

## Acknowledgements

Many thanks to the following individuals for sharing their time and expertise.

### City of Portland

Daniela Brod, Environmental Services  
Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning  
Jim Middaugh, Bureau of Planning, ESA  
Mike Reed, Bureau of Planning, ESA  
Judith Rees, Parks and Recreation  
Jim Sjulín, Parks and Recreation  
Brant Williams, Department of Transportation

### Johnson Creek Interjurisdictional Committee

Ruthanne Bennett, City of Milwaukie  
Cathy Daw, City of Happy Valley  
Greg Fritts, Clackamas County  
Kim Hatfield, Johnson Creek Watershed Council  
Ken Helm, Multnomah County  
Donna Hempstead, Multnomah County  
John Nagy, Clackamas County  
Don Robertson, City of Gresham  
Bob Storer, City of Gresham  
Ela Whelan, Clackamas County

### Community Partners

Chris Beck, The Trust for Public Land  
Taunja Berquam, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Nancy Chase, Metro  
Jayne Cronlund, Three Rivers Land Conservancy  
Ester Lev, The Wetlands Conservancy  
Kristin Newman, The Trust for Public Land  
Pat Obradovich, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Sue O'Halloran, Kohler, Myers, O'Halloran  
Juno Pandian, Oregon Water Resources Department  
Russ Pinto, The Nature Conservancy  
David Reid, Johnson Creek Watershed Council  
Dennis Sigrist, Oregon Emergency Management

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<i>vii</i>
<b>Overview and History</b>	
<b>Johnson Creek Watershed and Its History</b>	1
<b>Flooding and the Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan</b>	1
<b>The Changing National Trend</b>	2
<b>The 1997 Willing Seller Land Acquisition Plan and Program</b>	3
<b>The Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program</b>	4
<b>Willing Seller Program Evaluation</b>	
<b>The Current Status of the Willing Seller Program</b>	7
<b>Program Statistics</b>	8
<b>Stakeholder Interviews</b>	12
<b>Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program</b>	
<b>Johnson Creek Restoration Plan</b>	15
Restoration Plan Diagram	17
<b>Land Acquisition Target Areas</b>	18
Confluence	20
McLoughlin Boulevard	21
Crystal Springs	22
Tideman Johnson	23
North Clackamas	24
West Lents	25
Lents	26
Mt. Scott	27
Deardorff Road	28
Lower Powell Butte	29
Lower Jenne Butte	30
West Gresham	31
East Gresham	32
Kane Road	33
Stone Road	34
<b>Priorities and Program Management</b>	37

<b>Partnerships</b>	37
Partner Identification Matrix	38
City of Gresham	40
City of Happy Valley	41
City of Milwaukie	42
City of Portland Bureau of Planning	43
City of Portland Department of Transportation	44
City of Portland Endangered Species Act Program	45
City of Portland Parks and Recreation	46
Clackamas County	47
Johnson Creek Watershed Council	48
Metro	49
Multnomah County	50
Oregon Emergency Management / Federal Emergency Management Agency	51
Oregon Water Resources Department	52
Oregon Water Trust	53
Three Rivers Land Conservancy	54
The Trust for Public Land	55
US Army Corps of Engineers	56
The Wetlands Conservancy	57
<b>Acquisition Process Overview</b>	58
Acquisition Process Detail – Flow Chart	59
<b>Additional Resources</b>	
<b>Funding Resources and Opportunities</b>	61
<b>Other Potential Partners</b>	63

## List of Maps

Overview–Acquisition Target Areas

35

## List of Appendices

Appendix A: Stakeholder Interview Questions

Appendix B: Property Rating Form



The City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services, in collaboration with the other jurisdictions in the Johnson Creek Watershed, developed the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan (JCRP) in 2000/01. The Restoration Plan uses a multi-objective, watershed approach as the overriding strategy for developing solutions to a broad suite of issues in the Johnson Creek Watershed. The Restoration Plan recognizes that “nuisance” flooding, water quality problems, and fish and wildlife declines have related causes, and that a common solution requires the restoration of natural floodplain functions.

The Johnson Creek Restoration Plan is not intended to be a stand-alone document for protecting and restoring Johnson Creek. The Plan’s recommendations focus on the mainstem and floodplain areas of Johnson Creek. The intention is for the Restoration Plan to be a base from which additional investigations and recommendations for the remainder of the watershed can be implemented. As additional work is completed it will be folded into the plan with the continued goal of restoring and protecting the health of the watershed. The Johnson Creek Restoration Plan is not a stopping point, but rather a place to start. The recommendations in the Plan must be combined with other City programs and policies (such as stormwater management, land use controls and education programs in the uplands), as well as continued monitoring and investigations, if the restoration of Johnson Creek is to be successful.

The Restoration Plan was developed using a detailed and thorough process: (1) Vision, goals, and specific objectives were identified; (2) Purpose and direction of the project was defined, a management plan created, management and technical

advisory teams formed, and a schedule developed; (3) Public and stakeholder involvement plans were developed; (4) Data and information was collected; (5) Data was analyzed and models constructed; (6) Problems and opportunities were identified under existing and future conditions (characterization); (7) Alternative strategies were developed; (8) Criteria were developed and strategies evaluated; (9) Recommendations were made and refined; and (10) the Plan was developed.

To achieve the multiple goals of flood damage reduction, water quality improvement, and fish and wildlife habitat restoration, the Restoration Plan recommends restoring components, such as floodplains, riparian buffers, wetlands and in-stream habitat complexity, that are compatible with natural watershed functions. The Plan identifies 58 reaches along the mainstem and selected tributaries of Johnson Creek. Recommendations are made on a reach-by-reach basis, with specific project ideas and targets outlined for each reach. For example, for reach *x*, located between *y* and *z*, the recommended targets are to complete 25 acres of floodplain reconnection (through creation and enhancement of wetlands and pulling back banks), remove 3 fish barriers, address 5 priority outfalls and one pipe crossing, and improve in-stream complexity along 1,422 feet of the creek. Through floodplain reconnection actions, water quality and fish and wildlife habitat will also be improved. Floodplain reconnection can happen both on publicly acquired properties and through working with creekside property owners in the watershed.

The Johnson Creek Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program is an implementation strategy of the Restoration Plan. Its focus is on the floodplain areas of the watershed. The Restoration Plan makes many

recommendations and will require detailed strategies to achieve the identified targets. The Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program outlines the procedure for land acquisitions which work toward meeting the JCRP targets. While the Restoration Plan focuses on floodplain areas, it is recognized that additional acquisitions, outside of the floodplain, may fulfill or complement restoration objectives in Johnson Creek. Portland Parks and Recreation is currently planning their acquisition goals for the Johnson Creek watershed, which focus on upland connections and other resource areas, in addition to the floodplain; where our objectives overlap there will be opportunity to partner in land acquisition.

This document is intended for agency and organization staff who may be interested in partnering with the Willing Seller Program to acquire land in the Johnson Creek Watershed; individuals and organizations interested in learning more about how a Willing Seller Program may be implemented; and individuals and organizations who are considering modeling their own programs on Johnson Creek's successes.

## **Overview and History**

The Johnson Creek Watershed is located in the southeast Portland metropolitan area. Johnson Creek flows westward approximately 25 miles from the headwaters near Cottrell to its confluence with the Willamette River in the city of Milwaukie. The watershed drains about 52 square miles and crosses six jurisdictions: the cities of Gresham, Happy Valley, Milwaukie, and Portland and the counties of Clackamas and Multnomah. The watershed is also within the jurisdiction of Metro, the area's regional government.

As pioneers settled along Johnson Creek in the mid-1800s, the banks of the creek were cleared, the timber used for railroad ties and building material, and many of the floodplains and wetlands were filled for agriculture. By the 1920s many residential areas had sprung up in the lower watershed, while the upper watershed was being steadily converted to agricultural uses. The increasing urbanization quickly led to flooding problems in the relatively flat watershed, and in the 1930s the Works Progress Administration (WPA) widened, deepened, rock-lined and channelized 15 miles of the creek in an effort to prevent future flooding. The effort failed, as evidenced by the flooding that occurred the year after completion of the project and continues to occur regularly.

Numerous efforts to address the flooding issues in the watershed have been attempted over the past 70 years. Most attempts have failed due to public opposition, lack of financing, or lack of integrated analysis. Finally, in 1993, a committee of agencies, businesses and citizens from throughout the watershed came together and developed the Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan (JCRMP). The first multi-jurisdictional, watershed-wide plan to address flooding in the context of habitat, water quality and stewardship, it was officially adopted by all of the jurisdictions in 1996. The multi-objective approach satisfied diverse interests in the watershed and was to be used as a guiding document for the jurisdictions in their watershed activities.

Prior to 1995, land acquisition was considered an unpopular and politically non-viable alternative to flood mitigation. However, as a result of the multiple objectives identified in the JCRMP, the changing national sentiment toward flood mitigation approaches, and the 1996 floods

in the Johnson Creek Watershed, land acquisition became a realistic possibility. After a thorough public involvement process, target areas were determined and willing seller land acquisition began with hazard mitigation funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Money from Regional Bond Measure 26-26 for purchase of greenspace (through Metro and City of Portland Parks and Recreation) and from the City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services served as local “match money” for these initial funds.

In 2000/01, the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan was developed as a ‘next step’ document to build off of the recommendations made in the JCRMP. While the JCRMP was the first plan in the watershed to address many objectives, it did not integrate those objectives well. As a solution to flooding it still recommended mainly structural solutions. These demonstrated to be unpopular in the upper watershed and were deemed costly based on the experience gained in the 1993 Midwest floods. Hence the Restoration Plan was necessary to implement flood reduction projects that also addressed fish and wildlife habitat and water quality. This became even more pertinent with the 1998 listing of Steelhead as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act, and the probable listing of Cutthroat in the near future. The Restoration Plan also defines a specific level of flood hazard to be addressed, namely the 10-year “nuisance flood,” instead of vaguely attempting to address all flooding.

## **Willing Seller Program Evaluation**

The Johnson Creek Willing Seller Land Acquisition Program has been actively purchasing properties in the watershed since 1997. To date more than 106 acres have been acquired and over 30 households have been assisted in moving out of harm’s way of flooding. Over \$8 million in funding for the program has been secured through FEMA and CDBG grants, Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds, and Metro’s 26-26 Regional Bond Measure for the purchase of greenspace.

As of 2001, most of those funds have been spent and money for land acquisition is in short supply. Very little of the Measure 26-26 money remains. BES CIP funding for the program is estimated at \$300,000/year for the next five years. This contribution, in conjunction with acquisition funds targeted for specific reaches of the creek, is less than 25% of what is needed to meet the objectives for land acquisition outlined in the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan.\* In order to accomplish the restoration objectives outlined in the JCRP, which necessitate some land acquisition, partnerships must be made to bridge the funding gap. Successes and deficiencies of the current land acquisition program have been compiled from comments made by stakeholders during partnership interviews. Recommendations from these interviews have been incorporated into this strategy.

## **The Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program**

The Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program is intended to act as a tool to implement recommendations from the Restoration

---

\* This figure is for Restoration Plan targets **in the City of Portland alone**. To date, no funds have been identified to meet JCRP acquisition targets in other jurisdictions of the Johnson Creek Watershed.



Plan. The Restoration Plan is the guiding document for land acquisition in the Johnson Creek watershed. Just as the Restoration Plan is intended to work in conjunction with other programs, the scope of the previous Willing Seller Land Acquisition Program was expanded to include all of the jurisdictions in the watershed and other potential partners who will make acquisition feasible given the current funding situation. The program cannot function in isolation, given the broad spectrum support necessary to carry out acquisition that will work toward restoration of the watershed's natural systems.

Land acquisition target area maps are provided along with an explanation of the procedure used to establish the target areas. These expanded acquisition target areas have been determined and prioritized based on targets set in the Restoration Plan. A total of fifteen target areas have been identified: eight (8) first priority (Confluence, Tideman Johnson, North Clackamas, West Lents, Lents, Deardorff Road, Lower Powell Butte, and West Gresham) and seven (7) second priority (McLoughlin Boulevard, Crystal Springs, Mt. Scott, Lower Jenne Butte, East Gresham, Kane Road, and Stone Road).

A target method is used to manage the program, and explicit priorities and criteria are used to evaluate specific properties. The program manager uses the target values identified in the Restoration Plan to direct funding to those areas where targets have not yet been met. Once target areas have been identified through the target value tracking and contact is made with a potential willing seller, individual properties are evaluated and ranked based on several criteria: (1) the property owner is a willing seller; (2) adequate funding and partnership opportunities are available; (3)

the property would be suitable for floodplain reconnection, habitat restoration, and/or passive flood storage; and (4) supplemental reasons exist which support acquisition of this property (e.g. community support, recreation potential, imminent development). A property rating tool has been developed to facilitate this evaluation and is included in this document.

Numerous partnership opportunities have been identified through this process. A broad spectrum of potential interests were considered in determining partnering and funding opportunities. Based on the partnering ideas generated during the stakeholder interviews, and the multiple goals and objectives of the agencies and organizations, two tools have been developed to facilitate the identification of opportunities. A Partner Identification Matrix identifies potential partners based on compatible goals and objectives. Individual partner pages profile a single agency/organization and identify partnering ideas specific to Johnson Creek and that entity.

The City of Portland's acquisition process itself can be simplified into seven basic steps: (1) contact and negotiate with willing property owner; (2) conduct appraisal; (3) perform Environmental Site Assessment; (4) enter into option agreement with property owner; (5) obtain City Council approval; (6) close on property; and (7) stabilize site. A detailed flow chart outlines the steps in this process and is included on page 75.

## **Additional Resources**

Many specific recommendations and references were collected during the writing of this report, both as a result of the stakeholder interviews and independent research. These recommendations and references have been compiled and organized into two sections: funding

resources and opportunities, and other potential partners. These lists are intended to be used as a resource and a guide for determining additional opportunities. The section will be updated periodically as new references emerge and others are utilized.

## Johnson Creek Watershed and Its History

The Johnson Creek Watershed is located in the southeast Portland metropolitan area. Johnson Creek flows westward approximately 25 miles from the headwaters near Cottrell to its confluence with the Willamette River in the city of Milwaukie. The watershed drains about 52 square miles and crosses six jurisdictions: the cities of Gresham, Portland, Happy Valley, and Milwaukie and the counties of Multnomah and Clackamas. The watershed is also within the jurisdiction of Metro, the area's regional government.

Johnson Creek once flowed through ancient western redcedar and Douglas-fir forests. Black cottonwoods, red alders and pacific willows dominated riparian areas. Associated wetlands were home to a diversity of migratory waterfowl, songbirds and birds of prey. Native mammals, amphibians and reptiles were abundant. Steelhead, Coho and Cutthroat Trout were thick in the meandering, cool-running creek.

In the mid 1800s, as pioneers settled along the banks of Johnson Creek, the large ancient trees were cut, primarily for railroad ties and housing material. The floodplains in the middle reaches were cleared and filled for farming, to take advantage of the fertile soil deposited by the frequent floods. Settlers in the upper watershed cleared land for vegetable and berry farming, dairies, and ranches.

By the 1920s, many residential areas had sprung up in the northwestern area of the watershed, along with the supporting infrastructure for water and sewer services. Impervious surfaces covered the previously well-draining and fast-infiltrating soils. Many areas of the upper watershed were

tilled to drain agricultural fields. As the urbanization moved eastward, more homes were built on floodplains, increasing the number of structures damaged by repeated flooding. In the 1930s, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) widened, deepened, rock-lined and channelized 15 miles of the creek in a failed effort to prevent future flooding.

Today these events continue to impact the Johnson Creek Watershed's ability to maintain a healthy ecosystem equilibrium. Everyday in the watershed forests are cleared and wetlands are filled as development continues to encroach on riparian and floodplain areas. Many pollutants from impervious surfaces drain directly into the creek, deteriorating water quality. The flooding continues and in some areas the creek floods, on average, every other year. In-stream habitat is lacking and riparian habitat buffers are narrow or non-existent in many areas. In 1998, Steelhead (a species native to Johnson Creek) was listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act. It is expected that Cutthroat will be listed in the near future. However, some small remnants of wetlands, forests and floodplains remain; these fragments provide valuable building blocks for the restoration and enhancement of the watershed as a whole.

## Flooding and the Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan

Johnson Creek has had at least seven major damaging floods in the last 35 years. The worst flood on record occurred in 1964. It had a peak flow of 2,620 cubic feet per second at SE 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Sycamore (east of the Lents area). Approximately 1,200 structures were flooded, most in the Lents area between SE 82<sup>nd</sup> and SE 122<sup>nd</sup>

Avenues. Damage from the 1964 flood totaled approximately \$3 million in 1994 dollars.

Over the next several years many attempts were made to address flooding problems in the Johnson Creek Watershed. The Soil Conservation Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Metro all attempted to find solutions to frequent flooding. Residents in the watershed were divided between those living in the floodplains and those living in the uplands. Heated debates about how flood control was to be funded and what the remedy, or remedies, should be has left plans for reservoirs, channelization projects, and regional detention facilities on the shelf.

In 1993, a committee of agencies, businesses and citizens developed the Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan (JCRMP). It was the first multi-jurisdictional, watershed-wide plan to address flooding in the context of other important watershed issues. It was adopted by all six jurisdictions in 1996. As a guidance document for all the jurisdictions in the watershed, it outlines conceptual projects in four major categories: flooding, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, and stewardship.

Significant flooding occurred again in February and November of 1996. This time damage totaled \$4.7 million. In October 1996, in response to “lessons learned during the flood,” the Portland City Council adopted the Flood and Landslide Hazard Mitigation Plan, which recommends acquisition of the most vulnerable properties from willing sellers for multi-objective projects.

## **The Changing National Trend**

In the mid 1990s, many local agencies throughout the country began to focus on ‘floodplain management’ rather than ‘flood

control,’ reflecting an emerging national trend which came about in response to the Midwest flood of 1993. Total damage estimates from Midwest weather events during that year range from \$12 billion to \$16 billion. Significant agricultural, residential, business, public facility and transportation resources were damaged. Hundreds were left homeless and many communities were devastated.

In the wake of this massive flood event, the nation began to re-evaluate its approach to floodplain management. A June 1994 report of the Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee entitled “Sharing the Challenge: Floodplain Management into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” addressed this evolving interpretation of floodplain management and implementation strategies in this way:

Over the last 30 years the nation has learned that effective floodplain management can reduce vulnerability to damages and create a balance among natural and human uses of floodplains and their related watersheds to meet both social and environmental goals. The nation, however, has not taken full advantage of this knowledge. The United States simply has lacked the focus and the incentive to engage itself seriously in floodplain management. The 1993 flood has managed to focus attention on the floodplain and has provided the incentive for action...

The Review Committee supports a floodplain management strategy of, sequentially, avoiding inappropriate use of the floodplain, minimizing vulnerability to damage through both structural and nonstructural means, and mitigating flood damages when they do occur... By controlling runoff, managing ecosystems for all their benefits, planning the use of the land and identifying those areas at risk, many hazards can be avoided. Where the risk cannot be avoided, damage

minimization approaches, such as elevation and relocation of buildings or construction of reservoirs or flood protection structures, are used only when they can be integrated into a systems approach to flood damage reduction in the basin.

Land acquisition was specifically mentioned in the report as an appropriate governmental response to damaging floods:

Buyouts are an appropriate federal response for the Midwest floods and for floods like it. Many of the buyout neighborhoods have been damaged repetitively by flooding... (A) significant percentage contain older, lower value housing, much of it of poor quality and in need of rehabilitation. Under the right circumstances, the buyouts will not only reduce flood damages and protect people and property but also achieve other objectives such as improving the quality of affordable housing, increasing recreational opportunities and wildlife values, and general betterment of the community.

## **The 1997 Willing Seller Land Acquisition Plan and Program**

Prior to 1995, land acquisition was considered an unpopular and politically non-viable alternative to flood mitigation. However, as a result of the changing national and local sentiment regarding flood response and floodplain management, land acquisition in the Johnson Creek Watershed became a realistic possibility. In the spring of 1995, BES proposed an on-stream detention facility at SE 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue near Foster Road to address flooding issues. Public reaction to the project was overwhelmingly negative. In general, property owners in the watershed and stakeholders were concerned about the lack

of multi-objective benefits of detention facilities and the City of Portland's focus of on-stream detention before pursuing other options. Many expressed concerns about loss of riparian habitat, fish passage blockage, and the unsightliness of a dam associated with on-stream detention. Due to the sensitive nature of flood control in the Johnson Creek Watershed, it was deemed vital to gain public input as specific elements of a land acquisition plan were pursued.

In February of 1996, a public involvement strategy was initiated to gauge public sentiment regarding land acquisition in two target areas: Lents and Lower Powell Butte. A third target area, Tideman-Johnson, was not included due to budget constraints. The target area selection was based on three priorities:

- 1) Lands needed to carry out recommendations in the Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan
- 2) Areas affected by repeated flooding
- 3) Areas of significant biological resources

Maps of the target areas were produced and properties were separated into three priority tiers to develop a realistic acquisition plan and budget.

The public involvement plan sought to answer two main questions: (1) Is land acquisition acceptable to the public? If yes, where and for what purposes? If no, why not?; and (2) What does the public see as the most critical management issue facing BES and how should that issue be addressed? Sixty-one individuals were surveyed by phone using a 26-question survey. Five thousand postcards were mailed to individuals in the target areas, inviting them to two public meetings held on April 24 and May 2 of 1996. Three hundred-fifty phone calls were made as follow-up on the invitation. Forty-one people attended on

April 24, and 27 people attended on May 2. Thirty-one out of 68 attendees completed written surveys.

The information gained through the public involvement process revealed the general sentiment that the public supported land acquisition through willing sellers for flood control and water quality improvement. A majority also agreed that flood control and water quality should be the top issues in Johnson Creek for BES. Priority areas for acquisition were identified as the Lents area (floodway and 5-10 year floodplain), Lower Powell Butte, and Holgate Lake (near SE 130<sup>th</sup> and Holgate). Citizens expressed that if land was acquired, it should be for multi-objective land uses (water quality, habitat and flood control). In addition, up-keep and maintenance of the acquired properties was of concern. On-stream detention was seen as a last resort.

Using the information gained from the public involvement plan, a process was established for how land was to be purchased by the City of Portland, including the use of options, negotiation, relocation and possession. The land acquisition plan for Johnson Creek focused on risk avoidance for people and structures, and was based on accepted floodplain management principles. Initial purchases were prioritized based on these objectives and funding opportunities.

In 1995, the Greenspaces Bond Measure, 26-26, was approved and a portion of the local share money was dedicated to Johnson Creek through Portland Parks and Recreation (PPR). Since PPR and BES have many of the same priorities for land acquisition, the bureaus collaborated on the purchase of property in the watershed for open space, water quality, and fish and wildlife habitat. Due to the floods of 1996, the Johnson Creek Watershed became

eligible for FEMA disaster mitigation funds, leading PPR and BES to apply for, and receive, a \$375,000 grant from the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. A \$1.5 million dollar Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) was also received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), through Multnomah County, for the purpose of moving people and structures out of harm's way of flooding in frequently flooded areas.

The preliminary land acquisition maps and target areas were modified to meet the requirements of the various grants. Individual properties within the target areas were prioritized according to the following criteria:

- Willing seller
- Developed property with a structure located within the floodway (for FEMA and HUD monies)
- Property with identified potential for flood storage
- Adjacent to Johnson Creek and/or property in public ownership
- Associated water quality benefits such as stream shade, high quality vegetation, bank stabilization, water sources, wetlands, or headwaters
- Potential for shared funding through grants or other partnerships

Using these priorities, and some additional information, a land acquisition priority list was developed. Letters were sent out to potential sellers in the target areas to gauge their interest in selling their property to the City of Portland. The above criteria were used to evaluate the order of purchase of each parcel once an owner was identified as a willing seller.

## **The Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program**

In 2000/01, the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan was developed as a 'next step' document to build off of the recommendations made in the Resources Management Plan. While the JCRMP was the first plan in the watershed to address many objectives, it did not integrate those objectives well. As a solution to flooding it still recommended mainly structural solutions. These demonstrated to be unpopular in the watershed, and were deemed costly based on the experience gained in the 1993 Midwest floods. In addition, the 1998 listing of Steelhead under the Endangered Species Act (and the probable listing of Cutthroat in the near future) created the need for consideration of alternative approaches. Hence the Restoration Plan was necessary to implement flood reduction projects that also address fish and wildlife habitat and water quality.

The Restoration Plan also defines a specific level of flood to be addressed, namely the "nuisance flood," instead of vaguely attempting to address all flooding. The nuisance flood is defined loosely as a frequently occurring event that causes "nuisance" damages. An extensive analysis was conducted in conjunction with the Restoration Plan to determine the return period for the Johnson Creek "nuisance flood." The analysis shows that there is a clear breakpoint around the 10-year return period flood at which most of the important economic and environmental areas of concern are affected. Therefore, managing the 10-year flood will likely provide a level of protection that is both cost-effective and maximizes environmental benefits.

The publication of the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan has changed and expanded the focus of the Willing Seller Program. As the overarching document that will now guide land acquisition in the

watershed, the Restoration Plan has initiated the expansion of the original Johnson Creek Willing Seller Program to include all of the jurisdictions, and other potential partners who will make acquisition feasible given the current funding situation.





## The Current Status of the Willing Seller Program

The Johnson Creek Willing Seller Land Acquisition Program has actively purchased properties in the watershed since 1997. Through the public involvement process described in the previous section, three target areas were developed in which acquisition was focused: Lents, Lower Powell Butte, and Tideman Johnson. These target areas flood frequently, and the program aimed to “move people out of harm’s way.” Since 1997, 56 properties have been purchased, totaling more than 106 acres. The program has assisted in moving over 30 households out of flood prone neighborhoods.

Environmental Services has partnered with both Portland Parks and Recreation and Metro to purchase properties in these three target areas. PPR has contributed \$1 million dollars to the program through the local share of Regional Bond Measure 26-26 (the Greenspaces bond measure). Metro contributed \$626,250 through the regional share of the bond. A total of \$3 million dollars for the program came from FEMA as hazard mitigation monies and from HUD through a Community Development Block Grant. The BES Capital Improvements Program (CIP) contributed \$1,625,000. All of this funding and more (over \$8 million) has already been spent on property acquisition in the Johnson Creek watershed.

As of 2001, funds for land acquisition in Johnson Creek are in short supply. The local share of the Measure 26-26 money has been spent and very little of the regional share remains. Environmental Services CIP funding for the program is estimated at \$300,000/year for the next five years. This contribution, in conjunction with acquisition funds targeted for specific reaches of the creek, is less than 25% of

what is needed to meet the objectives for land acquisition outlined in the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan.\* In order to accomplish the restoration objectives outlined in the Restoration Plan, which necessitate land acquisition, partnerships must be made to bridge the funding gap.

---

\* This figure is for Restoration Plan targets **in the City of Portland alone**. To date, no funds have been identified to meet JCRP acquisition targets in other jurisdictions of the Johnson Creek Watershed.

## Program Statistics

<b>Target Area</b>	<b>Acres Acquired</b>	<b>\$ Spent</b>	<b>Sources</b>
Lents	21.73	\$3,175,956	BES, CDBG, FEMA, PPR (26-26)
Lower Powell Butte	72.44	\$4,083,490	BES, CDBG, FEMA, Metro (26-26), PPR (26-26), Water Bureau
Tideman Johnson	2.16	\$476,000	BES, CDBG
Miscellaneous	10.03	\$743,750	BES, Metro (26-26), PPR
<b>Total</b>	<b>106.36</b>	<b>\$8,479,196</b>	

## Lents – Properties Acquired

Owner	Site Address	Tax Account #	Acres	Source \$	Ordinance #	Closing Date
Beckman	10808 SE Foster	R798000060	0.70	BES	171249	30 JUN 97
Cutts	SE 106th	R992220510	0.91	BES	171249	30 JUN 97
Philpott	6521 SE 108th	R798000650	0.14	BES	171288	30 JUN 97
Hughes	10910 SE Foster	R992150240	0.30	BES	171249	10 JUL 97
Le	10934 SE Foster	R992152330	0.16	CDBG	171488	15 AUG 97
Esters	6501 SE 110th	R992220520	1.10	FEMA	171578	15 SEP 97
Coverdell	6716 SE 110th	R992220440	0.56	CDBG	171847	12 DEC 97
Manny	6625 SE 110th	R992220120	1.06	CDBG	172018	20 FEB 98
Corbett	6651 SE 108th	R798000850	0.90	CDBG	172018	6 MAR 98
Anderson	6844 SE 106th	R992220880	0.96	FEMA	172168	30 APR 98
Anderson	6844 SE 106th	R992220890	0.96	FEMA	172168	30 APR 98
Justice	10724 SE Foster	R992151770	0.48	BES	172168	22 MAY 98
Justice	10724 SE Foster	R992150230	0.26	BES	172168	22 MAY 98
Moore	10738 SE Foster	R798000600	0.17	BES	172382	25 JUN 98
Moore	10736 SE Foster	R798000550	0.92	BES	172382	25 JUN 98
Castrignano	6544 SE 106th	R992220640	0.35	FEMA	172329	26 JUN 98
Randall	SE 110th	R992221050	1.30	BES	172054	6 AUG 98
Randal	SE 108th	R798000350	0.90	BES	172054	6 AUG 98
Kight	6546 SE 106th	R992220650	0.29	CDBG	172744	16 OCT 98
McSorley	6751 SE 108th	R798000950	0.91	FEMA	172799	30 OCT 98
King	6845 SE 106th	R992220670	0.76	FEMA	172799	17 NOV 98
King	6707 SE 106th	R992220860	0.47	FEMA	172799	17 NOV 98
Hilts	6722 SE 106th	R992220590	0.48	BES	172799	30 DEC 98
Robertson	6708 SE 106th	R992220580	0.48	BES	172945	31 DEC 98
Bogart	6606 SE 106th	R992221030	0.39	BES	173069	23 FEB 99
Hassett	6830 SE 110th	R992220450	0.48	PPR	172734	4 MAR 99
Barry	6618 SE 106th	R992221360	0.40	FEMA	173157	26 MAY 99
Pottratz	6630 SE 106th	R992221080	0.49	FEMA	173272	24 SEP 99
King	6646 SE 106th	R992220500	0.48	FEMA	173491	15 OCT 99
Uhl	6753 SE 112th	R992221110	0.67	BES	174426	15 MAY 00
Waltos	6735 SE 106th	R992220870	0.47	BES	174470	20 JUN 00
Ray	SE 108th	R798000990	0.90	BES	174470	21 JUN 00
Ray	6903 SE 108th	R798001020	0.85	BES	174470	21 JUN 00
Ray / Barber	SE 108th	R798001030	0.34	BES	174470	21 JUN 00
Choe	10946 SE Foster	R992152420	0.16	CDBG(FEMA)	174542	28 JUN 00
Jones	6537 SE 106th	R992220810	0.47	BES	174653	14 JUL 00
Mederos	10408 SE Yukon	R561204920	0.11	FEMA	174984	23 OCT 00

## Powell Butte – Properties Acquired

Owner	Site Address	Tax Account #	Acres	Source \$	Ordinance #	Closing Date
Ellingson	15908 SE Martin	R816602280	1.81	BES	171249	7 JUL 97
Garner	SE Martin	R816602360	0.70	PPR	171548	2 OCT 97
Alsop	6215 SE 159th	R816602600	1.42	FEMA/CDBG	171847	16 DEC 97
Jensen	6215 SE 159th	R993180150	11.66	PPR	171794	16 DEC 97
Jensen	6215 SE 159th	R816601500	0.18	PPR	171794	16 DEC 97
Pedersen	15139 SE Foster	R431100310	5.75	CDBG	171847	16 DEC 97
Brenner	SE Circle	R428501100	2.60	PPR	172065	2 APR 98
Brenner	SE Circle	R428501104	1.36	PPR	172065	2 APR 98
Burke	14553 SE Foster	R431101310	1.50	FEMA	172168	30 APR 98
Brownwood	16205 SE Martins	R816602550	1.13	PPR/Metro	172702	7 OCT 98
Brownwood	16205 SE Martins	R993180250	14.32	PPR/Metro	172702	7 OCT 98
Shannon	6265 SE 159th	R816602810	1.50	PPR	172736	23 OCT 98
Shannon	6265 SE 159th	R816602760	1.11	BES/PPR	172736	23 OCT 98
Whitmore	SE Circle	R428500500	3.10	Water	N/A	25 MAY 99
Brunkow	5509 SE Circle	R428503300	2.80	Metro/BES	173832	19 OCT 99
Nordby	SE 145th	R431101800	1.02	FEMA	174111	22 FEB 00
Nordby	6103 SE145th	R431101700	1.02	FEMA	174111	22 FEB 00
Nordby	6031 SE 145th	R431101600	1.10	FEMA	174111	22 FEB 00
Dickson	6363 SE 159th	R816602870	0.71	CDBG	174111	11 FEB 00
Walter	15051 SE Foster	R431100430	0.96	BES/CDBG	174542	23 JUN 00
Johnson	14605 SE Foster	R431101210	0.48	BES	174733	1 AUG 00
Fulop	4955 SE 174th	R993180060	0.84	BES	174460	15 JUN 00
Johnson	14605 SE Foster	R431101210	0.48	BES	174733	15 AUG 00
Olsen	6225 SE 159th Dr	R816602660	3.52	BES	174780	29 AUG 00
Olsen	6226 SE 159th Dr	R816602440	0.33	BES	174780	29 AUG 01
Olsen	6227 SE 159th Dr	R816602470	0.02	BES	174780	29 AUG 01
HammarSmith	5989 SE Jenne Lane	R428504200	9.07	BES	175292	14 MAR 01
HammarSmith	5907 SE Jenne Lane	R428504250	1.96	BES	175292	14 MAR 01

## **Tideman Johnson – Properties Acquired**

---

<b>Owner</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Tax Account #</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Source \$</b>	<b>Ordinance #</b>	<b>Closing Date</b>
Chaney	8405 SE 44th	R255308440	0.20	CDBG	172018	3APR98
Chaney	SE Harney Drive	R255308360	0.33	CDBG	172018	3APR98
Haney	SE 42nd & Harney	R992191820	1.35	BES	173491	30JUN99
Snyder	8306 SE 45th	R255307980	0.28	BES	174470	29JUN00

## **Miscellaneous – Properties Acquired**

---

<b>Owner</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Tax Account #</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Source \$</b>	<b>Ordinance #</b>	<b>Closing Date</b>
Garrison	5006 SE 174th	R993180230	1.50	PPR/Metro	172087	30MAR98
Benson	SE Foster	R992150730	0.23	BES	172404	8JUL98
Cornelison	12710 SE Claybourne	R992230200	5.70	PPR	172984	21JAN99
Dodge	8644 SE Lambert	R202614390	2.60	PPR	174373	11MAY00

## Stakeholder Interviews

In order to evaluate and revise the current Willing Seller Program for Johnson Creek, interviews were conducted with the following stakeholders to gauge interest in partnering and to assess potential opportunities:

- City of Portland Parks and Recreation (PPR)
- City of Portland Bureau of Planning (BOP)
- City of Portland Department of Transportation (PDOT)
- City of Portland Endangered Species Act Program (ESA)
- Metro
- Johnson Creek Interjurisdictional Committee (composed of technical staff from the cities of Gresham, Happy Valley, Milwaukie and Portland, the counties of Clackamas and Multnomah, and the Johnson Creek Watershed Council)
- Oregon Office of Emergency Management (OEM)
- US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- Real estate negotiator for the current Willing Seller Program
- Three Rivers Land Conservancy (TRLC)
- The Trust for Public Land (TPL)

Interviewees were asked whether they were interested in partnering to acquire land in Johnson Creek target areas; if they had advice or ideas about funding opportunities, public involvement strategies, and a final document layout; and for advice on how we might improve our program (see Appendix A). Advice regarding the program has been integrated throughout this document. Comments relating to the successes and deficiencies of the current Willing Seller Program are compiled below. Partnership ideas have

been utilized in the formation of the partnership section of the plan. Funding and additional partnership ideas are compiled in the last section of the document.

## Successes

- The team approach has worked well. Discussions have been open and focused.
- The program has had a good process. It has brought different perspectives to the table, which helps to resolve difficult situations.
- The FEMA and CDBG funds were great for the floodway areas. We were able to help move people out of the floodway area and relocate them.
- People in the community seem to have a good understanding of goals of the program. They don't seem to have a lot of questions.
- A lot of outreach has already been done for the program. Unless the goals of the program undergo a large shift, probably don't need to do a lot more.
- Where the program has been targeted on specific areas, with specific goals, it has achieved good results.
- Working with the City of Portland has been a very good experience. We appreciate the team organization and the levels of authority that were given to individual team members.

## Deficiencies / Recommendations

- The program hasn't explored as many acquisition options/alternatives as it could (e.g. easements).
- Lack of certainty of BES CIP funding can be a problem when working with other agencies/bureaus.
- The program needs to expand the partnering opportunities; work with

other agencies and organizations to maximize potential.

- Need to set firm policies about what land can be used for once purchased, so that as space gets tighter it doesn't get co-opted for some other purpose.
- Public opinion surveys must be undertaken with clear intent if they are to be undertaken at all.
- Need to do more publicity-type outreach. Have a press release once a property is purchased and a list of key people to send it to. Let the public know about specific plans for the property, who is in charge of maintaining it, and who they can report problems to.
- Do a better job of reporting on the backside; let the public know what happened and show them what we've accomplished. Let them see the outcome of the initial public involvement.
- Visually document property purchases, before and after.
- Inconsistent funding is a problem.
- Need to refocus target areas and reset priorities.
- There have been complaints about property maintenance. Be clear with the public what the objectives are at the time of purchase.
- When working with partners it was not always clear from the beginning who on the team was responsible for which details.
- Willing Seller Program is an example of a multi-objective program that needs a better, more-formalized means of coordination with other City programs that protect natural resources.

## The Johnson Creek Restoration Plan

The Johnson Creek Restoration Plan is an implementation plan that builds off of recommendations made in the Johnson Creek Resource Management Plan (JCRMP). While the JCRMP was the first plan in the watershed to address many objectives, it did not integrate those objectives well. As a solution to flooding it recommended mainly structural solutions. These were deemed both infeasible (due to unpopularity in the upper watershed) and costly (based on experience gained in the 1993 Midwest floods). Additionally, technical opinion is shifting away from using structural controls and toward using integrative solutions.

Hence the Restoration Plan was developed in order to implement flood reduction projects that also address fish and wildlife habitat and water quality. This multi-objective approach became even more pertinent with the 1998 listing of Steelhead, a species native to Johnson Creek, as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act, and the probable listing of Cutthroat in the near future. The Restoration Plan takes a multi-objective approach and presents projects that address a broad suite of problems in the watershed. The Restoration Plan recognizes that “nuisance” flooding, water quality problems and fish and wildlife declines have related causes, and that a common solution requires the restoration of natural watershed functions.

In order to ensure that Johnson Creek will be “managed as a natural waterway in an urban area rather than as a flood control channel,” as stipulated in the JCRMP, the Restoration Plan goal is to rehabilitate the watershed’s natural floodplain functions in order to alleviate flooding problems. This

approach will simultaneously address water quality and fish and wildlife habitat issues in the watershed.

The Johnson Creek Restoration Plan is not intended to be a stand-alone document for implementing watershed protection and restoration. The Plan’s recommendations focus on the mainstem of Johnson Creek. The intention is for the Restoration Plan to be a base from which additional investigations and recommendations for the remainder of the watershed can be implemented. As additional work is completed it will be folded into the Plan with the continued goal of restoring and protecting the health of the watershed. The Johnson Creek Restoration Plan is not a stopping point, but rather a place to start. The plan must be combined with other watershed programs and policies (such as stormwater management, land use controls and education programs in the uplands), as well as continued research and investigations, if the restoration of Johnson Creek is to be successful.

The success of the Restoration Plan is dependent on the implementation and effectiveness of other City and County programs which address impacts to Johnson Creek. Due to their scope many of these impacts could not be addressed in a single plan. In the City of Portland these programs might include, but are not limited to: (1) reducing stormwater impacts through applying standards required in the Stormwater Management Manual; (2) controlling sediment and erosion through the Erosion Control Manual (Title 24); (3) providing alternative means to reduce or mitigate impervious surfaces through additional programs and policy; (4) protecting riparian buffers and resources through Environmental Zoning code (Title 33); and (5) assisting in the recovery of salmon through the Framework for an



Endangered Species Act Recovery Plan. Programs will vary among jurisdictions. These types of programs and policies are intended to work in conjunction with the Restoration Plan in restoring the watershed to a stable functioning system.

To achieve the multiple goals of flood damage reduction, water quality improvement, and habitat restoration, the Restoration Plan recommends restoring components, such as floodplains, riparian buffers, wetlands and in-stream habitat complexity, that are compatible with natural watershed functions. The Plan identifies 58 reaches along the mainstem and selected tributaries of Johnson Creek. Recommendations are made on a reach-by-reach basis, with specific project ideas and targets outlined for each reach. For example, for reach *x*, located between *y* and *z*, the recommended targets are to complete 25 acres of floodplain reconnection (through creation and enhancement of wetlands and pulling back banks), remove three fish barriers, address five priority outfalls and one pipe crossing, and improve in-stream complexity along 1,422 feet of the creek. Through the floodplain reconnection actions it is assumed that water quality and fish and wildlife habitat will also be improved. Floodplain reconnection can happen both on publicly acquired properties and through working with creekside property owners in the watershed.

The Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program is an implementation strategy of the Restoration Plan. The Restoration Plan makes many recommendations and will require detailed strategies to achieve the identified targets. The Willing Seller Program outlines the procedure for land acquisitions which work toward meeting the Restoration Plan targets.

**The Restoration Plan Willing Seller Program is a tool to implement recommendations from the Restoration Plan.** The Restoration Plan is the guiding document for land acquisition in the Johnson Creek watershed. Just as the Restoration Plan is intended to work in conjunction with other programs, the scope of the previous Willing Seller Land Acquisition Plan was expanded to include all of the jurisdictions in the watershed and other potential partners who will make acquisition feasible given the current funding situation. The program cannot function in isolation, given the broad spectrum of support necessary to carry out acquisition that will work toward restoration of the entire watershed's natural systems.

## Land Acquisition Target Areas

Land acquisition in the Johnson Creek Watershed is implemented through a target area approach. Target areas were delineated based on the recommendations and information in the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan. Individual parcels are prioritized using a number of criteria based on the goals of the program and partners. Our experience to date has shown that through this target area approach and a well-managed program, separately-purchased parcels tend to form cohesive units over a relatively short period of time and condemnation is not necessary.

Target areas and their prioritization were determined in the following manner:

- 1) All 'priority project areas' identified in the Restoration Plan (with the exception of number 8) are identified here as *first priority target areas* for acquisition. Priority project area number 8, as identified in the Restoration Plan, is located in the upper watershed and acquisition was deemed less feasible due primarily to land uses (for the most part agriculture) and costs. It has been identified here as a second priority target area for acquisition, since acquisition is still desirable if feasible, but realistic opportunities are less likely to present themselves.
- 2) Initial groupings of reaches identified in the Restoration Plan were made based on two of the identified restoration target categories: number of properties inundated in the 10-year modeled flood and number of acres recommended for floodplain reconnection. In addition to the 'priority project areas' identified in the Restoration Plan, reaches with a restoration target of ten or more (properties or acres) in either category

were identified as first priority. Reaches with restoration targets of less than ten were identified as second priority. All reaches with no restoration targets for inundated properties and/or floodplain reconnection, OR reaches in which the Restoration Plan did not recommend acquisition, were not identified for acquisition (see #4 below).

- 3) Reaches were grouped into target areas based on location, property ownership, jurisdiction, land use, acquisition feasibility and three additional restoration targets identified in the Restoration Plan (acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement; number of fish barriers; and number of priority outfalls). Refer to the Restoration Plan for specific explanations of restoration targets. Acquisition target areas may be larger than the 'priority project areas' identified in the Restoration Plan in order to facilitate opportunistic project implementation.
- 4) Some reaches that may have high restoration target values were not placed in a first or second priority target area. These areas were not identified for acquisition in the Restoration Plan because it was deemed too cost prohibitive or it was decided that rehabilitation of the creek in that area of the watershed could be achieved through education and working with landowners, without acquiring the land.

The process used to determine whether a specific property will be acquired is explained in the Priorities and Program Management section following the target area overview map.

As a result of the above analysis, a total of 15 target areas were identified for land acquisition in the Johnson Creek Watershed: eight (8) first priority and seven (7) second priority.

<b>First Priority</b>		<b>Second Priority</b>	
Confluence	Deardorff Road	McLoughlin Boulevard	Kane Road
Tideman Johnson	Lower Powell Butte	Crystal Springs	Stone Road
North Clackamas	West Gresham	Mt. Scott	
West Lents		Lower Jenne Butte	
Lents		East Gresham	

## Confluence Acquisition Target Area

**Reach:** 1

**Priority:** 1

**Jurisdiction:** City of Milwaukie

**Location:** Confluence of Willamette River and Johnson Creek

Part of the Lower Johnson Creek Restoration priority area (Project 1 in the Restoration Plan). Contains the confluence of Johnson Creek with the Willamette River and is thus a unique and irreplaceable portion of the watershed. Any salmon entering Johnson Creek or one of its tributaries must pass through this area. In addition, the mouth of the creek has been identified as a resting point for salmon migrating along the mainstem of the Willamette.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>6</b>

## McLoughlin Boulevard Acquisition Target Area

**Reach:** 2

**Priority:** 2

**Jurisdiction:** City of Milwaukie

**Location:** Just upstream from the confluence of JC and the Willamette River to SE Ochoco Street

Part of the Lower Johnson Creek Restoration priority area (Project 1 in the Restoration Plan). This area is just upstream from the confluence of Johnson Creek and the Willamette. It is dominated by large industrial and commercial complexes, but restoration and reconnection of the floodplain would significantly improve habitat in this area.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>5</b>

## Crystal Springs Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 3, 4

**Priority:** 2

**Jurisdiction:** City of Portland

**Location:** SE Ochoco Street to the west end of Tideman Johnson Park, including Crystal Springs

This area includes Crystal Springs, a cold water, spring-fed tributary of Johnson Creek known to support endangered fish species. Portions of this area are subject to summer flooding caused primarily by high groundwater. This area is mainly medium density, single-family residential. Restoration along the mainstem and Crystal Springs could dramatically improve habitat in the area.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>4</b>

## Tideman Johnson Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 5, 6, 7

**Priority:** 1

**Jurisdiction:** City of Portland

**Location:** SE 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to SE Johnson Creek Boulevard

The Tideman Johnson Nature Park priority area (Project 2 in the Restoration Plan) is in this target area. This area is subject to flooding and contains wetlands of high habitat value. A cold water, spring-fed tributary in this target area could potentially provide high value habitat for endangered fish species. The historic WPA fish ladder and the oxbow are located in this target area.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>2</b>

## North Clackamas Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 8, 9, 10, 11

**Priority:** 1

**Jurisdiction:** City of Milwaukie (8), Clackamas County (8, 9, 10, 11)

**Location:** SE Johnson Creek Boulevard to SE 78<sup>th</sup> Avenue

The Bell Station Flood Mitigation priority area (Project 3 in the Restoration Plan) is in this target area. This area is subject to flooding and many sites have considerable restoration potential. This area is a mixture of medium density residential and industrial/commercial complexes.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>5</b>



## West Lents Acquisition Target Area

**Reach:** 12  
**Priority:** 1  
**Jurisdiction:** City of Portland  
**Location:** SE 77th Avenue to SE 92<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

The West Lents Flood Mitigation priority area (Project 4 in the Restoration Plan) is in this target area. This area of medium density residential and commercial properties has multiple opportunities for floodplain reconnection and habitat restoration.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>4</b>

## Lents Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19

**Priority:** 1

**Jurisdiction:** City of Portland

**Location:** Interstate 205 to SE 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue, including portions of the floodplain that are not located directly adjacent to the creek (north of Foster Road)

The Lents Alternative priority area (Project 5 in the Restoration Plan) is in this target area. This area is subject to frequent flooding and has multiple opportunities for floodplain reconnection and habitat restoration. The direction of acquisition in this target area is dependent on the finalization of the Lents Urban Renewal 2040 Concept Plan

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>1</b>

## Mt. Scott Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 20, 21

**Priority:** 2

**Jurisdiction:** City of Portland

**Location:** SE 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue to SE Deardorff Road

This target area is primarily residential and steeply banked. There is potential for riparian restoration. Leach Botanical Garden is located in this target area.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>1</b>

## Deardorff Road Acquisition Target Area

**Reach:** 22

**Priority:** 1

**Jurisdiction:** City of Portland

**Location:** SE Deardorff Road to SE Foster Road just east of SE 145<sup>th</sup> Avenue

This area is of high habitat value and has considerable restoration and floodplain reconnection potential. It consists mainly of single-family residential properties and has some forested riparian corridor along the creek.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>3</b>

## Lower Powell Butte Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 23, 24, 25, 26

**Priority:** 1

**Jurisdiction:** City of Portland (23, 24, 25), Multnomah County (26)

**Location:** SE 141<sup>st</sup> Avenue to SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue

The Alsop Floodplain Restoration priority area (Project 6 in the Restoration Plan) is in this target area. The confluence of Kelley Creek, a tributary with high habitat value for endangered fish species, is in this area, as well as numerous wetlands of high habitat value. This area is subject to considerable flooding and also contains Urban Reserve Area #5.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>342</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>2</b>

## Lower Jenne Butte Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 27, 28, 29

**Priority:** 2

**Jurisdiction:** Multnomah County (27), City of Gresham (28, 29)

**Location:** SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue to SE Pleasant View Drive

Located at the base of Jenne Butte, this target area runs along the Springwater Corridor. There is significant opportunity in this area for habitat restoration. Wetlands with moderate to high habitat value are located along the Springwater Corridor in this target area.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>2</b>

## West Gresham Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 30, 31, 32, 33

**Priority:** 1

**Jurisdiction:** City of Gresham

**Location:** SE Pleasant View Drive to SE Walters Road

The Gresham Stream Corridor priority area (Project 7 in the Restoration Plan) is in this target area. This area contains multiple opportunities for floodplain reconnection and habitat restoration.

<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>1</b>

## East Gresham Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 35, 37, 38

**Priority:** 2

**Jurisdiction:** City of Gresham

**Location:** SE Regner Road to west of SE 252<sup>nd</sup>

This target area has considerable restoration and floodplain reconnection potential. Much of the area is low density single-family residential.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>233</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>21</b>



## Kane Road Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 41  
**Priority:** 2  
**Jurisdiction:** Multnomah County  
**Location:** SE Callister Road to SE 262<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

This target area has considerable potential for habitat restoration and floodplain reconnection. It consists primarily of forested areas interspersed with light agricultural property, as well as a few single-family homes.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Number of priority outfalls</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>1</b>

## Stone Road Acquisition Target Area

**Reaches:** 46, 47

**Priority:** 2

**Jurisdiction:** Multnomah County

**Location:** Highway 26 to SE Short Road

Part of the Upper Reaches Riparian Improvements priority area (Project 8 in the Restoration Plan). This target area presents multiple opportunities for upper watershed habitat restoration and floodplain reconnection. Some forested and emergent wetlands are located in this target area.

<b>Number of properties inundated in 10-yr modeled flood</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Acres recommended for floodplain reconnection</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Acres of high value habitat / habitat corridor recommended for protection and enhancement</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Number of fish barriers</b>	<b>2</b>

## Priorities and Program Management

The program manager uses the target values identified in the Restoration Plan (and listed on the target area maps) to direct funding to those areas where targets have not yet been met. As properties are acquired in target areas, the target value is adjusted to reflect the additional acreage. Tracking of target values allows the program manager to base acquisition decisions on the specific recommendations made in the Restoration Plan. Current public land holdings are not yet deducted from the targets values.

Once the program manager has identified target areas to work in based on the target tracking, individual properties within those target areas are evaluated and ranked for purchase based on the following general criteria:

- 1) The property owner is a willing seller.
- 2) Adequate funding and partnership opportunities are available.
- 3) The property would be suitable for floodplain reconnection, habitat restoration, and/or passive flood storage.
- 4) Supplemental reasons exist which support acquisition of this property (e.g. community support, recreation potential, imminent development).

The Property Rating Form (see Appendix B) is used to assist in the determination of whether a specific property fulfills these criteria.

## Partnerships

A broad spectrum of potential interests were considered in determining partnering and funding opportunities for this

acquisition strategy. Based on information gathered from the stakeholder interviews (see the previous section), numerous partnering opportunities have been identified and are documented in this report. These opportunities are intended to be used to build the program from the base of matching funds available in the BES Capital Improvement Projects fund. In order to utilize these partnering ideas more efficiently and to use common goals and objectives to initiate partnerships as initial funding for the program is utilized, two reference tools have been created.

The **Partner Identification Matrix** will help identify potential partners based on compatible goals and objectives. Once a property has been evaluated using the Property Rating Form (see Appendix B), specific criteria applicable to that property can be used to identify partners with compatible objectives. Partnership commitments may be secured before individual properties are identified for purchase, based on common goals and objectives. In that case, funds from a specific source would be linked to a particular property based on the identified goals and objectives of the funding source. If a pool of funding is not available at the time a particular property becomes available, research could be conducted at the time of purchase regarding whether potential partners could contribute funding or other assistance.

The individual **partner pages** which follow the matrix profile potential land acquisition partners. Each partner page outlines the mission of the organization/agency, their work relating to property acquisition, their sources of funding, identified partnering opportunities, and contact information. These pages will be updated regularly as information changes, and new partner

pages will be added as additional partners are identified.

## Partner Identification Matrix

The Partner Identification Matrix on the next page will assist in identifying partner goals and objectives. Restoration Plan objectives are listed across the top of the matrix. Specific criteria numbers from the Property Rating Form (Appendix B) are listed along the left side. If a criterion relates to a specific Restoration Plan objective, an X is placed in the column. If a criterion may correspond to an objective but is site

dependent, an (X) is placed in the column. Potential partners, based on their objectives meshing with a *specific* criteria and Restoration Plan objective, are listed down the right column of the matrix. Along the bottom of the matrix, partners are listed corresponding to *general* overlapping objectives identified in the Restoration Plan.

X = criteria corresponds to objective  
(X) = criteria may correspond to objective (site dependent)

The following acronyms are used in the matrix:

- BOP – City of Portland Bureau of Planning
- DEQ – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
- EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency
- ESA – City of Portland Endangered Species Act Program
- FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency
- JCWC – Johnson Creek Watershed Council
- OEM – Oregon Emergency Management
- OWT – Oregon Water Trust
- PDOT – City of Portland Department of Transportation
- PPR – City of Portland Parks and Recreation
- TPL – The Trust for Public Land
- TRLC – Three Rivers Land Conservancy
- TWC – The Wetlands Conservancy
- USACE – US Army Corps of Engineers
- WRD – Oregon Water Resources Department

## Partner Identification Matrix

Rating Criteria #	Restoration Plan Objectives								Potential Partners
	Flood Mitigation	Habitat Restoration	Fish Barrier Removal	Priority Outfall Removal	Non-point Source Pollution Reduction	Public Use/Passive Recreation	Water Quality		
1	Site dependant								Restoration Plan partners
2	Site dependant								Other jurisdictions
3		X	X			X	X	Metro	
4		X				X		PPR	
5		X	X	X	X		X	ESA	
6					X		X	PDOT	
7	Site dependant								Restoration Plan partners
8		X				X		Metro, PPR, TPL	
15	X							OEM/FEMA, USACE	
16	X							OEM/FEMA, USACE	
17	X	X			X		X	OEM/FEMA, ESA, JCWC, Metro, TRLC, USACE	
18	X	X					X	OEM/FEMA, ESA, Metro, USACE	
19		X			X		X	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, Metro, TRLC, USACE	
20		X						ESA, JCWC, Metro, PPR, TRLC, TWC, USACE	
21		X	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	ESA, JCWC, Metro, PPR, TRLC, USACE	
22		X			X	(X)	X	ESA, JCWC, Metro, PDOT, PPR, TRLC, TWC, USACE	
23		X	(X)					ESA, JCWC, TRLC, USACE	
24				(X)			X	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, PDOT	
25		X					(X)	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, Metro, OWT, PPR, TRLC, WRD	
26		X			X		X	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, Metro, PPR, USACE	
27		X					X	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, Metro, TRLC	
28		X					X	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, Metro, TRLC	
29		X						ESA, JCWC, Metro, PPR, TRLC, TWC, USACE	
31		X				(X)		ESA, JCWC, Metro, PPR, TRLC	
33		X				X		JCWC, Metro, PPR	
36						X		Metro, PPR	
37						X		JCWC, Metro, PPR	
<b>General Partner Objectives</b>	OEM/FEMA	ESA, JCWC, ESA, Metro, PPR, TPL, TRLC, TWC,	ESA, JCWC, Metro, USACE	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, PDOT,	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, Metro, PDOT	JCWC, Metro, PPR, TRLC	EPA/DEQ, ESA, JCWC, Metro,		

## **Partner–City of Gresham**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

- The mission of the Parks and Recreation Division is to offer facilities and programs that invite the public's use. Our efforts enhance the quality of life for Gresham's citizens through the significant benefits provided by recreation. We take an active role in delivering park and recreation services in a cost-effective manner. We strive to offer fully accessible services in partnership with others, encouraging volunteer involvement.
- The mission of the Stormwater Division is to work to improve flood protection and water quality through the construction and maintenance of the public stormwater system and the preservation and restoration of area waterways.

### *Work related to acquisition*

- The City of Gresham preservation program manages stunning examples of open space that includes scenic vistas, riparian areas, agricultural wetlands, waterways, buttes, and upland forests. The benefits of this land preservation will impact future generations through improved water quality, preservation of fish and wildlife habitat, and enhanced stewardship, awareness, and environmental protection of natural areas.
- Over the next six months the City of Gresham will begin to identify properties for revegetation and for more extensive restoration projects. This will take place as part of a conceptual planning effort that will be followed by a more intensive Master Plan and incorporated into the capital improvement program for the Johnson Creek basin within Gresham.

### *Sources of funding*

The City of Gresham has acquired over 700 acres of open space land. About one-half of the primarily hillside and creekside area came from land donations and dedications. The other half was acquired by direct purchase. The source of funding was a 1996 citizen-approved bond measure for \$10.285 million. No other sources of funding currently exist. The City of Gresham looks forward to partnering with other agencies to seek outside funding.

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in grant applications
- Contribute direct funding
- Assist in decision-making process for properties in City of Gresham

### *Contact information*

Don Robertson, Gresham Parks and Recreation Division Manager  
(503) 618-2531

## ***Partner–City of Happy Valley***

The City of Happy Valley was not able to contribute information in time for the printing of this document.

*Contact information*

Cathy Daw

[cathyd@ci.happy-valley.or.us](mailto:cathyd@ci.happy-valley.or.us)



## **Partner–City of Milwaukie**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To maintain Milwaukie as a good place to live and work, a place which is clean, safe, responsive and provides quality services.

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Acquire land for parks and open spaces
- Acquire land for transportation projects and mitigation projects

### *Sources of funding*

- COM General fund
- 26-26 Bond Measure
- Potential future bond measures
- Gas tax
- Storm utility fund

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in grant applications
- Contribute direct funding
- Assist in decision-making process for properties in City of Milwaukie
- Partner in acquisition of properties in City of Milwaukie

### *Contact information*

Ruthanne Bennett (503) 786-7610

[bennetr@ci.milwaukie.or.us](mailto:bennetr@ci.milwaukie.or.us)

## **Partner–City of Portland Bureau of Planning**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

None provided

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Create zoning regulations, area plans, plan districts, and natural resource management plans.
- Coordinate setting Comprehensive Plan policies and goals that guide how Portland will develop in the future. These policies are implemented via zoning code regulations, and by other bureaus as they carry out capital plans.
- Coordinate many different City functions with the goal of enabling the City to act as a coordinated entity, in a way consistent with community-defined vision. This might extend into areas beyond zoning.
- Work on many non-regulatory efforts as they relate to achieving Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives. For example, we might work with PDC to facilitate a strategic plan for a specific neighborhood, or we might work with BES to facilitate environmental protection consistent with environmental zone program goals. The special area plans we are involved in may result in zoning regulations, but they might also result in specific actions to be undertaken by other agencies.

### *Sources of funding*

- General fund
- Inter-agency agreements
- Inter-governmental agreements
- Grants

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Provide information about the current status of a properties with regard to zoning, area plans underway, Comprehensive Plan goals, etc.
- Help determine what the most efficient method of environmental protection would be for a specific property (i.e. acquisition, easement, regulation, etc.).
- Coordinate acquisition program goals with other city goals (e.g. help broker agreements if another agency has a different vision for the property).
- Coordinate program with adopted neighborhood plans.
- Coordinate public involvement with any planning efforts underway in the area.
- Using the environmental zoning program as a policy framework, BOP can help identify properties that have a high resource value, and are at risk due to future development plans.

### *Contact information*

Tom McGuire, for natural resource land acquisition plans (503) 823-7855  
[tmcguire@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:tmcguire@ci.portland.or.us)

Sallie Edmunds, Environmental Planning Manager (503) 823-6950  
[sedmunds@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:sedmunds@ci.portland.or.us)

## **Partner–City of Portland Department of Transportation**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To be a community partner in shaping a livable city. To plan, build, manage, and maintain an effective and safe transportation system that provides access and mobility.

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Acquire public right-of-way for transportation projects
- Acquire public right-of-way or public property for project mitigation purposes

### *Sources of funding*

- Private development
- Federal and state grants
- Gas tax and other roadway user taxes
- Future transportation fee (limitations on spending)
- Transportation SDC funds (limitations on spending)

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in acquisition of properties where PDOT could build a required stormwater facility
- Partner in grant applications
- Assist in decision-making process for select properties

### *Contact information*

Brant Williams (503) 823-5767

[Brant.Williams@trans.ci.portland.or.us](mailto:Brant.Williams@trans.ci.portland.or.us)

## **Partner–City of Portland Endangered Species Act Program**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

The ESA Program was created by the City Council to create a comprehensive framework that would guide City activities to avoid the liability of the “take” provision under the Endangered Species and to meet the Council resolution to “assist in the recovery of salmonids.”

### *Work related to acquisition*

- The acquisition program addresses many of the watershed issues that have been identified by the ESA Program as important for the recovery of watershed health and salmon: water quantity (flow), habitat and water quality restoration.

### *Sources of funding*

The ESA Program receives funding from seven bureaus (Planning, OPDR, Water, PDC, Parks, BES, PDOT) and the general fund.

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in grant applications
- Contribute direct funding
- Assist in decision-making process for select properties
- Advise on importance of a property in terms of endangered species recovery

### *Contact information*

Jim Middaugh (503) 823-7032  
[jmiddaugh@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:jmiddaugh@ci.portland.or.us)

Mike Reed 823-3399  
[mreed@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:mreed@ci.portland.or.us)

## **Partner—City of Portland Parks and Recreation**

### *Mission of organization/agency.*

To protect and restore natural resource values in Portland parks, contributing to the natural resource quality of a larger, connected system of greenspaces.

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Manage properties
  - Protect and improve habitat for wildlife and fish
  - Provide resource-based recreation and education opportunities when and where compatible with resource protection
- Acquire land for parks and open spaces
  - Connect significant wildlife habitat areas
  - Connect the Springwater Corridor to Johnson Creek

### *Sources of funding*

- COP General Fund
- Portion of the Portland local share of the 26-26 Metro bond measure (Johnson Creek portion now spent)
- Potential future bond measures
- SDC funds

### *Partnering Opportunities*

While the Restoration Plan focuses on floodplain areas, it is recognized that additional acquisitions, outside of the floodplain, may fulfill or complement restoration objectives in Johnson Creek. Portland Parks and Recreation is currently planning their acquisition goals for the Johnson Creek watershed, which focus on upland connections and other resource areas, in addition to the floodplain; where our objectives overlap there will be opportunity to partner in land acquisition.

- Provide maintenance for acquired properties
- Partner in grant applications
- Contribute funding
- Assist in decision-making process for select properties
- Partner in restoration and enhancement planning and implementation

### *Contact information*

Jim Sjulín (503) 823-5122  
[pkjims@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:pkjims@ci.portland.or.us)

## **Partner–Clackamas County**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To protect, enhance and promote watershed health in our community.

### *Work related to acquisition*

Would purchase property to build detention or water quality facilities, or to restore to a natural state, thereby improving functioning of the floodplain or natural resource area.

### *Sources of funding*

- Surface water funds
- Bond funds
- Grants

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in grant applications
- Contribute direct funding
- Assist in decision-making process for properties in Clackamas County

### *Contact information*

Ela Whelan (503) 353-4568

[elaw@co.clackamas.or.us](mailto:elaw@co.clackamas.or.us)

Mike Henley (503) 794-8002

[mikehen@co.clackamas.or.us](mailto:mikehen@co.clackamas.or.us)

John Nagy

[johnnagy@co.clackamas.or.us](mailto:johnnagy@co.clackamas.or.us)

## **Partner –Johnson Creek Watershed Council**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To inspire and facilitate community investment in the Johnson Creek watershed for the protection and enhancement of its natural resources.

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Increase watershed awareness through outreach and education activities
- Promote solutions to watershed problems
- Directly coordinate and support restoration projects which improve wildlife habitat, water quality, and recreation opportunities
- Secure outside expertise, labor, recognition, and money to benefit watershed conditions

### *Sources of funding*

- OWEB
- City of Gresham
- City of Portland
- City of Milwaukie
- Metro
- Multnomah County
- Clackamas County
- Potentially other non-profits, foundations and government agencies

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Initiate and cultivate community partnership and support for the program
- Publicize the program in the watershed
- Coordinate acquisition activities among jurisdictions
- Partner in grant applications
- Assist in decision-making process for select properties
- Coordinate or assist in habitat restoration
- Provide monitoring and maintenance for acquired sites
- Coordinate volunteer stewardship of acquired lands
- Provide education and involvement opportunities

### *Contact information*

Kim Hatfield, Watershed Council Coordinator (503) 239-3932  
[kim@jwc.org](mailto:kim@jwc.org)

David Reid, Outreach Coordinator (503) 239-3932  
[david@jwc.org](mailto:david@jwc.org)

## **Partner–Metro**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

Metro is the elected regional government that develops and administers long range plans affecting the livability of the region, including planning for land use, transportation, natural resource protection, parks, and waste reduction and disposal. Metro also operates regional facilities including parks, open spaces, the Oregon Zoo, the Oregon Convention Center, and the Expo Center.

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Acquire land for parks and open spaces
- Manage regional parks and green spaces
- Protective planning for water quality, floodplains, wetlands, and riparian and upland habitat

### *Sources of funding*

- 26-26 Bond measure
- Potential future bond measures
- Various voter-approved fees and taxes that fund general budget

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in grant applications
- Contribute direct funding
- Assist in decision-making process for select properties

### *Contact information*

Nancy Chase (503) 797-1845  
[chasen@metro.dst.or.us](mailto:chasen@metro.dst.or.us)



## **Partner–Multnomah County**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

- To conserve natural resources and guide land uses to sustain and enhance the rural communities of Multnomah County

### *Work related to acquisition*

- None

### *Sources of funding*

- County tax revenue

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in grant applications
- Leverage existing resources
- Assist in decision-making process for properties in Multnomah County

### *Contact information*

Mike Powers (503) 988-3043 x29604  
[mike.p.powers@co.multnomah.or.us](mailto:mike.p.powers@co.multnomah.or.us)

## **Partners—Oregon Emergency Management (OEM) and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To execute the Governor's responsibilities to maintain an emergency services system as prescribed in Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 401 by planning, preparing and providing for the prevention, mitigation and management of emergencies or disasters that present a threat to the lives and property of citizens of and visitors to the State of Oregon.

### *Work related to acquisition*

Provide funding for acquisition of land for the purposes of flood mitigation or prevention.

### *Sources of funding*

Federal funding: Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA)

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in grant applications
- Facilitate funding partnerships through coordination with other state agencies and federal program resources

### *Contact information*

Dennis Sigrist, Hazard Mitigation Officer (503) 378-2911 x247  
[dsigrist@oem.state.or.us](mailto:dsigrist@oem.state.or.us)

## **Partner–Oregon Water Resources Department**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To serve the public by practicing and promoting wise long-term water management.

### *Work related to acquisition*

Manage water rights

### *Sources of funding*

State funds

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Provide information about water rights
- Enforce water rights rules and activities

### *Contact information*

Juno Pandian, Watermaster District 20 (503) 657-6811

[Juno.G.Pandian@wrd.state.or.us](mailto:Juno.G.Pandian@wrd.state.or.us)

## **Partner–Oregon Water Trust**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To maintain and restore surface water flows in the rivers and streams of Oregon.

### *Work related to acquisition*

Work with willing water users to acquire part, or all, of existing out-of-stream water rights and convert them to in-stream water rights.

### *Sources of funding*

Donations

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Work with us to obtain water rights
- Transfer to in-stream water rights under Oregon Law

### *Contact information*

Andrew Purkey, Executive Director (503) 226-9055  
[owt@teleport.com](mailto:owt@teleport.com)

## **Partner–Three Rivers Land Conservancy**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

Three Rivers Land Conservancy is dedicated to promoting and protecting open space, scenic areas, wildlife, and other natural and historic resources in the greater metropolitan area of Portland.

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Acquire land for protection and conservation
- Acquire and enforce conservation easements

### *Sources of funding*

- Fee-for-service work relating to acquisition
- Donations
- Potential grant monies

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in/write grant applications
- Provide matching funding (as land or easements)
- Research and acquire conservation easements
- Hold and enforce conservation easements

### *Contact information*

Jayne Cronlund, Executive Director (503) 699-9825  
[jcronlund@trlc.org](mailto:jcronlund@trlc.org)

## **Partner–The Trust for Public Land**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) conserves land for people to improve the quality of life in our communities and to protect our natural resources and historic resources for future generations.

### *Work related to acquisition*

TPL serves as a partner and problem-solver for public agencies. If an agency lacks staff, funding or legal authority to move quickly when important conservation properties come on the market, TPL can act swiftly to take the land off the market until funds are available for public acquisition. TPL's staff of real estate and legal professionals can tailor a transaction for public purchase. Working with governments, community groups, environmental organizations, foundations, and businesses, TPL helps assess open space needs and develop grass-roots support for conservation purchase.

### *Sources of funding*

- Fee and charitable donations
- Foundation grants

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Assist with writing and submitting grant applications
- Use private capital to secure and hold threatened properties on an interim basis
- Offer professional assistance with property surveys, appraisals, title searches and environmental assessments

### *Contact information*

Chris Beck (503) 228-6620  
Kristin Newman (503) 228-6620

## **Partner—US Army Corps of Engineers**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To provide quality, responsive engineering services to the nation including:

- Planning, designing, building and operating water resources and other civil works projects (Navigation, Flood Control, Environmental Protection, Disaster Response, etc.).
- Designing and managing the construction of military facilities for the Army and Air Force (Military Construction).
- Providing design and construction management support for other defense and federal agencies (Interagency and International Services).

### *Work related to acquisition*

- Acquire land for flood control and environmental protection/restoration projects
- Maintain flood control projects

### *Sources of funding*

- Federal funding under Section 206 (Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Authority)
- Planning Assistance to States (PAS)

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Count City of Portland land acquisitions as match money in USACE project areas
- Provide planning assistance
- Partner in grant applications
- Contribute direct funding
- Assist in decision-making process for select properties
- Provide real estate services

### *Contact information*

Pat Obradovich (503) 808-4730

[patricia.m.obradovich@usace.army.mil](mailto:patricia.m.obradovich@usace.army.mil)

Taunja Berquam (503) 808-4733

[taunja.j.berquam@usace.army.mil](mailto:taunja.j.berquam@usace.army.mil)

## **Partner–The Wetlands Conservancy**

### *Mission of organization/agency*

To conserve, protect, and restore the physical and ecological values of wetlands, other aquatic systems and related uplands.

### *Work related to acquisition*

Accomplish mission through education, research, acquisition, and promotion of private and public stewardship.

### *Sources of funding*

- Donations
- Membership dues

### *Partnering Opportunities*

- Partner in/support grant applications
- Research and acquire conservation easements
- Technical assistance and advice on restoration and management of wetlands

### *Contact information*

Ester Lev (503) 691-1394

[wetlands@teleport.com](mailto:wetlands@teleport.com)



## Acquisition Process Overview

The success of the program is founded in a team approach. The Land Acquisition Team works together throughout the process to prioritize properties and carry out land acquisition procedures. The team meets on a regular basis while the program is operating.

The Land Acquisition Team consists of the following members:

- Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) Program Manager and staff member(s)
- Negotiator
- Appraiser
- BES Special Wastes Division staff (Environmental Site Assessments)
- Bureau of General Services (BGS) staff (site stabilization)
- Portland Parks and Recreation (PPR) staff and/or other funding partners

The acquisition process used by the City of Portland can be simplified into seven basic steps:

- 1) Contact and negotiate with willing property owner
- 2) Conduct appraisal
- 3) Perform Environmental Site Assessment
- 4) Enter into Option Agreement with property owner
- 5) Obtain City Council approval
- 6) Close on property
- 7) Stabilize site

A detailed flow chart on the following page outlines the steps in this process.