

CONSULTATION WITH GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE MUNICIPALITIES AND OTHER LAND SECUREMENT GROUPS

Comments	Halton Region (May 14, 2013)	Peel Region (June 21, 2013)
Question 1: Has the process worked as intended or has it changed over time?	Implementation guidelines are difficult; ensure that there are stepwise instructions for both the applicant and the administrator; process needs to be clear; an evaluation form and checklist provides a screening tool to ensure that the right information is included; Halton has a weak definition of the eligible project costs; appendices are unclear; guidelines need to be descriptive; it is a requirement of the application process to go to council regardless of type of approval; should be a process for expediting the application process for donations.	Guidelines have been changed from 2007 in 2010; initially the application process was through staff and staff would approve applications with CA and regional staff; approvals are now part of a sub-committee of council; applicants come in with a budget and appraisal for approval; there is more certainty; process is working as best as it can; it depends on real estate staff to look at appraisal information which is a different process from expropriation; trying to get everyone on staff side; different ways of looking at things; limited numbers of partners works well; partners that do not have agreements with the region work with other partners to get funding.
Question 2: What changes in the process would you make?	N/A	N/A
Question 3: How have criteria evaluation of funding applications been developed? Would you change any of the criteria?	An evaluation form / checklist should provide the types of criteria required; consideration should be given for different tools used; qualitative method of evaluation works well; priority setting also helps in determining criteria.	Evaluation matrix questionnaire for scoring is indirectly related to criteria for funding; criteria for funding is does it contain a core greenland feature and is it part of the land securement strategy of the Conservation Authorities; scoring doesn't affect whether a project is brought forward or not; allows for a sense of how properties relate to the area.
Question 4: How does the process for determining	Every partner has their own strategy; developing a list of priority properties	Region doesn't determine priority areas; left up to CA since they know best what lands

Comments	Halton Region (May 14, 2013)	Peel Region (June 21, 2013)
<p>priority areas work? Do Conservation Organizations like the process?</p>	<p>helps to provide certainty for partners and is a way to prioritize; properties not on the priority list go to bottom of pile; annual meeting and a list of priority properties is sent out ahead of time; list shows prior priorities and new priorities; GIS services does a quick evaluation to determine if the property meets the eligibility criteria; only eligible properties are put on the list; cap of priority properties for each partner (10 properties); the annual meeting is also used to help track successes; a report goes to council with a map of priority areas and a table of properties (confidential report.)</p>	<p>should be secured; sense of where lands are being secured; priority areas could aid in fundraising efforts because there is a lack of funding; Conservation Authorities also look at properties adjacent to connecting areas.</p>
<p>Question 5: what type of timeframe do you allow for review and evaluation of an application?</p>	<p>It takes a lot of time to review applications; 12 week turnaround time; pre-consultation; identification of checklist to ensure complete application; preparation of a staff report; there is a need for leveraging scarce funds; a lot of different departments involved (realty services, planning, legal).</p>	<p>Applications are submitted 1 month before the report is written (report writing requires 2 month timeframe); if appraisal information has been provided, it is easier to get the information together; Region touches base with partners so there are limited surprises.</p>
<p>Question 6: How is the application process received by the applicants? Do you think that the process is too onerous?</p>	<p>Applicants say the process takes a long time and would like an expedited process; Halton requires all information; applicants would like conditional approvals; would like approval upfront for funds; there is a certain level of risk involved.</p>	<p>Be upfront with the review; what is the position of staff and the committee; properties that have used partial taking may be more difficult; require appraisal and budget with maps designating natural areas (similar to Halton); if other studies are required (Phase I Assessment) they can be submitted after funding is approved and are only reviewed by staff.</p>

Comments	Halton Region (May 14, 2013)	Peel Region (June 21, 2013)
<p>Question 7: Do you provide an annual progress report? What types of information do you include to evaluate whether the program is achieving its goals?</p>	<p>Annual progress report indicates how much funding was leveraged, how many properties were secured, how many priority properties were identified; staff report where priorities are identified; summary of what has happened; partners supply data to track all securement even unsuccessful applications.</p>	<p>Required to report back every year to subcommittee on changes that have occurred to the budget; indicate what properties have been acquired but doesn't specifically say what projects are being worked on; haven't completed an evaluation of the program although performance measures have been identified; annual report provides applications received, recommendations, summary of expenditures, landowner contacts and reserve level.</p>
<p>Question 8: Do you have a specific communication plan that is implemented as part of the program?</p>	<p>Not a specific communications plan in place; important to blitz landowners, publicize successes to gain awareness of program; important to include communications in guidelines.</p>	<p>No communications plan; partner securing property are those that provide communication plan; region puts properties on website although partners don't like to publicize current owner's name on website.</p>
<p>Question 9: Do you require progress reports or update reports on how the money has been used after it is given to the applicant?</p>	<p>A land acquisition agreement is signed by the partner; staff report indicates Region would enter into agreement; clauses within agreement that cover for perpetuity and first refusal.</p>	<p>Council approves amount of money; money isn't provided until final invoice is submitted; overall agreement deals with money; have 1 agreement for the organization and not for the projects.</p>

The following questions were asked during consultation with Other Land Securement Groups:

Comments	Other Land Securement Groups Hamilton Naturalists Club (September 12, 2013)
<p>Question 1: Has the Naturalists’ Club been involved in the process to obtain funds from Halton Region’s Greenland Fund? Is the process onerous? Are there things that you would change about the application process?</p>	<p>The process should not be made like Ontario Heritage Trust since the application process is onerous; things need to happen quickly (not necessarily for donations but for sales) and knowing that a project could go ahead and funding will be available is important; having a council approved map with the properties that are important for securement also helps; it could then come to senior staff level for approval; meadows/grasslands should be included as part of the criteria (grassland birds are in decline, potential for species at risk); meetings with staff ahead of time would make things go faster; no guarantee but would provide a sense for opportunities; need to have a very clear application form.</p>
<p>Question 2: Has the Naturalists’ Club been involved in Halton Region’s Priority Setting Workshop? If so, Do you think that it is a good process?</p>	<p>Priority setting workshop provides an idea of what everyone is working on; priorities on the landscape and reduces overlap; provides what is involved in the process ; interaction is helpful; good mapping provides both municipality and stakeholder with a service; provides mapping for long-term and short-term areas; each stakeholder uses their own criteria and priorities to determine specific locations; offers community support.</p>
<p>Question 3: How would the Naturalists’ Club determine if the property is a priority to secure?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Question 4: What is an appropriate level of funding required from a municipal funding source (e.g. funding would be 50 percent or up to \$50 000)? Is this an appropriate level of funding?</p>	<p>50 percent of the costs for securement is good; cost for acre of open space ranges from \$6000-8000; cost for developable land costs \$15 000-20 000; appraisal fees \$3000 and legal fees \$3000; \$50 000 might buy 2 acres of land; this amount is good help for donations and costs but does not go very far for a sale; not a lot of funders for</p>

Comments	Other Land Securement Groups Hamilton Naturalists Club (September 12, 2013)
	<p>securement (Ontario Heritage Trust; not always a source; community fundraising); would like to see that the money be spread around and not just focussed on a particular area (i.e. Pleasentview); there are other areas such as Vinemount Quarry and Swamp.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you think a specific communication plan and education awareness plan should be included in the Implementation Guidelines or is it best left for each partner to undertake their own programs? What are the key messages that are to be stressed relating to long-term protection and securement?</p>	<p>A comprehensive program would be okay; funders put in communication expectations (i.e. media releases, blogs); workshops-landowners may not be interested; partnerships should be with landowner stewardship; ways of getting the message out should involve stakeholder sessions where open advice is solicited from stakeholders; key messaging involves phrases such as natural legacy, still use the land (through negotiation), stewardship; messages from landowners to landowners; takes a lot of negotiation; landowners don't understand that acquisition is a benefit; partnership with watershed stewardship program (easier opportunity to promote stewardship and acquisition).</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you have specific objectives for evaluating lands to be potentially secured? Are there specific parcel sizes that you are looking at in terms of securement?</p>	<p>No particular size criteria; look at whatever comes along in terms of size; criteria used to evaluate lands include whether lands are under threat, protected, valued strategically on the landscape; need to look at what is happening on the landscape now.</p>
<p>Question 7: How many projects would you have that would potentially qualify for funding?</p>	<p>The naturalists would have about 1 property a year for securement.</p>
<p>Other Comments</p>	<p>Overall agreement with partners would be helpful since the City approves what the partners are trying to achieve; funding wait for invoices for the money but it would be helpful in what needs to be included in the invoice; having a budget form is helpful; budget form could have the acquisition cost (survey, legal, appraisal) and how much money from the City, partner and others; partners can give</p>

Comments	Other Land Securement Groups Hamilton Naturalists Club (September 12, 2013)
	presentation to council to express success; does in-kind funding count towards matching; this needs to be made clear; does land donation count as matching; there should be a meeting with partners prior to the finalization of guidelines.