



Land for Maine's Future Program
Minutes of the Meeting
July 15, 2014

Department of Transportation Headquarters, Augusta, Maine

Board Members Present:

Ben Emory, Norman Gosline, James Norris, Neil Piper, Walter Whitcomb,
Chandler Woodcock, Bill Vail, Patrick Keliher

Board Members Absent:

James Gorman

Staff Members Present:

Sam Morris Tom Miragliuolo R. Collin Therrien Ed Meadows

Others

Shannon Ayotte, DACF Commissioner's Office
Kathy Eickenberg, DACF Bureau of Parks and Lands
Deirdre Gilbert, Dept. of Marine Resources
Jeff Romano, Maine Coast Heritage Trust
Sarah Demers, Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
Stephanie Gilbert, DACF
Todd Souza, Town of Wiscasset
Diano Circo, The Trust for Public Land
Michael Little, Island Heritage Trust
Christine Bennett, MTA2C Coalition/Kittery Land Trust
Reeve Wood, Maine Farmland Trust
Alan Stearns, Royal River Conservation Trust
Keith Fletcher, Maine Coast Heritage Trust
Erik Greven, Friends of Clapboard Island
Bucky Owen, Orono Land Trust
David Thompson, Orono Land Trust
Jim Mitchell, Mahoosuc Land Trust
Bob Iles, Mahoosuc Land Trust
Jerry Bley, Creative Conservation LLC
Peter Weston, Weston Homestead Farm
Gregg Caporossi, Trust for Public Lands
Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited
Lee Dassler, Western Foothill Land Trust
Carrie Wallia, Loon Echo Land Trust
Hugh Cowperthwaite, Coastal Enterprises Inc.
Kaitlyn Bernard, Appalachian Mountain Club
Steven Hufnagel, Damariscotta River Association
Karin Tilberg, Forest Society of Maine
Roger Poulin, Somerset Woods Trustees
Chris Cabot, Kennebec Estuary Land Trust
Nina Young, Maine Farmland Trust
Erica Buswell, Maine Farmland Trust
Penny Asherman, Chebeague & Cumberland Land Trust
Steve Walker, Maine Coast Heritage Trust
Keith Fletcher, Maine Coast heritage Trust

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Vail called the meeting to order at 9:40 AM, and explained that the delayed start was due to board members who had been delayed by another commitment. He welcomed everyone and asked for introductions around the room.

Mr. Vail stated that the purpose of the meeting was to hear the reports of the LMF Scoring and Nominations Committees and to select project finalists. Funds would not be authorized for acquiring land or easements at this meeting. Rather, projects are given preliminary allocation of funds. Those projects would then need to complete a series of due diligence steps and once completed, the Board would hold a public hearing on each project before authorizing release of funds.

Chairman Vail reviewed the Ground Rules for the day; each Board member was provided a copy.
(Copy of Ground Rules is in the file for July 15 meeting).

2. Funding Update

Mr. Meadows presented the funding update. He reviewed replacement (updated) Attachment A-1 and Attachment A-2, and explained that the LMF bond account had received reimbursements from several access improvement grants that were completed and did not need all the funds authorized by the Board.

9. Working Waterfront Access Protection Program

Commissioner Keliher asked that agenda item #9, the Working Waterfront Access Protection Program (WWAPP), be presented at this time, out of order of the agenda.

Deirdre Gilbert of DMR gave an overview of the WWAPP, also referred to as the Working Waterfront program (WWF). The WWAPP is jointly administered by DMR and LMF. It has a separate application process and project selection criteria. Applications are screened by the DMR Commissioner's Review Panel, which includes a member of the LMF board, currently Chairman William Vail. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Gilbert presented summaries of each of the three applications received in this round of funding. Commissioner Keliher provided his recommendations for the new proposals:

- A. Erica's Seafood in Harpswell. Focus of the project is on maintaining access, with a covenant on buildings, land, property and wharf. The property has a very high chance of conversion away from fishing access. Project provides diversity in the type of access in that fishing oriented area of the coast. It is a good site to ensure continued access to Casco Bay.
- B. Jonesport Municipal Landing in Jonesport. This is a very strong application, however the Town and property owners need to resolve certain issues before recommending allocation of funds.
- C. Sea Hag Seafood in Tenant's Harbor. Property has high chance of conversion; and diversity of potential uses, however proposal could benefit from refinement.

Mr. Keliher recommended tabling the Jonesport and Sea Hag proposals at this time, pending further evaluation.

Motion: by Comm. Keliher, 2nd by Mr. Gosline: To authorize allocation of \$250,000.00 for Erica's Seafood in Harpswell and move forward with due diligence. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Comm. Keliher, 2nd by Mr. Norris: To reserve time for additional discussion at the September 16, 2014 LMF Board meeting for the Jonesport and Sea Hag Seafood proposals, to complete the additional work needed. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Emory asked why LMF is seeing and reviewing incomplete applications. Comm. Keliher explained that WWF applications go through a different review process. At this point Comm. Keliher was called away from the meeting and later returned at approximately 1:00 PM.

3. China Lake Water Access - Project Withdrawn

Mr. Meadows advised that the applicant requested this project be withdrawn (due to inability of the Town to raise the necessary matching funds) and the \$122,000 has been worked back into the available funds.

4. Kennebec Estuaries, Day Parcel

Mr. Meadows presented an overview of the Kennebec Estuaries project from Round 7 of 2011, stating that two parcels closed to date, and one did not. He reported that DIFW is asking to substitute a new parcel for the one that did not close. A letter from DIFW was submitted to the Board, describing the merits of the replacement parcel. Sarah Demers added comments.

The replacement parcel is the Fawcett parcel which is wooded and has forested wetlands. The appraisal is underway. The \$200,000 allocation is sufficient. Ms. Demers stated that there is potential for an access right of way which has not been negotiated yet. Mr. Emory asked if the Board can be assured the parcel is contiguous with the existing project lands. Sarah Demers confirmed.

Comm. Whitcomb asked if there was a protective easement on the agricultural land. It was indicated that discussions are in progress to have the agricultural portion of the property under agricultural conservation easement, as a separate project with non-LMF funds.

Motion: by Mr. Gosline, 2nd by Mr. Emory: To accept MDIF&W's request to amend the Round 7 Kennebec River Estuary proposal by replacing the Day parcel with the Fawcett parcel. Motion passed 7-0-1. Mr. Piper abstained, stating he was not involved in the original Round 7 discussion and not familiar with the properties.

5. Orbeton Stream - Round 7

Sam Morris presented an overview of the Orbeton Stream project, a working forest easement near Madrid.

Appraisal Oversight Committee (AOC) Recommendation

Mr. Norris presented the AOC recommendation stating that the committee supports and accepts the valuation.

Public Notice

On July 4th, in the Kennebec Journal and July 5th in the Sun Journal.

Public Comment

There were no comments received and no comments from the audience at this time.

Motion: by Mr. Norris, 2nd by Mr. Piper: To approve the recommendation of the LMF Appraisal Oversight Committee to accept the appraiser's value of the conservation easement of \$1,615,000. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Mr. Norris, 2nd by Mr. Piper: To approve the \$150,279 in LMF Conservation and Recreation funding to support the DACF/Bureau of Parks and Lands acquisition of the working forest easement on the Orbeton Stream parcels, subject to the standard conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Lily Pond Water Access Deer Isle

Mr. Morris presented the proposal. Mr. Norris reported the appraisal had been reviewed and approved by the AOC.

Motion: by Mr. Emory, 2nd by Comm. Woodcock To approve the AOC recommendation to accept the appraiser's value of \$120,000.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Mr. Emory, 2nd by Comm. Woodcock to support acquisition of the project and allocate \$120,000 in Access to Public Waters funds. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Bond Fund Set-aside Proposal

Mr. Meadows presented a proposal (Attachment E of July 15 meeting materials) for designating certain percentages of bond funds for acquisition-related project expenses. The proposal had been discussed in concept at the November 2013 board meeting, with additional evaluation of costs since the November meeting.

Motion: by Comm. Whitcomb, 2nd by Mr. Norris: To allot LMF funds as follows:

- A. Transaction costs at 5% of gross available funds for farmland; 12% for working waterfront; 2% for water access, and 3.5% for conservation/recreation projects.
- B. Access improvement grants at 2% of gross available C&R and Water Access funds.

Motion passed unanimously.

The result of this action provides \$11,150,640 available to allocate to new projects as follows:

	Gross \$ Available	Transaction Costs	5% Biz Plan or Cap. Imp. Grant set aside	Access grant 2%	Total Expenses	Net Available
Farmlands	\$1,350,000	5.0%	0%	\$0	\$67,500	\$1,282,500
Water Access Fund	\$622,000	2.0%	0%	\$12,440	\$24,880	\$597,120
Conservation & Recreation	\$8,500,000	3.5%	0%	\$170,000	\$467,500	\$8,032,500
Other	\$94,300				\$0	\$94,300
Working Waterfront	\$1,300,250	12.0%	0%	\$0	\$156,030	\$1,144,220
Totals	\$11,866,550				\$715,910	\$11,150,640

The “Gross \$ available” includes funds from Ch. 645 not previously allocated and \$5 million from Ch. 696.

Mr. Meadows reported that the figures above include allocation of funds not needed from projects approved in Round 7 (\$115,000) and funds from donations received by the LMF program in the amount of approximately \$33,300, of which the Board authorizes use for projects determined most appropriate by the staff in the spirit of the donated funds.

8. Rules of the Day - Overview of the Board’s Proposal Review Process

Chairman Vail presented an overview of the process for Board discussion and action on Round 8 proposals. (Copy of Chairman’s comments is in the file for July 15 meeting).

9. Working Waterfront Access Protection Program

Matter was taken out of order before Agenda Item #3, and summarized above.

10. Public Presentation of Farmland and Conservation and Recreation Proposals

Mr. Meadows described the process used by staff and the Board in evaluating proposals, which included:

- Followed process in the 2013 LMF Proposal Workbook
- Included input from Working Groups on scoring and Deer Wintering Areas
- Included input from potential applicants, including the August 8, 2013 letter to the Board from a coalition of land trusts making recommendations on project selection and funding for Round 8
- Numerous letters received from interested parties

- Two workshops held for potential applicants
- Used essentially same process as previous rounds
- Excellent participation by Board members in Scoring and Nominations discussions

He reported that over the course of last 2 months, as we kept working on preparations for this meeting, it became clear just how massive this undertaking has been.

- Enormous effort by applicants
- Enormous effort by staff
- Thousands of details and fine points in the proposals

We have gotten to know the projects. At first glance, some may not jump up and say "Wow!" Over time though as you look at them more, you get to understand and appreciate in a new way. Some may not appear to the board as having those special qualities that we think of as "State significance." However such projects are extremely important and valuable to the local area, and those communities are very engaged with them. For example:

- Some communities have voted new taxes, or increased assessments to pay their matching share.
- When we see the support for Towns, or the local chamber of commerce, we recognize that, yes, conservation groups are fully engaged with the business interests and the community.
- They are doing what the board set as a goal of community engagement, and it is happening.
- These local and regional projects are the grass root supporters of LMF. They look to this board for leadership and support.

It is also true that some of the smaller projects may be less able to stand a reduced amount of funding; especially in the smaller towns there may be fewer alternatives to make up the difference.

These are all reasons why it has never been just a matter of the scores. And, why the Board has used a five stage process – to make sure all projects get fair consideration.

He then presented an illustrated review of the 32 proposals received (including a water access site proposal, which can be submitted at any time), with maps and photographs of each proposal. He said there are 26 conservation and recreation proposals, 5 farmland protection proposals and one water access proposal. The description of the projects is included in the file of this meeting.

11. Report from the Scoring and Nominations Committees

Mr. Emory, Chair of the Scoring Committee reported on the process used by the Scoring Committee, including: Individual committee members scored each proposal.

Then they met as a group, in public session; they discussed each proposal, then developed consensus scores.

Group discussion could change insight/perspective of an individual member.

He reported that in the LMF process consensus is not an average of the individual scores.

Mr. Emory commented on the difficulty committee members had evaluating the documentation of Economic Benefit criteria. How much documentation is sufficient? What kind of documentation? Is simply including a list of businesses in the area sufficient evidence of benefit? He suggested these criteria be reconsidered for the next Round.

Mr. Emory noted that the following items were called to the attention of the Nominations Committee:

- Possibly move some projects to different category without changing score
- Evaluate projects as a whole, not just the LMF funded parcel

- Whether to fund projects in all significance categories (local, regional, statewide)
- Degree of judgment required in applying scoring criteria

Mr. Emory also noted that the Scoring Committee recommended that the Nominations Committee not just rely on scores alone. Consider, for example: geographic distribution, balance and diversity of types of projects, “impact” and “bang for the buck”, project design, readiness, and potential for public use.

William Vail, Chair of the Nominations Committee, described the process used by the Nominations Committee

- Identified 5 (4) proposals to not fund
- discussed partial funding for 8 proposals
- discussed, but did not decide, move some to other category
- identified questions for clarification or Special Conditions, (e.g., cemeteries, CE on LMF funded property)
- developed ideas and preliminary allocation for discussion
- did NOT make formal recommendation to the Board

Mr. Piper commented about his experience as a new board member applying the criteria and making the judgments needed. After seeing the criteria for WWAPP proposals at this meeting he commented that perhaps having a work group to review the scoring and project selection process for farmland projects, perhaps similar to the WWAPP criteria. He also asked, what is the function of Nominations Committee? Their role, and what the criteria are, needs to be clarified

12. Board Discussion of Proposals and the Addition of Project specific Special Conditions

The board engaged in discussion of perspectives regarding selecting projects and funding allocations.

Mr. Norris, a member of the Nominations Comm. urged the Board not to go by scores alone. He said he favored moving funds, if necessary, between the preliminary categories established by the Board at the November 19, 2013 meeting. He said he did not favor leaving funds unallocated if there are good projects to support.

Comm. Woodcock stated he feels scoring plays the significant role. He supports the board discussion of different perspectives, which has been one of the strengths of the program. He does not favor moving funds to different categories, but would support using funds designated for water access projects for those proposals that qualify. He believes the best projects should get the funding, and recognizes the LMF criteria do not favor local projects.

Mr. Emory said he hoped to fund as many projects as possible in all categories.

Comm. Whitcomb stated that local projects might get more use than the larger statewide projects in remote areas. He expected there would be some substantial discussion on how to allocate the funds.

Mr. Meadows then outlined several considerations the Board may wish to discuss as a platform for deciding funding allocations for projects. He pointed out that all finalist projects are subject to the Board’s standard conditions. These were adopted by the Board in July 2011 and will be distributed to all successful applicants, along with the “Threshold Criteria” and Due Diligence Checklist from Appendix N of the Proposal Workbook.

For some projects, the Board may have questions about the proposal, if it is to be recommended for funding. The Board may attach Special Conditions if they feel it is warranted. For example:

- for multi-partner projects, designating one lead coordinator
- subject to resolution of outstanding rights (minerals, leases, etc.)
- Examples this round include enforcement rights on conservation easements and provisions about cemeteries

This round of proposals has a number of variations and new approaches to innovative project design, and staff has not had time to define all the issues, and how these may affect the state's interest going forward. Some of these could pertain to funding matters that may be considered in Executive Session.

Mr. Meadows indicated the board might require certain specific conditions be met, for example obtaining board approval prior to conveying a conservation easement on property acquired with LMF funding. These possible conditions include matters raised in discussion by the Scoring and Nominations committees, as well as issues identified by LMF staff in reviewing proposals. These issues emerge as a result of the project design proposed by applicants. They may affect project completion and cost to LMF.

Some issues may not need to be resolved as a condition of funding. It is appropriate to inform applicants and sponsors of these issues. He provided a short list of conditions that the Board may want to discuss.

Four specific items were identified, as follows:

- A. Conservation Easements.** Some Round 8 proposals indicate conservation easements “might be” conveyed on the properties acquired with LMF funding at a future date. This can provide additional protection but raises several policy issues the Board should discuss, such as:
- a. Should the Board require that the LMF template be used, so that the terms of the easement are consistent with the requirements of LMF funding?
 - b. Should the Board approve the proposed granting of easement, but request it be brought back for Board approval prior to being executed (and require approval by LMF attorney)?
 - c. The workbook was clarified to indicate the state will hold 3rd party enforcement rights for conservation easements held by cooperating entities. Some current proposals do not have this provision. Would this apply also to conservation easements conveyed at a future date by cooperating entities?

The Workbook states “Where a project involves an easement that is to be held by a local entity ... the easement must give the State of Maine third party enforcement rights on the terms of the easement.” (page 11).

There are cost implications to the LMF program and to the sponsoring agencies. We need to balance the right to enforce with the obligation to monitor. Would the state want future repayment to be at full value, vs. the “after” value in event of conversion?

We don't want to create disincentive for sponsoring projects. However, we need to maintain adequate protection of state funds.

Options:

- a. Require LMF template conservation easement. Specify in Project Agreement.
- b. Require applicant to bring easement back for Board approval
- c. Require state agency to hold 3rd party enforcement rights (affects Gulf Hagas, East Machias, Ellis River, Howard Hill, Knight's Pond, Weston Family Farm and maybe Caribou Bog, U of M parcel), and all of the farmland proposals.
- d. Require LMF template easement, with state agency as 3rd party holder (Designated State Agency, DSA). DSA to have the option to request exemption if they can demonstrate there is adequate protection for the state investment for the future.
- e. The Board may wish to convene a Work Group to review these issues.

Board Action: It was the sense of the meeting that the Board adopt these recommendations as stated.

B. Cemeteries

Some proposals have a small cemetery plot on the land to be protected. These plots are likely subject to existing rights and are not public recreation land. Some are informal, historic family plots; others may be subject to statutory and regulatory provisions. Three proposals are affected: Brave Boat Headwaters, Gardiner Pond and Parker Farm. Mr. Meadows suggested that possibly the cemetery areas be excluded from appraisal, and that LMF funds not be used in that parcel.

Board Action: It was the sense of the meeting that these areas be excluded from LMF funding, but that they do not need to be excluded from appraisal of the proposed property.

C. Project Specific conditions – A sample of possible special condition was distributed.

Board action: The Board took action on this item later in the day in agenda item #15.

D. Time limit on funds.

Mr. Meadows asked if the Board wants to establish a time limit on the funds. Consider there are \$2 million in projects approved in last Round 7 in July 2011 where the funds have not yet been invested three years later. These funds could have been used on other worthy projects. A time limit might involve, for example, two years with option to request a 1 year extension.

Board action: The Board took action on this item later in the day in agenda item #15.

13. Discussion of the Acquisition and financing of property/property interests of publicly-held property

Board members offered comments and discussion of perspectives for how they approach which projects to recommend and for what amounts.

Motion: by Mr. Norris, 2nd by Mr. Emory: To go into Executive Session for discussions related to negotiations and acquisition of public land and rights in land. Motion passed unanimously.

The Board went into Executive Session at 1:05 p.m.

Chairman Vail reconvened the Board back into Public Session at 5:40 PM

Board members present for the public session were Ben Emory, William Vail, Norman Gosline, Comm. Patrick Keliher, Comm. Walter Whitcomb, James Norris. Board members absent: James Gorman, Chandler Woodcock, Neil Piper.

Chairman Vail summarized the discussions related to negotiations and acquisitions which occurred in Executive Session. He indicated no votes or official actions occurred during that session.

14. Overview of Board's Funding Methodology

Mr. Meadows described the process used by the Board for selecting project finalists and the funding methodology as similar to that of previous rounds. He stated that the selection of proposals was a tough decision, there is not enough funding available to fully fund all projects, all are good projects and the Board recognizes the massive amount of work – by applicants, and LMF staff to prepare the proposals, conduct discussions with the sellers, raise the matching funds, etc.

The board proceeded with discussion of finalist project selection and preliminary funding allocations by category.

15. Allocation of Funds and Selection of Finalists

Motion by Ben Emory, 2nd by Jim Norris: To table the Thurston Farm proposal and have it be reconfigured as an agricultural conservation easement project instead of a fee acquisition. Applicant has until December 31, 2014 to submit a new proposal with funding request, with approval of the Designated State Agency (DACF, BAFRR). Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Mr. Gosline, 2nd by Mr. Emory: To allocate \$683,500 to the following farmland proposals subject to standard conditions (adopted by reference) and special conditions voted on by the board (*listed separately below*):

- Nezinscot Farm
- Parker Farm
- Winterwood Farm
- Wormell Farm

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Mr. Norris, 2nd Mr. Gosline: To allocate \$8,096,013 to the following conservation and recreation proposals subject to standard conditions (adopted by reference) and special conditions voted on by the board (*listed separately below*):

- Cold Stream Forest
- Seboomook Expansion
- Gulf Hagas - Whitecap Project
- Lower Weskeag Fields and Forests
- Central ME Sportsman's Access Project
- Redington Forest
- Brave Boat Headwaters
- Ellis River to Whitecap Mountain
- Howard Hill
- North Falmouth Conservation Corridor
- Biddeford Riverwalk Park Project
- Crooked River Forest
- Knight's Pond
- High Island
- Kimball Pond
- Crow Island Thread of Life
- Caribou Bog Conservation Area
- Clapboard Island
- Gardiner Pond
- Roberts Farm Preserve Extension
- Save Eagle Bluff
- Raymond Community Forest

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Comm. Whitcomb, 2nd by Mr. Gosline: To allocate \$250,000 to the following working waterfront project proposal subject to standard conditions (adopted by reference) and special conditions voted on by the board:

- Erica's Seafood

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Comm. Whitcomb, 2nd by Mr. Gosline: To establish a time limit of two (2) years on the availability of LMF funding allocation for Round 8 finalist projects with an option of two, (1 year) extensions of LMF funding with prior review and approval by the Designated State Agency (DSA).

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: by Mr. Emory, 2nd by Comm. Keliher: To apply the following Special Conditions to the following projects:

Brave Boat Headwaters	1. Exclude potential sale parcel from appraisal and LMF funding 2. Exclude cemetery parcel from LMF funding
Caribou Bog Conservation Area	1. LMF and Sponsoring Agency to determine if conservation easement needed on parcel to be conveyed to UMO 2. Convey "Lucien" parcel directly to UMO
Cold Stream Forest	Easement rights to Maine Huts and Trails not to interfere with deer winter use of the Biological Deer Wintering Area; resolve in Habitat Management Agreement or other

	executed document
Ellis River to Whitecap Mountain	Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement for the match parcel
Gardiner Pond	Exclude cemetery parcel from LMF funding
Gulf Hagas - Whitecap	Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement
High Island	A plan to be submitted for approval by Sponsoring Agency detailing how use by the existing outdoor education program will be managed such that use by the public is not impaired
Howard Hill	1. Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement 2. LMF Board to approve easement to be placed on LMF-funded property
Knight's Pond	1. Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement 2. LMF Board to approve easement to be placed on LMF-funded property 3. Due to configuration of property, a management plan is to be submitted for approval by Sponsoring Agency for managing potential encroachments by adjoining property owners and for minimizing public trespass on adjacent private lands
Lower Weskeag Fields and Forests	Clarify how existing avigation easement may affect parcels and value
Nezinscot Farm	Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement
North Falmouth Conservation Corridor	For easement to be placed on Town land as match, use LMF template easement
Parker Farm	1. Exclude cemetery parcel from LMF funding 2. Phase II and Phase III to be completed before closing on LMF-funded project 3. Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement
Redington Forest	1. BPL to hold 3rd party enforcement rights
Weston Homestead Forest	1. Exclude cemetery parcel from LMF funding 2. Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement
Winterwood Farm	Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement
Wormell Farm	1. Discuss the excluded building site; possibly limited to 1 acre within a 4 acre envelope 2. Contact LMF staff prior to developing draft conservation easement

Motion passed unanimously.

16. Meeting Minutes of March 18, 2014

Motion: by Mr. Norris, 2nd by Comm. Keliher to approve as written the minutes of the March 18, 2014 Board meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

17. Staff Updates

Mr. Meadows provided an overview of the next steps in the LMF project selection process, as follows:

- Notification letters to towns, legislators
- Award letters to applicants
- Assign project managers
- Create accounts
- Prioritize follow-ups with DSAs
- New appraisal standards apply
- Publicity/Press Release – when applicants produce publicity materials, appropriate credit to LMF for funding is appreciated and helps maintain public (and voter) support of the LMF program

18. Correspondence - Mr. Meadows advised the Board they had received communications of interest, including from students at the Breakwater School in South Portland and from the Mt. A 2 C coalition regarding the project selection process. Other letters were from the Town of Kittery in support of the Brave Boat Headwaters proposal and from Topsham residents in support of the Seboomook Expansion project.

19. Board Per Diem Forms

Mr. Meadows reminded Board members to submit their per diem documentation.

Motion: by Mr. Vail, 2nd by Mr. Norris to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourned: 5:55 PM

Next Meeting: The next LMF Board meeting is September 16, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. at the DACF Bolton Hill Facility. The next Appraisal Oversight Committee meeting is August 12, 2014.

Documents incorporated by reference, copy in file:

Ground rules – Agenda Item 1

Chair’s description of process – Agenda Item 8

Project Summaries – Agenda Item 10