

# *Creating a Land Conservation Agenda for Urban Areas*

A Summary of the 2005 Urban Land Protection Forum

NOVEMBER 14, 2005



## **Sponsored by:**

Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

Boston University Department of Urban Affairs and City Planning

Greater Worcester Land Trust

Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust

The Trustees of Reservations-Putnam Conservation Institute

The Trust for Public Land

Urban Ecology Institute



---

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:**

The 2005 Urban Land Protection Forum was made possible by the support of several sponsors: Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA), Boston University Department of Urban Affairs and City Planning, Greater Worcester Land Trust, Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust, The Trustees of Reservations-Putnam Conservation Institute, The Trust for Public Land (TPL), and the Urban Ecology Institute (UEI). We also wish to thank the Consensus Building Institute for their participation and facilitation skills.

### **Planning Committee:**

Jane Calvin, Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust  
Melissa Cryan, EOEA  
Andrea Freeman, The Trustees of Reservations  
Nancy Kafka, The Trust for Public Land  
Kwabena Kyei-Aboagye Jr., EOEA  
Dan LeClair, Boston University  
Colin Novick, Greater Worcester Land Trust  
Robert O'Connor, EOEA  
Aaron Toffler, Urban Ecology Institute

### **Forum Facilitators:**

Ona Ferguson, Consensus Building Institute  
Patrick Field, Consensus Building Institute

## Table of Contents

<b><u>The Need for a Land Conservation Agenda in Urban Areas</u></b>	<b>2</b>
<b><u>Introductory Remarks</u></b>	<b>4</b>
<b><u>Four Key Challenges</u></b>	<b>5</b>
Massachusetts Case Study - The Million Dollar Acre (Lowell)	7
Massachusetts Case Study - Creating an Urban Waterfront Park (Chelsea)	9
<b><u>Next Steps and Conclusion</u></b>	<b>11</b>
<b><u>Appendices</u></b>	
<b>Appendix A</b> Survey Summary of Invitees to the Forum	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix B</b> Invitation Letter	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix C</b> List of Forum Participants	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix D</b> Forum Agenda	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix E</b> Matrix of Conservation Tools/Funding Sources and Cities Using Them	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix F</b> Resource List of Ongoing Urban Conservation Projects Around the Country	<b>26</b>
<b><u>List of Urban Land Conservation Practitioners in MA</u></b>	<b>29</b>
<b><u>The Planning Process for this Forum</u></b>	<b>30</b>

---

# The Need for a Land Conservation Agenda in Urban Areas

---

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

---

Massachusetts is the third most densely populated state in the U.S. and has one of the highest numbers of land trusts of any state in the country. While Massachusetts has abundant scenic and cultural landscapes in rural and suburban regions, the majority of the state's population lives in urban areas. People living in these urban areas need and deserve easy access to natural, relaxing, recreational, and inspiring outdoor places in their own neighborhoods.

To address urban land conservation in Massachusetts, a small group of urban land trusts and urban conservation and land-use professionals have been meeting semi-regularly since 2004 to network, share project successes and stumbling blocks, and address common misperceptions about urban land protection.

The first gathering, *Improving Life in your City or Town: Land Conservation on a Neighborhood Scale*<sup>1</sup>, was a day-long conference that took place in Lowell, MA, in September 2004 with former Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis as the keynote speaker. With more than 100 participants, this conference highlighted the uniqueness of urban land conservation work, the importance of sharing information within the state, and the sheer diversity of entities concerned about urban land conservation. The entities represented at this conference weren't just land trusts—participants came from state and federal agencies, municipalities, community development corporations, garden clubs, trail groups, neighborhood associations, watershed associations, environmental justice organizations, and more.

A few months later, participants from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA) saw the need to follow-up on ideas and concerns expressed at the 2004 Lowell conference. EOEA gathered the conference sponsors plus several more likely partners and began planning the *Urban Land Protection Forum: Creating a Land Conservation Agenda in Urban Areas*, described within this document.

## WHY NOW?

---

### Building on Ideas & Concerns from a Previous Conference

Held in Boston, on November 14, 2005, the day-long Urban Land Protection Forum focused on three goals that stemmed from the 2004 *Land Conservation on a Neighborhood Scale* conference:

- To create an **agenda** to guide land conservation in Massachusetts' urban areas;
- To recognize the **roadblocks** to conservation of additional natural areas and development of urban parks in Massachusetts; and
- To identify and connect leaders, advocates, and key **stakeholders** throughout Massachusetts who are involved in land conservation in urban areas.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sponsored by The Trustees of Reservations' Putnam Conservation Institute, Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust, The Trust for Public Land, and hosted at the Lowell National Historic Park's Tsongas Industrial History Center

---

## **Building on the State's Smart Growth Agenda**

In addition to the ideas spurred by the 2004 conference in Lowell, the 2005 Urban Land Protection Forum builds on the "Smart Growth" agenda that the Massachusetts Office of Commonwealth Development (OCD) began advocating in 2003. Since Smart Growth encourages "in-fill" development in urban areas with existing infrastructure, it is critical to also conserve urban green space, parks, gardens, and trails so that Massachusetts' cities are inviting places to live, work, and play.

OCD's Smart Growth agenda has advanced urban park restoration and development projects through the Commonwealth's Urban Self-Help Grant Program, which has more than doubled its grants to cities to \$30 million over the past four years.

## **Showcasing a Partnership for Determining Priority Areas for Land Protection in Urban Areas**

Finally, the Urban Land Protection Forum was timely because it built on the collaborative work of the Urban Ecology Institute, Greater Worcester Land Trust, The Trust for Public Land, and the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs in implementing a new model for identifying priority land for urban green space, parks, and gardens based on neighborhood need, public support and natural resource attributes.

## **INTRODUCTORY REMARKS - Robert O'Connor, EOE**

---

This Forum was the result of the hard work of a planning committee that met several times to plan the agenda and arrange logistics and funding. Thanks to the work of Dan LeClair at Boston University who provided the great setting for the forum. Thanks to Andrea Freeman of The Trustees of Reservations' Putnam Conservation Institute who organized much of the logistics and provided funding for our lunch. Thanks Colin Novick of the Greater Worcester Land Trust, Jane Calvin of the Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust, Aaron Toffler of the Urban Ecology Institute, Nancy Kafka of The Trust for Public Land, and Kwabena Kyei-Aboagye and Melissa Cryan from the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs for all their work in planning the agenda.

Why have this Forum now? Many of the planners for this Forum were involved in an urban land conservation conference held in Lowell in September of 2004 with over 100 participants. This conference highlighted the critical nature of urban land conservation work and shared information about ongoing projects and conservation techniques being employed by participants. This Forum also builds on the "Smart Growth" agenda being pursued by state government. As Smart Growth focuses growth in "in-fill" areas with existing infrastructure, protection of urban green space and development of urban parks must go hand-in-hand with these efforts if we are to make our cities inviting places to live and work. The Smart Growth agenda has meant strong funding for state urban parks grant programs (record funding was received this year), so this Forum is also needed to help ensure that this funding provides the best possible benefits to cities. Finally, this Forum is timely because it builds on the collaborative work of the Urban Ecology Institute, The Trust for Public Land and the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs in implementing a new model for identifying priority land for urban green space, parks, and gardens based on neighborhood need, public support, and natural resource attributes.

Recent work by EOE with forest groups and land trusts has shown that the Forum format can be very effective in moving priorities forward. The planning committee selected leaders in the urban land conservation movement in Massachusetts for this Forum so that the group would be diverse and representative of the great ideas and work happening across the state but also small enough to effectively discuss these issues and set joint priorities. So we encourage you to participate actively today. Thanks for taking the time from your busy schedules to participate. With such a great group, only good things can happen from this day.

## FOUR KEY CHALLENGES

---

*Protecting land from development means overcoming many challenges. Land trusts, municipalities, and agencies have become quite adept at conserving land of all types and sizes in rural and suburban areas, however, conserving land in urban areas presents new and different challenges. Below is a summary of the commentary from many people involved in conserving land in Massachusetts' urban areas.*

### **1. High Cost of Land/Lack of Funding**

In 2005, Boston, MA, was ranked as having the highest cost of living in the country, outpacing New York City, Washington, D.C., and Seattle, WA. The high cost of living is propelled by high housing costs, which follow high land costs. In urban areas, where in-fill development competes against the need for green space and recreation areas, land conservation advocates find themselves competing with developers, aggressive real estate agents, and local governing boards anxious to increase tax revenue. With tremendously high profit margins, it is difficult to negotiate “bargain sales” in urban areas. Few nonprofits have the resources, capacity, and/or experience to think like real estate agents. Decreased state, federal, and local government funding sources add to the obstacles of land acquisition and few foundations are willing to make the large-scale investments to help finance such projects. All of these challenges are compounded by the reality, fear, or perception of potential contamination, increasing the costs associated with assessing property acquisition decisions.

### **2. Misperception**

One of the greatest challenges in urban land protection is that “it’s not worth the effort, because what are you really protecting anyway?” While urban areas may not have the ecological significance of a 1,000-acre woodland, a 1-acre site in the middle of an urban area has vital conservation assets, though at a smaller scale. Providing access for gardening, passive recreation, quiet reflection, trees and other vegetation, and scenic vistas in areas measured by square footage rather than acres is central to quality of life for urban residents. Measuring the number of people served by an urban acre maybe a more compelling measure than total acres protected. Furthermore, the assemblage of smaller parcels and narrow corridors can provide important access among properties, creating opportunities for neighborhood residents to explore nature, walk along a river, or safely bike to work along a greenway. By improving the quality of life in urban areas, cities become more “livable” thereby reducing the desire for people to leave the city and deterring sprawl. Finally, an additional misperception is that often much of the green space in urban areas is assumed to be protected when it’s not. This leads to encroachment issues, further reducing the quality of these smaller open space parcels.

### **3. Lack of Local Capacity**

Urban land conservation groups are few and far between. Where urban land conservation succeeds is in communities that have strong partnerships between municipal agencies and local non-profits. Local planning boards and conservation commissions also need to be attuned to local land conservation efforts. Even tax assessors that monitor tax delinquent properties should be connected with such efforts. Unlike “traditional” land conservation, urban land conservation often requires varied expertise and complex strategies to address a range of issues when acquiring urban parcels including assessing tax title properties, railroad corridors, powerline easements, contamination and remediation, liability, and property ownership and management, among others. Municipal personnel as diverse as environmental officers, planners, and legal staff may be connected at different levels to a specific property or have different institutional memories. A local nonprofit that has strong partnerships across agencies will enhance its opportunities to acquire properties that might otherwise seem unavailable. This need to reach across

multi-layered municipal departments and political boundaries can make projects time consuming, which increases acquisition costs. Within Massachusetts, such entities as Conservation Commissions, Massachusetts Municipal Association, and regional planning groups should receive training in addressing urban green space issues. Youth are also the next stewards of properties that need to be engaged.

#### **4. Conservation Tools and Strategies**

Land protection strategies in urban areas require different approaches. Just as in any conservation transaction constant vigilance, luck, and timing play significant roles in project success. Of the variety of conservation tools available, land transactions in urban areas tend to lean more toward fee acquisitions, rather than conservation restrictions. Furthermore, actual ownership is complicated by such issues as potential contamination, park design and maintenance, and the cost of managing encroachment issues.

There is a strong need for a cohesive statewide plan for urban land protection. A comprehensive statewide plan would provide leverage for local planning efforts and encourage partnerships. Often local governments need to be shown the financial value of open space as compared to the financial value of development. There is also a role for state acquisition of smaller parcels, especially those that abut existing state owned properties in dense urban areas. Furthermore, within the state park system, urban parks and heritage state parks historically have received fewer resources (e.g. no staffing in Lowell State Heritage Park).

Many municipalities hold significant acreage in tax-title “limbo,” waiting for development opportunities to provide tax revenues. State agencies should create incentives for municipalities to provide, where appropriate, local land trusts or other agencies an interest in the property (ownership or conservation restriction) to increase protection of the land. Local land protection organizations can also partner with affordable housing agencies to combine efforts to promote both goals.

In the Commonwealth’s urban areas, some land trusts are working with developers that have strong reputations for limited development to tackle head-on the cost of land. Networking within the land protection community should allow for the sharing of contacts/developers interested in “limited development.” Additionally, conservation groups should identify and consider opportunities to partner with affordable housing groups that are interested in redevelopment and green space.

Land trusts and conservation groups should encourage and work with local government to secure grant funds dedicated to land conservation and urban parks development. Many cities and towns throughout the Commonwealth have not taken advantage of available funding sources. State grant programs offered through the Commonwealth’s Division of Conservation Services such as Self-Help and Urban Self-Help grants have for several decades been instrumental in helping local municipalities with land protection and parks creation. The Self-Help program is available for open space acquisition and passive recreation and the Urban Self-Help program is available for land acquisition and active recreation projects such as park and playground development.

## Case Study 1: Lowell's \$1 Million Acre (former Red Cross site)

### How Project Addresses the Four Key Challenges

- 1) **Misperceptions:** Without extensive local knowledge of the historic significance of this one-acre site, few can appreciate the loss of this open space property in such a dense city.
- 2) **Funding/High Cost of Land:** The Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust (LP&CT/The Trust) took on \$1 million in debt to acquire this property. Fortunately, the Trust had the backing of a local foundation which drove the process in financing the project.
- 3) **Local Capacity:** This project took the leadership of a small local nonprofit that saw the conservation value in the property, as well as strong partnerships with the Lowell National Historical Park (LNHP), the regional planning agency (NMCOG), the City, and U.S. Representative Marty Meehan's office.
- 4) **Conservation Tools:** This project required a high level of risk, political savvy, strong negotiation skills, and an understanding of the complex ownerships abutting the property to create meaningful partnerships. Most importantly it relied on thinking like a real estate developer!



### **BACKGROUND**

The Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust owns the Spalding House (c. 1760) at 383 Pawtucket St. The Trust acquired this property from the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) in 1996. Their membership was dying out and they wanted to have the house in good hands. At that time, no other organization in the city was interested in acquiring the house, its 900 artifact collection, and an associated \$56,000 endowment - not even the Lowell National Historical Park (LNHP) or Lowell Historical Society were interested. After determining that the house was structurally sound and foundation funding was in place, LP&CT went ahead and acquired the house. The house abuts the Gatekeeper's House (part of the MA Dept. of Conservation and Recreation curatorial program) and the LNHP's Blacksmith Shop (both noted at "NPS" on map above). The Blacksmith shop is used today to provide the pins that support the flashboards for the dam at Pawtucket Falls, right behind the house.

The Trust acquired the house with the intention of opening an urban environmental education center. The Spalding House is a critical structure that illustrates Lowell's pre-industrial history. It is Lowell's 3<sup>rd</sup> oldest home and the oldest home open to the public. This location at Pawtucket Falls is historically where the Pawtucket Indians (Penacook Confederacy) settled seasonally due to its abundant fisheries. Prior to Lowell's canals being built, the Spalding House [then known as the Moses Davis Inn (late 1700's)] provided overnight accommodations for barge keepers as they portaged their barges around the falls and overland to what is now the Spinners' baseball field, LeLacheur Stadium. In 1796, the Pawtucket Canal was built and could accommodate barges bringing timber from NH to the seacoast.

With strong support from the local Parker Foundation and the MA Historical Commission (MHC), the Trust took on the \$250,000 restoration of the exterior of the building in 1999, even winning a 2000 Preservation Award from MHC. LP&CT has since catalogued, professionally photographed, archived, and stored all 900 artifacts and tackled several more steps, including upgrading storm windows, upgrading the heating and security systems, landscaping the exterior front of the house, and having an interior paint analysis completed.

In acquiring the Spalding House, LP&CT factored in having a good neighbor, the Red Cross, next door. The Spalding House came without access to parking for which the Trust has relied on the good graces of the Red Cross. They understood the desire to access the Merrimack River via an easement through their parking lot and LP&CT was in the midst of negotiating that easement when it learned the Red Cross needed to sell the property due to financial troubles.

In November 2003, the Red Cross was looking to consolidate their property to Haverhill and sell their Lowell property to a developer. At that time the property was zoned to accommodate one unit per 1,000 sq. ft. – that meant about 30 units on 37,000 sq. ft. and/or a 6-7 story building, which would dwarf the Spalding House, eliminate parking and access to the river, and negate much of LP&CT's investment in the property. By June 2004, the Trust purchased the property for \$821,000. Support for the down payment came from a foundation and the remainder through conventional financing through a typical mortgage at a variable interest rate for 18 months. Grant support from the same foundation has since provided operating expenses and the cost of a real estate consultant, hired to help develop an exit strategy.

LP&CT primary goals:

- protect access between the Merrimack River and the Spalding House,
- ensure parking access for Trust staff, directors and visitors, and
- ensure that the Trust has a good neighbor next door

After goals achieved objectives include:

- 1) to protect the historic Red Cross main house (rated A-1 by LNHP) to ensure that future use of the site did not require demolition of the building, and
- 2) create a park at the back of the property overlooking Pawtucket Falls.
- 3) Alternative to #1 and #2: an historically appropriate limited development on site that would enable LP&CT to pay back primary lender on time.

To ensure objectives #1 and #2 and, as a worst case scenario #3, the Trust set to work on two parallel tracks:

- Permitting a limited development on the property of 14 units (6 in Red Cross and 8 in one new building at the back ) – see attached map
- Seeking funds for developing a park on the back portion of the Red Cross property. (see attached)

Where LP&CT stands now:

Through the National Park in Lowell, the Trust secured a \$1million federal earmark in the transportation bill with the help of U.S. Representative Marty Meehan's office. Achieving the federal earmark deterred limited development on the site and enabled LP&CT to extend its loan repayment through December 2007. In October 2007, LP&CT will convey the property to the City of Lowell, which will utilize the site by creating a park overlooking Pawtucket Falls on the back of the property and developing affordable housing in the former Red Cross building.

## **Case Study 2: Condor Street Urban Wild - Creating an Urban Waterfront Park**

In early October 2003, the Urban Wild on Condor Street opened as a long-desired 4.5-acre park; the first public-access point to the highly industrialized Chelsea Creek in East Boston. Once a contaminated brownfield site with little or no value as open space, the property was fenced-off and closed to the public. The property remained blighted for two decades until the Chelsea Creek Restoration Partnership came together to advance clean-up and development of the site.

The Chelsea Creek Restoration Partnership (CCRP), a coalition of the Chelsea Green Space and Recreation Committee (Green Space), the Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH), and the Urban Ecology Institute (UEI), worked with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to leverage \$1.2 million for the development, maintenance, and programming of this previous brownfield site—adding to the City of Boston’s investment for remediation of the site.

The Urban Wild abuts the Chelsea River, a highly industrialized waterway that separates East Boston from the City of Chelsea. Industrial uses line the banks of this waterway, known locally as Chelsea Creek, because of its designation by the state Office of Coastal Zone Management as a Designated Port Area (DPA). The DPA requires that any land along the Creek be used for a water-dependent industrial purpose. This designation is based on the infrastructure of the area, including a deep water channel appropriate for commerce, ability to accommodate large tankers, as well as good highway access to support industrial uses. Because of this industrial designation, developing open space and public access to the waterfront is particularly difficult and creates environmental injustices for local residents as they bare the burden of industry as well as limited access to natural areas and open space. It is within this context of environmental injustice that the community advocated for clean-up and accessible open space along the waterfront.

The local community was (and continues to be) organized by the two on-the-ground nonprofit organizations on each side of the river; Green Space in Chelsea and NOAH in East Boston. Residents of these communities come together for monthly meetings to chart out the direction and focus areas for the organizations to pursue. For years, the 4.5-acre Urban Wild had been the object of local activism, presenting an unfulfilled but promising opportunity for open space along the Chelsea Creek. Because it had been purchased with Land and Water Conservation Fund money, the property had been designated for passive recreation, but there had been no funding or incentive to clean-up and develop the site. Without the resources to develop the property into a park, the City of Boston held on to the land. As a result, it stood dormant and closed off from the community by a barbed-wire fence. Weeds and scrub brush took over the site, which became a dumping area and gathering place for homeless people.

Since its opening in October 2003, the Condor Street Urban Wild has been the hub of ecological, environmental, and recreational activity along the Chelsea Creek. Monthly community engagement events such as kite flying, flower planting, a catch and release fishing day, and snowshoeing have brought hundreds of residents onto the shores of the Creek celebrating the area’s rare natural resources. Resources such as these are scarce in industrialized communities like Chelsea and East Boston, making their existence and preservation vital to the health of the community.

The creation of the Condor Street park required coordinated fundraising, a strong partnership between the community and all levels of government, and some good fortune. The first piece of good luck occurred as a result of the way in which the City of Boston acquired the property. Because it was purchased with Land and Water Conservation Fund money, it was required to be set aside for passive open space. If this restriction had not been on the property, it could have been used for any purpose that the City saw fit. Its location in a Designated Port Area would have likely resulted in a water-dependent industrial use (perhaps as a result of a sale by the City).

The community groups in Chelsea and East Boston have had a great deal of success in working with government at all levels on open space projects. They are well-organized and have established good working relationships with the City of Boston, the state, and the Environmental Protection Agency. These relationships have been cultivated by, among other things, Environmental Justice tours of their project work to local, state and federal officials. As a result of these relationships, the Chelsea Creek Restoration Partnership has been named one of fifteen Environmental Justice demonstration projects in the country by the EPA. This designation is designed to bring attention and resources to projects in environmental justice communities across the nation.

In addition to highlighting its work with agency decision-makers, the CCRP put the Urban Wild project into an EPA data bank of projects that were in need of funding. This data bank, called the Supplemental Environmental Project data bank, lists community-supported projects that will result in direct environmental benefits for the community. The Urban Wild had been the focus of community attention for several years, as local residents wanted to see natural open space on site, including a restored salt marsh along the Chelsea River. They had been discussing and planning for restoration of the site for several years and hired landscape architects to work with them to come up with a design for the site which included the salt marsh restoration.

When the design process was through, the only piece of the puzzle left to be resolved was the funding to make the project a reality. Obviously, this is a big issue in urban green space creation. This project was fortunate to fit within the guidelines of the SEP data bank and to have received an infusion of cash while the project was waiting to be built. The SEP program funds environmental projects that will have specific benefits to the communities in which they are located. An alleged environmental violator, one that is the subject of a lawsuit by the EPA (or a state agency) can settle their case by financially supporting a project that has some nexus to the violation. For example, a company that allegedly violates the Clean Air Act can choose to support a community-based project that would result in the planting of trees instead of paying a fine directly to the Federal Treasury. In this way, the project would have a beneficial effect in the area of the alleged violation. At the time that the Urban Wild was ready to be built, the EPA had identified an alleged violator who was interested in supporting the project (because the program is voluntary, the alleged violator has the option to choose the project that will benefit). This resulted in an infusion of approximately \$900,000 from the violating company towards the completion of the park. The City had also leveraged other funding from past owners of the property to complete the remediation of the site. Through this public and private collaboration, led by community activists, the first park was created along Chelsea Creek in a generation.

## **NEXT STEPS**

The Forum concluded with participants voting on the most important issues/ideas raised at the group break-out sessions. Consensus was achieved on four critical elements that will be important to achieve throughout the coming years. A full list of the priority voting results is attached in Appendix E.

The highest ranked idea (17 votes) was to develop a model to quantify the “value” of urban land parcels for conservation. These values would include direct economic value (adjacent land and housing prices) to less tangible social values (improved health, water quality, etc) A foundation would provide prize money for the best submittals. The forum attendees suggested that the model would have natural resource inputs that quantify economic and public health values of a given open space parcel.

The second highest ranked idea (15 votes) was to expand the inclusion of urban open space in the Statewide Land Conservation Plan. Although this plan has a goal of adding 50,000 acres of new city parks and open spaces, it does not include specifics on how this land would be identified or protected. Details to the handling of urban open space should be added to the plan. Expanding upon EOEAs’ 2005-2006 pilot “Urban Open Space Assessment” project conducted by TPL’s Parks for People Program and the Urban Ecology Institute would further the inventory, assessment, and acquisition strategy for urban open space in the Commonwealth. The initial assessment included the cities of Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Somerville, and Worcester.

The third highest ranked idea (14 votes) was to enhance environmental education for urban youth utilizing local open space resources and to create more work/volunteer opportunities in these open space areas.

Two ideas tied for fourth (7 votes each). The group felt that guidelines for the “Areas of Critical Environmental Concern” (ACEC’s) should be interpreted to allow more on public health. Currently, very few of the 27 existing ACEC’s are in urban areas. The other fourth-ranked idea was to increase technical assistance or funding to help urban land conservation entities move good land conservation ideas to implementation through additional project planning and design work.

## **CONCLUSION**

Overall, the 2005 Urban Land Protection Forum was a unique opportunity for fellow urban land conservationists and planning practitioners to network, share challenges, goals and ideas, and help give urban land protection a higher profile. The “next steps” previously outlined will provide opportunities to focus efforts collectively. Locally, regionally, and nationally urban land conservation is gaining attention at conferences, within philanthropic organizations, and city planning agencies. The approach of this Forum was not directed at sharing stories, as many conferences are, but in discussing roadblocks and challenges to protecting urban land. By understanding our common challenges and the distinct set of professional skills that urban land protection requires, we can focus on creating real and positive change in urban land conservation in Massachusetts.

# APPENDIX A

## E-Survey Summary<sup>2</sup> Conducted prior to the Urban Land Conservation Forum

- 24 respondents representing:
  - \* 4 cities in Massachusetts
  - \* 4 local or regional land trusts
  - \* 4 nonprofit organizations
  - \* 2 statewide land trusts
  - \* 2 state agencies
  - \* 1 national land trust
  - \* 1 federal agency

### QUESTION 1:

**What most significantly hinders your ability to conserve land in urban areas?  
(Please check a maximum of 3)**

---

	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
High Price of land	69.2%	18
Existing urban open space isn't well maintained	30.8%	8
Complexity of clean-up	26.9%	7
Fear of contamination (real or perceived)	26.9%	7
Trouble finding an entity willing to own it	26.9%	7
Lack of support from selectman/mayor	26.9%	6
Lack of public support	15.4%	4
Fear of crime (real or perceived)	11.5%	3
Shortage of technical/legal expertise	11.5%	3
Lack of support from Municipal Boards	3.8%	1
Other (please specify)	26.9%	7
<i>- Unwillingness of city governments to take on land that they should (vs. putting responsibility onto private or non-profit sector). Open space is not seen as a priority and is not funded.</i>		
<i>- Availability of appropriate land for existing grant programs</i>		
<i>- Limited outside pools of funding to draw on</i>		
<i>- Lack of funding</i>		
<i>- Small city (~4 Sq. Mi) with very high population density and mostly developed land</i>		
<i>- Little undeveloped land remaining</i>		
<i>- Lack of stewardship funding</i>		

---

<sup>2</sup> We conducted this survey electronically using Survey Monkey ([www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com)) which is quite easy to set up (no HTML experience needed). This web site is free if you have no more than 10 questions and no more than 100 respondents. Beyond that it costs \$19.95 per month or \$200 per year.

**APPENDIX A, continued (E-Survey Summary)**

**QUESTION 2:**

**If you could have more of the following for your community, which ONE would it be?**

---

	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
Trails/greenways	34.6%	9
Access to or along bodies of water	19.2%	5
Natural places	15.4%	4
Urban wilds	11.5%	3
Parks	7.7%	2
Community gardens	3.8%	1
Other	3.8%	1

*- Places to celebrate public events*

**QUESTION 3:**

**What do you believe your community sees as important reasons to conserve land in urban areas?**

---

	<b>Quite important</b>	<b>Somewhat important</b>	<b>Not important</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
Recreation opportunities	65% (17)	35% (9)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Connection to people/community interaction	54% (14)	38% (10)	8% (2)	0% (0)
Good for children and teenagers	54% (14)	46% (12)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Meeting places for neighborhoods	54% (14)	35% (9)	12% (3)	0% (0)
Connection to nature	42% (11)	54% (14)	0% (0)	4% (1)
Physical health benefits	42% (11)	54% (14)	0% (0)	4% (1)
Protects water quality	35% (9)	42% (11)	19% (5)	4% (1)
Food-producing gardens	23% (6)	42% (11)	35% (9)	0% (0)
Mental health benefits	23% (6)	58% (15)	12% (3)	8% (2)
Increases neighboring property values	19% (5)	50% (13)	23% (6)	8% (2)
Ecological benefits	15% (4)	62% (16)	19% (5)	4% (1)
Economic reasons/cost of community services	15% (4)	38% (10)	31% (8)	15% (4)

APPENDIX A, continued (E-Survey Summary)

QUESTION 4:

What are the TOP 3 issues you face in conserving land in urban areas today?

---

	Response Percent	Response Total
Lack of state funding acquisition	61.5%	16
Lack of planning capacity/planning staff	42.3%	11
Lack of local funding for acquisition	38.5%	10
Misperception of urban open spaces	38.5%	10
Lack of federal funding acquisition	34.6%	9
Competing uses for land	26.9%	7
Perceived lack of conservation value	15.4%	4
Inadequate regulatory pressure	7.7%	2
Lack of nonprofit partners	3.8%	1
Out of date open space plans	0%	0
Other (please specify)	15.4%	4
- <i>Competing local priorities</i>		
- <i>Time to contact owners</i>		
- <i>Lack of local and federal funding for site assessment, cleanup and capital improvements</i>		
- <i>Limited undeveloped land available</i>		

## APPENDIX A, continued (E-Survey Summary)

### QUESTION 5:

**Who are the key players (leaders) in your community that impact the protection and stewardship of land in urban areas? Please provide names and/or titles.**

- Arlington Community Trabajando
- Boston Parks Department (Paul Sutton)
- Boston Natural Areas Network (Valerie Burns)
- Boston Schoolyard Initiative
- Charles River Watershed Association
- Charles River Conservancy
- Chelsea Creek Action
- City of Fall River
- City of Holyoke Mayor
- Codman Square NDC (Dorchester, MA)
- Congressman Jim McGovern
- Environmental Protection Agency (Kristi Rea)
- Esplanade Association
- Friends of the Lowell / Dracut / Tyngsborough State Forest (Mehemed Ali)
- Greater Worcester Land Trust (Colin Novick, Allen Fletcher)
- Groundwork Lawrence
- Groundwork Somerville
- Lawrence City Councilors
- Lawrence Conservation Commission
- Lawrence Mayor Michael J. Sullivan
- Lawrence Community Works
- Lowell Conservation Commission (Chris Zacharer)
- Lowell Division of Planning and Development (Matt Coggins)
- Lowell Parks and Conservation Trust (Jane Calvin)
- Lowell Parks Department (Tom Bellegarde)
- Lowell planning staff, George Proakis
- Lowell planning board, Gerge Zaharoulis
- Mass Audubon's sanctuary directors at urban sanctuaries (Deborah Cary)
- Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (Mary Ellen Welch, Gail Miller, Stacey Chacker)
- Nuestras Raices, Inc. (Holyoke, MA)
- Southside Community Land Trust (Providence, RI)
- The Growing Center (Somerville, MA)
- The Trustees of Reservations
- The Trust for Public Land (Nancy Kafka)
- Urban Ecology Institute (Charlie Lord, Aaron Toffler)
- Worcester City Manager Mike O'Brien
- Worcester City Council (Councilman Tom White)
- Worcester Conservation Commission (Chair Peter McKone)
- Worcester Planner & Conservation Staffer (Katie Donovan)

# APPENDIX B

## Invitation Letter



*The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
*Executive Office of Environmental Affairs*  
*100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900*  
*Boston, MA 02114*

Mitt Romney  
GOVERNOR

Kerry Healey  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Stephen R. Pritchard  
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000  
Fax: (617) 626-1181  
<http://www.mass.gov/envir>

September 12, 2005

### **RE: Environmental Affairs' Creating A Land Conservation Agenda For Urban Areas**

Dear Environmental Friends and Partners:

On behalf of the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, I would like to invite you to our **Creating A Land Conservation Agenda For Urban Areas Forum** being held on Monday, November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2005 from 9:00am – 3:30pm. The Forum will be held in the School of Management Conference Room on Boston University's Charles River Campus on 595 Commonwealth Avenue, by the Blanford Street T Station (directions and maps attached). Lunch will be served and complimentary parking is available. This facilitated discussion is co-hosted by the Boston University Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, Trustees of Reservations, Greater Worcester Land Trust, Lowell Parks and Conservation Trust, Urban Ecology Institute, Trust for Public Land, City of Somerville, and DCR's Urban and Community Forestry Program.

The goals of the Forum are to: 1) create an agenda to guide land conservation in Massachusetts' urban areas; 2) recognize the roadblocks to conservation of additional urban parks and natural areas in Massachusetts; and 3) identify and connect leaders, advocates, and key stakeholders throughout Massachusetts who are involved in land conservation in urban areas.

The Forum will bring together representatives of environmental organizations, federal, state, and local officials, as well as academic researchers who are currently working on the issue of urban land conservation. Patrick Field, a skilled and well-respected facilitator from the Consensus Building Institute will facilitate the Forum. The Forum will begin with each participant briefly describing the work of their organization and issues they see critical to land conservation –why land conservation is important; what key issues face land conservation in urban areas today; and how as a group, we can overcome the challenges facing those trying to conserve land in our urban areas. There will be opportunities to meet environmental professionals across a broad range of disciplines, and hopefully begin new collaborations. By the end of the day, we hope to have the framework of a conservation agenda we can begin to move forward.

Please let us know whether you can attend by e-mailing our partner Andrea Freeman of the Trustees of Reservations at [afreeman@ttor.org](mailto:afreeman@ttor.org) before Friday, October 14<sup>th</sup>. Space is limited. We will confirm your registration via email on or before Friday, November 4<sup>th</sup>. We hope that you will be able to participate in this Forum to create an agenda for land conservation in urban areas. Please contact Andrea Freeman if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Stephen R. Pritchard". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "S" at the beginning.

Stephen Pritchard  
Secretary

# APPENDIX C

## Participants at the *Urban Land Protection Forum* November 14, 2005 – Boston, MA

Lois Adams  
Environmental Protection Agency, Region One  
Boston, MA

Gene Benson  
Alternatives for Community & Environment  
Roxbury, MA

Roseann Bongiovanni  
Chelsea Greenspace and Recreation Committee  
Chelsea, MA

Lisa Brukilacchio  
Tufts University - Univ. College of Citizenship &  
Public Service  
Medford, MA

Jane Calvin  
Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust  
Lowell, MA

Deb Carey  
Mass Audubon - Broad Meadow Brook  
Worcester, MA

Stacy Chacker  
Neighborhood of Affordable Housing  
East Boston, MA

Tony Chaves  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Boston, MA

Anna Lina Colamussi  
Boston University  
Boston, MA

Melissa Cryan  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs-DCS  
Boston, MA

Dan Driscoll  
Department of Conservation & Recreation  
Boston, MA

Ona Ferguson  
Consensus Building Institute  
Cambridge, MA

Patrick Field  
Consensus Building Institute  
Cambridge, MA

Catherine Finneran  
MA Dept. of Environmental Protection  
Boston, MA

Roger Freeman  
Friends of Cass, Roxbury Heritage  
Dorchester, MA

Andrea Freeman  
The Trustees of Reservations  
Leominster, MA

Kurt Gaertner  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Boston, MA

Betsy Goodrich  
Rails-to-Trails Conservancy  
Lowell, MA

Nancy Hammett  
Mystic River Watershed Association  
Arlington, MA

James Harrison  
The Food Project  
Lynn, MA

Eric Hove  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Boston, MA

Kwabena Kyei-Aboagye, Jr.  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Boston, MA

Dan LeClair  
Boston University  
Boston, MA

David Lutes  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Boston, MA

Marc MacQueen  
US Dept of Ag., Natural Resource Conservation  
Service  
West Wareham, MA

Colin Novick  
Greater Worcester Land Trust  
Worcester, MA

Robert O'Connor  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Boston, MA

Daria Ovide  
Trust for Public Land  
Boston, MA

Jane Pfister  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Boston, MA

David Queeley  
Trust for Public Land  
Boston, MA

Chris Rodstrom  
The Trustees of Reservations  
Leominster, MA

Daniel Ross  
Nuestras Raíces  
Holyoke, MA

Heidi Samokar  
Metropolitan Area Planning Council  
Boston, MA

Eric Seaborn  
Dept. of Conservation & Rec.-Urban & Community  
Forestry  
Boston, MA

Laurie Suda  
MA Association of Conservation Commissions  
Belmont, MA

Maggie Super Church  
Groundwork Lawrence  
Lawrence, MA

Aaron Toffler  
Urban Ecology Institute  
Chestnut Hill, MA

Charles Tracey  
National Park Service  
Boston, MA

Ryan Tully  
Boston University  
Boston, MA

Maria Van Dusen  
Consultant/Former Director of Mass Riverways  
Boxford, MA

Peg Wheeler  
The Trustees of Reservations  
Leominster, MA

Robert Wilber  
Mass Audubon  
Lincoln, MA

Beverly Woods  
Northern Middlesex Council of Governments  
Lowell, MA

Alicia Zoeller  
Holyoke Conservation Commission  
Holyoke, MA

# APPENDIX D

## *FORUM: Creating a Land Conservation Agenda for Urban Areas*

*November 14, 2005 - Boston University School of Management*

### **Forum Planning Partners**

Boston University Department of Urban Affairs & City Planning  
Department of Conservation & Recreation- Urban & Community Forestry  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
Greater Worcester Land Trust  
Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust  
The Trust for Public Land  
The Trustees of Reservations' Putnam Conservation Institute  
Urban Ecology Institute

## Agenda

- 8:30 am-9:30 am**      **Check-in & Continental Breakfast (Room #412)**
- 9:00 am-9:15 am**      **Good Morning**  
- Welcome to Boston University – Jay Halfond, Dean of BU's Metropolitan College  
- The "Why" of this Forum – Bob O'Connor, Director of EOEA's Div. of Conservation Services
- 9:15 am-9:25 am**      **Facilitators, Agenda & Ground Rules**  
- Patrick Field & Ona Ferguson, Consensus Building Institute
- 9:25 am-9:55 am**      **Introductions of Participants**
- 9:55 am-10:10 am**      **Four Key Challenges of Conserving Land in Urban Areas**  
- Bob O'Connor
- 10:10 am-10:30 am**      **The Four Key Challenges in Real Projects**  
- Lowell Case Study – Jane Calvin, Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust  
- Chelsea Case Study – Aaron Toffler, Urban Ecology Institute
- 10:30 am-10:45 am**      **Break**
- 10:45 am-11:30 am**      **Facilitated Discussion: Four Key Challenges of Conserving Land in Urban Areas**  
- Patrick Field & Ona Ferguson
- 11:30 am-11:45 am**      **Facilitated Discussion: Additional Challenges?**  
- Patrick Field & Ona Ferguson
- 11:45 am-12:30 pm**      **Buffet Lunch – Seating in Room #430**

- 12:30 pm-1:00 pm**    **Agents of Change and/or Assistance: What are the current abilities of:**
- MA state agencies (Bob O'Connor)
  - Conservation nonprofits in MA (Colin Novick, Greater Worcester Land Trust)
  - Academia (Dan LeClair, Boston University)
  - Others?
- 1:00 pm-1:15 pm**    **Assignment for Small Group Discussions**
- Andrea Freeman, The Trustees of Reservations
- 1:15 pm-2:05 pm**    **Group Reports**
- 2:15 pm-3:00 pm**    **Identifying Priorities**
- Patrick Field & Ona Ferguson
- 3:15 pm-4:00 pm**    **Discussion: Results, Upshot & Next Steps**
- Patrick Field, Ona Ferguson, Bob O'Connor

# APPENDIX E

Matrix of Massachusetts Towns, Tools & Resources for Land Conservation in Urban Areas  
(data through November 2005)

Municipality	Population 2004	Passed Community Preservation Act?	Current Open Space & Recreation Plan as of 8/05?	Urban Self-Help Grant Received?	Self-Help Grant Received ?	Community Specific Land Trust?	Commonwealth Capital Score (FY05)	Tree City USA?
Agawam	28,144	CPA	Current	FY06			66	
Amesbury	16,450			FY04				Tree City USA
Arlington	42,389		Current			Arlington Land Trust	57	
Attleboro	42,068		Current			Attleboro Land Trust	66	
Barnstable	47,821	CPA	Current		FY06	Barnstable Land Trust	106	
Beverly	39,862		Current			Beverly Conservation Land Trust		Tree City USA
Boston	589,141		Current	FY01 FY03 FY04 FY05 FY06 (x2)		Boston Natural Areas Network	101	Tree City USA
Brockton	94,304			FY02 FY03			85	Tree City USA
Brookline	57,107					Brookline Conservation Land Trust	67	
Cambridge	101,355	CPA	Current		FY05		99	Tree City USA
Chelsea	35,080		Current	FY03 FY04 FY06			87	Tree City USA
Chicopee	54,653			FY03 FY04 FY06			65	Tree City USA

Municipality	Population 2004	Passed Community Preservation Act?	Current Open Space & Recreation Plan as of 8/05?	Urban Self-Help Grant Received?	Self-Help Grant Received?	Community Specific Land Trust?	Common-wealth Capital Score (FY05)	Tree City USA?
Easthampton	15,994	CPA	Current	FY06		Pascommuck Conservation Trust	84	
Everett	38,037		Current				44	
Fall River	91,938		Current	FY05 FY06			92	applying for '05
Fitchburg	39,102		Current	FY03 FY04 FY05 FY06 (with Leominster)		North County Land Trust	91	
Franklin	29,560		Current				90	
Gardner	20,770						86	
Gloucester	30,273						105	Tree City USA
Greenfield	18,168		Current			Franklin (Co.) Land Trust	77	Tree City USA
Haverhill	58,969		Current				66	Tree City USA
Holyoke	39,838		Current	FY03			101	Tree City USA
Lawrence	72,043		Current	FY05 FY06		Groundwork Lawrence	60	Tree City USA
Leominster	41,303			FY05 FY06 (x2 with Fitchburg)	FY03 FY04 FY05 FY06	Leominster Land Trust	71	Tree City USA
Lowell	105,167		Current	FY05		Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust	85	Tree City USA

Municipality	Population 2004	Passed Community Preservation Act?	Current Open Space & Recreation Plan as of 8/05?	Urban Self-Help Grant Received?	Self-Help Grant Received ?	Community Specific Land Trust?	Commonwealth Capital Score (FY05)	Tree City USA?
Lynn	89,050			FY06			76	Tree City USA
Malden	56,340			FY03 FY05 FY06 (x2 with Melrose)			65	
Marlborough	36,255		Current				90	
Medford	55,765		Current	FY03 FY05			70	Tree City USA
Melrose	27,134			FY03 FY05 FY06 (x2 with Malden)			40	
Methuen	43,789						40	
New Bedford	93,768		Current	FY06			92	Tree City USA
Newburyport	17,189	CPA	Current	FY03 FY04	FY06			Tree City USA
Newton	83,829	CPA	Current			Newton Conservators	86	Tree City USA
North Adams	14,681		Current	FY05			72	Tree City USA
Northampton	28,978	CPA				Valley Land Fund	129	
Peabody		CPA					78	Tree City USA
Pittsfield	48,129						79	
Plymouth	51,701	CPA	Current				87	
Quincy	88,025		Current		FY05		72	Tree City USA

Municipality	Population 2004	Passed Community Preservation Act?	Current Open Space & Recreation Plan as of 8/05?	Urban Self-Help Grant Received?	Self-Help Grant Received?	Community Specific Land Trust?	Commonwealth Capital Score (FY05)	Tree City USA?
Revere	47,283		Current				84	
Salem	40,407						78	Tree City USA
Somerville	77,478		Current	FY03 FY04 FY05 FY06			94	Tree City USA
Southbridge	17,214							
Springfield	152,082		Current	FY03 FY04 FY05 FY06 (x4)	FY03 FY04		93	Tree City USA
Taunton	55,976						46	
Waltham	59,226	CPA		FY03		Waltham Land Trust		Tree City USA
Watertown	32,986						68	Tree City USA
Westfield	40,072	CPA	Current	FY05		Winding River Land Conservancy	94	Tree City USA
West Springfield	27,899			FY06			71	Tree City USA
Weymouth	53,988	CPA						Tree City USA
Woburn	37,258						68	
Worcester	172,648			FY04 FY05		Greater Worcester Land Trust	80	Tree City USA

# APPENDIX F

## Resource List and Ongoing Projects from around the Country

---

### **Project Name:**

Philadelphia Green

<http://www.pennsylvaniahorticulturalsociety.org/phlgreen/index.html>

The Pennsylvania Horticultural Society  
100 N. 20th Street - 5th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: 215-988-8800  
Fax: 215-988-8810

**Description from website:** A program of the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, Philadelphia Green is the nation's most comprehensive urban greening program. Since 1974, Philadelphia Green has supported the development and ongoing care of community gardens, neighborhood parks and high-profile public green spaces in Philadelphia.

Working in partnership with neighborhood residents, community organizations and city agencies, the program uses greening as a community building tool. It educates and empowers people to make the City a more attractive and livable place through horticulture.



---

### **Project Name:**

Atlanta Beltline Initiative

[http://www.tpl.org/tier3\\_cd.cfm?content\\_item\\_id=20306&folder\\_id=249](http://www.tpl.org/tier3_cd.cfm?content_item_id=20306&folder_id=249)



Photo: TPL Archives

**Description from website:** The BeltLine Initiative, a major focus of The Trust for Public Land's Parks for People Program, is Atlanta's once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to develop an integrated network of urban parks, linked together by a multi-use trail and transit system. Surrounding the 22-mile loop of historic railroad tracks known as the BeltLine, this initiative is a massive urban revitalization undertaking unlike any other opportunity in the country,

**Project name:**

Woonasquatucket River Greenway, Providence

<http://www.woonasquatucket.org/greenwayProject.htm>

The Watershed Council Office is at  
27 Sims Avenue  
Providence, RI 02909  
(401) 861.9046  
(401) 861.9038 fax

**Description from website:** The Woonasquatucket River Greenway Project is a catalyst for renewal along the Woonasquatucket River in Providence. The green linear park will revitalize a major hidden natural resource on the West Side of the City and become a destination for neighborhood residents and people throughout Providence and Rhode Island. A bicycle/pedestrian path will link recreational areas, green spaces, destination sites, and the neighborhoods of Manton, Hartford, and Valley, as well as Olneyville and Smith Hill (Enterprise Community neighborhoods) to Waterplace Park in downtown Providence.

The Greenway and restored parks will provide needed urban recreation areas, address local transportation needs, and promote restoration of abandoned industrial sites and impaired riverbank habitats. The Greenway will also provide economic reinvestment opportunities in the river corridor.

---

**Project Name:**

River Revitalization Foundation

<http://www.riverrevitalizationfoundation.org/homepage.html>

Executive Director: Kimberly A. Gleffe  
1845 N. Farwell, Suite 100  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
Phone: (414) 271.8000  
Fax: (414) 273.7293  
[kgleffe@riverrevitalizationfoundation.org](mailto:kgleffe@riverrevitalizationfoundation.org)

**Description from website:** River Revitalization Foundation is serving as the urban rivers land trust in Milwaukee, caring for the Milwaukee, Menomonee and Kinnickinnic Rivers. We focus on conservation and protection of riparian corridors. This is done through land acquisition, easements, connecting green space, creating a parkway which provides public access to the river valley, and landowner education.



We currently own land, a nearly 5-acre parcel in Riverwest just south of Gordon Park, and coordinate projects, such as bike and pedestrian trails, for increased public access and awareness of the river valley. Our guiding document, The Riverway Plan (1991), contains goals, priority recommendations and strategies to implement the plan's main objective: to create a continuous environmental corridor, or greenway, along the Milwaukee River and address issues affecting water quality.

**Project Name:**

Scenic Hudson

<http://www.scenichudson.org>

Scenic Hudson, Inc.  
One Civic Center Plaza, Suite 200  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601  
info@scenichudson.org  
Phone (845) 473-4440  
Fax (845) 473-2648

**Description from website:** Scenic Hudson through its Riverfront Communities Program works with concerned citizens, local officials, developers, community groups and policy makers to encourage "Smart Growth" that protects resources and focuses mixed-use and appropriately-scaled development in and adjacent to existing communities, thus reducing auto-dependence and creating a vibrant, walkable environment that will enhance community character, preserve the Hudson Valley's unique sense of place and help protect farmland and open space.

---

**Project Name:**

Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust

<http://www.lanlt.org/>

**Tsilah Burman**

Executive Director  
Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust  
315 W. 9th Street, Suite 1002  
Los Angeles, CA 90015  
phone (213) 572-0188  
fax (213) 572-0192  
[tburman@lanlt.org](mailto:tburman@lanlt.org)



**Description from website:** The Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust (LANLT) is an independent non-profit organization that facilitates the creation of small, accessible community green and open space, such as parks and gardens, to address the inequity of open spaces in Los Angeles' underserved neighborhoods, and to ensure community participation and collaboration in every step of the process of creating these parks and community gardens.

---

---

**MASSACHUSETTS**  
**Land Trusts and Non-profits involved in Urban Land Protection**

Colin Novick, Executive Director  
**Greater Worcester Land Trust**  
172 Shrewsbury Street, Worcester, MA 01604  
E-mail/web: [mail@gwlt.org](mailto:mail@gwlt.org)  
Phone:(508)795-3838

Jane Calvin, Executive Director  
**Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust**  
PO Box 7162, Lowell, MA 01852  
E-mail/web: [info@lowelllandtrust.org](mailto:info@lowelllandtrust.org)  
Phone: (978) 934-0030

Maggie Super Church, Executive Director  
**Groundwork Lawrence**  
60 Island Street  
Lawrence, MA 01840  
Phone: (978) 974-0770  
E-mail/web: [msuper@groundworklawrence.org](mailto:msuper@groundworklawrence.org)

Charlie Lord, Executive Director  
**Urban Ecology Institute**  
355 Higgins Hall, 140 Commonwealth Ave.  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467  
Phone: (617) 552-1563  
E-mail/web: [info@urbaneco.org](mailto:info@urbaneco.org)

Andrea Freeman  
Putnam Conservation Institute  
**The Trustees of Reservations**  
Leominster, MA 01453  
Phone: (978) 840-4446 ext 1915  
E-mail/web: [afreeman@ttor.org](mailto:afreeman@ttor.org)

David Queeley  
Parks For People Director  
**The Trust for Public Land**  
Boston, MA 02108  
Phone: (617) 367-8310 ext 316  
E-mail/web: [david.queeley@tpl.org](mailto:david.queeley@tpl.org)

Robert Wilber  
Director of Land Acquisition  
**Mass Audubon**  
208 South Great Road  
Lincoln, MA 01773  
Phone: (781)259-2155  
E-mail/web: [rwilber@massaudubon.org](mailto:rwilber@massaudubon.org)

## The Planning Process for This Forum

---

### 24 Weeks Prior

The MA Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA) brought together representatives from a handful of local, regional, statewide, and national nonprofit organizations and asked these questions:

- *“Could we as a conservation community benefit from convening a larger group of people thinking about and working to protect more land in Massachusetts’ urban areas?”*
- *“If so, who do we bring together and what do we want to know?”*

The group agreed that there were indeed benefits to convening such a group and agreed to serve as a Planning Committee for this effort. The Planning Committee met several times to determine:

- the goals for the Forum;
- who to involve in the discussion;
- when and where to hold it;
- roles and responsibilities for Planning Committee members; and
- the Forum agenda, facilitator, and outcomes.

### 12 Weeks Prior

Confirm site and caterer for the Forum.

### 8 Weeks Prior

Mailed 123 invitations on EOEA stationary with the signature of the Secretary—a gubernatorial appointee (See Appendix B).

### 6 Weeks Prior

Sent email to all invitees asking them to complete an online survey (See Appendix A). The Planning Committee and facilitators would use the results of this survey to provide a framework for the day’s agenda.

### 4 Weeks Prior

Planning Committee members followed-up with calls and emails to people who had not yet RSVP’ed or completed the online survey. (We encouraged all the invitees to do the survey, whether they would attend the Forum or not.)

### 2 Weeks Prior

Planning Committee met with the Facilitators to:

- Finalize agenda
- Determine what information to give people before the Forum and what to hand out on site.

### 5 Days Prior

Sent email to all participants with the final agenda, directions for public transit, driving/parking and a contact name and number for any last minute questions.

Photocopied materials to hand out; made name tags; verified plans with the caterer, facilitator, and graduate students assigned to take notes.