

University of New Hampshire University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

PREP Reports & Publications

Institute for the Study of Earth, Oceans, and Space (EOS)

10-22-2004

Land Conservation Transaction Fund, Taylor, J

Dorothy Tripp Taylor Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/prep



Part of the Marine Biology Commons

Recommended Citation

Taylor, Dorothy Tripp, "Land Conservation Transaction Fund, Taylor, J" (2004). PREP Reports & Publications. 222.

https://scholars.unh.edu/prep/222

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for the Study of Earth, Oceans, and Space (EOS) at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in PREP Reports & Publications by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

LAND CONSERVATION GENERAL FUND

Matching Grants for Transaction Costs

A Final Report to

The New Hampshire Estuaries Project

Submitted by

Dorothy Tripp Taylor
Center for Land Conservation Assistance
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests
54 Portsmouth Street
Concord, NH 03301

October 22, 2004

This report was funded by a grant from the New Hampshire Estuaries Project, as authorized by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 320 of the Clean Water Act.



Table of Contents

Executive	Summary	2
Introductio	n	3
Project Go	als and Objectives	4
Activities		4
Results an	nd Discussion	8
Conclusio	ns	9
Recomme	ndations	10
Appendice	9S	
Α	Application Review Team Members	12
В	Application Form	13
С	Rubric for How to Handle Applications	17
D	Postcard Announcing the Grants	18
Е	Memo "What is a Project"	19
F	Tax Implication Warning	20
G	Press Release	21
Н	Excerpt from CLCA Newsletter	23
1	Summary of Each Grant	
J	Summary of All Grants	47

Executive Summary

Between May of 2002 and December of 2003, the New Hampshire Estuaries Project provided the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest/Center for Land Conservation Assistance with \$64,400 for matching grants to distribute to assist with transaction costs associated with permanent land conservation projects in the New Hampshire estuaries area. Application materials were created and distributed, applications were received and reviewed and grants were made.

The project was well received and very successful. Twenty-three grants were made to support transaction costs associated with projects that provided permanent protection for 1158 acres in 9 estuaries area communities. Grant funds of \$57,141 leveraged over \$187,657 of additional transaction funding from 15 other sources. The value of the land protected is well over \$6.6 million.

An ongoing program to provide similar assistance for the coming decade is recommended.

Introduction

New Hampshire has been the most rapidly growing state in New England for the past forty years. Much of that growth is focused on the seacoast area of the state, an area that has the good fortune to receive considerable support for environmental issues from the New Hampshire Estuaries Project. NHEP has observed that "many of the threats to the environmental character of our estuaries are the direct result of human activities, including development of land for residential, commercial, industrial and other uses." In response, a whole section of the NHEP Management Plan is dedicated to Land Use, Development, and Habitat Protection. The section details a number of measurable threats to the ecology of the area that are related to land use decisions being made primarily at the local level, and sets a goal that "communities, government agencies, organizations, and individuals participate in achieving the goals for land use and habitat protection for New Hampshire's estuaries." Elements of the Action Plans for this part of the Management Plan address Future Development, Sprawl, and Habitat Protection.

In the same vein, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, while celebrating its 100th anniversary in 2001, challenged the conservation interests of the state to conserve another million acres in the coming 25 years. SPNHF's detailed analysis of the amount of conserved land needed to continue to provide the people of the state with community lands, clean drinking water, wood fiber products, land to produce locally grown food, and adequate habitat for plant and animal species and specifically suggested that towns work toward a goal of 25% of the land in permanent conservation. Land area conserved in the 42 towns included in the estuaries area ranged from a low of 1% to a high of 21%, with an average of 9%.

Working with willing landowners to secure more permanently conserved land in the communities of the estuaries area is a goal that is endorsed by many. There are landowners willing to donate or sell land for conservation in the area. There are a number of conservation groups and agencies assisting the towns and landowners in the estuaries area with conservation projects. However, securing sufficient funding to accomplish conservation goals in an area of rapidly escalating land values is challenging. Even when landowners are willing to donate land for conservation purposes, there are real costs associated with the transaction.

The program described in this report sought to assist with permanent land conservation projects in the New Hampshire estuaries area by proving matching grants to cover a portion of the transaction costs for such projects.

-

¹ New Hampshire Estuaries Project, 2000, Management Plan, p. 2-12

² Ibid, p. 5-14

Project Goals and Objectives

The objective of this project was "To support the conservation of ecologically significant land in the coastal watershed by cost-sharing land conservation transactions with landowners and conservation organizations." The goal was to encourage permanent land protection projects that conserve important natural resources and significant habitat in the estuaries area by providing a financial incentive for landowners by cost-sharing 50% of transaction costs. Eligible costs included: cost of surveys, land protection staff fees and other related fees, including (under limited conditions) appraisal costs.

This project was undertaken to implement the following NHEP Management Plan Action items:

- LND-15 "Support land conservation efforts in shoreland areas."
- LND- 29 "Provide technical assistance in land protection and management to regional land trusts and municipal conservation commissions."
- LND- 36 "Encourage conservation easements."
- EDU-1 "Use the media to enhance educational efforts."

The project funding was received by SPNHF/CLCA as two separate grants, an original grant of \$44,000 in May of 2002, and an amendment adding \$20,000 in December of 2003. The purpose of the funds in the amendment was to "assist land protection organizations with transaction costs associated with the permanent protection of shoreland properties." The amendment also extended the deadline for project completion and distribution of program funds from December 2003 to the middle of 2004.

The grants to SPNHF/CLCA specified that \$4,000 from the original grant funds and \$2,600 from the amendment could be used to cover costs of administering the grant program. This provided a total of \$57,400 to be distributed in grants.

Activities

The work tasks for this project included assigning lead staff, creating application review team and process, publicizing the fund to eligible applicants, and administering program funds. Lead staff and project administrator for the project was Dorothy Tripp Taylor, Director of the Center for Land Conservation Assistance at the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

³ NHEP Contract CE#612417, Exhibit A, Section 2C

⁴ New Hampshire Estuaries Project, 2000, Management Plan, p. 5-62

⁵ Ibid, p. 5-92

⁶ Ibid, p. 5-106

⁷ Ibid, p. 8-11

Application Review Team and Process

Participants in for the application review team were sought among people who work closely with conservation activists in the estuaries area. In addition to the lead staff person, members of the review team included representatives of New Hampshire Estuaries Project, Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension, Bear-Paw Regional Greenways, Great Bay Resource Protection Partnership and Moose Mountains Regional Greenways. A complete list of the members of the application review team and their affiliations is found in Appendix A.

The Review Team assisted CLCA and NHEP in creating an application process and format. The 50/50 matching grants were for amounts of up to \$3000. Applicants were to be either qualified non-profit tax-exempt 501(c)(3) conservation organizations or units of government. Applicants were allowed to re-grant the funds to landowners. The application form was purposefully made quite simple. The intent was to make the process as accessible as possible to community groups who might not have a lot of experience in grant writing. The grants were also intended to be as non-competitive as possible. If applicant's projects met the criteria, they were to be funded as long as funds were available. A copy of the application form is found in Appendix B of the hard copy of this report.

The Review Team created a rubric for how to handle applications as they came in, which can be seen in Appendix C. One important piece of the rubric is the conflict of interest element, which was followed carefully by Review Team members:

When an organization for which a Review Team member serves as staff or director submits an application, that person shall be available to the team to respond to any questions about the project, but shall physically remove him- or herself from the meeting during discussion of the project.

The Review Team held meetings in September 2002 and December 2003. Following the guidelines in the rubric, one round of applications was reviewed in virtual meeting, between June 5 and June 20, 2003. The Review Team also provided insight into a variety of large and small questions about the details of the fund.

Publicizing the Fund to Eligible Applicants

The transaction grants were publicized by way of post cards that were sent to about 160 contacts that both NHEP and CLCA had in the estuaries area communities, including conservation commissions and land trusts. An image of the post cards is included in Appendix D of the hard copy of this report. The post cards were sent in June of 2002 and invited potential applicants to request the application form.

The grant program was also described and application forms made available at the following events:

New Hampshire Association of Conservation Commissions Annual Meeting – November 2, 2002

New Hampshire Land Conservation Coalition meeting, March 3, 2003 Coastal Watershed Forum, March 11, 2003 New Hampshire Conservation Conference, April 12, 2003

Between June 2002 and September of 2003, application forms were sent out to about thirty individuals and groups who expressed an interest in applying for assistance from this program.

Administering Program Funds

The Center for Land Conservation Assistance provided administration for the grants. This included:

distributing application forms for the grants
responding to questions about applications
resolving concerns about the details of the program
reviewing all applications
convening the Review Team
providing the Review Team with copies of applications and supporting materials
communicating with applicants
tracking status of projects
reviewing final documentation of completed projects
sending checks to successful applicants

Applications were received from August 2002 through October of 2003. A total of 30 applications were received. One was determined to be ineligible because it was outside of the defined area; four were withdrawn because they could not be completed within the required time frame.

Applicants were allowed and encouraged to submit applications before projects were completed. The Review Team could then provide applicant with a conditional response to the request. This allowed successful applicants to proceed to create funding packages that included this funding. Funds were not released to the applicant until the project was completed and the project administrator had seen all of the necessary documentation of the expenses that had been listed in the application.

One of the issues that the Review Team had to resolve was the definition of a project. Several projects in one town were under consideration. They were being treated as a single project for purposes of different grant funding sources. With input from the Review Team and the NHEP Director, a definition of project was arrived at. A copy of the memo clarifying the definition of "project" in Appendix E. (hard copy only.)

Letters to the applicants addressed a few other problems that were found in the application form. One of these was a reminder that the match for the grants must come from non-federal sources. Another was making applicants aware of tax issues that should be considered if the funds were being re-granted to individual land owners. Great care was taken in crafting this message to be clean and accurate but not overwhelming. The wording used for the latter message is found in Appendix F.

When the additional funds were added to the grant for shoreland projects, the intent was to re-advertise to solicit applications for projects with suitable shoreland values. However, it turned out that the existing pool of applications for the original fund contained enough projects with shoreland values. Re-advertising when the funds could be appropriately distributed to existing applicants seemed counterproductive and was not done. Because there were enough applications with shoreland values in hand when the grant was amended, there was no need to re-advertise the grant to attract applicants for the new funds.

When evaluating projects toward the end of the availability of the funding, the Review Team selected four reserved projects. Two of these were expected to receive partial funding if all the projects before them in queue were completed as expected, and two were qualified but would not receive funding if all the others were completed as expected. As it turned out, all four of these projects could be funded because of projects that were withdrawn from the program. The amount left over at the end of the grant making was \$251.

To assist with New Hampshire Estuaries Project Management Plan action item EDU-1 "Use the media to enhance educational efforts," the awarding of the grants was publicized to the estuaries area media via press releases. On the advice of the Senior Director for Communications at the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, the information was sent out as one press release for a large group of grants, rather than a series of small press releases about individual grants.

The press release is shown in Appendix G. The release was sent to the following news outlets: The Union Leader, Concord Monitor, Nashua Telegraph, The Valley News, Portsmouth Herald, Foster's Daily Democrat, The Laconia Citizen, The Laconia Daily Sun, The Berlin Daily Sun, The Conway Daily Sun, The Exeter News-Letter, The Hampton Union, Atlantic News, The Milford Cabinet, The Derry News, Salem Observer, Rochester Times and The Associated Press (wire service).

The grants were also announced in the July 14, 2004 issue of CLCA's electronoic newsletter, which is distributed to over two hundred conservation-minded people throughout the state. The text of the announcement is shown in Appendix H.

Areas of some question or problem related to the application form that were observed but not addressed include the following:

Clarify that contact information is needed for representative of the applicant organization, not the landowner

Specifically request name of the landowner

Ask for anticipated date of completion for the project

Ask specifically if the project is within the watershed

Request site map at standard topographic map scale of 1:24,000 and also enlarged if needed to show detail of location

Define what is meant by proximity to other protected parcels
What about projects that are partially within and partially outside of the NHEP
area?

The Review Team did not provide a standard format or a list of items that applicants were required to provide to document that the project had been completed and that anticipated expenses had been incurred and paid. This oversight led to quite a lot of additional time for the project administrator to obtain the needed information from the applicants.

Results and Discussion

There was a great deal of interest in this grant program. A total of 29 applications were received. They came from 9 different applicants and were for projects in 12 of the 42 estuaries area communities.

Twenty-three projects totaling 1158 acres were funded for a total of \$57,141 granted. All projects were granted the full amount that they applied for. Projects ranged in size from 4 acres to 163 acres. The projects were in nine different towns, or slightly over 20 percent of the 42 towns in the estuaries area: Brentwood, Deerfield, Durham, Hampton Falls, Kensington, Lee, Newmarket, Rollinsford and Strafford. The transaction grants leveraged over \$187,657 of additional transaction funding from 15 other sources, including landowners, towns and land trusts.

Fifteen of the projects, 692 acres, were funded from the original grant. Seven projects, 421 acres, were funded from the shoreland-specific amendment. One project, 45 acres, was supported by funds from both parts of the grant.

The land protected includes agricultural lands (including an organic farm), wetlands, scenery, components of large unfragmented blocks, frontage on streams and rivers including one federally designated Wild and Scenic River, productive forest land, additions to previously protected lands, exemplary natural communities, swamps and prime wetlands, wellhead protection and public drinking water supply areas, vernal pools, and habitat for a variety of common and unusual wildlife species.

The total appraised value of the land protected is well over \$6,600,000. There are 20 projects and 936 acres of conservation easement, and 3 projects and 222 acres of fee acquisition. 12 projects covering 428 acres were donated, 5 covering 244 acres were bargain sales and 6 projects covering 489 acres were purchased at full value. Grants ranged in size from \$530 to the maximum allowed of \$3000. Match for the grants ranged from \$530 to almost \$19,000.

Grants from the shoreland-specific amendment supported eight projects that protected more than 11,478 feet of frontage on three major rivers in the region, the Exeter (3854 feet), Oyster (5714 feet) and Piscassic (1900 feet) Rivers.

Appendix I shows summary information for each project. Appendix J provides a summary of all of the projects.

Although the awards were made to a good number of different applicants, it is worth noting that much of the funding went to two towns that happened to be in a position to take advantage of the grants during the time when they were available. The Town of Lee accounted for 9 projects (39% of the total), 455 acres (39% of the total) and received \$24,150 (42% of the total) in assistance. The Town of Brentwood accomplished 6 projects (26% of the total), protecting 206 acres (19% of the total) and received \$10,007 (17% of the total) in assistance. The Town of Newmarket, with 3 projects (13% of the total), protected 235 acres (20% of the total) and received \$7992 (14%) in assistance.

The extension of both funding and deadline that occurred in late 2003 was very important to the success of this project. Land conservation projects are frequently complex and time-consuming, especially when there is a conservation easement involved and/or when donation of some or all of the value of a property is part of the project. Even though almost all of the projects had been underway for months, six of them could not be completed until sometime in 2004, and would not have been eligible to receive support without the extension of time that came with the shoreland-specific funding amendment.

The rubric that the Review Committee worked under was not followed exactly, as it turned out to be too cumbersome and to set timelines that were unrealistic based on the number and timing of the applications as well as other demands on the project administrator's time.

Some potential applicants expressed regret that they did not have project ready to go during the somewhat limited time frame of the grant. Several eligible applicants expressed a hope that funding of this sort would be available again in the future.

Conclusions

The project was highly successful! It was popular with the intended recipients. It was also clearly effective at accomplishing the goal of encouraging permanent land protection projects that conserve important natural resources and significant habitat in the estuaries area, having assisted with the permanent protection of 1158 acres and over 2 miles of river front shoreland, as described above.

Allowing applicants to submit applications while projects were developing provided them with flexibility of knowing that this funding would be available if the project was completed as proposed.

The amount of money available through this program seemed to be remarkably well suited to the needs of the projects taking place. The program was neither inundated with many more applications than there was funding for, nor did it end up with large amounts of money that could not be used in the time frame prescribed.

The application process was, as designed, simple for applicants. The fact that so many of the awards were made to groups with little or no staff suggested that the effort at simplicity was effective: all-volunteer groups were able to compete successfully with larger, better-staffed organizations.

Total transaction costs for land conservation projects range from modest to very high, even if the interest in the land is being donated or sold for less than full value. This grant program has helped to ensure that many projects could be accomplished that might not have been possible without this assistance. Given the rapid pace of land consumption in the estuaries area of New Hampshire at the present moment, any tool that can support and encourage good land conservation projects is very important.

Recommendations

An ongoing grant program to continue to provide matching funds to assist with transaction costs for permanent land conservation projects in the New Hampshire estuaries area is needed. Ideally, such a program would be funded for the ten or so years between the present and the time when all the land in the entire region will be either "built out" or "conserved out". A longer-term program would provide opportunity for more projects in more different areas to be developed and come to fruition. The total amount needed could be determined from this program, with appropriate increases for inflation, increases in land value as competition for the limited resource increases and growing skill among the groups undertaking land conservation projects.

The program descriptions and application form could be improved to fix the small problem areas that were discovered during this grant experience. The Review Team worked well, and a similar team could be convened to review applications to a new program. Some simple revisions to the materials applicants were required to submit would greatly decrease the burden of checking the documentation of projects once they were completed.

If the New Hampshire Estuaries Project could decrease the number of reports required annually, and otherwise simplify the reporting requirements for its grants, NHEP-funded projects would be much easier to administer.

The Center for Land Conservation Assistance at the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests is pleased to have been a vehicle for providing this much-needed support for land conservation projects in the New Hampshire Estuaries area. If funding for similar assistance becomes available in the future, we would welcome an

opportunity to discuss it and perhaps to again assist the New Hampshire Estuaries Project with distributing the funds.

Appendices

Appendix A

Application Review Team Members

Name	Title	Affiliation
Brad Anderson (until October 2003) Joyce ElKouarti (after November 2003)	Executive Director	Moose Mountains Regional Greenways
Brenda Lind	Seacoast Technical Specialist	Center for Land Conservation Assistance at the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest
Danna Truslow	Executive Director	Seacoast Land Trust
Dea Brickner-Wood	Great Bay Coordinator	Great Bay Resource Protection Partnership
Dorothy Tripp Taylor	Director	Center for Land Conservation Assistance at the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest
Frank Mitchell	Land and Water Conservation Specialist	University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension
Jennifer Hunter	Director	New Hampshire Estuaries Project
Susan Zankel (through August 2003) Sherry Godlewski (starting September 2003)	Executive Director	Bear-Paw Regional Greenways
Tom Howe	Director of Land Conservation	Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest

Not all team members participated in each application review round, but all received copies of the applications and had the opportunity to provide insights if they wished to.

Appendix B

Application Form

Appendix C

10/20/02

Rubric for handling applications for NHEP transaction assistance grants:

- 1. Review team hopes to accomplish review of applications with as few meetings as possible.
- 2. Project Administrator to do initial review of proposals
 - a. Applications to be date stamped when received
 - a. Dijit to send letter or email to applicant, telling them that the application has been received, and if it is complete or incomplete.
 - a. If complete, the date it was received and the time frame in which it will be reviewed
 - b. If incomplete, what other information is needed and that it will not be dated to have been received until all needed material is submitted.
 - c. Each letter to include additional information that was not included on application form: the funds used to match the grant must come from a non-federal source and the project must be completed in time for the money to be distributed prior to the end of December 2003
- 3. When proposal is complete and adequate, Project Administrator will forward it to other members of review team to solicit opinions and any questions.
- 4. Project Administrator to coordinate relaying questions from whole group to applicant, and responses to review team
 - a. questions from any group member are to be shared with all group members, as are responses from applicants
- 5. When an organization for which a Review Team member serves as staff or director submits an application, that person shall be available to the team to respond to any questions about the project, but shall physically remove him- or herself from the meeting during discussion of the project.
- 6. Applications are to be dealt with monthly.
- 7. Project Administrator to keep and share regularly with the Review Team a list of how much money is available, how much is committed and how much as been spent, with details of which projects are in which stage, and how much the match is or is proposed to be.
- 8. Press release needed for first completed grant-supported project and each subsequent one.

Append	dix D	Post card announcing the grants			

Appendix E

Memo showing definition of a parcel

Appendix F Warning about tax implications of funds re-granted to landowners (excerpted from letters to applicants)

If the town intends to re-grant any of these funds to individual landowners, please be aware of the following:

- 1. Because the reimbursement is essentially income to the landowner, it should be reported to the IRS;
- 2. Funds from this program should **not** be used to cover any part of the cost of a landowner's appraisal if s/he will be seeking a charitable deduction for any part of the transaction. IRS rules state that if the landowner wishes to claim a charitable deduction for any part of the value of a donated (or partially donated) interest in land, the <u>landowner</u> must obtain *and pay for* a "qualified appraisal," which must be done in a specific way and which must contain specific items according to IRS rules. (Contact CLCA office if you want more information about this topic.)

Appendix G

Press Release



July 2, 2004

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Dijit Taylor (603) 717-7045 Jim Graham (603) 224-9945, ext. 330

\$42,000 AWARDED FOR LOCAL CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Grants support 18 projects in five New Hampshire communities

Eighteen conservation projects in five New Hampshire communities were awarded a total of \$42,000 recently by the Center for Land Conservation Assistance, a program of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. The land conservation projects are in the towns of Brentwood, Durham, Lee, Newmarket and Strafford.

The grants provide matching funds of up to \$3,000 per project to help cover transaction costs associated with permanent land conservation. Transaction costs include surveys, attorney's fees, land protection staff time, consultant's fees and other related costs.

In total, the projects supported through these grants provide permanent conservation for more than 880 acres. The appraised value of the conserved land is more than \$5 million. Some of the projects are conservation easements and some are acquisition of full title to the property.

"We're pleased to award these grants, which will play a critical role in protecting some of the most cherished open spaces in the fastest-growing region of New Hampshire," said Dijit Taylor, director of the Center for Land Conservation Assistance. "With so much development pressure on the land these days, it will take partnerships like this – between federal, state, private and local interests – to craft creative solutions for land conservation."

The effort was funded by a grant from the New Hampshire Estuaries Program, pursuant to an award from the federal Environmental Protection Agency. All towns and land conservation groups in the New Hampshire Estuaries area were invited to apply for the money. Applications were reviewed by a team of regional and state land conservation professionals.

Details of the grants are shown below:

- Bear-Paw Regional Greenways received \$3000 for a project in **Strafford** that protects 48 acres.
- The Town of **Brentwood** received \$7,007 for five projects that protect 171 acres.

Page 2 Land protection grants

- The Town of **Lee** received \$21,142 for eight projects that protect 380 acres.
- The Town of **Newmarket** received \$7,851 for three projects that protect 235 acres.
- The Strafford Rivers Conservancy received \$3000 for a 50-acre project in **Durham** and **Lee**.

For more information about the grants or any of the projects, contact Dijit Taylor, director of the Center for Land Conservation Assistance, Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, 54 Portsmouth Street, Concord, NH 03301, 717-7045, dtaylor@ForestSociety.org

The Center for Land Conservation Assistance provides support and assistance to land trusts, conservation commission and other seeking to conserve undeveloped land in New Hampshire through direct assistance, coordination and education, access to training and funding, and referrals. CLCA is a program of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

Founded in 1901, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests is a 10,000-member, nonprofit organization that has helped protect more than one million acres. Visit www.forestsociety.org for more information, or call (603) 224-9945.

###

Appendix H Excerpt from July 14, 2004 CLCA Electronic Newsletter

CLCA has recently distributed \$42,000 in matching grants to assist with transaction costs for permanent land conservation projects in the towns of Brentwood, Lee, Durham, Newmarket and Strafford. The grants provide matching funds of up to \$3,000 to help cover transaction costs associated with permanent land conservation. The projects supported through these grants provide permanent conservation for more than 880 acres. The appraised value of the conserved land is more than \$5 million. Some of the projects are conservation easements and some are acquisition of full title to the property. The New Hampshire Estuaries Program provided the funding, pursuant to an award from the federal Environmental Protection Agency.

Appendix I Summary of Each Grant (listed in alphabetical order by project)

Project Name	Brownell			
Project location	Strafford			
(town)				
Number of Acres	47.5			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain		
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$205,000			
Entity holding title or CE	Bear-Paw Ro	egional Greenways		
Entity receiving funds	Bear-Paw Ro	egional Greenways		
Date project closed	May 28, 200	4		
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source*
	\$2400	Appraisal		Landowner
	\$300	Attorney Fees		Landowner
	\$3,480	Survey		Landowner
	\$384	Land Protection Cor	nsultant	Landowner
	\$115	Deed Recording Fe	е	Landowner
	\$2,500	BPRG Stewardship	Fee	BPRG
	\$200	BPRG staff time		BPRG
Total Transaction	\$9379	*(Town of Strafford	to pay for E	BPRG and landowner
Costs		costs)		
Match total	\$6379			
Grant Purpose(s)	Portion of transaction costs			
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant				
Funds		Transaction Grant	Shorela	and Transaction Grant
Date Grant distributed	6/24/04			

Project Name	Carpenter			
Project location	Kensington & Hampton Falls			
(town)	_	•		
Number of Acres	96			
Protection Method	✓ Con	servation Easement		Fee
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	n Purchase, bargai	n price 🔝 l	Purchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised V	'alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of				
Entity holding title	Society for t	he Protection of New	Hampshire	Forests
or CE				
Entity receiving	•	he Protection of New	Hampshire	Forests
funds	•	grant to landowner)		
Date project	August 2, 20	004		
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$6350	Survey		landowner
Total Project Costs	\$6350			
Match total	\$3350			
Grant Purpose(s)	Reimburse landowner for part of survey cost			
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant				
Funds	_ ✓ _ Original Transaction Grant Shoreland Transaction Grant			
Date Grant	8/20/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Dunham				
Project location	Lee & Durham				
(town)					
Number of Acres	50.1				
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee	
Acquisition Method	Donation	Purchase, bargain pr	ice √Pu	ırchase, full value	
If purchase,	Appraised Va		Purchase	Price	
documentation of	\$40,000- \$4	5,000	\$45,000		
Entity holding title or CE	Strafford Riv	ers Conservancy			
Entity receiving funds	Strafford Riv	ers Conservancy			
Date project	March 28, 20	004			
closed					
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source	
	\$2213.75	Survey		landowner	
	\$213.75	Closing fees		SRC	
	\$1365.00	Volunteer time		SRC	
Match total	\$3792.50				
Grant purpose(s)	\$2436.25 su	rvey			
	\$350 apprais				
	\$213.75 clos	sing			
Amount of Grant	\$3000				
Source of Grant					
Funds	_√_ Origina	Transaction Grant	Shorela	and Transaction Grant	
Date Grant distributed	5/21/04				

Project Name	Ellis			
Project location	Lee			
(town)				
Number of Acres	14			
Protection Method	C	onservation Easemer	nt	✓ Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation	Purchase, bargain pr	ice ✓ P	Purchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va		Purchase	e Price
documentation of	\$130,000		\$111,026	6
Entity holding title	Town of Lee			
or CE				
Entity receiving	Town of Lee			
funds				
Date project	9/29/03			
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$3430	Legal		Landowner
	\$432	Legal		Town
	\$7808	,		Landowner
	\$2736	Closing		Landowner
	\$87	Recording Fees		Town & landowner
	\$1800	Appraisal		Town of Lee
Total Project Costs	\$16,293			
Match total	\$13,292			
Grant Purpose(s)	Portion of tra	Insaction expenses		
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant				
Funds	Original Transaction Grant _√_ Shoreland Transaction Grant			
If Shoreland,	555 feet on one shore of Oyster River plus 635 feet on both			
frontage & location	shores			
Date Grant	6/23/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Grant Ro	ad (Falzone)		
Project location	Newmarket			
(town)				
Number of Acres	163			
Protection Method		Conservation Easemer		1 00
Acquisition Method	Donation	Purchase, bargain pr	ice √ F	Purchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraise	d Value	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$1,265,00	00	\$1,265,00	00
Entity holding title	Town of I	Newmarket		
or CE				
Entity receiving	Town of I	Newmarket		
funds				
Date project	Septemb	er 5, 2003		
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$50	Appraisal Update		Town
		Survey (partial)		Town
	\$2750		essment	Town
		Attorneys		Town
	\$8,838		3	Town
	\$2497	Title Insurance		Town
Total Project Costs	\$22,984			
Match total	\$19,984			
Grant Purpose(s)	Portion of total transaction cost			
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant				
Funds	√ _ Oriç	ginal Transaction Grant	Shore	land Transaction Grant
Date Grant	6/24/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Hull				
Project location	Brentwood				
(town)					
Number of Acres	6				
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee	
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain	price Pu	ırchase, full value	
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price	
documentation of	\$20,000		\$0		
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Brei	ntwood			
Entity receiving funds	Town of Brei	ntwood			
Date project	Aug 19, 200	3			
closed					
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source	
	\$1800	survey		town	
	\$2600	appraisal		town	
	\$153	Title research		town	
		Legal review		town	
Total transaction	\$4647.50				
costs					
Match amount	\$2324.50				
Grant Purpose(s)	Half of total transaction expenses				
Amount of Grant	\$2323				
Source of Grant		_	_	_	
Funds	_√_ Original Transaction Grant Shoreland Transaction Grant				
Date Grant	5/7/04				
distributed					

Project Name	Lee/Hartgerii	nk			
Project location	Lee				
(town)					
Number of Acres	10				
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee	
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain	price Pu	ırchase, full value	
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price	
documentation of			N/A		
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Lee				
Entity receiving funds	Town of Lee				
Date project	Sept 29, 200	3			
closed	-				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source	
	\$1800	appraisal		landowner	
	\$2650	survey		town	
	\$573	Legal fees		town	
	\$350	Mortgage subord/tit insurance	le	landowner	
Total expenses	\$5373				
Match total	\$2687	Half of total transac	tion expens	es	
Grant Purpose(s)		Half of total expenses			
Amount of Grant	\$2686				
Source of Grant					
Funds		Transaction Grant _	Shorela	and Transaction Grant	
Date Grant	4/28/04				
distributed					

Project Name	Loiselle			
Project location	Newmarket			
(town)				
Number of Acres	45			
Protection Method	С	onservation Easemer	nt	√ Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation	Purchase, bargain pr	ice ✓ Purc	hase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase Pric	ce
documentation of	\$724,000		\$684,899.63	
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Nev	vmarket		
Entity receiving funds	Town of Nev	vmarket		
Date project	7/28/03			
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$3000	Appraisal		landowner
	\$315	Appraisal update		town
	\$5,089	Survey		Town
	\$1200	Environmental site a	assessment	town
	\$6,758	Attorney		town
	\$4,114	Attorney's closing co	osts	town
	\$1,445	Title Insurance		town
Total Project Costs	\$21,921			
Match total	\$18,921			
Grant Purpose(s)		Portion of town's co	sts	
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant	_√_ Original Transaction Grant (\$2013)			
Funds	_√_ Shoreland Transaction Grant (\$987)			
If Shoreland,	1,900+ feet of frontage on the Piscassic River			
frontage & location				
Date Grant	\$2859 6/24/04			
distributed	\$ 141 8/24/04			
	(payment was split while reserving funds for projects ahead of this			
	one in queue	e, then paid when the	y could not be	completed)

Project Name	MacMullen			
Project location	Brentwood			
(town)				
Number of Acres	20.68			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain		urchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$200,000		\$0	
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Brei	ntwood		
Entity receiving funds	Town of Brei	ntwood		
Date project	Aug 19, 200	3		
closed	_			
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$2500	survey		town
	\$600	appraisal		town
	\$147.50	Title research		town
	\$94.50	Legal review		town
Total transaction	\$3342			
costs				
Match amount	\$1671			
Grant Purpose(s)		ransaction expenses		
Amount of Grant	\$1671			
Source of Grant	_		_	
Funds	_ Original Transaction Grant _√ Shoreland Transaction Grant			
If Shoreland,	1390 feet of frontage on the Exeter River			
frontage & location				
Date Grant	5/7/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Maud Jones Town Forest					
Project location	Lee					
(town)						
Number of Acres	75					
Protection Method	✓ Conservation Easement Fee					
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation Purchase, bargain price Purchase, full value					
	(conservation easement on town owned land donated by town to					
	SPNHF, ensuring permanent protection)					
If purchase,	Appraised V	alue Purchase		Price		
documentation of						
Entity holding CE	Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests					
Entity receiving	Town of Lee					
funds						
Date project	July 28, 2004					
closed						
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source		
	\$6800	Survey				
	\$3692	Legal costs		Town of Lee		
	\$150	Appraisal				
Total Project Costs	\$10,642					
Match total	\$7642					
Grant Purpose(s)	Portion of town's costs for this transaction					
Amount of Grant	\$3000					
Source of Grant						
Funds	_✓_ Original Transaction Grant Shoreland Transaction Grant					
Date Grant	8/24/04					
distributed						

Project Name	McCue					
Project location	Rollinsford					
(town)						
Number of Acres	40+					
Protection Method	✓ Conservation Easement Fee					
Acquisition Method	Donation ✓ Purchase, bargain price Purchase, full value					
If purchase,	Appraised Value Purchase Price			}		
documentation of	\$1,060,000 \$780,000					
Entity holding title or CE	Strafford Rivers Conservancy					
Entity receiving funds	Strafford Rivers Conservancy					
Date project	December 12, 2003					
closed						
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source		
	\$4250	Appraisal and update		Landowner		
	\$4950	Survey		Landowner		
	\$375	Document Review &Tax Planning		Landowner		
	566.50	Legal fees		Landowner		
	\$2450	Closing attorney		Landowner		
	\$1440	Title insurance Recording Fees Transfer stamps		Landowner		
	\$76			Landowner		
	\$7800			Landowner		
	\$28	Recording revised p	olan	Landowner		
Total Project Costs	\$21935.50					
Match total	\$18,935.50					
Grant Purpose(s)	Portion of all transaction costs					
Amount of Grant	\$3000					
Source of Grant						
Funds	_✓ Original Transaction Grant Shoreland Transaction Grant					
Date Grant	8/26/04					
distributed						

Project Name	McLean				
Project location	Lee				
(town)					
Number of Acres	4				
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee	
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain	price Pu	ırchase, full value	
If purchase, documentation of	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase N/A	Price	
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Lee		-		
Entity receiving funds	Town of Lee				
Date project	Sept 29, 200	Sept 29, 2003			
closed					
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source	
	\$1800	appraisal		town	
	\$2500	survey		town	
	\$381	Legal services		town	
Total expenses	\$4681				
Match total	\$2341	Half of total transac	tion expens	es	
Grant Purpose(s)		Half of total expense	es		
Amount of Grant	\$2340				
Source of Grant					
Funds	_√_ Original	Transaction Grant _	Shore la	and Transaction Grant	
Date Grant distributed	4/28/04				

Project Name	Nekton			
Project location	Brentwood			
(town)				
Number of Acres	31.5			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation •	✓ Purchase, bargain ¡		urchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	
documentation of	\$260,000		\$175,000	
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Brei	ntwood		
Entity receiving funds	Town of Brei	ntwood		
Date project	Aug 19, 2003			
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$2500	survey		town
	\$600	appraisal		town
	\$227			town
	\$94.50	Legal review		town
Total transaction	\$3421.50			
costs				
Match amount	\$1710.50			
Grant Purpose(s)		ransaction expenses		
Amount of Grant	\$1711			
Source of Grant	.			
Funds			_	nd Transaction Grant
If Shoreland,	1320 feet of frontage on the Exeter River			
frontage & location				
Date Grant	5/7/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Pratt			
Project location	Brentwood			
(town)				
Number of Acres	35.44			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easen	nent	Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation 🗸	Purchase, bargain	price P	urchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$348,000		\$261,000	
Entity holding title	Rockingham	County Conservation	n District (p	rimary)
or CE	Town of Brei	ntwood (executory)		
Entity receiving	Town of Brei	ntwood		
funds				
Date project	July 30, 2004			
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$4000	survey		Town Conservation
	\$1200	appraisal		Fund
	\$1886	Rockingham County		
		Conservation Distric	•	
	\$928	Legal fees (\$847 no		
		documented as of 8,	/10/04	
Total Project Costs	\$8014			
Match total	\$5014			
Grant Purpose(s)	Portion of to	wn's costs for this tra		
Amount of Grant		\$30	000	
Source of Grant				
Funds		Transaction Grant _	Shorela	nd Transaction Grant
Date Grant	82404			
distributed				

Project Name	Quigley	,		
Project location	Lee			
(town)				
Number of Acres	35			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain	price Pu	ırchase, full value
If purchase, documentation of	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase N/A	Price
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Lee			
Entity receiving funds	Town of Lee			
Date project closed	Sept 29, 200	03		
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$4300	survey		town
	\$605	Legal services		town
Total expenses	\$4905			
Match total	\$2453	Half of total transact	tion expens	es
Grant Purpose(s)		Half of total expense	es	
Amount of Grant	\$2452			
Source of Grant Funds	✓_ Origina	Transaction Grant	Shorela	and Transaction Grant
Date Grant distributed	4/28/04			

Project Name	Randall/Cox			
Project location	Lee			
(town)				
Number of Acres	141			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation	Purchase, bargain pr	ice √Pu	rchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$552,500		\$552,500	
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Lee			
Entity receiving funds	Town of Lee			
Date project	9/29/03			
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$3973	survey		landowner
	\$2000	appraisal		landowner
	\$\$1404	U		landowner
	\$78	LCHIP application		landowner
Total Transaction	\$7455			
Costs				
Match total	\$4455			
Grant Purpose(s)		Insaction costs		
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant				
Funds	Original Transaction Grant _√_ Shoreland Transaction Grant			
If Shoreland,	2321 feet of frontage on the Oyster River			
frontage & location				
Date Grant distributed	6/23/04			

Project Name	Richmond			
Project location	Newmarket			
(town)				
Number of Acres	26.9			
Protection Method	√Conservation Easement Fee			
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain		
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	e Price
documentation of				
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Nev	vmarket (conservatio	n commiss	sion)
Entity receiving funds	Town of Newmarket			
Date project closed	10/9/03			
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$1774.55	Survey		town
	\$800.00	Legal services (McN Taylor)	Veil &	town
	\$1250.00	Rockingham Land T stewardship fee	rust	town
	\$160.00	Conservation easer drafting	ment	town
	\$600.00	Legal services (Pec	kham)	town
Total transaction costs	\$3984.55		-	
Match total	\$1992.55	Half of total transact	tion expen	ses
Grant Purpose(s)	Half of total t	ransaction expenses		
Amount of Grant	\$1992			
Source of Grant	Original Transaction Grant Shoreland Transaction			
Funds	Grant			
Date Grant	4/27/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Schmalzer			
Project location	Brentwood			
(town)				
Number of Acres	47.5			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation •	✓Purchase, bargain ı	orice Pu	ırchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$815,000		\$250,000	
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Bren	ntwood		
Entity receiving funds	Town of Bren	ntwood		
Date project	August 19, 2	August 19, 2003		
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$164	Title research		town
	\$1380	Legal review		town
Total transaction	\$1544			
costs				
Match amount	\$772			
Grant Purpose(s)		ransaction expenses		
Amount of Grant	\$772			
Source of Grant				
Funds	Original Transaction Grant _√_ Shoreland Transaction Grant			
If Shoreland,	1156 feet of frontage on the Exeter River			
frontage & location				
Date Grant distributed	5/7/04			

Project Name	Schulz/Fried	lander		
Project location	Lee			
(town)				
Number of Acres	90			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Ease	ment	Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation ✓	Purchase, bargai	in price	Purchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$270,000		\$28,726	
Entity holding title	Town of Lee			
or CE				
Entity receiving	Town of Lee			
funds	0/00/00			
Date project	9/29/03			
closed				
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$1448	Legal		Landowner
	\$2131	Survey		Landowner
	\$1368	Legal		Town
	\$250	Title		Town
	\$852	Survey		
Total Project Costs	\$6049			
Match total	\$3049			
Grant Purpose(s)	Half of transa	action costs		
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant				
Funds		Transaction Grant ✓		
If Shoreland,	Over 1400 feet of frontage on the Oyster River			
frontage & location				
Date Grant	6/23/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Short				
Project location	Lee				
(town)					
Number of Acres	10				
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Easem	ent	Fee	
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain	price Pu	ırchase, full value	
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price	
documentation of			N/A		
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Lee				
Entity receiving	Town of Lee				
funds					
Date project	Sept 29, 200	Sept 29, 2003			
closed					
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source	
	\$2950	survey		town	
	\$384	Legal services		town	
Total expenses	\$3334				
Match total	\$1672	Half of total transact	tion expens	es	
Grant Purpose(s)		Half of total expense	es		
Amount of Grant				\$1662	
Source of Grant					
Funds	_√_ Origina	Transaction Grant _	Shorela	and Transaction Grant	
Date Grant	4/28/04				
distributed					

(The amount for the Short project is slightly less than half of the costs because project administrator detected an error in arithmetic in the summary sheet about the costs after the check was cut. Amount granted is what the town requested in summary on 12/4/03.)

Project Name	South and H	aigh Roads		
Project location	Brentwood			
(town)				
Number of Acres	65			
Protection Method	✓	Conservation Ease	ment	Fee
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain	price Pu	ırchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised V	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of				
Entity holding title	Rockingham	County Conservation	n District	
or CE				
Entity receiving	Town of Brentwood			
funds				
Date project	11/26/04			
closed		T		
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$1061	Attorney's fees		Half paid by town
Total Project Costs	\$1061			
Match total	\$531			
Grant Purpose(s)	Half of costs	of attorney for the pr	oject	
Amount of Grant				\$530
Source of Grant				
Funds	√_ Origina	Transaction Grant _	Shorela	nd Transaction Grant
Date Grant	10/2/03			
distributed				

Project Name	Tuckaway/C	OX		
Project location	Lee			
(town)				
Number of Acres	76			
Protection Method	√ Conse	ervation Easement		Fee
Acquisition Method	Donation I	Purchase, bargain pr	ice ✓ Pu	ırchase, full value
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase	Price
documentation of	\$261,000		\$235,366	
Entity holding title or CE	Town of Lee			
Entity receiving	Town of Lee			
funds				
Date project	9/29/03			
closed				,
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source
	\$3973	Survey		Landowner
	\$1404	Legal		Landowner
	\$78	LCHIP Application		Landowner
	\$2000	Appraisal		Landowner
Total Project Costs	\$7455			
Match total	\$4455			
Grant Purpose(s)		nsaction costs (not a	ppraisal)	
Amount of Grant	\$3000			
Source of Grant				
Funds	Original Transaction Grant _✓_ Shoreland Transaction Grant			
If Shoreland,	803 feet of frontage on the Oyster River			
frontage & location				
Date Grant	6/23/04			
distributed				

Project Name	Willoughby				
Project location	Deerfield				
(town)					
Number of Acres	28.4				
Protection Method	✓ Conse	✓ Conservation Easement Fee			
Acquisition Method	✓ Donation	Purchase, bargain p	rice Pu	rchase, full value	
If purchase,	Appraised Va	alue	Purchase I	Price	
documentation of					
Entity holding title		egional Greenways (p	rimary)		
or CE		rfield (executory)			
Entity receiving	Bear-Paw R	egional Greenways			
funds					
Date project	August 10, 2	004			
closed					
Match information	Amount	Purpose		Source	
	\$1808	,		BPRG	
	\$361	•	sultant fee		
	\$76	Deed recording fee			
	\$3175	Survey			
	\$2750		fee		
	\$200				
	\$125	Title search		Donated by C.	
	**			Auger	
Total Project Costs	\$8495				
Match total	\$5495				
Grant Purpose(s)	Portion of co	sts of project			
Amount of Grant		\$30	000		
Source of Grant	,				
Funds		Transaction Grant _	Shorela	nd Transaction Grant	
Date Grant	8/30/04				
distributed					

Appendix J Summary of all NHEP-CLCA Transaction Grants

Project	Location	Grant Recipient	Acres	Protection Method	Acquisition Method	Source (original or shoreland)	If shoreland, feet protected	Grant Amount	Match Amount	Appraised Value
Brownell	Strafford	BPRG***	48	CE	Donation	0		\$3000	\$6379	unknown
Carpenter	Kensington & Hampton Falls	SPNHF****	96	CE	Donation	0		\$3000	\$3350	unknown
Dunham	Lee & Durham	SRC*	50	CE	Full value purchase	0		\$3000	\$3792	\$45,000
Ellis	Lee	Town of Lee	14	Fee	Full value purchase	S	1190 Oyster R	\$3000	\$13,292	\$130,000
Grant Road	Newmarket	Town of Newmarket	163	Fee	Full value purchase	0		\$3000	\$19984	\$2,265,000
Hull	Brentwood	Town of Brentwood	6	CE	Donation	0		\$2323	\$2323	\$20,000
Lee/Hartgerink	Lee	Town of Lee	10	CE	Donation	0		\$2686	\$2687	unknown
Loiselle	Newmarket	Town of Newmarket	45	Fee	Full value purchase	O&S	1900+ Piscassic R	\$3000	\$18,921	\$724,000
MacMullen	Brentwood	Town of Brentwood	21	CE	Donation	S	1390 Exeter	\$1671	\$1671	\$200,000
Maud Jones	Lee	Town of Lee	75	CE	Donation	0		\$3000	\$7642	unknown
McCue	Rollinsford	SRC*	40	CE	Purchase, bargain price**	0		\$3000	\$18,935	\$1,060,000
McLean	Lee	Town of Lee	4	CE	Donation	0		\$2340	\$2341	unknown
Nekton	Brentwood	Town of Brentwood	32	CE	Purchase, bargain price**	S	1320 Exeter	\$1711	\$1711	\$260,000
Pratt	Brentwood	Town of	35	CE	Purchase,	0		\$3000	\$5014	\$348,000

		Brentwood			bargain price**					
Quigley	Lee	Town of Lee	35	CE	Donation	0		\$2452	\$2453	unknown
Randall/Cox	Lee	Town of Lee	141	CE	Full value purchase	S	2321 Oyster	\$3000	\$4455	\$552,500
Richmond	Newmarket	Town of Newmarket	27	CE	Donation	0		\$1992	\$1993	unknown
Schmalzer	Brentwood	Town of Brentwood	47	CE	Purchase, bargain price**	8	1154 Exeter	\$772	\$772	\$815,000
Schultz/Friedlander	Lee	Town of Lee	90	CE	Purchase, bargain price**	S	1400 Oyster	\$3000	\$3049	\$270,000
Short	Lee	Town of Lee	10	CE	Donation	0		\$1672	\$1672	unknown
South & Haigh Roads	Brentwood	Town of Brentwood	65	CE	Donation	0		\$530	\$520	unknown
Tuckaway/Cox	Lee	Town of Lee	76	CE	Full value purchase	S	803 Oyster	\$3000	\$4455	\$261,000
Willoughby	Deerfield	BPRG***	28	CE	Donation	0		\$3000	\$5495	unknown
Total	9 towns	6 recipients	1158 acres	3 Fee 20 CE	12 Donations 5 Bargain Prices 6 Full Value	15 original 7 shoreland 1 original and shoreland	11478 feet 3 rivers	\$57,149	\$132,906	More than \$6,649,500

*SRC = Strafford Rivers Conservancy *** BPRG = Bear-Paw Regional Greenways Forests

^{**} Bargain price of 80% or less of fair market value **** SPNHF = Society for the Protection of New Hampshire