection and management of unique natural resources on private lands. The program provides matching funds on a 2:1 ratio for management of natural resources on private lands permanently dedicated to conservation. To qualify, lands must be dedicated to conservation in perpetuity through a transfer of fee title or a conservation easement to the state or a cooperating entity. The program provides \$1,500,000 per year to fund ongoing and new projects, and also dedicates funding derived from a portion of the conveyance tax.

Private Land Trusts: Community Trust for Kaneohe Bay (Kaneohe), Hui'aina o Hana (Hana), Kauai Public Land Trust (Lihue), Maui Land Conservancy (Makawao), Maui Open Space Trust (Kula), North Shore Community Trust (Haleiwa), Pacific Islands Land Institute (Kailua).

IDAHO

State Program: The *Idaho State Legislature* passed critical enabling legislation in 1999 to authorize counties to issue bonds to purchase conservation easements and/or land to preserve open space for scenic and recreational purposes.

Private Land Trusts: Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands (Boise), Land Trust of Treasure Valley (Boise), Palouse Land Trust (Moscow), Payette Land Trust (McCall), Sawtooth Society, Inc. (Boise), Southern Idaho Land Trust (Twin Falls), Teton Regional Land Trust (Driggs), Wood River Land Trust (Ketchum).

KANSAS

Private Land Trusts: Kansas Land Trust (Lawrence), Sunflower Land Trust (Augusta).

MONTANA

State Programs: In spring 1998, the *Montana Consensus Council* convened multi-stakeholder discussions involving representatives from industry groups, conservation groups, various state agencies and the legislature. Their efforts led to the development of a state PDR program—the **Montana Agricultural Heritage Program**—that was created by the 1999 legislature to help stem the loss of critical farm, ranch and forest land to inappropriate development. The program received an initial allocation of \$1 million from the general fund. A citizen commission oversees funding for the acquisition of conservation easements from willing sellers and donors. In its first year of operation, the commission approved eight landowner grant applications totaling \$888,000. This figure is to be matched by \$6.36 million additional dollars from various federal, local, and private sources, including the participating landowners. The corresponding easements preserve 9,923 acres. The *Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks*' **Habitat Montana Program** was established in 1987 and is funded with hunting license fees totaling \$2.8 million per year. The program can purchase conservation easements in exchange for hunting access and adoption of rest-rotation grazing management systems. It has protected 180,000 acres.

Local Programs: A state statute passed in 1997 allows the formation of local open space boards that foster the preservation of open space. *Helena and Missoula* each passed \$5 million open space bonds backed by property taxes that are used to purchase conservation easements as well as acquire lands fee simple. *Pending:* *The Gallatin County Open Lands Board* was established in 1998 following the recommendation of a county commissioner-appointed task force. Its mission is to preserve open space through the preservation of ranch and agricultural lands. The Board conducted surveys and other research to investigate public support for finance measures that would protect open space, and then petitioned the County Commission to place a \$10-million bond measure on the ballot of the November 2000 election. The measure passed and will be backed by property taxes. Since agricultural producers in Gallatin County will bear additional tax burdens, the Board agreed to raise 10% in additional matching funds from non-county sources to create a grant program to which agricultural producers can apply for tax relief.

Private Land Trusts: Bitter Root Land Trust (Hamilton), Five Valleys Land Trust (Missoula), Flathead Land Trust (Kalispell), Gallatin Valley Land Trust (Bozeman), Mid-Yellowstone Land Trust (Park City), Montana Land Reliance (Helena), Prickly Pear Land Trust (Helena), Save Open Space, Inc. (Missoula).

NEBRASKA

State Program: Nebraska's **Environmental Trust Fund**, established in 1992, receives a portion of the Nebraska lottery profits to purchase easements. The Fund awarded grants totaling \$45 million over seven years to private and government agencies, individuals, and non-profit organizations. The grant-application rating scale favors the use of matching funds. More than 10,000 acres have been protected through the program, through both title and easement purchase.

Private Land Trusts: Platt River Whooping Crane Maintenance Trust (Wood River), Prairie/Plains Resource Institute (Aurora).

NEVADA

State Program: The *Nevada Parks and Wildlife Board* issued a \$47.2-million bond in 1990 to purchase land and conservation easements.

Local Programs: The **Tahoe Bond Act Program** was established in 1986, and has raised \$27.8 million for land acquisition and conservation easements. The **Tahoe Mitigation Program**, established in 1997, purchases conservation easements using mitigation fees collected by the *California and Nevada Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*.

Private Land Trusts: Nevada Land Conservancy (Reno), Nevada Trust for Public Lands (Carson City).

NEW MEXICO

State Program: *PENDING:* A program is under consideration to acquire conservation easements on private forest land using funding from the U.S.D.A. Forest Service's Forest Legacy Program.

Local Programs: *Santa Fe County* passed a bond measure on November 7, 2000, to acquire real estate and easements for open space, totaling \$8 million. *Bernalillo County* passed a two-year sales tax to raise \$7 million for open space preservation.

Private Land Trusts: Canyon Preservation Trust (Santa Fe), The Forest Trust, Inc. (Santa Fe), Malpai Borderlands Group (Douglas, AZ), Partners Land Trust (Sena), Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust (Lemitar), Santa Fe Conservation Trust (Santa Fe), Socorro Agricultural Land Trust (Socorro), Southern Rockies Agricultural Land Trust (Capitan), Taos Land Trust (Taos).

NORTH DAKOTA

Private Land Trust: North Dakota Wetlands Trust (Bismarck).

OREGON

Local Program: *PENDING:* *Deschutes County* is developing a PDR program.

Private Land Trusts: Central Coast Land Conservancy (Depoe Bay), The Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT—Lincoln City), Deschutes Basin Land Trust (Bend), Gorge Trust (Hood River), Greenbelt Land Trust (Corvallis), McKenzie River Trust (Eugene), North Coast Land Conservancy (Astoria), Northwest Land Conservation Trust (Salem), Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust (Canby), Seven Generations Land Trust (Dexter), South Coast Land Conservancy (Coos Bay), Southern Oregon Land Conservancy (Ashland), Symbiota Land Conservancy/Trust (Wolf Creek), Three Rivers Land Conservancy (Lake Oswego), The Wetlands Conservancy (Tualatin).

SOUTH DAKOTA

Private Land Trust: Spearfish Canyon Land Trust (Spearfish Canyon).

TEXAS

State Program: *PENDING:* On February 24, 2000 then-Governor George W. Bush created a 12-member task force to study the issues of conservation, land fragmentation, public parks, outdoor recreation, and nature tourism, and to make recommendations for how best to protect and increase outdoor recreation for Texans. The task force established a PDR working group to define the next steps to establish a statewide PDR program.

Local Programs: The City of Austin initiated a \$65 million bond to protect the water quality of the Edwards aquifer. A portion was used for PDR to protect 1,600 acres.

Private Land Trusts: The Archaeological Conservancy (San Marcos), Bexar Land Trust (San Antonio), Big Thicket Natural Heritage Trust (Jasper), Buffalo Bayou Partnership (Houston), Cibolo Conservancy (Boerne), Coastal Bend Land Trust (Corpus Christi), Connemara Conservancy (Dallas), The Conservation Fund (Austin), The Cradle of Texas Conservancy (Lake Jackson), Galveston Bay Foundation (Webster), Hill Country Conservancy (Austin), Hill Country Land Trust (Fredericksburg), Hudspeth Directive for Conservation (Dell City), Katy Prairie Conservancy (Houston), Legacy Land Trust (Houston), National Trust for Historic Preservation (Fort Worth), Native Prairies Association of Texas (Austin), Natural Area Preservation Association, Inc. (Dallas), Parks and Wildlife Foundation of Texas (San Antonio), Texas Cave Conservancy (New Braunfels), Texas Cave Management Association (Austin), Texas Land Trust Council (Austin), Texas Parks and Recreation Foundation (Richardson), The Valley Land Fund (McAllen).

UTAH

State Programs: Utah's **Forest Legacy Program** protects environmentally-important forest lands that are threatened with conversion to residential subdivisions, commercial development and mining. The program funds PDR transactions that allow private forest landowners to maintain their lands as working forests. In May 1996, Governor Mike Leavitt issued an Executive Order creating the *Utah Critical Lands Conservation Committee* to encourage local governments to identify lands critical to agriculture, wildlife habitat, watershed management and recreation. The **LeRay McAllister Critical Land Conservation Fund**, established in 1998, received an appropriation of \$100,000 for a revolving loan fund available to local governments and non-profit organizations interested in preserving open lands. The **Quality Growth Act of 1999** created the thirteen-member *Quality Growth Commission* that replaced the Critical Land Conservation Committee, and assumed the responsibility of managing the LeRay McAllister Critical Land Conservation Fund. Additionally, the Act bolstered the Fund

from its original \$100,000 to nearly \$3,000,000 to be used for the preservation of Utah's natural open lands.

Local: *Park City* voters overwhelmingly approved a \$10-million bond for open space in November 1998. The City formed a *Citizen's Open Space Advisory Committee* to prioritize lands, and has spent \$4 million to purchase five properties. The City hopes to use easements in the future as a way of leveraging conservation dollars.

Private land trusts: Cache Open Lands (Smithfield), Ogden Valley Land Trust (Huntsville), Salt Lake City Open Space Trust (Salt Lake City), Southern Branch of Utah Open Lands, Inc. (Boulder), Swaner Memorial Park Foundation (Salt Lake City), Utah Open Lands Conservation Association (Salt Lake City), Virgin River Land Preservation Association (St. George), Wasatch Land Conservancy (Salt Lake City).

WASHINGTON

State Program: The *Department of Natural Resources* has acquired funds through the USDA Forest Service's Forest Legacy Program for purchasing development rights to protect key wildlife corridors, water quality, and recreation in high population growth areas.

Local Programs: *King County* established its **Farmland Preservation Program** in 1979 with funding totaling \$50 million from municipal bonds. By 1987, the Program had completed its purchase of development rights on 12,846 acres. It continues to monitor the easements. A *San Juan County* program was established in 1991. It protects 1,418 acres with funds derived from a real-estate transfer tax, a statewide property tax, and revenue from state timber harvests. *Skagit County* started a program in 1998 and is protecting 705 acres. Funds result from property tax, revenue from state timber harvests, a state grant, and the USDA Farmland Protection Program. *Thurston County* purchases conservation easements using funds from property tax revenues, state grants, and the Conservation Futures Act. Since 1996, the County has protected 960 acres.

Private Land Trusts: Bainbridge Island Land Trust (Bainbridge Island), Blue Mountain Land Trust (Walla Walla), Capitol Land Trust (Olympia), Cascade Land Conservancy (Seattle), Chehalis River Basin Land Trust (McCleary), Chelan-Douglas Land Trust (Wenatchee), Cold Spring Conservancy/Little White Salmon Biodiversity Reserve (Underwood), Columbia Land Trust (Vancouver), Cowiche Canyon Conservancy (Yakima), Great Peninsula Conservancy (Bremerton), Heritage Land Trust (Covington), Inland Northwest Land Trust (Spokane), Jefferson Land Trust (Port Townsend), Kitsap Land Trust (Bremerton), Lummi Island Heritage Trust (Lummi Island), Methow Conservancy (Winthrop), Nisqually River Basin Land Trust (Yelm), North Olympic Land Trust (Port Angeles), Northwest Institute for Historic Preservation (Seattle), Opal Community Land Trust (Eastsound), Puget Sound Farm Trust (Seattle), San Juan Preservation Trust (Lopez Island), Skagit Land Trust (Mt. Vernon), Skagitians to Preserve Farmland (Mount Vernon), Tapteal Greenway (Richland), Vashon-Maury Island Land Trust (Vashon), Whatcom Land Trust (Bellingham), Whidbey-Camano Land Trust (Clinton), Yakima Greenway Foundation (Yakima).

WYOMING

State Program: The *Lands Administration Branch of the Wyoming Fish and Game Commission* administers the **Game and Fish Easement Program** to assure that adequate habitat exists in areas crucial to wildlife. The program uses hunting and fishing license fees, totaling \$1 million in FY1999, to purchase conservation easements. In addition, a useful resource from Governor Geringer—*Ways to Conserve Wyoming's Wonderful Open Lands: A Guidebook*—is available at: www.state.wy.us/governor/openspace/openspaces.htm

Private Land Trusts: Green River Valley Land Trust (Pinedale), Jackson Hole Land Trust (Jackson), Platte River Parkway Trust (Casper), Wyoming Open Lands (Buffalo), Wyoming Stock Growers Agricultural Land Trust (Cheyenne).

Appendix B

Land Conservation Organizations

National and Regional Non-Profit Land Conservation Organizations

Note: The following list of national and regional land conservation organizations is not comprehensive, but will serve as a starting point for those interested in further information. While each has its own specific mission and focus, all offer technical and/or funding assistance in the development of PDR transactions and programs. They are also excellent sources of research information on a variety of related topics. Many have state or regional offices across the United States.

American Farmland Trust, 1200 18th St., NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 331-7300
www.farmland.org

Conservation Fund, 1800 N. Kent Street, Suite 1120, Arlington, VA 22209-2156, (703) 525-6300
www.conservationfund.org

Ducks Unlimited, One Waterfowl Way, Memphis, TN 38120-2351, (905)758-3825
www.ducks.org

The Forest Trust, P.O. Box 519, Santa Fe, NM 87504, (505) 983-8992
www.theforesttrust.org

Land Trust Alliance, 1331 H. St. NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 638-4725
www.lta.org

The Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, 2291 W Broadway, P.O. Box 8249, Missoula, MT 59807
(800) 225-5355; (406) 523-4500
www.rmef.org

Sonoran Institute, 7650 East Broadway Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85710, (520) 290-0828
www.sonoran.org

The Nature Conservancy, 1815 N. Lynn St., Arlington, VA 22209, (703) 841-5300
www.tnc.org

Trust for Public Land, 116 New Montgomery St., 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 495-4014
www.tpl.org

The Wilderness Land Trust, 4060 Post Canyon Drive, Hood River, OR 97031, (541) 386-9546
www.wildernesstrust.org

Agricultural Land Trusts Formed by Producers in Western States

California Rangeland Trust, 1221 H Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, (916) 444-2096
Contact: Dan Macon, Executive Director
www.rangelandtrust.org

Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust, 8833 Ralston Road, Arvada, CO 8000, (303) 431-6422
Contact: Lynne Sherrod, Executive Director
ccaglt@aol.com

Wyoming Stock Growers Agricultural Land Trust, P.O. Box 206, Cheyenne, WY 82003, (307) 638-3942
Contact: Jim Magagna, Executive Vice President, Wyoming Stock Growers Association
wsgajim@uswest.net

The **Western Governors' Association (WGA)** is an independent, non-profit organization representing the governors of 18 states, American Samoa, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands. Through their Association, the Western governors identify and address key policy and governance issues in natural resources, the environment, human services, economic development, international relations and public management.

With leadership from Governors Geringer of Wyoming and Kitzhaber of Oregon, the WGA's Open Lands and Stewardship Initiative focuses on voluntary, inclusive, community-based approaches to environmental and natural resource conservation. It assists states in the protection and maintenance of economic and biological diversity, recreational opportunities, scenic values, and the agricultural industry by protecting working landscapes and by improving the quality of Western life. The High Plains Partnership for Species at Risk (HPP) and development of a regional open lands program and policy agenda are two important projects of the Initiative. It emphasizes the use of market- and incentive-based, conservation tools, such as PDR, for use on private working ranches, farms and timber lands.

The **Trust for Public Land (TPL)** is a non-profit land conservation organization that works to protect land for human well-being and enjoyment, and to improve the quality of life in American communities. Founded in 1972, TPL's legal and real estate specialists work with landowners, community groups, and government agencies to conserve land for watershed protection, scenic beauty and open space, recreation, and a host of other public values.

TPL established its National Public Finance Program in 1994 specifically to help states and localities develop legislation and implement their own funding sources. By working with community leaders, public officials and willing landowners, the Program assists communities to realize their open space goals by developing individually-tailored PDR programs and other conservation tools. All told, more than three-dozen states and communities in the West have successfully created new sources of funding with assistance from TPL.

The **National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA)**, established in 1898, is the trade association for America's one million cattle farmers and ranchers. NCBA works to advance the economic, political and social interests of the U.S. cattle business and to be an advocate for the cattle industry's policy positions and economic interests.

As family farmers and ranchers, cattlemen have a vested interest in protecting the environment. As responsive producers, they share an interest in meeting the needs of consumers worldwide by providing high-quality, nutritious beef, while setting higher quality and safety standards than those required by the government. As individual entrepreneurs, cattlemen help sustain a way of life in thousands of rural communities.

The Property Rights & Environmental Management Committee of the NCBA was formed to protect the property rights and property values of members and to enhance members' profitability. In addition, this Committee works to recognize members' efforts to protect and enhance the environment. The Committee has developed the Environmental Stewardship Award Program, which recognizes such efforts and stimulates educational opportunities for cattle producers and the public. The Committee also forms partnerships to identify and initiate projects which reflect the technologies and ideas used by environmental stewardship winners.



1515 Cleveland Place, Ste. 200
Denver, CO 80202
tel. 303.623.9378
fax. 303.534.7309
www.westgov.org



116 New Montgomery St, 4th Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94105
tel. 415.495.4014
fax. 415.495.4103
Addresses for regional offices
across the United States may
be found on the TPL Web site:
www.tpl.org



1301 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Suite 300,
Washington, D.C. 20004
tel. 202.347.0228
fax 202.638.0607
Addresses for offices in
Chicago and Denver may be
found on the NCBA Web site:
www.beef.org



Since 1997, over 20 state legislatures have enacted laws that either provide state funds—often general funds—for acquisition of development rights to open space and agricultural land, or encourage the donation of conservation easements through income tax credits. The obvious value to legislators is the voluntary, incentive-based nature of these approaches, especially in Western states where property rights protection has been an issue that has stalled progress toward preserving open lands. The most politically successful PDR programs also share another common element—they provide matching grants to local governments in partnership with nonprofit groups, further emphasizing local, private land stewardship. As a component of growth management strategies, they can serve as a hedge against sprawl.

This report is a “how-to” primer for state policymakers and landowners interested in establishing PDR programs to preserve open space and agricultural lands. Brief case studies illustrate what works and why.

- Larry Morandi

National Conference of State Legislatures