

APPEARANCES

(All Parties Participated by Microsoft Teams)

Board of Trustees:

John Wilson, Chair Ann Browning Amy Grissom E. Greer Cawood Renee Kumor Jason Walser Mike Rusher David Womack Darrel Williams

Staff:

Will Summer, Executive Director
Hank Fordham, Legal Counsel
Terri Murray, Restoration Program Assistant
Steve Bevington, Restoration Program Manager
Marissa Hartzler, Stewardship Program Manager
Marie Meckman, Acquisition Program
Justin Mercer, Eastern Field Representative
Damon Hearne, Western Field Representative

Guests

Reid Wilson, Chief Deputy Secretary, Department of Natural and Cultural Resources

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1:03 P.M.

Chairman Wilson: Okay, I would like to call today's meeting of the North Carolina Land & Water Fund Board of Trustees to order. I am John Wilson, the Board Chair, and I would like to welcome everyone who is with us virtually today. We had hoped when the full Board last met in December that this meeting could be in person, but alas here we are again, but our plan is to meet in person for the Board meeting and committee meetings in Wilmington May 16th and 17th, perhaps not the committee meetings as well, perhaps just the full Board meeting. I'll let Will correct me later if he would. Let me start by asking you to please mute your microphones unless you are speaking, and also while I'm at it, ask you to please put your mobile phone ringers on vibrate or turn them off altogether. And with that, I will call the role of our Trustees; Ann Browning.

Vice-Chair Browning: Here.

Chairman Wilson: Greer Caywood.

Ms. Caywood: Here.

Chairman Wilson: Hello, Greer; Amy

Grissom.

Ms. Grissom: Here.

25 Chairman Wilson: Renee Kumar?

Page 4 1 Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Here. 2 Chairman Wilson: Mike Rusher? 3 Mr. Rusher: Here. 4 Chairman Wilson: Jason Walser. 5 Acquisition Committee Chairman Walser: Here. 6 Chairman Wilson: Darrel Williams? 7 Mr. Williams: Here. 8 Chairman Wilson: David Womack? 9 Mr. Womack: Here. 10 Chairman Wilson: And John Wilson is 11 here also. All right, General Statute § 138A-15 12 mandates that the Chair inquire as to whether any 13 Trustee knows of any conflict of interest or the 14 appearance of a conflict of interest with respect to 15 matters on the agenda. If any Trustee knows of a 16 conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of 17 interest, please state so at this time. Okay, hearing 18 none, we will move on. I've already asked you to 19 please put your cell phones on vibrate. Now I will ask 20 if there are any revisions or additions to the agenda. 21 All right, hearing none, I'll entertain a motion that 22 we adopt our agenda. 23 Vice-Chairman Browning: Ann, I vote we adopt 24 the agenda. 25 Mr. Williams: Second.

	Page 5
1	Chairman Wilson: Who was that second?
2	Mr. Williams: Darrel.
3	Chairman Wilson: Thank you, Darrel;
4	any discussion; all right, how do you vote, please;
5	Ann?
6	Vice Chairman Browning: Yes.
7	Chairman Wilson: Greer?
8	Ms. Caywood: Yes.
9	Chairman Wilson: Amy?
10	Ms. Grissom: Yes.
11	Chairman Wilson: Renee?
12	Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Yes.
13	Chairman Wilson: Mike?
14	Mr. Rusher: Yes.
15	Chairman Wilson: Jason?
16	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Yes.
17	Chairman Wilson: Darrel?
18	Mr. Williams: Yes.
19	Chairman Wilson: David?
20	Mr. Womack: Yes.
21	Chairman Wilson: And John is a yes.
22	All right, our consent agenda has only on it the
23	approval of the minutes from the December 2021 Board
24	meeting; any discussion or suggested amendments to
25	those minutes; all right, hearing none, motion to

	Page 6
1	approve the minutes, please?
2	Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Renee
3	makes that motion.
4	Chairman Wilson: Thanks, Renee;
5	second, anyone?
6	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Jason
7	will second.
8	Chairman Wilson: Thanks, Jason; any
9	discussion; all right, how do you vote; Ann?
10	Vice Chairman Browning: Yes.
11	Chairman Wilson: Greer?
12	Ms. Caywood: Yes.
13	Chairman Wilson: Amy?
14	Ms. Grissom: Yes.
15	Chairman Wilson: Renee?
16	Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Yes.
17	Chairman Wilson: Mike?
18	Mr. Rusher: Yes.
19	Chairman Wilson: Jason?
20	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Yes.
21	Chairman Wilson: Darrel?
22	Mr. Williams: Yes.
23	Chairman Wilson: David?
24	Mr. Womack: Yes.
25	Chairman Wilson: And John is yes

also; all right, moving right along, our executive director's update over to you, Will Summer.

Executive Director Summer: Thank you, Mr. Chair; let me welcome all of the members of the Board, staff, and quests. I am thrilled to address the full Board for the first time as the Executive Director. I can't think of a more exciting or for that matter busier time in my nearly fourteen years with the fund. In the first year, I had the opportunity to implement near-record levels of conservation and restoration, help develop a new flood risk reduction program and continue to develop and at capacity to a team that is second to none. I would like to sincerely thank my staff and the Board for your support and for making these otherwise formidable challenges seem effortless. I'd also like to thank our partners and advocates for their hard work. Your continued success in your communities makes what we do important to decision makers in your efforts to see highlights that we can have so many opportunities to do so much more. There's a lot that's happened since December that I'd like to share with you, so let me get started. last time we all met you approved 83 grants for a total of over 60 million dollars. Except for the three that are pending requests to transfer to another grantee,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

staff has drafted all the contracts and sent them to the grantees for review and over a quarter of them have been returned and executed. In January the Flood Risk Reduction Committee began meeting and has since met twice in February. They heard from staff about similar resiliency efforts in other agencies, invited three outside subject matter experts, received feedback from over fifty of our partners in our input survey, and reviewed their first draft of the program guidelines and rating system. The Committee is currently on track to review the second draft later this month, and I anticipate that the program documents will be ready for consideration at the May Board meeting, and applications could be released in June. Despite the enormity of the task, we are on schedule thanks to the hard work of Steve and the outstanding dedication of the Committee, who continue to meet every three weeks. In February we received 195 applications requesting over 180 million dollars. Aside from telling you that this is the most we've seen in over a decade, I will save the remaining details of the 2022 grant cycle for later in the agenda. We've all had to adapt to the way we do things over the past two years, and I'm certain we learned some new tricks that we won't soon forget; however, things seem -- seem to be improving, and we're

25

beginning to return to normal. As of yesterday, staff is working from the office, and beginning next week, masks will be optional in DNCR facilities. While these remote meetings have been useful, and I anticipate continuing to use this tool as needed to save time and travel, there's something that's lost in not being able to occasionally meet in person and perhaps break bread together after a meeting. I'm currently planning for our two-day May Board meeting to be in person in Wilmington, where we'll split time between a business meeting and site visits to see some of your work in the area, and I will share more details about that soon. To answer John's question, I envision that many of our smaller committee meetings will probably still be optional for a Teams meeting to keep Trustee time and travel down to a minimum, but we will begin opening meetings up for in-person attendance as well. We do have a lot happening with our staff at the moment. First, I want to congratulate and thank Justin Mercer for accepting the Stewardship Manager Position in December. It's a critical role for us, and I'm grateful to have someone that I know has the ability and passion for conservation to handle that challenge. The only downside of an internal promotion is that we still have the same number of staff and another vacancy

24

25

to fill; however, we are working hard to remedy that and currently recruiting two field representative positions. The posting closes tomorrow, and I hope to complete interviews within three weeks. We have several other positions that I expect to post soon, including an attorney that will have -- that will report to DNCR General Counsel and assist us with our closings and other legal needs, and I'm told that that posting is imminent. This brings me to our third retirement in the last twelve months. Hank Fordham, who has served as our legal counsel, will retire at the end of this month. Before joining our department, Hank had a long legal career with a range of experiences that made him so valuable for what he does here. For the first three years of his career he worked for a federal judge. He then spent twenty years in private practice, where in addition to litigation, served as the outside counsel for the Town of Apex. Eventually the Town decided they wanted their own counsel and hired Hank directly in 2011. He joined DNCR in 2015 and has since done everything under the sun, from flying to Montana to sort out mineral and fossil rights to secure our famous dueling dinosaurs, to providing the critical legal review that gets our projects to the finish line and makes the documents that protect our

investment in conservation more robust. By this time next month Hank will be fishing somewhere in Western North Carolina and hopefully breaking ground on his new store, Hank's Haberdashery, where one can find a complete line full brand headwear suitable for every occasion. The last part's not true, but it should be. Hank, your experience and counsel have made what we do better and stronger, and I sincerely wish you the best in your retirement. That concludes my report, but if it pleases the Chair, I'd like to give Mr. Fordham the opportunity to speak.

Chairman Wilson: Absolutely.

Mr. Fordham: Well, I appreciate

those — those — those friendly and kind words, and it's been, you know, a wonderful experience for me and an honor and privilege to work with this whole group, the Board, and the staff. I mean, you have a wonderful mission and not just for the Land & Water Fund, the National Heritage Program, and you implemented it extremely well with a lot of excellence, commitment, and passion, and you treat each other well. You treat your partners well, and you're a credit to the State, that's the Board and all the staff. So it's been a great pleasure for me to work with you and for you over these past five years, and Will called me yesterday for

24

25

just a little -- just a little background information, I mean, the hat stuff. He already knew I had kind of a funky hat that I wear around, but he went over some of the details, and I thought, well, I'll just mess with him a little bit, so I said, yeah, but the one thing you don't know is that I've been arrested four times. And I was expecting Will to immediately start laughing and know it was a joke, but got Will got somber and it was like, uh-oh, what is it I don't know about. that was just a joke, Will, but I appreciate your confidence in me, and he didn't explain it, but it really has been great. And one other thing that strikes me about the environmental community is it's highly intelligent, and that's something I admire, but, you know, fundamentally committed to the -- the public's good, and so it's been my honor and privilege.

Chairman Wilson: Thank you, Hank; I would just like to say what a pleasure it has been to work with you, not only on questions pertaining to contracts, but also I -- I know I'm not the only Trustee who has reached out to you when we were concerned about a potential conflict of interest, and you have been so helpful to me, and I know others, and at times, reassuring, and at times confirming that indeed we do have -- have a conflict, and giving us

very good advice in that regard, and I -- at the risk

of offending every other attorney that I know,

including my older sister, you are the nicest attorney

I have ever met in my life.

Mr. Fordham: Well, thank you; I appreciate it.

Chairman Wilson: Yep, okay; all right, so we will move on to the public comments section of our meeting. Members of the public are invited to make comments to the Board. If you would, please limit your comments to three minutes maximum and make sure you unmute yourself and let us recognize you before you start talking. Okay, I do not hear any public comments, so either there is none or whoever is making a wonderful comment is on mute, but regardless we are going to keep on moving to our business agenda. First item is an update on the 2022 grant cycle and back to you, Will.

Executive Director Summer: Thank you,

John, so today I'm going to talk about -- briefly about

our 2022 application requests and give you a little bit

of the statistics and some details about that. I'll

talk a little bit about our staff review process and

then finally talk about the Trustee site visit protocol

as we want to do every -- every year before we get into

25

a grant cycle. So as promised, we had 195 applications requesting a little over 180 million dollars. 129 of those were acquisition requesting over 154 million dollars, and going forward I'll just refer to that as 128, because one was withdrawn. We have 48 restoration projects requesting 22 million, seven innovative stormwater and 11 planning. This is fairly consistent with what we've had in recent years, perhaps skewing a little bigger on acquisition. There were some very large individual acquisition requests this year that -that are perhaps making that part of the pile a little larger than usual. This is the breakdown of our projects that are across the state. You'll note that by number it's pretty equally distributed across the state. Looking to the far right-hand side of the graph, you'll notice that by the amount requested forms the Coastal Plain is skewed large, and again that's because of a few very large requests, again this year in Coastal Plain, which you'll see more about later in the -- in the application review season. Moving on into the individual program types for acquisition, we had 108 applications total. We have 112 from 18 different non-profits, and worthy of note that 44 of those are proposed to eventually transfer to the state, which is pretty typical that we do get a lot of

24

25

non-profits kind of being the first path and the bridge to State agencies, eight applications from eight local governments and eight applications from three State agencies. Looking a little deeper, if you look at these applications by the four resources types that we score on the first half of our -- our rating system all -- all of them have some riparian buffer component, which is not surprising. That's pretty typical. Nearly all of them, 122 out of 128, have a natural heritage component. Forty-one of them have plains, historic and cultural, and I will note that based on some spatial analysis that Marissa did just last night for another purpose, she discovered that there were several more that in fact had overlapped with places that were on the National Historic Register. So once we get done with the review by the Department's Historic Review staff, that number may go up, and will place us actually at -- I think a larger number than we've seen in the past with some historic and cultural significance. And finally, 21 have a greenway component. Looking at the restoration program, we have 40 applications; 36 come from 16 different non-profits, 10 from nine local governments, and 2 from two State agencies. Breaking those applications down by project type, you'll note that 28 of them are stream

25

restoration, and this is kind of following a trend in recent years, where I think if you had looked several years ago, a greater percentage of our restoration projects would have been traditional natural channel design restoration. But in recent years, that started to expand and diversify, which I think is a good thing because it helps one get more restoration projects down east where a traditional stream restoration is not the normal practice. But another thing I would note in these, as you scroll down the list, you note that we have three nature-based flood reduction projects, so already our advocates are kind of tuning in to our focus on that, and we're seeing response in our regular grant cycle, which I think is exciting. Looking at innovative stormwater, we have seven applications, three from three local governments, two from two non-profits, and two from two State agencies, so pretty -- pretty typical for that program. And finally our planning program which has 11 applications, 6 from nonprofits, and 5 from local governments, but I will note as with the restoration, we do have three apps specifically targeting flood resiliency in the planning side of the shot. So that's the breakdown in short. The next five months are the busiest of the year for our project review staff, and it's going to be busier

25

still this year because we have more projects and less staff than we've had in recent years, though we're working hard to -- to fix that. Field reps will be visiting with each applicant and inspect -- inspecting sites nearly daily through -- through May. I think of note as in most years we have a certain percentage of applications that we've seen in previous years and have been reviewed in previous years. Because we -- we were so successful last year in funding projects, there are less -- less of those projects in which our field reps are already familiar, so that's -- that's a little more work on their part to become familiar with essentially a new -- all new projects. Program managers will be reviewing and scoring the projects. They'll reaching out to our National Heritage filers, who will also be in the field on most of our acquisitions reviewing those projects. We'll be reaching out to historians to review all the projects with historic significance, reaching out to military installations to confirm that the military buffer projects that the applicant has specified is important to the base is in fact important to the base. I will note that based on just what the applicant specified on their application we have 17 military buffer projects requesting around 20 million in grant -- grant requests, so a pretty strong showing

25

from that sector this year. And finally, the staff will be reviewing our innovative stormwater projects as well. So there's a lot of review work that goes into these early months as we go over the applications. As we do generally, there is a -- an update deadline in June for our applicants to get to us any information that we found deficient in the application or to get us information about updated funding status as various other programs had made decisions about maps where they can confirm to us in June that maps they had requested is in fact secured. I will note that as I alluded to an email to Trustees a few weeks ago, we will be sharing with you applications earlier than we did in -in previous years. In looking at it and talking with a few Trustees and talking with the staff, I think the best time to share the application with you will be after that June update, so that we're not sharing information with you that's old or is bound to be corrected. So probably by the end of June, we'll be able to share with you a link to the application that's up to date and been checked and verified by staff. That gives you several months before August, when we will also send you the PowerPoints, the project summaries, and some of the other more detailed information that you're used to receiving from us

25

before a Board meeting. I'll show you this Gantt chart not for you to be able to see it or read it, though if you'll really interested, I'll send it to you. only reason I show you this is to show that between the orange arrow on the left and the orange arrow on the right, these are all the steps and processes that staff has to do and with work with our partners to get from where we are to our September Board meeting, which is to say it will be as always a very busy spring, so keep that in mind as -- as -- as we move forward. Moving on to guidance for the Trustee side visits, as a reminder Trustees can visit sites if they so choose, but there are a few best practices that I will discuss. You know, we want to be sure that it promotes a public purpose and does not conflict with the open meetings law. So one, let me know when you wish to visit a site; two, let staff coordinate the visit; and three, share the fact that you have visited the site when discussing the project at the funding meeting. So the best practice for deciding to go is not that you've been asked by an applicant, but that you feel independently that is in the best interest of the public purpose. So I'm sure all of our applicants would love all of our Trustees to visit all of their projects and become advocates for them, but as we've

25

done in the past, I think it's really important that Trustees visit the site that -- that they have decided that they want to see and that there's information, additional information they want to gather that they feel can best be done by -- by putting boots on the ground. As I've mentioned, the -- well, one of the reasons that we let staff coordinate the visit is so we can ensure, one, that staff is available to join the visit so that all the information the Trustees may be hearing from an applicant is the same as what staff is hearing and that we're all on the same page, additionally to make sure that we get the opportunity for other Trustees to go, but finally that we ensure compliance with the open meetings law, which means that a majority of any one committee cannot be together in one place doing business of the Board without it being posted as an open meeting. So it's best to leave that to staff and primarily me to know who's going to be on the site, so that we can know whether or not that constitutes the majority of any one of our seven committees and just ensure that we stay in line with our open meetings law. As I mentioned, this year is going to be busier than usual, and we'd strongly prefer to do these visits after staff has had their opportunity to get our primary fieldwork completed, so

Page 21 that would be later in the summer as we did last year, usually during July and August; and finally, a reminder 3 that items of any significant value can be considered 4 gifts and are prohibited, and as a rule, I generally turn down anything of any value to just to ensure there's no appearance impropriety. This is all written 6 7 on our Trustee site visit procedure, which I will share with -- reshare with the Trustees soon just so you got -- got your hands on it, but if you have any questions, 10 please feel free to reach out to myself or -- or any other staff. And with that, I will be happy to take any questions. Chairman Wilson: Any questions for 13 14 Will; okay, thanks, Will. 15

1

2

5

8

9

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Executive Director Summer: You're most welcome.

Chairman Wilson: Very exciting; all right, we will move on to the second item on our business agenda, the Acquisition Committee report. I'll turn it over to Jason Walser, our Committee chair, who has several A through E items to deal with; thanks, Jason.

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Thank you, John; I just want to start out by saying, yes, Hank, thank you for all that you've done for me

25

personally. You have been a resource as the Chair of the Acquisition's Committee. You've been a resource as just a Trustee. When I joined, there were a lot of things up in the air and a lot of kind of funky decisions we had to make about military buffers and funding. I mean, we had limited funding, and you were just a godsend. You were always available and I can't thank you enough, so thank you for helping me as the Acquisition's Chair do my job much better. All right, so we met, the Acquisition Committee, I quess about two weeks ago, and I want everyone else on the Board to know that we had a very robust conversation and a very long meeting. I can't remember how long it was, but it was -- it was multiple hours, and I'll go ahead and start out by saying that I'm going to read the recommendations, and I'll invite conversation when I think it's appropriate, but I feel like our -- our Committee did its job. I really feel like we spent a lot of time and hashed out and had some pros and cons. And as you'll hear in one of them, we are -- actually two of them, we -- we have some votes that were not unanimous, so I'll be glad to talk about that in as much detail as everybody wants, but I do want to make sure that those who are on the Acquisition Committee that we -- I think did a really good job, and for those

25

who are on the Acquisition Committee during those conversations, I would encourage you to add any thoughts you have. I don't want to be dictatorial about it, because I thought it was a very, very healthy conversation. So let me start at the beginning, the letter A or the letter A transcript of 2021 contracts. We were asked to review contracts and consider -considering transferring them to other partners who work with acquisition to complete projects, and the first project 2021-044, the Amazing Grace Phase 1, Soapstone project that we funded and was requested to be transferred to Mainspring Conservation Trust. did agree that made a lot of sense, and there was no reason not to do that, so that will come as a recommendation from our Committee to approve. secondly, I think we can do these together. Project 2021-043, the Sharpe Tract-Alamance Battleground, has requested to transfer to the Department of Natural and Cultural Resources Historic Sites. Both of those applications were originally with the conservation fund, I believe. After looking at the proposed paperwork and all of the logistics of doing it, we didn't see any reason not to allow a transfer. make a recommendation to make a transfer of both of those contracts to the relevant organizations,

	Page 24
1	Mainspring Conservation Trust and the North Carolina
2	Department of Natural and Cultural Resources. John,
3	you're on mute.
4	Chairman Wilson: Thank you, Jason;
5	this is coming to us from the Acquisition Committee,
6	and before I ask for a vote on the transfer of these
7	two 2021 contracts as Jason explained, is there any
8	discussion? All right, I'll ask for your vote on these
9	now, please; Ann?
10	Vice Chairman Browning: Yes.
11	Chairman Wilson: Greer?
12	Ms. Caywood: Yes.
13	Chairman Wilson: Amy?
14	Ms. Grissom: Yes.
15	Chairman Wilson: Renee?
16	Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Yes.
17	Chairman Wilson: Mike?
18	Mr. Rusher: Yes.
19	Chairman Wilson: Jason?
20	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Yes.
21	Chairman Wilson: Darrel?
22	Mr. Williams: Yes.
23	Chairman Wilson: David?
24	Mr. Womack: Yes.
25	Chairman Wilson: And John is a yes,

1 also; all right, back to you, Jason.

2 Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Okay, 3 under letter B, the Triangle Land Conservancy Scope 4 Reduction, at a high level we were asked to review two 5 projects that are somewhat related and reduce their scope so that they might be able to reapply for other 6 7 phases of the projects. And let me read what I have 8 written here. The Committee heard a request from 9 Triangle Land Conservancy to reduce project scopes and 10 match for two 2021 orders, including project 2021-047, 11 the Fitch Tract, and project 2021-050, the McLean 12 Tract. They are two properties, both in Chatham County 13 near each other. The reduction in scope will align the 14 projects to be phased, completing the project with 2021 15 funding and allowing TLC to reapply or be considered 16 for funding in a competitive in the 2022 cycle. 17 Committee recommended the scope reductions to the 18 The votes were not unanimous, with one opposing 19 vote for 2021-047 and two opposing votes for 2021-050 20 McLean. I know that you all are curious, and I will 21 just say that I think the discussion centered around 22 our Committee's concern with precedence setting to 23 consider reducing the scope and then also being played 24 in a way that may open the door for others to play 25 games with how they've gotten projects. We did not --

25

I think this was across the board. Everybody went out of their way to say that Triangle Land Conservancy did nothing wrong, so there was no nefarious conduct suspected. They were concerned about what this might mean for the future. At the end of the day, I was persuaded, and the majority was persuaded that these projects scored on their own very well. Even with a reduction in scope, they still far surpassed the amount of match and the scores they would have had were within the range of what would have been funded based on the revisions of scope, and the staff did a really good job of breaking down what these had applied for with revised scope, requested if any were applied for originally and found how they would have scored and they would have both scored quite highly. So while less concerned about the precedent setting nature, at the end of the day we focused on the projects and we focused on the revised scope, getting us good projects that we would have funded if they had been applied for in that way. And with no further ado, I will open it up for any questions or discussion or any insights from those who were involved in these hours worth of -- I guess it was not an hour of conversation. If anybody has any thoughts that they would like to add if I mischaracterized that in any way, please -- please feel

free to add to my thoughts.

Ms. Caywood: Jason, it's Greer.

I think you laid it out extremely well explaining the discussion, and it was an extremely thoughtful discussion and nothing that we think, you know, tells that he's doing anything wrong, but just the precedent setting was troubling to me, so thank you for explaining it.

Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor:

Jason, this is Renee. I -- I wondered when you speak

of precedent setting, did that then indicate or send a

message to the staff about things they should be

looking for in the future when they're reviewing any of

these grant proposals?

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser:

That's a great question. I'll take a stab at it, but I welcome Will to join me in answering the question. We talked a lot first of all about making sure in the future that we are very clear, and I think we have been, but we talked a little bit in the beginning about some of the national and larger land conservation organizations were applying for what they wanted for really large projects, but the local land conservancies have been applying for caps that are consistent with what we had been awarding in years past and making sure

21

22

23

24

25

that we were very clear in communicating openly as loudly as we can to ask for what we need for every project no matter what. So that's the first thing, and secondly, we did talk about making sure that staff was prepared to have the difficult conversations as necessary to not put us in a position to do this again. What -- we really would avoid revising scope of work to break up projects in case -- I mean, at the end of the day the issue is we don't want because a fundraising campaign doesn't go well or there's some changed circumstance that we're the ones asked to change the way we do things. That -- that's ultimately what this is about, at least that's how I interpret it, that we want them to ask for what they need, stand-alone projects and not come back and take a second bite at the apple, and we did talk about that. Will, do you want to add to my comments?

Executive Director Summer: Yeah, I'll just support what you said, but I think what staff heard and what any of our partners on the call heard was that they need to ask what they need when they put in the application, period. And the other thing is that I think the message was pretty clear that the Committee would not be enthusiastic about seeing this type of request in all but the most extraordinary circumstances

Jason, this is Amy.

1 and -- you know, I think it was, you know, probably a 2 3 4 5 6 7 Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: 8 9 Ms. Grissom: 10 11 12 13 14 Committee. 15 16 17 18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Sched (phonetic) that takes sort of a line approval. So I think the message was sent that this door did not get flung wide open for a change in requests. That's what I heard, and what I think staff will convey to our partners that -- that were listening.

That's a very good restatement; thank you, Will.

I just have a procedural question. When we come to voting, will it be for each of these individually, or is this going to be paired? I mean, I don't know if the -- how it comes as a recommendation of the

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser:

That's a great question. I hadn't thought it through, but I think it wouldn't be a bad idea to break them up individually. I think that's a really good idea, Amy; thank you. So I will make a recommendation on behalf of the committee for individual separate votes between two projects.

Chairman Wilson: Will, this is John. Would you mind just sharing with the Trustees in case any don't know what the percentage match was for these two projects as applied in -- in their 2021

applications, and then what the next file the -- the third and perhaps fourth highest match percentages were.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Executive Director Summer: Absolutely, it might be easiest for me just to share a screen. Let's do this one. So what you are looking at right now is a list of the -- I've sorted it by the ten projects that were requested kind of at that. They self-imposed a cap. Let me put it that way. So the projects that self-imposed a cap and then sorted it by the percent match, which is in this kind of peach column, these two that we're talking about, McLean and Fitch, are the highest two by terms of match 85 percent and 77 percent respectively, and under the revised scope, they would be still among the highest. I think McLean is going to be 68 percent under the new terms, which makes it still the second highest match, and then Fitch would be 50 percent which would put it right about here in terms of match, so still both matched at 50 percent or higher and towards the top end of the list.

Chairman Wilson: Thank you.

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: So I welcome additional questions, but I'm also prepared to make a recommendation to the Board -- the Chairman about the first project which will be the Fitch Tract

	Page 31
1	- Big Woods Forest.
2	Mr. Williams: Jason, how many
3	members do we have the Acquisition Committee?
4	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: I
5	want to say five. Does that sound right, Will?
6	Executive Director Summer: I think you
7	actually have six.
8	Mr. Williams: Okay.
9	Executive Director Summer: Yes.
10	Mr. Williams: I was just curious.
11	There was two voting against it, so I was curious what
12	what the total number was.
13	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser:
14	That's right. It is six. I'm sorry. You are right,
15	Will.
16	Chairman Wilson: So one of the votes
17	was 5 to 1, and one was 4 to 2, is that correct?
18	Acquisition Committe Chair Walser: Yes.
19	Chairman Wilson: Okay.
20	Mr. Williams: Okay.
21	Chairman Wilson: Any more questions
22	for Jason or for staff; okay, on behalf of the
23	Acquisition Committee, we will take first this 2021-047
24	Fitch Tract - Big Woods Forest request for reduction in
25	scope. Any more discussion on this one before we vote;

Chairman Wilson:

23

24

25

from the Committee to approve the request for reduction

in scope of 2021-050 McLean Tract - Big Woods Forest,

All right, coming

	Page 33
1	any last discussion on this one before we vote; all
2	right, let's vote; Ann?
3	Vice Chairman Browning: Yes.
4	Chairman Wilson: Greer?
5	Ms. Caywood: No.
6	Chairman Wilson: Amy?
7	Ms. Grissom: No.
8	Chairman Wilson: Renee?
9	Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Yes.
10	Chairman Wilson: Mike?
11	Mr. Rusher: Yes.
12	Chairman Wilson: Jason?
13	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Yes.
14	Chairman Wilson: Darrel?
15	Mr. Williams: Yes.
16	Chairman Wilson: David?
17	Mr. Womack: Yes.
18	Chairman Wilson: And John is a yes,
19	also; thank you; back to you again, Jason, for C.
20	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Just
21	then I did make note of the fact that how nice it was
22	for the first time in my life to have my name at the
23	end of the alphabet, so I got to vote after everybody
24	else had to make their vote. That was that was fun
25	then in the Committee, and it was fun just now. Okay,

23

24

25

letter C, we were also asked to consider to make an Allocation of Monitoring Funds. Staff requested that we look at funding \$10,625.00 unallocated principal of the Stewardship Endowment and set it aside for monitoring the 198 acre conservation easement on the City of Morganton's Catawba Meadows Park. monitoring will be carried out by Foothills Conservancy of North Carolina. This is permitted per the stewardship policy, and staff supports reducing the number of monitoring easements -- of unmonitored easements, excuse me, whenever funding and available partners allow. The Committee unanimously recommends -- recommended assigning \$10,625.00 in unallocated principal for the monitoring of this conservation easement by Foothills Conservancy. I will say this for Darrel and Mike, some of our newer board members. If you'd like to get a little more information on how we've done this in the past and what this means, I certainly think it would be worth staff giving you a little bit of time and understanding of why we're doing this. I saw a head nod, I think, from Mike. Mike and Darrel, would you like a little bit more background on this?

Mr. Rusher: Sure, that would be helpful.

1 Mr. Williams:

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: So I had a feeling you might. Will, would you like to give a little overview of this discussion or maybe have

Marissa or someone else.

Agreed.

Executive Director Summer: I think either would be fine. Marissa, if you have -- if you have any thoughts, I will just -- just loop in. Marissa is my expert.

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: My thought is that -- my thought is just at a high level, letting them know how we do this, when we do this, how often, just general, and then we can get into the weeds too if we need to. I just think if I were then, I'd want to know what this really entails.

Executive Director Summer: Sure, I'll take it at a very high level, and Marissa can come back and fill in my -- my details. As you know from seeing the way that we fund projects now days, when we fund a project, part of our award goes into our stewardship endowment, and we place that in the -- in the investment, and it earns interest. And we use that interest every year to pay our partners to monitor those projects and submit reports to us, so we can keep an eye on our investments in those easements and

25

properties. That has not always been the case. really got good about that in 2007. Prior to that, it was hit or miss, and in the early days, we just recorded State-held easements on these with really for lack of a better term, lack of understanding about all that would be involved in making sure that our investment was protected in the future and that we would need some resources to go back and have someone monitor these. So the stewardship policy allows us to take any funds that become available within the stewardship endowment and reallocate them to projects as opportunities arise. Now it's not just about finding the funds. It's about finding a partner who without the incentive of a grant on the line is willing to say, yes, I will take this six or seven hundred dollars a year, and for that I will commit to go and do this monitoring, look at the property, talk to the landowner and submit a report to you each year. whenever we do find those things aligning or a project that doesn't have an endowment, and they -- and a partner who is willing to help us out, we take advantage of that opportunity. They don't come along too often, but when we do, we try to strike. So that's what this is, is Marissa and staff had identified an opportunity, and as the policy requires, we request

that the Board approve reallocating those funds from

our endowment to this particular opportunity. Marissa,

did I do a good job? What did I miss?

Absolutely, I don't think anything. I think the only other thing I would add is that the retired principal in the endowment comes from projects where there were State-held conservation easements, but then the deed was transferred to the State of North Carolina. And so we now work with our state agency's partners on that long-term protection and don't require the land trust to -- to monitor those anymore. So that's the action that actually frees up that principal and allows us to put it towards different project.

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser:
Thank you, Marissa; that's a key part. Darrel, were you saying something?

Mr. Williams: Yeah; no, I was saying I appreciate that. I really appreciate you pointing that out. That was helpful.

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Okay, so we're taking easements that were -- endowment funds that were there; then they were freed up and marrying them to another project that needs them. Okay, and this was -- we were happy to support them. It was

unanimously and positively. We think that the more clean-up we can do on more projects to get them endowed, the better. So that comes as a recommendation, Chairman Wilson.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Chairman Wilson: I have a question.

How did this request for this particular allocation

come to be? Did Foothills make it, or did our staff

recognize the opportunity and that the stars were

aligning? Who initiated this particular request?

Stewardship Program Manager Hartzler: I'll be happy to tackle that. So we had become aware of a trail plan on the property, and it was actually being managed by Foothills Conservancy, and so it was the perfect opportunity. They're engaged. They're partners with the city, and their office is just around the block. They could walk to the site. So this was a very obvious potential to get them involved, and most importantly, Foothills with their trail work on the property and just their connections with the city they are very willing, and we're very appreciative of their -- of their willingness to take on monitoring in this case. So this was just catch as catch can. Certainly as -- you know it just didn't come from the Board. we have opportunities to buy more strategically, we'll -- we'll definitely be looking at that. We have about

	Page 39
1	\$100,000.00 of retired principal in the endowment right
2	now so, and there's not a lot of opportunities
3	available, but as Will mentioned, we'll take them when
4	we can.
5	Chairman Wilson: Okay, any more
6	questions for Jason or staff; all right, this
7	recommendation of Allocation of Monitoring Funds for
8	1997A-032 Catawba Meadows Park coming to us from the
9	Acquisition Committee; any final discussion before we
10	vote; all right, here we go, Ann?
11	Vice Chairman Browning: Yes.
12	Chairman Wilson: Greer?
13	Ms. Caywood: Yes.
14	Chairman Wilson: Amy?
15	Ms. Grissom: Yes.
16	Chairman Wilson: Renee?
17	Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Yes.
18	Chairman Wilson: Mike?
19	Mr. Rusher: Yes.
20	Chairman Wilson: Jason?
21	Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Yes.
22	Chairman Wilson: Darrel; I'm sorry.
23	Darrel, I didn't hear you.
24	Mr. Williams: Yes.
25	Chairman Wilson: Thank you; David?

1 Mr. Womack: Yes.

Chairman Wilson: And John is a yes;

3 all right, Jason, back to you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Okay, letter D under the Property Management Revision proposal, the Committee reviewed and the Board's policy on Property Management expenses and staff's recommendations to clarify the policy to allow for up to \$5,000.00 of Property Management expenses when needed to address immediate threats to conservation values. The policy was previously unclear about by when and by whom these funds could be requested. Committee unanimously recommends revising the policy to align the background with the intent of allowing Property Management requests on all Acquisition projects as shown in the drafted policy included in the agenda. And again in the agenda, I think everybody saw the proposed revisions. There was not a lot of -- we didn't see a lot of controversy on this one. This is for stopping immediate erosion which includes putting a gate in place to control access to a property or throwing seed down or whatever. These are projects that we all have universally liked and supported in the past. It was just a matter of who had to access to the funds. Marissa can give probably a little more context

	rage 41
1	if we want her to, but this was this was one we
2	thought was a no-brainer. So you can see the proposed
3	changes in red. So that's that's the recommendation
4	if there's no discussion. But I'm sure Marissa will
5	gladly give you good answers if there is any
6	discussion.
7	Chairman Wilson: Any discussion, any
8	questions for Jason or Marissa; all right, this is a
9	Committee recommendation to revise the Board's policy
10	Acquisition-007 Property Management. Last chance for
11	discussion before vote; all right, Ann, how do you
12	vote?
13	Vice Chairman Browning: Yes.
14	Chairman Wilson: Greer?
15	Ms. Caywood: Yes.
16	Chairman Wilson: Amy?
17	Ms. Grissom: Yes.
18	Chairman Wilson: Renee?
19	Restoration Committee Chairman Kumor: Yes.
20	Chairman Wilson: Mike?
21	Mr. Rusher: Yes.

23

24

25

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Yes.

Yes.

Chairman Wilson: Jason?

Chairman Wilson: Darrel?

Mr. Williams:

Chairman Wilson: David?

2 Mr. Womack: Yes.

Chairman Wilson: And John is a yes

also; Jason, back to you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Acquisition Committee Chair Walser: Last, the last thing on our list is the Acquisition -- letter E, Acquisition-001, the Appraisal Policy Revision. Committee reviewed the Board's policy on appraisals for the Acquisition Program, and staff's recommendations to clarify and update the policy, especially with respect to when appraisals or requests are required, excuse me, when a tax value can be used in lieu of an appraisal. The Committee unanimously recommends revising the policy by updating the language and reduce ambiguities as shown on the draft policy included in the agenda; yeah, thank you, so just a lot cleaner and neater. We've got risks and ambiguities that staff had wrestled with in the past, and then trying to decide when the appraisals were needed -- and when an appraisal was needed. Again, I'll let Marissa take any questions. She can answer them better than I can, but we looked into it, discussed it, and the revisions to the codes made sense to us.

Chairman Wilson: Okay, any questions for Jason or Marissa; all right, this is another

24

25

have anything else on our agenda. Do any Trustees or staff have anything else they would like to mention or discuss? I would just like to give a shout out to Steve and Will, and other staff, but particularly Steve, for his leadership and hard work with the Flood Risk Reduction program, basically helping to -- leading the creation of this brand-new program in addition to all the other work that -- that he and other staff are doing, really remarkable work. I want to thank Ann for agreeing to chair the Committee in addition to being vice-chair of the Board and also the Trustees who agreed to serve, including both of our other Committee chairs, you know, this additional work in addition to everything else they're doing as Trustees. I think all of us who have been actively involved in that can just say we've really, really gotten a long way. And I think this last meeting we had where we saw first drafts of guidelines and rating systems, I think we all felt like wow, we just made a giant step, and we know -- we see the light at the end of the tunnel here. And it's really exciting, so, Steve, Will, Ann, everybody else, thanks a lot. All right, last chance; any farewell Hank jokes; no, okay; Hank, you got any? Mr. Fordham: Well, you know, of course everybody has their favorite lawyer joke, but

you know, we try to not tell them on ourselves. there were two guys that were at a funeral, and one turned to the other one and said there's two people buried in that grave. And he said, well, how can you tell, and he says, well, there lies a lawyer and an honest man. So I think it's kind of sad. Anyway, that's kind of a bad way to go out.

Chairman Wilson: We wouldn't have it any other way; all right, thanks again, Hank; thank you, everybody. We are now adjourned.

(The proceedings were concluded at 2:00 P.M.)

NORTH CAROLINA WAKE COUNTY

CERTIFICATE

I, Diane C. Byrd, Notary/Reporter, do hereby certify that this Board of Trustees Meeting was taken by me and transcribed under my direction and that the forty-six pages which constitute this Board of Trustees Meeting are a true and accurate transcript.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of April, 2022.

Dians C. Byrd
Diane C. Byrd
Notary Public

Certificate No.: 19933130099