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Conservation Funding Sources

State
- General Obligation Bonds
- Lottery Proceeds
- Transfer Taxes
- License Plate Programs

Local
- General Obligation Bonds
- Dedicated Property Taxes
- Dedicated Sales Taxes
- Budget Appropriations
How Are These Sources Enacted?

• Legislative Enactment
• Ballot Measure
  – Ballot Initiative
  – Referendum
Ballot Measures 2000 - 2004

- **2000**
  - 208 measures
  - 174 measures passed (83%)
  - $4.4 billion created

- **2001**
  - 197 measures
  - 138 measures passed (70%)
  - $1.6 billion created

- **2002**
  - 190 measures
  - 140 measures passed (74%)
  - $5.4 billion created

- **2003**
  - 134 measures
  - 100 measures passed (70%)
  - $1.2 billion created

- **2004**
  - 217 measures
  - 162 measures passed (75%)
  - $4.1 billion created
LandVote Ballot Measures 1998 - 2004
Who is Creating Funding?

Since 1996, Voters Have Approved 1,071 Open Space Ballot Measures, Authorizing $27.3 Billion in Conservation Funding*

Successful Measures
100% = 1,071

Cons. Funds Approved
100% = $27.3 B

State 3% 18%
County 18% 42%
Municipal 76% 34%
Special District 3% 23%

Analysis of Land Vote data by Peter Szabo for the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation
*Note: This does not include legislatively authorized spending programs, such as those in Florida, New York, and Maryland, which were not submitted directly to voters
Passage Rates are Consistently High

Conservation Ballot Measures Pass Nearly 80% of the Time, With Voter Support a Consistent 60% Across All Jurisdictions

Success Rates by Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction Type</th>
<th># Fail</th>
<th># Pass</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$ Approved ($ billion)</th>
<th>% Pass by Juris</th>
<th>Avg. &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Land Vote data by Peter Szabo for the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation
Conservation Finance Ballot Measures
National Trends

• Bipartisan -- Red State/Blue State popularity
• Not subject to economic fluctuations
• Broad support base: environmental and business community
• Leading States: NJ, CO, FL
April 2004 National Poll Reveals Strong Support for Land Conservation

- 65% of U.S. voters would support small increase in taxes to fund state or local government programs to purchase land to “protect water quality, natural areas, lakes, rivers or beaches, neighborhood parks and wildlife habitat”
  - 56% would pay $50 more per year in taxes
  - 60% would pay $25 more per year in taxes

- Poll of 1,500 registered voters surveyed April 3 to 12, 2004, by Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) for the Trust for Public Land and the Nature Conservancy
April 2004 National Poll Reveals Strong Support for Land Conservation

• Top national goals for land conservation (ranked “very important”)
  – Quality of life: 70%
  – Protect working farms and ranches: 63%
  – Protect natural areas: 62%

• 84% feel it’s very important to buy land to protect drinking water quality; 75% to improve water quality in our lakes, streams and rivers
## TPL’s Conservation Finance Services

### Technical Assistance
- Feasibility Research
- Public Opinion Surveys
- Program Recommendations
- Ballot Measure Design
- Legislative Support

### Campaign Assistance
- Campaign polls
- Campaign planning
- Campaign management and fundraising
- Media professionals
- Direct mail, radio and television advertisements
- Get-out-the-vote drives
Arcata, CA

- City of Arcata Community Forest
- Acres Acquired: 622
- Population: 16,651
- Median Household Income: $22,315
- Funding:
  - California Wildlife Conservation Board Grant
  - Federal Funds
  - Timber Revenue
Brooks Township, MI

- Coolbough Natural Acres (Community Forest)
- Acres Acquired: 400
- Population: 3,671
- Median Household Income: $34,257
- Funding:
  - Michigan Department of Natural Resources
  - Donation from The Nature Conservancy
Whatcom County, WA

- Canyon Lake Creek Community Forest
- Acres Acquired: 2,300
- Population: 176,571
- Median Household Income: $40,005
- Funding:
  - Nearly $700,000 from County Conservation Futures Fund (derives revenue from a 6.25 cents/$1,000 assessed value property tax)
Errol, NH

- Errol Community Forest
- Acres Acquired: 5,300
- Population: 298
- Median Household Income: $35,625
- Funding: $2.2 million general obligation bond
Maple Grove, MN

- City of Maple Grove Community Forest
- Acres Acquired: 250
- Population: 59,209
- Median Household Income: $76,111
- Funding: $5 million bond for the preservation of forestland
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