C&R Scoring & Selection Process Workgroup

This workgroup met on October 31st for approximately two hours to discuss possible changes to the scoring and selection process of future C&R projects. The concerns below are from workgroup members or LMF staff. Some possible solutions listed were contributed during the October 31st meeting while others have been provided by staff. To understand many of the items addressed it is best to simultaneously view the C&R Scoring criteria on page 22 of the workbook. Also please remember that status-quo may be the best option.

Concerns raised Oct. 31st and possible solutions.

DWA Criteria (page 30).

DWA criteria was specific to the November 2012 bond. There was general agreement that the new DWA criteria would be removed in a future round unless it is specifically called for in a new bond. DWAs can continue to be covered in the 'additional land types' scoring category. Staff could expand the DWA criteria in the 'additional land type'.

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Max Score.

There was some general agreement about the confusion around a maximum score of 216. Below are two scenarios that bring total points to 100 or 130. Both scenarios keep score weighting the same among each category since the existing score is simply being divided by 2.16 (for 100 max points) or 1.66 (for 130 max. points).

	Current Max Score	Formula to Equal **100** (score/2.16)	Formula to Equal **130** (score/1.66)
Naturalness of the Land	12	6	7
Accessibility of the Land	8	4	5
Proximity to Other C&R Lands	16	7	10
Major Land Type - Significance	30	14	18
Major Land Type - Need/LAPAC	40	19	24
Additional Land Types	50	23	30
Economic Benefit	10	5	6
Single Exceptional Value	50	23	30
	216	100	130

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Local, Regional, Statewide Significance Confusion

Significance category chosen: Applicant's sometimes select a significance category that differs from what the board or the program believes it should be. For example currently if the proposal identifies Statewide significance when Regional may be more appropriate then staff flags this for the Scoring Committee to consider and for the Boards ultimate vote on changing the category on a specific proposal(s). The issue with this is that by the time the Board takes this vote the Scoring Committee has already conducted its business and each member of the Scoring Committee has taken significant time and at this point it is too late to rescore proposals.

The goal of the below options is to provide a significance category for each proposal BEFORE they are scored.

Possible Options:

a) staff would confirm a proposals significance category when proposal is received. Staff will consult with the applicant when deciding to change a category and will have the responsibility to change the category if appropriate. Proposals would be presented to the Board and it's subcommittees with the proper category assigned.
b) Staff makes recommendation on changing categories to the Scoring Committee Chair.
c) Staff makes recommendation on changing categories to the Scoring Committee. Committee votes on changes prior to scoring proposals (additional public meeting of the Scoring Committee would be needed).

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Misuse or misinterpretation of the terms Local, Regional, and Statewide in the Workbook: There was strong agreement that these terms are misused in the workbook and sometimes misinterpreted by applicants and Board members.

Possible Option:

a) Since the terms local, regional, and statewide have a specific meaning related to the significance of the Major Land Category then staff is to remove all <u>other</u> uses of the words local, regional, & statewide in the scoring criteria. This involves removing these words in the scoring criteria for 'Proximity', 'Need Rating', & 'Multiple Land Categories'.

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Proposals Are Too Thick.

There was a comment about the need for proposals to include addendums such as appraisals, deeds, draft easements, etc.

Although the deed is the only one of these documents that is required, staff would prefer that if available the proposals continue to include this information.

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Southern Verses Northern Maine Conservation Land.

There continues to be significant confusion of Board members as to what is considered southern verses northern Maine. The LAPAC report calls for a focus on "the southern portion of the state (south of Bangor)" because of rich biological diversity, development threats, limited public holdings, and proximity to population.

Possible options:

a) South of Route 2 / Route 9 corridor (Bethel to Calais) (historically used by LMF)
b) Projects south of 44° 48' N latitude (downtown Bangor)
c) South of Route 2 (Bethel to Bangor) then west of the Penobscot River (Bangor to Penobscot Bay). Consideration needed for islands of Penobscot Bay.

For multi-parcel projects do all parcels need to be in southern Maine to achieve the higher multiplier?

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Who Should Score Proposals.

There was discussion of possibly having staff score of proposals. Some Scoring Committee members thought the process was very time consuming.

Possible options:

a) Staff score proposals, present, and explain their scores to the Scoring Committee for their editing and acceptance.
b) Staff score proposals and present scores to the Nominations Committee for their consideration (eliminates Scoring Committee).
c) Status quo: Scoring Committee continues scoring all proposals without staff scoring.
d) Status quo alternative: Assign a sub-set of proposals to each scoring committee member who is responsible for knowing proposal and leading its review.

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Scoring Criteria and Proposal Format sections of the workbook are redundant.

Staff could merge the Workbooks scoring criteria section with the proposal format section. This could eliminate redundant text and eliminate any inconsistencies.

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Site Visits.

Some expressed the importance of site visits to all properties either by staff or the Board.

Possible options:

a. Visit case by case (status quo)
b. Site visits to all properties that have not been visited by sponsoring agency (timing & cost concerns)
c. Request sponsoring agencies to visit properties

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

LAPAC Multiplier (page 27).

There was some agreement that the LAPAC multiplier was confusing.

Currently LAPAC is accounted for with a multiplier. An example of how this formula works is (Need of the major land type x LAPAC category). This is the equivalent of saying (need of recreation land x river system), or (need of water access x trail system).

One option is to replace the LAPAC multiplier with a LAPAC score of 0-20. The total points remain the same.

New example:
An Ecological Reserve would be scored on its qualities and receive a score of 0-20.
A Trail System would be scored on its qualities and receive a score of 0-15.

Focus Areas:	Point range
Southern Maine Conservation Lands, Ecological Reserve, River System, or Undeveloped Coastline	0-20
Northern Forest Conservation Land, Trail System, Island, or Significant Mountain	0-15

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Proposal Presentation.

There was brief discussion on the manner proposals are presented to the Board. Currently Board members are presented with a one page summary sheet, a copy of the proposal, and a couple PowerPoint slides on the day of proposal selections.

One options discussed was to hold a meeting separate from the selection meeting for the presentation of proposals. Each applicant would have 10 minutes to present their proposal. Board members would still receive a summary sheet and copy of the proposal.

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Economic Significance.

The economic significance points are particularly difficult for applicants and for those who score proposals. It was intended to be temporary for round 7 but stuck for round 8.

Possible options:

a. Remove economic significance points
b. Simplify points. How? (we tried in 2013 and had a subcommittee examine it)

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Role of Nominations Committee.

Makes the business decisions. The Nominations Committee is to consider:

- Scores.
- Cost – bang for the buck (strong match).
- Balance of statewide, regional, and local projects.
- Fair geographic distribution of dollars, taking into account not just this round but distributions made in previous rounds.
- Good projects that may not fit LMF scoring system well.
- Municipal applicants if that is something that should be encouraged in future rounds
- Popularity of projects with the public.
- Fair sharing between various applicants (could favor new applicants).
- Size of requests. Funding small requests, even if scores are a little low relative to competitors, may at times make sense.
- Capacity of the applicant/partner.
- Project readiness.

DOES THE WORKGROUP AGREE WITH EACH OF THESE? ADDITIONS OR SUBTRACTIONS?
WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Executive Session:

There were some concerns that at the proposal selection meetings the public waits for hours while the Board is in executive session.

Board could hold a separate meeting for Executive session, then a separate public meeting with a vote and other public business (maybe on a separate day). Having separate meetings could also provide for more time and analysis of the details needed.

WORKGROUP DECISION: _____

Statewide Projects.

Clarify if all parcels in a statewide project must be owned (in whole or in part) by the state. Does this include non-conservation entities of state government?

Workbook says; "The interest in real estate for State Significant projects is to be held by the State."

Possible options:

a. All "State Significant" lands are to be fee or easement properties held by a State of Maine conservation agency.
b. All "State Significant" lands are to be fee or easement properties held by the State of Maine.
c. All "State Significant" lands are to be fee or easement properties held by a combination of a State of Maine conservation agency and an eligible partner.
d. All "State Significant" lands are to be fee or easement properties held by a combination of the State of Maine and an eligible partner.

STAFF MAY SEEK TO HAVE THIS ISSUE REVIEWED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE.
WORKGROUP DECISION: _____