

Date: August 25, 2015

To: LMF Board and Appraisal Oversight Committee:
Bill Vail, LMF Board Chairman, Jim Norris, AOC Chairman; Jim Gorman, Neil Piper,
Ben Emory, Commissioner Walt Whitcomb, Commissioner Pat Keliher and
Commissioner Chandler Woodcock

FR: Sarah Demers, Director

CC: Sam Morris; R. Collin Therrien, Tom Miragliuolo, LMF staff; Bethany Atkins, IFW
staff; Katherine Eickenberg, Stephanie Gilbert, DACF staff; Deirdre Gilbert, DMR
staff, Jonathan LaBonte, Director, OPM

RE: LMF Board Workshop – GEA Report

LMF Board Workshop – GEA Report
Tuesday, August 25, 2015 12:30 – 3:30

Welcome, Meeting Expectations & Agenda Review
Proposed Schedule for GEA Report
Update from OPM on progress to date & next steps

Neil Piper
Sarah Demers
Jonathan LaBonte

Board discussion on emerging issues to be considered in GEA report All

NOTES FROM THE BOARD DISCUSSION

LMF Board Emerging Issues

- **Stewardship responsibilities for conservation easements**
 - Are existing policies and practices in place sufficient to address project amendments/proposed changes in use to a property acquired with LMF funds? Does LMF receive regular reporting on LMF funded easements? Does this reporting provide sufficient protection of LMF funds?
 - Utility/road expansions on LMF funded properties – what is the process for reviewing/approving? Is It sufficient?
- **Efficiency of the LMF process**
 - Site visits could improve efficiency of Board awareness of projects – Board & staff
 - Impact of legislated priorities/bond priorities to scoring process and selection of projects in relation to overall LMF process leads to potential conflicts in priorities
 - LMF is reactive to applicant projects – difficult to be efficient in that context
 - Appraisals: robust database of prior sales, comps. Used, relevant sales, etc...would increase efficiency of AOC.
- **What are the conservation needs in Maine? What is LMF's role in determining how much and what kind of conservation land is enough?**
 - Do we set policy on conservation priorities? Role of agencies vs. LMF Board?
 - Revisit LAPAC
 - Given changes in landownership, both private and public, does LMF provide a service relevant to current needs? Public access
 - Balancing Board priorities with public priorities identified in bond language
 - how much \$ is "needed" for LMF?
 - Assessment of accomplishments, needs/priorities to help move from reactive to pro-active

- **Role of the Director, Board**
 - Board has been primarily administrative and that has been time consuming.
 - Bi-annual Board training could improve efficiency of the Board given appointment schedule
 - Balancing policy level and project level details for Board members could be improved
 - Decision making process and time commitments of Board members – how can staff assist in ensuring Board is adequately prepared to do its job?
 - **Promote awareness of LMF funded properties**
 - need for a tool (database, gis data) to make location of LMF funded projects more accessible to the public, but also for use in determining economic value, recreational use, etc..
 - Understanding what LMF has accomplished in order to understand what role/priorities LMF should play in the future
 - Data to help measure effectiveness of what has been accomplished.
 - **How can we separate LMF from the bigger political process?**
 - Bond priorities identified by political process - what is role of Board?
 - LMF Statutes identify funds (C&R, AG, WA, WW), Board identify priorities within those funds
 - **Project Scoring**
 - Doesn't appear to be consensus btwn. scoring & nominations on program priorities/public needs
 - Need to review recommendations of scoring sub-committee and consider adoption of changes
 - State, regional, local Scoring categories might not reflect all aspects of "importance" from a visitation perspective
 - **Multi-parcel projects – what's appropriate and what if any different considerations need to be hi-lited for the Board?**
 - **LMF contribution & match**
 - Has match increased over time? Does that have an impact on what/how many projects are approved?
 - Should project selection be based on LMF \$ contribution or public values represented by the project?
1. Improving information technology – availability & distribution of data.
 - What specific data is needed and what analysis tools? For what purpose and what audience?
 2. Assess scoring & evaluation – does it work? Does it emphasize current priorities?
 3. Improve public awareness and use of public lands acquired w/ LMF \$