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 Miragliauolo, 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   Neil Piper
Proposed Schedule for GEA Report      Sarah Demers
Update from OPM on progress to date & next steps   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 $