

**Lessard - Sams Outdoor Heritage Council**  
**Meeting Summary**  
June 7, 2011

**Members Present:**

|                        |                     |                  |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Jim Cox                | Jane Kingston       | Scott Rall       |
| Chair David Hartwell   | Rep. Leon Lillie    | Sen. Tom Saxhaug |
| Sen. Bill Ingebrigtsen | Rep. Denny McNamara | Ron Schara       |

**Members Absent:**

|              |            |             |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Ryan Bronson | Les Bensch | Wayne Enger |
|--------------|------------|-------------|

**Call to order:** Call to order at 9:11 a.m. A quorum was present.

**Recognition of Past Council Members**

Chair Hartwell and members recognized the service of Mike Kilgore, Darby Nelson and Rep. Bob Gunther. Other past members, Rep. Rick Hansen, Sen. Ellen Anderson, Sen. Lisa Fobbe, and Bob Schroeder will receive their recognition plaques in the mail.

**Review and approve agenda:** Motion by J. Kingston to approve the agenda. Motion adopted.

**Review and Approve Minutes: March 18, 2011**

Motion by Senator Ingebrigtsen to approve the minutes. Motion adopted.

**Executive Director's Report (5:03)**

Mr. Becker provided the following update: 1) Staff continue to receive amendments to accomplishment plans most of which are minor changes and parcel substitution. 2) Staff will be meeting tomorrow with the contractor who is completing an analysis of a back office system for an inclusion in a full RFP. The cost of this system analysis is under \$5,000. The contract for coding the system could exceed \$50,000. 3) The 2009 recommendations are concluding and Legacy signage will be posted soon. Billings continue to come in to the DNR for reimbursement. 4) The Legislative Auditor report on the Legacy Funds is due in August. The auditor's office will give us an update on that process at the June 21st meeting. Members were given an invitation to a roundtable the auditor is holding to receive information on the accountability of the funds. 5) The Council may approve accomplishment reports at June 21 meeting, otherwise August 23rd is the next opportunity unless a meeting is added. Members discussed this and decided on approving them with approval effective contingent on the bill passing at the June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. 6) Members received an Outdoor Heritage Fund Annual Report in the mail and it is posted on the web as well. It shows the funding history and will be updated annually. 7) A draft Communication Plan was received and staff will continue to work on that.

**Post-Session Review (23:01)**

Mr. Becker stated that there was not much to report as bills pertinent to the Council's work were not enacted into law. Once the bills have been executed, staff will assemble a summary for members. Legislative members offered a review of the Legacy bill during session and reasons why it didn't pass in the final moments of the session. Members also discussed the open meeting law, reasons why it was first put into 97A.056, and the differing legislative views on it.

**Members report any Conflict of Interest on Today's Agenda (44:23)**

No conflicts were reported.

**Action: Conservation Partners Grants Committee Status (44:52)**

Mr. Becker gave the background on the consideration of appointing a CPL members liaison rather than having the subcommittee in existence.

Motion by R. Schara to abolish the Council's Conservation Partners Subcommittee and replace it with a Conservation Partners Grant Program Liaison; require staff to draft an amendment to the operating procedure implementing the above action for Council consideration at its next meeting; and temporarily appoint Scott Rall as Conservation Partners Program Liaison pending adoption of revised Council Operating Procedures." Motion passed.

### **Update: Agenda for June 21 Issues Seminar (55:07)**

Ms. Koop reviewed the June 21<sup>st</sup> agenda stating that it was based on a survey of members on the topics of importance. She reviewed the roundtable topics and the information each presenter will provide.

### **Presentation (1:08:30)**

Steve Chaplin, The Nature Conservancy; Bill Penning, DNR; and Kevin Lines, BWSR presented the "Prairie Plan" the work of the Prairie Plan Collaborative and answered questions posed by members.

### **Update: Process for Ranking Proposals (2:23:51)**

Mr. Becker reviewed the process used in the past. Members concurred to use the same process as used in the past.

### **Decision: Finalize FY13 Call for Funding Request (2:39:34)**

Judy Grew, MMB, Management Analysis and Development facilitated this portion of the meeting. She gave background and context to the planning process. Members reviewed the different section of the Call for Funding Request and discussed the following changes.

#### Statewide Strategic Issues

##### Issue 1 – Aquatic Invasive species

- Long terms approaches are preferred.
- It is understood that the OHF is not the primary source of money.
- There is some willingness to fund more or less permanent or innovative strategies.
- Research on this may be better suited to the Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund statutory uses.

**Change:** under statewide Priority Criteria, "8. Address wildlife species of greatest conservation need, Minnesota County Biological Survey data, and rare, threatened endangered species inventories in land and water decisions, as well as permanent solutions to aquatic invasive species."

##### Issue 2 – Level of restoration/enhancement verses protection/acquisition

- Council does not support a moratorium on land acquisition.
- The council should be sensitive to concerns about public land purchases while making its allocations.
- More information needed on PILT and other economic effects of land acquisition. The Council would be willing study this issue within our administrative budget. There were studies funded within other legislation [possibly budget bills passed during a special session may fund studies.]

##### Issue 3 – Wildlife benefits associated with water retention projects

- We would consider the wildlife management aspect of these projects, and would also review the overall management plan.
- Water retention projects are already considered - #2 in the criteria states that we are looking for projects with multiple benefits – therefore, no change to the Call for Requests is needed.

##### Easements Issue – S. Rall

- Concerns about proposers having a cost effective plan for purchase of easements. We need to know how the easement compares with the fair market value of the land.
- Amend the project requirements – an easement proposal must state the easement acquisition cost compared to fee title acquisition, for a cost effectiveness comparison.

**Change:** under proposal requirements, add "20. Proposal must show, if applicable, the easement costs as a percentage of fee acquisition costs for each parcel."

## Sections Specific Changes

### Issue 1 – Metro/Urban balance

- No special weighting of Metro/Urbanizing proposals is called for in the Call for Requests. Members should consider geographic balance when allocating funds.
- We want to see the whole legacy package sorted by region – the whole legacy package might look different when you look at the other sources of funding besides outdoor heritage.
- We nevertheless need to be sensitive to and cognizant of metro area concerns and should be looking at the distribution while making allocations.

### Issue 2 – Water quality measures in Metro/Urbanizing section

- Concern over water quality measures – there was some discussion on adding a mention of this specifically. After discussion and review of the Metro Section priorities, members believed that this was included in priority #4 – no change necessary.

### Issue 3 – Improve degraded watersheds and make more specific the reference to habitat experiencing decline in the Northern Forest section

- Change the wording of priority action #2 so that it places greater emphasis on obtaining access to landlocked public properties.  
**Change:** in Northern Forest section, ~~2. Protect forest land through acquisition or easement, to prevent parcelization and fragmentation and to provide the ability to access and manage landlocked public properties.~~  
2. Provide access to manage habitat on landlocked public properties or protect forest land from parcelization and fragmentation through fee acquisition, conservation or access easement.

It is understood that “access” can’t be funded in and of itself (advice by Greg Knopf). However, if a restoration or enhancement project is happening on a landlocked piece of property, we need to consider access roads so that people other than the adjacent landowners can access the land.

- Add a mention of watersheds to priority action #1  
**Change:** in Northern Forest section, “1. Protect shoreland and watersheds to restore or enhance critical habitat on wild rice lakes, shallow lakes, cold water lakes, streams and rivers, and spawning areas.”

## Operational Issues

Chair Hartwell asked members if they would like to continue with the DNR administering the CPL program or include that in the Call for Funding Request and put it out for bid. S. Rall said that the recent discussion with DNR have been good and he is seeing steps taken to bring the program closer to what they had originally envisioned and recommended that it continue with the DNR and given the opportunity to see some different operational results.

## Overall/universal items

- Mention to proposers that priorities are *not* in order preference within the section-specific listings
- There was some discussion as to whether they should be put in priority order in the future – the general sense was that this would make the application scoring very complex

## Items that were considered, but dropped

- There was a proposal to remove statewide priority #5 (urgency of action) because some saw it as redundant with other priorities. However, other members noted that they liked having it there. Proposal was withdrawn
- Staff pointed out that Example Outcomes have been added to the Call and requests will be expected to contain a discussion of outcomes of the OHF investment

Decision on Call for Request

Members adopted the Call for Funding request with the changes discussed. Staff will review the final changes with Chair and Vice-Chair prior to issue on June 13<sup>th</sup>. Members also concurred with including the examples of outcomes measures related to each section vision and priority.

**Opportunity for Public to Address the Council**

none

**Adjournment (5:21:55)**

The meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

APPROVED:

---

David Hartwell, Chair

Date