LCHIP Board of Directors Meeting
Doug Cole, Board Chair
Folsom Tavern, American Independence Museum, Exeter NH
March 17, 2014


Non-voting members:  Tracey Boisvert, John Kanter, Beth Muzzey, Paul Susca

LCHIP Staff:  Dijit Taylor, Amy Dixon, Jess Charpentier, Melissa Jones

Board members were free to explore the handsome Folsom Tavern as they arrived for and departed from the meeting.  LCHIP provided $100,000 toward restoration of the building in 2006.  Later in the meeting, American Independence Museum staff member Michelle Johnson welcomed the group to the site.

MINUTES:
Judith Spang proposed two minor corrections to the minutes.

   MOTION to approve minutes from January as corrected:  Judith Spang
   SECOND:        Charlie Royce
   VOTE:        Unanimous in favor

FINANCIAL
January Finance Report:

   MOTION to accept the January Finance Report:  Amanda Merrill
   SECOND:       Bill Norton
   VOTE:        Unanimous in favor

Trust Fund Report:  New income to the Trust Fund (from the dedicated fees) was $2,274,824 as of 2/28/14, slightly under budget

Community Conservation Endowment:  Market Value of $3,069,769 as of 2/28/14.  YTD income = $141,000.  Dijit, Treasury staff and Tracey participated in a telephone meeting with the fund manager.  Investment Policy is almost ready for review by Treasury, fund manager and Finance Committee.  CORD vote on expenditure for monitoring incentive payments has been delayed by a change in the CORD meeting schedule.  All but a few monitoring reports are in.  Staff will convey to those not reporting on monitoring that they are losing money as well as failing to meet terms of agreements with LCHIP.
STAFF UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS

Staffing Update: Natural Resource Specialist Jess Charpentier is leaving to pursue PhD at Antioch. We are searching for new NR Specialist. Thirty candidates submitted application material by the March 14 deadline. Mandy and Amy are on search committee. Dijit hopes to interview 4-6 candidates. If all goes well, Jess will overlap with new person to help with transition.

The Fells Extension Request: This property has had turn over in leadership, including a new Executive Director, since being awarded half the funding they requested in GR 11 (2012). A major capital campaign for is in planning phases. The Fells requests an extension of the project deadline from November 2014 to December 2015 to accommodate the time needed for an effective capital campaign.

MOTION to extend completion date for the Cottage at the Fells to December 2015:
Charlie Royce
SECOND: Amanda Merrill
VOTE: Unanimous in favor

Green Eggs Environmental Policy Breakfast back in January featured great celebration of full funding for LCHIP including from Senate President Chuck Morse.

Meetings with 30 Non-funded Applicants: All were extremely appreciative to discuss strengths and weaknesses. Dijit requested discussion and clarification of the LCHIP’s “Executive Limitation” that “The Executive Director shall not encourage that an applicant reapply more than once for the same, exceptional, yet un-funded project.” Last year the Board allowed Dijit to waive that Executive Limitation because of the extremely limited funding available in the most recent grant rounds. Dijit inquired how the Board feels about that issue for the upcoming grant round.

No one on current board could recall when or why this was a policy. Some questions: is this about consecutive applications from the same organization – no it applies to the same project not the same organization. ED “not encouraging” is not the same thing as prohibiting. Applicant should change/improve the project if resubmitting. Consider reapplications on a case-by-case basis. Dijit’s sense of the meeting is that the Board is giving her flexibility in her judgment to allow some to apply for a more than second time.

OUTREACH/REBRANDING UPDATE:
The Outreach/Rebranding Committee interviewed four firms, requested updated proposals from two and selected Clearly Creative. NH Charitable Foundation has awarded a grant of $10,000 to support this outreach. Clearly Creative will be updating and managing an updated emailing list, organizing and distributing a monthly e-newsletter, establishing a Facebook presence for LCHIP and creating four short videos showcasing the 39 projects awarded grants in 2013.

Questions discussed:
• Why are we doing this? Because of 2012 UNH survey that found very low name recognition for LCHIP, but good support once the work of the program was described.
Who is the intended audience? The general public, current and future applicants with hopes that their interest will be felt by legislators before making decisions about FY 16-17 budget.

Are there other possible sources of outside funding for this? Mutual banks (Meredith Village Savings Bank, Merrimack County Savings Bank, Bank of NH). Boards of each need to be approached.

Is Facebook the best platform for LCHIIP? Cynthia proposes that Twitter may be more effective and lower maintenance. Tracey and others point out that Facebook requires constant maintenance to watch for and counter any negative response messages.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY:
Based on some confusion about why annual conflict of interest forms were requested at the January meeting, Dijit summarized the three different conflict of interest situations for LCHIP Board members:

1. Secretary of State requirements under RSA 15-A for anyone appointed by G&C.
2. General LCHIP Board conflicts.
3. Grant Selection meeting is for project-specific conflicts.

Item 1 is required under state law. Items 2 and 3 are established by the LCHIP Conflict of Interest Policy and thus can be amended by the Board if they feel useful.

Discussion led to the general conclusion is that it is best to disclose as much as possible to avoid any perception of conflict. Board confusion might be lowered if ED packages items 1 and 2 above as one unit. The existing policy is clear that voting members with conflict can’t vote on projects where they have a conflict, but is less clear about whether conflicted member should leave the room or just not vote.

Term Stewardship Agreements:
Following up on a question from the January meeting about LCHIP signs on properties that don’t look well maintained: Term stewardship agreements are established by the CGP. Once a term stewardship agreement expires, LCHIP has NO control over the project. Projects can stop maintaining after expiration which may lead to LCHIP signs on buildings that look (and may be) substandard. After considerable discussion, two actions were agreed to:

- Beth will provide information to compare LCHIP and NPS Term Stewardship Agreements
- Dijit will seek Board volunteers and staff to check the appearance of all properties with expired Term Stewardship Agreements and report back to her.

A further suggestion is that LCHIP check on the status of the buildings at the last contact before the expiration of a Term Stewardship Agreements.

Schedule for Grant Round 13:
The Board agreed in concept to a grant round with applications due at the end of June, with a few changes in early dates to maximize time for applicants to work on applications.

MOTION to schedule Grant Round 13 as in table below: Dave Hess
SECOND: Rusty McLear
VOTE: Unanimous in favor
Board Meeting Schedule for FY 2015 – Board is happy to continue to meet at 3-5 p.m. in grant recipient sites when possible. Final schedule and locations anticipated at June Board meeting.

Review of LTA Standards 9 and 10: Standard 9, Ensuring Sound Transactions, includes several areas where LCHIP practices are not in conformance with the established standard:
1. Legal review of every transaction (LCHIP’s review is technical)
2. Review of hazardous materials near target property
3. Easement drafting (a staff revision of the check list for required/recommended deed language is pending)
4. Record keeping – original documents secure from fire, floods and other damage
5. Policy about transfers of protected land
Standard 10, Tax Benefits, does not apply to LCHIP since the program does not communicate information on this topic to landowners. This leads to a discussion of the potential for eminent domain applying to LCHIP protected properties (generally only by a higher level of government than is party to the agreement), the need for recreation plans to be appropriate to the values of the property (LCHIP Board can designate “limited public access” in special situations) and the complications landowners are facing in using funding from multiple sources with varying requirements. Lorraine contributed personal examples from a recent family farmland acquisition.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: Nothing with direct potential to harm LCHIP is expected to pass.

NO OTHER BUSINESS, PUBLIC COMMENTS or EXECUTIVE SESSION

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm

Respectfully Submitted:

______________________________   ______________________________
Doug Cole                      Melissa Jones
LCHIP Board Chair             LCHIP Office Manager