

**Minutes of the
One Hundred and Sixth Meeting of the
Maryland Heritage Areas Authority
January 9, 2025**

The one hundred and sixth meeting of the Maryland Heritage Areas Authority (MHAA) was convened virtually on January 9, 2025. The public had the opportunity to listen/watch via live-stream.

Authority Members/Designees Present

Secretary Rebecca M. Flora (MD Department of Planning and serving as the Chair for the Maryland Heritage Areas Authority); Melissa Archer (representing MD Department of Housing & Community Development Secretary Jake Day); Elizabeth Fitzsimmons (representing MD Department of Commerce Secretary Kevin Anderson); Pete Leshner (Maryland Association of Counties representative); Sandy Turner (Maryland Tourism Development Board representative); Jonathan Hughes (Speaker of the House representative); Nathan Brown (Maryland Municipal League representative); Robert D. Campbell (Governor's Appointee for Historic Preservation and serving as the Vice Chair for the Maryland Heritage Areas Authority); Mary Anne Harms (Speaker of the House representative); Nicholas Redding (President of the Senate representative); Hilary Bell (representing MD Department of Natural Resources Secretary Josh Kurtz); Natalie Chabot (Maryland Greenways Commission representative); Geoffrey Newman (representing Maryland Department of Higher Education Secretary Sanjay Rai)

Authority Members/Designees Absent

Dennis Doster (Governor's Appointee for Heritage Tourism); Elizabeth Hughes (State Historic Preservation Officer); Peter Ramsey (representing MD State Superintendent of Schools Mohammed Choudhury); Rowland Agbede (representing MD Department of Agriculture Secretary Kevin Atticks); Julie Schablitsky (representing MD Department of Transportation Secretary Paul Wiedefeld)

Staff Present

Ariane Hofstedt (Administrator, Maryland Heritage Areas Program); Martha Waldron (Assistant Administrator, Maryland Heritage Areas Program); Andrew Arvizu (Assistant Administrator, Maryland Heritage Areas Program); Anne Raines (Deputy Director/Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Maryland Historical Trust); Nell Ziehl (Chief, Office of Planning, Education

and Outreach, Maryland Historical Trust); Rieyn Delony (Deputy Principal Counsel, Office of the Attorney General)

CALL TO ORDER

Secretary Rebecca Flora called the meeting to order at 10:07 and wished everyone a Happy New Year.

Ms. Martha Waldron conducted the roll call.

Resolution R-100 to Approve Minutes from October 23, 2024 meeting

Sec. Flora called for a motion to approve the minutes from the October Authority meeting as presented. Mr. Pete Lesher made the following motion, which Ms. Mary Anne Harms seconded.

The motion passed with no abstentions.

RESOLVED, that the Authority approves the October 23, 2024 Minutes as presented.

MHAA Chairperson Report

Sec. Flora welcomed Ms. Jane Cox as the new executive director of the Chesapeake Crossroads Heritage Area and invited her to introduce herself later in the meeting.

Sec. Flora gave a legislative update, sharing that MDP’s Legislative Coordinator Mr. Andrew Wilson is tracking all of the bills related directly or indirectly to the agency, the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) and the Maryland Heritage Area Program including Senate Bill 16 “Natural Resources – Maryland Heritage Areas Authority – Funding and Grants” put forward by the Maryland Heritage Areas Coalition. SB16 has been filed and includes language to double the Program’s appropriation from \$6 million to \$12 million. The bill that was filed also includes some additional elements which are still being reviewed but appear to include considerations that are being discussed in the current strategic planning process. There may be another bill put forward by the Washington County delegation that will supersede this original version.

Sec. Flora reminded the group that at this point, the Authority is not being asked to take a position on the proposed legislation one way or another. As this unfolds in session, if anyone chooses to testify, please do so as an individual, not as an Authority member. She will keep everyone posted as this develops. She also reminded folks on the call that this meeting is public and is being recorded.

Mr. Nicholas Redding asked Sec. Flora if she could share MDP’s position on the bill right now as it has currently been filed.

Sec. Flora replied that as an agency, MDP will most likely not be taking any position on SB16, particularly since there is a budget ramification. As with any bill, MDP will be available to

provide information but won't take a position for or against. This is consistent with all bills that have budget ramifications.

Mr. Redding asked if the Authority could take a position on the bill as they are an appointed governing body.

Sec. Flora differentiated MDP as an agency and the Authority, which is still a state-level body. She reminded everyone that this information was recently received and just made available to the group. If there is a need for an Authority vote in the future, we can discuss but she is not anticipating asking the Authority to take a position, particularly because elements in the current version of the bill relate to items being discussed during the current strategic planning and it would be premature to those efforts and the work that will come out of that effort.

Mr. Redding expressed concern about the timing and asked when the Authority will meet next. From his perspective, doubling the resources for the Program is positive. Since these are special fund dollars, it's slightly different than if we were discussing the general fund and because the legislative session is so fast, he would hope that the Authority could take a position and is concerned about them not taking a position or not being supportive.

Sec. Flora stated that there is not enough information about the current bill or any changes coming with a future version of the bill that may supersede this one to take a position. We don't have enough information at this time and need more time to assess the other elements in the bill that are being discussed as part of strategic planning process. It is premature for the Authority to digest and take position at this meeting. Once the legislation has been evaluated, a special Authority meeting or perhaps an executive committee meeting could be convened.

Ms. Chabot asked if the Coalition has asked the Authority to support the bill.

Sec. Flora is not aware of such a request.

Mr. Redding acknowledged that in her position as Secretary of Planning, Sec. Flora may not be able to request the Authority take a position on the legislation, and this might need to come from the floor.

Sec. Flora respectively requested additional time to get more information.

Mr. Redding asked if there could be a motion from the floor at a future meeting.

Sec. Flora said she would explore this and would like time to clarify whether or not it's appropriate for the Authority, as a state-level body, to take a position on a bill like this.

Mr. Redding asked if the Authority took a position when the Program's appropriation was raised from \$3 to \$6 million.

Sec. Flora said we could find out.

Mr. Campbell suggested that there is a possibility that Sec. Flora's position as a state official may limit her ability to vote rather than the rest of the Authority to support a position in the legislation.

Sec. Flora agreed and reiterated the need for more information in order to give a definitive answer.

Mr. Leshar offered the perspective from when the cap was raised to \$6 million previously, he personally spoke in favor of the increase but not on behalf of the Authority – and shared that others did as well. He believes that the record will show that the Authority itself did not take a position, and the lobbying effort was led by the Coalition.

Ms. Harms said that the concern being expressed is that the Authority would not meet again before the end of session. A special meeting in a few weeks, after all the information has been reviewed, would be advised to discuss who is supporting what and when, either as an Authority or as individuals. She feels this is very important and the amount of money being considered is remarkable.

Sec. Flora stated that if a special meeting is needed, we will schedule one.

Ms. Harms asked when a meeting would take place.

Sec. Flora said that staff would need to take a poll, keeping in mind how hard it is to coordinate schedules and when the new version of the bill is introduced. She can't estimate the timing until she sees the new bill and the hearings are scheduled.

Ms. Chabot asked that if the Coalition requests the Authority's support on the legislation can it be addressed?

Sec. Flora said, yes that would be the intent with the final version of the legislation.

Ms. Bell responded to a comment Mr. Redding made about special funds versus general funds and shared that although the proposed legislation doesn't change the transfer tax allocation formula – some monies are allocated via a percentage, a flat amount, or "up to" language – there is an expectation that funding would be provided when increasing the cap. She reminded the Authority that this does have implications on other state programs and has a fiscal impact regardless of the funding source. She shared that DNR is also reviewing the bill and future iterations of this.

Sec. Flora thanked Ms. Bell and said the impact of the proposed legislation will also be assessed as part of MDP's review.

Mr. Redding agreed that a special meeting should be held and asked for the Authority to agree on the intent to schedule one even just for a chance to discuss and receive updates from DNR, MDP, and the Coalition, for example. He asked if he could make a formal motion to request this and clarified that the meeting should be held at an appropriate time once all the information has been received and reviewed.

Sec. Flora asked that the meeting minutes reflect Mr. Redding's request for the Authority to commit to holding a special meeting in a timely manner about the bill once we have a final version. In the meantime, Sec. Flora will check in on the appropriate legal procedures required for notice and appropriate procedures for public meetings. The bill is worthy of discussion once we have everything in front of us.

Sec. Flora moved forward with the agenda and gave an update on the MHAA member appointments, thanking Mr. Redding, Ms. Chabot, Ms. Harms, and Mr. Campbell for continuing to serve in their positions as the staff work with the Appointments office to bring new Authority members on board. If anyone has candidates in mind, please always feel free to send those names to Ms. Ariane Hofstedt to pursue.

Next on the agenda is an action item specific to the reserve and emergency funds. Sec. Flora reminded the group that the Authority has discussed in the past what the minimum should be in the emergency fund. She asked Ms. Hofstedt to summarize the current status of the funds prior to voting on the resolution.

Ms. Hofstedt reminded the Authority of their vote to set aside \$100,000 in emergency funds for FY25. Resolution R-200 is the same type of action for FY26. She also reminded everyone of the additional resolution that was passed in July 2024 that capped the reserve fund at \$100,000. Any unspent funds from FY25 will roll over to the reserve fund but the \$100,000 cap will remain in place.

Ms. Hofstedt shared that the reserve fund currently holds \$126,554.80. The July 2024 resolution also stated that if the amount of the next project grant on the reserve list is more than the amount in the overage of the \$100,000 cap, then that money remains until it can support that grant. The \$26,554.80 in overage money has not been distributed yet because the next grant on the reserve list is a \$100,000 request.

There is \$75,000 in FY25 emergency funds that have yet to be spent. If those funds are not spent between now and the end of FY25 (June 30, 2025), they will move over to the reserve fund. If this happens, there will be \$201,554.80 in the reserve fund as of July 1, 2025. To uphold the July 2024 resolution to cap the reserve funds at \$100,000, the excess \$101,554.80 would need to be spent on FY26 reserve list grants and the reserve fund would go back down to \$100,000. If the Authority would like to have more than \$100,000 for reserve and emergency

purposes in FY26, then the resolution R-200 to set aside \$100,000 for emergency grants would provide an additional \$100,000.

Action items

Resolution R-200 to Approve Reservation of \$100,000 in FY26 Emergency Funds

Sec. Flora called for a motion to approve the resolution.

Ms. Liz Fitzsimmons made the following motion, which was seconded by Mr. Campbell.

RESOLVED, that the Authority approves the reservation of \$100,000 from MHAA's FY26 annual appropriation, to be used to fund FY26 emergency grants in accordance with MHAA's Emergency Grant Policy.

The motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Management Report

Ms. Hofstedt reiterated the \$126,554.80 in the reserve fund with \$75,000 unspent in the emergency fund for FY25.

Ms. Hofstedt called attention to the memo that was distributed in the meeting briefing materials on December 23 in response to a request from the Coalition at the last Authority meeting. This memo provided approximate percentages of the different line items included in the Program's operating costs on an annual basis. These figures fluctuate slightly from year to year depending on staff transitions and consulting costs, but the approximate breakdowns stay relatively consistent. The memo highlights that 70% of the operating costs go to staff salaries and benefits, which is full and partial coverage of six positions: three full-time MHAA positions and three partial MHT staff that provide direct support to the Maryland Heritage Areas Program. 16% goes to contractual services, typically consultant work approved by the Authority like strategic planning and past economic impact studies. 13% is attributed to our grant software, and less than 1% goes toward postage, travel, and office supplies.

Ms. Hofstedt added that under the staff salary line, in addition to the six positions receiving direct support from the MHAA funds, there are approximately ten additional staff positions throughout MHT in finance, IT, legal counsel, compliance, easements, and archaeology who provide indirect support to the Program throughout the year. None of these positions are funded with MHAA money.

Sec. Flora thanked Ms. Hofstedt and asked the group if there were any questions about the breakdown report.

Mr. Redding asked if the memo provided the Coalition with the information they were asking for.

Ms. Carty asked about the \$300,000 that is utilized by MHT for their Historic Preservation Non-Capital Grant Program. She also added that public agencies like MHT, DNR, and others have the responsibility in statute to provide support to MHAA and the Program even though they are not included in the operating budget.

Mr. Redding felt the information outlined in the memo was helpful but asked if it would be possible to see a spreadsheet with the numbers.

Sec. Flora replied that it is not typical to provide a breakdown like this for every state program that exists.

Ms. Hofstedt said that because MHAA staff are housed within MHT, they are part of the larger MHT budgeting process. To her knowledge, there is not a report that breaks down those specific costs.

Mr. Redding then asked how the Program knows it is only using 10% when reporting to DBM, for example.

Ms. Hofstedt replied that the 10% is tracked but it is part of the larger MHT budget.

Ms. Raines provided information about how the \$300,000 for the MHT Historic Preservation Non-Capital Grant Program is taken out. Out of the \$6 million allocated for the Maryland Heritage Areas Program, 10% (\$600,000) is removed for administrative costs and \$300,000 is removed for the MHT Non-Capital Program which leaves \$5.1 million for MHAA grants. Ms. Hofstedt has provided the percentage breakdown for the \$600,000 in operations which includes the total cost of employees to the state (salaries, benefits, pension plans), travel and meeting costs, grant software costs, and consultant costs. All of this information was reflected in the memo Ms. Hofstedt provided. A cost breakdown for each specific staff member was not provided.

Ms. Carty stated that MHAA is not a program of MDP. MHAA is managed by MDP and allows MHT to receive administrative funding up to 10% as stated in statute. As an independent state entity, she believes that the Program should have their own budget each year that is voted on and approved by the Authority. At the end of the year, there should be an accounting to the Authority for how the money was spent.

Mr. Redding expressed a need to understand what is needed for the Program to operate for the Authority to make wise and informed decisions given the inclusion of these dollars in the upcoming bill. Years ago there was a piece of legislation requiring the state to report out on how special funds are expended. DBM runs the chart on this and it includes MHAA. He shared that

the intent of that was to see how much administrative costs were spent on a year-to-year basis and to know if there is any carryover. These details are important for deciding whether or not we should support the operating percentage number outlined in the bill. He believes that there is not enough information provided in the memo.

Mr. Leshner asked to pause and reflect on 2-3 years ago when the Program was understaffed, running behind, and grants were distributed slowly. Those staff vacancies have been filled, and other changes have been made. He gave kudos to MHAA Program staff and appreciation for what full staffing has allowed the Program to accomplish.

Sec. Flora thanks Mr. Leshner for his thoughtful comment and asked if Ms. Delony could provide any additional information from the statute.

Ms. Delony clarified that the authorization for distributing \$300,000 to MHT to be awarded as non-capital historic preservation grants is in statute: DNR Article Section 5-903(a)1(ii).

Sec. Flora thanked her and said that the Authority has some homework to do. She personally wants to understand the statute better. She also reminded the group that the Program is in the middle of a strategic planning process. If there are concerns or issues they should be brought up as part of that process so that the recommendations that evolve from the process can help the Program continue to improve and evolve. She expressed some concerns herself that the group is getting out in front of the process, which she thoroughly believes in. Many of these topics have been brought up and she is looking forward to that discussion later in the agenda. She asked if Ms. Hofstedt had any additional updates as part of the management report.

Ms. Hofstedt shared that we are in the process of adding new members to the MHAA Grants Review Panel for the FY26 grant round. The application/nomination form closes January 10 so if anyone has recommendations, please send their names to Program staff or encourage folks to apply.

Sec. Flora emphasized how the Grants Review Panel is an amazing group that reflects and represents Maryland constituents and professionals.

Member Announcements/New Business

Before moving into the strategic planning update, Sec. Flora asked the group if there was any new business, member announcements, or additional discussion items. There were none.

Strategic Planning Session with Due East

Due East Partners provided a strategic planning update, presented by Bess Langbein via a PowerPoint slideshow. Information included a review of roles and responsibilities, input gathered to date, a draft framework, key insights, and a definition of the Program. There was

conversation about how the different stakeholders are defined and the nomenclature used when referring to the Program vs. MHAA. For the purposes of the strategic planning process and moving forward, we are making a point to only use MHAA when referring to the Authority, and state level staff as Program staff. This will help clarify roles.

Mr. Redding asked for clarification on if MHAA was an independent unit of government and if that should be included in the definition of the Program.

Ms. Hofstedt confirmed that the Authority is an independent unit of government that is under MDP. The Authority oversees the Program which is housed and administered within MHT. The definition provided is articulating how we define the Program, not the Authority.

Ms. Chabot stated that she felt the heritage areas were the Program and found the definition confusing.

Ms. Langbein clarified that the strategic plan that is being developed is for the state level Program, but it will be implemented in conjunction with the heritage areas.

Ms. Chabot stated again that she felt the management entities are the Program.

Ms. Hofstedt pointed out that one of the activities of the Program is certifying heritage areas and that they cannot certify themselves.

Mr. Redding asked for further clarification on who the strategic plan is for.

Ms. Langbein confirmed that we are creating a strategic plan for state level Program staff that will be governed by the Authority. As independent management entities, we are not creating a plan for the heritage areas. The plan is informing the work of state level staff.

Ms. Langbein went on to go over roles and responsibilities and primary constituent groups of MHAA, MHT, Program staff, and the heritage areas. DEIA commitment and definitions were also addressed.

The draft strategic framework was presented: Vision, Purpose, Priorities, and Results. Guiding principles and clear measures are also in development.

A review of the constituents that have been engaged for input and the following key insights were presented.

- Expand the focus and extend reach and impact through grantmaking
- Prioritize partnerships
- Boost the Program's brand and awareness
- Strengthen the core structure to enhance efficiency and effectiveness

There was conversation about the suggestion to develop renewable collaborative agreements with heritage area management entities that would provide a new, hopefully more efficient, format for providing them with management, marketing, and block funding that would be aligned with their action plans that get approved by the Authority. The agreements could be 3 or 5 years and would articulate expected roles and activities of the state staff and the heritage areas. Task agreements could be tied to agreements to help move funding more quickly. Renewals would be based on evaluations that would be conducted at the end of each agreement's term.

After some questions about how the strategies will be prioritized, Ms. Langbein shared that the final draft of the strategic plan will go in front of the Authority for approval in April. We are not making any decision today. All of the strategies will be included, and they will be presented in a priority order that will be determined collaboratively.

Ms. Chabot stated that she feels strengthening the core structure is the most important thing so all of the other things can be carried out.

Ms. Langbein confirmed that the draft plan will be field tested, to include Authority members, before April.

Sec. Flora emphasized the difference between a strategic plan (direction, vision, strategy) and an implementation plan (who, how, when of recommendations). She asked Due East to consider if prioritization is appropriate in the strategic plan vs. approving a set of recommendations that can then be used as part of an implementation or action plan. For this 7-year plan prioritizing everything vs. figuring out a timeline may be a different process.

Ms. Chabot shared she has been in different roles with the Program over the years and she sees a lingering struggle or push/pull between Coalition, Program staff, and Authority to some degree. She feels she does not have the same communication and participation as state employees. This is a great Program that can be improved moving forward with more coordination.

Ms. Langbein said we will make sure there are more opportunities for all members of the Authority to participate over the next few months and feel more engaged.

Mr. Redding said he agrees with Ms. Chabot and sees the great work of heritage areas in the field and feels the Authority doesn't get enough feedback from the heritage areas in these meetings. He understands that the state staff is administering the Program, but he has often felt that the heritage areas should be more front and center. The Authority should be able to comment more as well as take in more feedback from the heritage areas.

Since Ms. Langbein was facilitating this conversation Sec. Flora was able to comment that as Chair, she facilitates the Authority as a governing board that has fiduciary responsibility. She takes that role very seriously ensuring the role of the Authority is as any board of directors in governing. In the end the Authority has to vote on a strategic plan that informs the governance of this work. She hopes that with the amount of outreach that has been undertaken that everyone would feel, if they've chosen, to have their voice heard. We are now synthesizing and digesting all of the information with the goal of pulling it all together to be voted on at the April meeting. If that is not possible it could be extended to the next meeting. We should do whatever is needed to understand the issues that have come up and have additional conversations. It is concerning that people believe we are in a push/pull, she believes relationships have been quite strong. The strategic planning process was intended to strengthen those connections and have constructive conversations. She believes the process has been robust and the Authority still has a job to do as a governing body.

Ms. Harms shared that she felt the heritage areas are the boots on the ground and that their voices should be paramount in what we do. If there is an issue with them not feeling heard we should address that immediately.

Ms. Langbein shared that the heritage areas have been generous with their time through two-hour long interviews, surveys, and various Coalition meetings, but wants to hear if they feel like they have not been heard.

Ms. Walker commented that she feels further discussion is needed and appreciates all of the comments made.

Mr. Redding, regarding streamlining grant application review under key insights. Prefers the word simplifying and looking for ways to make it more efficient.

Next steps with the strategic planning process are to meet with the executive committee and go into field testing. The goal with these meetings is to strengthen the plan and relationships. The plan will be refined based on this feedback and, if ready, presented to the Authority in April.

Ms. Harms asked about what markers there will be for achievement?

Ms. Langbein confirmed that there will be quantitative performance measures that Program staff will be accountable for in implementing the strategies. Those performance measures will be used by Program staff to report back to Authority. The implementation plan will be a staff driven process that will be part of the plan.

Mr. Campbell noted the robust schedule of the plan and asked if we need more time to move through the process.

Sec. Flora stated that we will take as long as everyone needs but have to keep the timing of our contract with Due East in mind. Part of the reasoning behind the schedule was to ensure we have outcomes in time for the next legislative session and adequate time going into the next budget round. Getting everyone on board is good but we also need to align with FY27 and session 2026.

Maryland Heritage Areas Coalition Report

Ms. Walker expressed her surprise to note the level of surprise by MDP, MHT, and MHAA Program staff in a previously held meeting about SB16 in addition to the concerns in today's meeting that the legislation is premature or that they are, in some way, jumping ahead of the strategic planning process. The Coalition only intends to support and promote what this Program can be and already is, just like the Authority, Sec. Flora, and the Program staff.

Ms. Walker shared that they have been holding discussions for many months about the possibility of raising the amount of funding which is much needed for the Program. She also highlighted the importance of momentum and shared that the Coalition originally considered requesting funding for a study in this legislative year. Specific legislators have expressed a desire for a bill to proceed and the Coalition is grateful for their interest and enthusiasm and for them looking at this Program as a solution for some of the problems Maryland is facing. The Coalition has been speaking with Program Open Space and Partners Open Space and is trying to be very clear about where they are and where they stand.

Ms. Walker clarified that SB16 is not technically the Coalition's bill; it is a legislator-driven initiative that went from two legislators pre-filing the bill. The Coalition admits that there are corrections needed and that they do want input to ensure it is a good piece of legislation for everyone. Now that the Washington County delegation is interested in filing the next version of this bill, the Coalition is interested to know what is needed from everyone's perspective. This is not a Coalition bill, it is something the Coalition is supporting and advocating for the bill.

Ms. Walker believes that more funding for the Program would allow the strategic planning process to be even more successful and it is not intended to be in front of or block those efforts that have been very deliberate and thoughtful. The Coalition is concerned that they may not be expressing the great enthusiasm that this Program has statewide. She believes that even in a difficult budget year, increasing special funds into the Program helps to protect Program Open Space by keeping it in Program Open Space. The MHAA Program is a byline in Program Open Space and they were very deliberate to not in any way attach to the percentage. This is validated by the amount of grant requests that go unfunded every year and the amount of money needed to have a real impact in capital, programmatic, and management grants. Looking to build sustainability of the Program and be in partnership even more. Do not wish adversarial

relationship regarding what the Coalition sees as a positive response to getting more funding in a difficult year. Funding is not guaranteed, if it does not pass then worst that happens is we show need and impact and are more engaged with legislators. Lucille has been speaking with the Coalition extensively and for the Coalition, and they are in agreement that this is a positive approach for everyone. Coalition is enthusiast to be going after this boost for the Program and does not wish to usurp the Authority's decision making. Do not feel things are premature but striking while the iron is hot. Want to work in concert so no one is left behind in conversation.

Ms. Carty added that there is precedence for a funding increase and referenced the African American Heritage Preservation Program (AAHPP) whose funding was raised from \$1 to \$5 million two years ago. From this, we know that Maryland is supportive of preservation and the work that the heritage areas do. The Governor and the administration have expressed that they are supportive of the work that the heritage areas do.

Ms. Walker invited the Authority, Sec. Flora, and Program staff to have discussions about the legislation. The Coalition will be busy throughout the legislative session explaining why the need and why now. As soon as the new language and new draft is ready, it will be shared in terms of what is moving forward and how it can be implemented.

Ms. Carty added that this is why the Coalition is asking about the administrative costs; because they have to have answers when legislators ask them specific questions. Just like each heritage area has to be accountable and transparent in their financial aspects.

Ms. Walker stated that the suggested change to 7% in operating funds for Program administration that is currently in SB16 came from the legislators themselves. The Coalition would be happy to defend the existing 10%, but need more insight into what is needed to be able to explain to legislators.

Sec. Flora thanked Ms. Walker and Ms. Carty and asked Ms. Cox to please introduce herself to the Authority.

Ms. Cox greeted the Authority and gave a brief overview of her background. She is excited to be in this role and looks forward to getting to know the Authority.

The following heritage areas shared updates with the Authority: Southern Maryland National Heritage Area (Lucille Walker), Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area (Emily Huebner), Anacostia Trails Heritage Area (Meg Baco)

Adjourn

Sec. Flora thanked the Authority and Coalition for their hard work. She called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Redding made a motion and it was seconded by Mr. Leshner. The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 PM.