Minutes of a Meeting of the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board
Held on January 13 and 14, 2014 at 8:00 a.m.
Department of Mineral Resources Conference Room
1000 East Calgary Avenue
Bismarck, ND

DRAFT

Present: Wade Moser, OHF Advisory Board Chairman
Eric Aasmundstad, OHF Advisory Board
Randy Bina, OHF Advisory Board
Carolyn Godfread, OHF Advisory Board
Jon Godfread, OHF Advisory Board
Blaine Hoffman, OHF Advisory Board
Tom Hutchens, OHF Advisory Board
Bob Kuylen, OHF Advisory Board
Jim Melchior, OHF Advisory Board
Patricia Stockdill, OHF Advisory Board
Dan Wogsland, OHF Advisory Board
Larry Kotchman, OHF Advisory Board
Terry Steinwand, OHF Advisory Board
Rhonda Vetsch, OHF Advisory Board
Mark Zimmerman, OHF Advisory Board

Also Present: A list is available in the Commission files

Chairman Moser called the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board ("Board") meeting to order with a quorum being present.

Chairman Moser asked if there were an additions or deletions to the agenda. There were none.

Chairman Moser indicated that the October 17, 2013 meeting minutes were being distributed this morning. He asked that the Board members take the minutes with them this evening and then the Board will take them up for consideration tomorrow.

Ms. Karlene Fine, Industrial Commission Executive Director and Secretary, presented the Outdoor Heritage Fund Financial Report as of November 30, 2013 as follows:

Outdoor Heritage Fund (294)
Financial Statement
2013-2015 Biennium
January 13/14, 2014 OHF Advisory Board Meeting

	Cash Balance
July 1, 2013 Balance	$ 0.00
Interest Revenue through November 30, 2013	$ 138.55
Revenues through November 30, 2013	$ 3,286,997.74
Grant Expenditures through November 30, 2013	$ (000,000.00)
Administrative Expenditures through November 30, 2013	$ 1,254.95)
	$ 3,285,881.34
Outstanding Project Commitments as of November 30, 2013	$ (000,000.00)
Balance	**$ 3,285,881.34**

Outdoor Heritage Fund
Continuing Appropriation Authority
2013-2015 Biennium

Uncommitted Balance July 1, 2013	$ 000.00
Interest Revenue	$ 20,000.00
Revenues Fiscal Year 2014	$15,000,000.00
Revenues Fiscal Year 2015	$15,000,000.00
	$30,020,000.00
Administration Expenditures	$ (300,000.00)
Project Commitments 2013-2015	$ (000.00)
Available Funding	**$29,720,000.00**

54-17.8-02 North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund – Continuing appropriation
There is created a North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund that is governed by the Commission. Any money deposited in the Fund is appropriated on a continuing basis to the Commission for the purposes of this chapter. Interest earned by the Fund must be credited to the Fund. The Commission shall keep accurate records of all financial transactions performed under this chapter.

57-51-15(d). Outdoor Heritage Fund - Deposits.
First the tax revenue collected under this chapter equal to one percent of the gross value at the well of the oil and one-fifth of the tax on gas must be deposited with the State Treasurer who shall: ...

(d) Credit four percent of the amount available under this subsection to the North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund, but not in an amount exceeding fifteen million dollars in a state fiscal year and not in an amount exceeding thirty million dollars per biennium;

Mr. Moser indicated that Representative Todd Porter has been delayed and this agenda item will be taken up when he arrives. Mr. Moser stated that after visiting with Board members he had learned that there was an interest in hearing more about legislative intent in regards to the Outdoor Heritage Fund. Based on those comments he had invited Rep. Porter as the primary sponsor of the legislation to the meeting to provide background information regarding legislative intent.

Mr. Moser provided an overview of the process he is recommending. Every proposal will be given 10 minutes for a presentation followed by a time for questions. The questions should be for clarification purposes and not for a discussion on the merits of the proposal. The discussion on the merits of the proposal will take place after all the presentations have been made. He encouraged the Board members to be working on their scoring sheets as the presentations are made. Another tally sheet has been provided where each Board member will include their scores and their recommended funding level. If there are some items in the proposal that do not qualify for some reason please note those and subtract them from the recommended funding level. If, in your opinion, the proposal does not meet the criteria for the Fund then insert a zero for your funding level. He stated that if there are six or more Board members recommending zero funding then that proposal will not be receiving a majority vote. Those proposals will be combined together for one vote -- a type of consent agenda vote. If a Board member wishes to pull a proposal off of that list and have additional discussion for a particular project that will be allowed.

In response to a question, Mr. Moser said there would be an opportunity after all the presentations have been made to have a discussion about each project prior to the Board members being asked to determine their funding amount.

Mr. Moser also noted that in the Board members' packets are "white papers" on issues that were identified when the Technical Committee was dealing with questions from the Board members. These were issues that weren't really technical but more policy issues. He suggested that the Board keep these in mind when they have the discussion with Rep. Porter. As the Board goes through this process and discusses the proposals tomorrow the Board will be setting some precedent without an actual policy. At the end of the meeting we will set another meeting date prior to the IC meeting in order to make recommendations for policy. This first round the Board wanted to leave it wide open and take all applications but now after seeing the applications the Board needs to make some recommendations to the Commission regarding parameters for applications. The Industrial Commission has to set that policy but the Board can make recommendations.

Mr. Moser noted that any application that is not funded in Grant Round 1 can modify their application and reapply--if their project still falls within the parameters for the program.

Ms. Fine asked that if any Board member has a conflict of interest they fill out the form and turn it in to her before the end of the day.

In response to a question, Ms. Fine reviewed the disbursement process for applicants receiving their funding. She indicated that if a project is not being completed as outlined in the contract, the Commission can cancel that contract and the funding that had been set aside for that project will be made available for other projects. She stated that if the entity disagrees with the cancelation they can contact the Industrial Commission. In regards to the other Commission programs this has not been an issue. In regards to the projects that will be funded over more than the current biennium, Ms. Fine stated that because this is a new program it is her recommendation that all the funding awarded at this time be allocated to the first $30 million even though it would be disbursed over future biennia. That could change in the future as the program has been through at least one more legislative session, but for right now that is how she is allocating the dollars.

In response to a question, Mr. Moser stated that if it appears that the project application could be broken down in phases the Board could recommend that only the first phase of a project be funded.

There was discussion regarding setting a funding target amount for this Grant Round 1 before the Board started hearing presentations. The discussion ranged from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000 with the number of other Grant Rounds already scheduled for later in the biennium (April 1, August 1 and November 1 and April 1, 2015). **It was moved by Dr. Hutchens and seconded by Mr. Bina that the target amount for Grant Round 1 be set at $8,000,000.** The suggestion was made to delay a vote until after the discussion with Rep. Porter.

The Board then heard presentations on the following applications:

001-SSS – Measurable and Sustainable Agricultural, Economic, Watershed and Wildlife Impacts with Cover Crops Along the 49th Parallel – Northern Plains Resource Conservation and Development Council - $494,000 - Directive B - Presentation made by Paul Overby. Mr.

Overby's slides are available in the Commission files. It was clarified that no monies awarded by the Industrial Commission will be used in Manitoba.

001-P – Implementing a Holistic Approach to Rangeland Management and Land Conservation through Mentoring and Education – ND Grazing Lands Coalition - $430,818 - Directive B - Presentation made by Josh Dukart. Mr. Dukart's slides are available in the Commission files.

001-J – Antelope Creek Wild Rice Corridor Watershed Restoration Project – Richland Soil Conservation District - $220,000 - Directive B - Presentation made by Jennifer Klostreich. Ms. Klostreich distributed a handout that is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Ms. Klostreich stated that the breakdown of funding would consist of 50% from Section 319 funding, 40% would be Outdoor Heritage Funding and 10% would be the responsibility of the landowner. She clarified that the District has two years left of their Section 319 grant and will be applying for more funding for subsequent years. In response to a question she discussed the type of monitoring they will be doing in regards to suspended solids in the water.

001-N – Ransom County Water Quality Improvement Project – Ransom County Soil Conservation District - $450,000 - Directive B - Presentation made by Chris Nannenga. Mr. Nannenga's slides are available in the Commission files. In response to a question Mr. Nannenga indicated that the five producers have been identified and these practices are ready to be implemented. In response to a question, Mr. Nannenga stated that he is working with the Health Department on the monitoring as well as other watersheds. In response to a question Mr. Nannenga stated that producer would be providing 10% of the costs. He also indicated that they have Section 319 funding for one more year and then they will be applying for additional funding.

001-QQQ – Perennial Grass Establishment with Grazing Plan – Stutsman County Soil Conservation District - $31,915 - Directive B - Presentation by Ryan Odenbach. Mr. Odenbach provided an updated budget form reflecting that the entire cost of the project is $117,022.40 but the amount being requested from the Outdoor Heritage Fund did not change. He also presented a PowerPoint presentation. Both of these items are available in the Commission files. It was clarified that this is a demonstration project for 3 years. It was stated that this was a regeneration of CRP acreage.

001-A – Sheyenne River Sedimentation Reduction Project – Barnes County Soil Conservation District - $200,000 – Directive B - Presentation by Lori Frank. Ms. Frank presented a PowerPoint presentation. A copy of the presentation is available in the Commission files. She stated that the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars will be used for only putting best management practices on the ground. She noted that she has received her Section 319 funding in the amount of $305,000. The producer is responsible for 40%. She noted that what is being proposed will mirror the Section 319 funding. In response to a question Ms. Frank stated that the producers come to their offices because they want to implement best management practices and need some financial assistance to get them started. They want to make changes. For that reason she believes they will continue to implement those practices even after the funding is no longer made available to them. In response to a question, Ms. Frank stated that the District Health Units are the regulatory bodies that oversee septic systems in rural areas.

Representative Todd Porter joined the meeting at this time for a discussion on legislative intent regarding the Outdoor Heritage Fund legislation. He indicated that he is watching the work of

the Board and has reviewed all the applications that were submitted. He stated that in the legislative discussions they had anticipated "boots on the ground" types of projects rather than research and development projects. He also stated that they had hoped there would be shovel ready projects with the applicant bringing a cost share from the sponsoring organization.

Representative Porter also stated that in reviewing the projects he had noted there were a number of projects that funded staffing. Again this was not something that legislators had anticipated--the intent of the Fund was for dirt ready projects that would enhance the outdoors and not fund staffing for agencies and organizations. He also noted that he didn't believe the paving of roads was a role for this group; there are other funds for that purpose. He also stressed the importance of the applicants bringing something to the project -- if they have money in the project the better the project will be.

Representative Porter also stated that when the Board looked at equipment they should be sure they understand what happens to the equipment after the project is complete and also if there is any liability associated with owning equipment.

In response to a question, Rep. Porter stated that when you are improving and maintaining water quality for agriculture and farming there is also an overall good impact for the outdoors. Enhancements will benefit nesting coverage and food plots for habitat. He had noted that there was one project that had rotational grazing on public lands and thought that would be a benefit to the land as well as to the hunters who would have access to that land. He saw that as a positive in building on the resources the State already has and improving it for the good of the rancher who is leasing the land as well as the hunter who will have access to the land

In response to a specific question about urban parks and playground equipment he stated that the legislators did not have in-depth discussions about those particular points. He personally would not fund the equipment but that is an issue for the Board--they are the experts and will need to make those tough decisions and balance that with the level of participation from the sponsoring entity. He suggested that the Board needs to keep the big picture in mind when looking at the applications.

He thanked the Board for the work they were doing and indicated they were the experts that the State is relying on to be the gatekeepers of the Fund. He indicated that they were laying the groundwork for this Program and making a difference for the future with our outdoor heritage.

Mr. Moser thanked Representative Porter for taking the time to come and visit with the Board. The Board then went back to their agenda and continued with the presentations. It was indicated that consideration of the pending motion would take place later in the day.

001-R – Valley City Riverfront Greenway and Restoration Project – City of Valley City - $1,863,500 - Directive A - Presentation was made by Mary Lee Nielson, a City Commissioner and Marketing Coordinator for the Sheyenne River Valley National Scenic Byway. Ms. Nielson's presentation and handouts are available in the Commission files. She recognized Senator Robinson was at the meeting and expressed her thanks for his support for their project. She noted that their project has 3 areas and it was their recommendation that priority be given to Area 2 (approximately one lot deep from the river and four blocks long) in the amount of $595,000 with the Outdoor Heritage Fund portion being $523,500. In response to a question, Ms.

Nielson stated that their goal is to have the flood protection in place by 2020. She did note that their proposal is for recreation items that will be on the wet side of the flood control.

001-VV – ND Statewide Conservation Tree Planting Initiative – ND Association of Soil Conservation Districts - $2,500,000 - Directive B. A presentation was given by Dawn Martin. A copy of her slides is available in the Commission files. She played two public service announcements that their association is now airing regarding tree planting. She also distributed a handout that is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Ms. Martin stated that they would be following NRCS specifications for tree plantings - farmstead windbreaks, feed lot windbreaks, wildlife and riparian plantings and living snow fences. Statewide for tree plantings; 3 year planting cycle; a 10-year agreement with the producer. Will require a 40% cost share of the landowner. In response to a specific question she stated that this is above and beyond the funding the soil conservation districts get from the EQIP program.

001-III – Food Barley – Adding Value & Diversity to Western ND Farms – ND Barley Council - $193,850 - Directive B - Presentation was made by Greg Kessel and Dr. Christine Fastnaught. A copy of their slides is available in the Commission files. Dr. Fastnaught distributed samples of barley. There was discussion about the royalties that were mentioned in the proposal. It was indicated that should this project be funded this would be an area that needed to be looked at. It was clarified that Phoenix Seeds is a North Dakota company. In response to a question, Mr. Kessel provided an update on what is happening nationally on food barley. In response to a question, it was indicated that some of the funding would be used for the test plots in Arizona.

001-L – Winter Cereals Sustainability in Action – Ducks Unlimited, Inc. - $3,000,000 – Directive B- Presentation by Blake Vander Vorst - A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files. Mr. Wogsland indicated that the North Dakota Grain Growers is not a non-cash or in-kind supporter of the grant. In response to a question, Mr. Vander Vorst indicated that their organization is spending $2,000,000 a year on the expanded program in North Dakota although with the ground work they have done with their partners they will be able to drop that to $1,500,000 a year in the future.

The Board took up the pending motion regarding the motion to establish a target amount for Grant Round 1. In response to a question on the forecast of funding that will be available this biennium, Ms. Fine stated that there has not been an official revision to the forecast --that is done in July -- but based on the monies that have been coming in she thought the number might be in the $21 to $25 million range. It was pointed out that if an $8,000,000 cap is adopted it does not mean that the Board had to spend $8,000,000.

Mr. Wogsland stated that he would resist the motion as he did not think it was appropriate to tie the Board to an arbitrary number. He suggested that by setting a number we limit the Board's ability to get this program up and running. There was discussion about being flexible and focus on the quality of the applications.

After discussion **it was moved by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Reierson that the motion be tabled until Tuesday afternoon. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.**

The Board took a five minute break before resuming the presentations.

001-Z – Maah Daah Hey Trail Administrator – Maah Daah Hey Trail Association - $286,606 – Directive A - Presentation was given by Don Mayer, President of the Maah Daah Hey Trail Association. In response to a question as to partial funding on a decreasing basis, Mr. Mayer said he hoped they would be able to maintain that person by obtaining additional funding from other sources. In response to a question, Mr. Mayer indicated that the Forest Service does have a Trail Coordinator position but the duties of that position are focused on other issues and based out of Bismarck.

001-F – Outdoor Adventures Initiative 2014 – The Outdoor Adventure Foundation Inc. - $25,000 – Directive A - Presentation was given by Curtis Kenner.

001-DD – 2013 Paving Project, McKenzie Bay Recreation Area – Watford City Park Board - $340,000 – Directive A - Presentation was given by Keith Backes - Mr. Backes provided a handout which is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Mr. Backes indicated that they do not charge a fee for use of the boat ramp.

001-V – Project LL Paving – Williams County Water Resources District - $933,500 – Directive A - Presentation was given by Jim Torgerson - A copy of the handout he provided is available in the Commission files.

001-LLL – Schatz Point South Side Boat Ramp – Tri-Cities Joint JDA at Lake Tschida - $39,393 - Directive A - Presentation was given by Michelle Psyck and Steven Schadler. Copies of their handouts are available in the Commission files. In response to questions, they indicated that they currently have 8 boat ramps (open to the public) with 5 of them being used all the time and they also have the ability to maintain the facilities.

001-HH – Spring Creek & Iglehart Subdivision's Concrete Boat Ramp (Spring Creek Landing) – Heart & Lung Clinic Foundation - $471,295 – Directive A - Presentation given by Jeff Stamaris, Karen Hagel and Doug Doerr. Copies of their presentations are available in the Commission files. In response to a question it was indicated that they have 140 members of the Spring Creek Subdivision.

001-UU – Riverside Park Enhancement Project – City of Washburn - $756,616 – Directive A - Presentation given by Milissa Price. Copies of her presentation are available in the Commission files. She noted that their priority would be to fund Priority A. In response to a question, Ms. Price stated that they have sought out other funding for the portions of the project that they have already done. She noted that once the street is paved it will become part of the City infrastructure and will be maintained by the City.

001-KKK – Devils Lake Winter Ice Fishing Trail System – Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce - $49,850 - Directive A - Presentation given by Suzie Kenner. Ms. Kenner distributed a one page handout which is available in the Commission files. She explained Woodland Resort, which is a private entity, does a trail system mainly for their guests at the resort and they had stated that in an average year they spend about $25,000 just maintaining that trail system on that portion of the lake. It is great the anglers are able to get out in that area but this proposal would cover a little more and accommodate the different areas where the fish are biting. In response to a question

regarding what the plan was to continue the funding if they received this grant, Ms. Kenner said they are currently looking for permanent funding for the winter lake access whether it be possibly doing something with gaming or if we can show a real need to other entities such as the City or the State Tourism Department. If the Chamber can show what the trail system is doing for us, it will help the Chamber get the needed funding. In response to a question Ms. Kenner stated they are just keeping up with their summer maintenance costs and were unable to divert any funds from summer maintenance for winter maintenance.

001-E – Tallgrass Prairie Seed Source Program – Save The Hens Foundation, Inc. - $1,294,800 – Directive A - Presentation given by John DeVries. Copies of his presentation are available in the Commission files. In response to a question Mr. DeVries indicated a small portion of the Outdoor Heritage Fund funding would be used for equipment. In response to a question Mr. DeVries stated that they are currently working with a political subdivision in the eastern part of the state regarding the distribution of the seed. He said it could also be used by any interested party -- as long as the recipient is committed to properly managing the tallgrass on a long term basis. He reviewed some of the management practices that needed to be implemented to maintain prairie tallgrasses. In response to some questions Mr. DeVries discussed the quantity of seed needed for certain acreage and also pointed out that some of the early maturing season seed, especially the pollinators, would be harvested by hand.

001-II – The Marcus Friskop Nature Center – Hankinson Public School - $297,850 – Directive B - Presentation given by Anne Biewer with the assistance of American Legion members--Dick Crooks and Arnie Althoff and another individual. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Ms. Biewer said the number of individuals that would use these facilities could be 1,000 to 2,000 on an annual basis.

The Board took a break for lunch and resumed the presentations at 1:30 p.m.

001-Q – Bowman County Conservation Grazing Project – Bowman County Weed Board - $14,085 – Directive B. Presentation given by Randy Gaebe and Cheryl Mandich. A copy of their presentation is available in the Commission files.

001-RR – Red River Riparian Project – Red River Regional Council - $358,792 – Directive B - Presentation given by Sarah Braaten Johnston. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission file. She spoke of the critical need for match funding to keep their water quality programs moving forward. In response to a question she indicated that the federal funding would be awarded if the Outdoor Heritage Funding is granted.

001-GG – Stump Lake Park Improvement – Nelson County Park Board - $20,000 - Directive D. Presentation was given by Mr. Odell Flaagen, Park Board Member. A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission file. In response to a question there was a brief discussion on the costs for the playground equipment and the tennis court.

001-LL – Aquatic Habitat Infrastructure Enhancement – Ducks Unlimited, Inc. - $800,000 - Directive C. Presentation was given by Rick Warhurst - A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question he indicated the costs on the private land would be in the $80,000 range. In response to a question he indicated that there are no encumbrances on the landowner - he has just asked us to repair his dam. All these projects are to

repair dams -- in the future they may be requesting funding for new stock dams. In response to a question he indicated that the maintenance of the dams is on public lands -- the public agency and on private lands it is the landowner. The agencies or the landowner sign a maintenance agreement for 30 years. In response to whether they have prioritized the five projects he said no although the private land project would probably be done first.

001-XX – Documenting Aquatic Organisms of ND Rivers – Valley City State University - $314,802 – Directive C - Presentation was made by Casey Williams.

001-OOO – Enhancing the Wildlife Value of Working and Public Lands in the Grand Forks Prairie Project Area through Demonstrated Land Management – University of North Dakota - $466,547 – Directive B - Presentation was given by Dr. Kathryn A. Yurkonis. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Dr. Yurkonis stated that it would take numerous "burns" over four years to properly prepare the lands for the grazing and fencing. (A quarter section would be burned each year--a rotation plan.) In response to a question Dr. Yurkonis stated that in regards to sustainability of the project they may be requesting additional funding in 2017 from the Outdoor Heritage Fund to continue the grazing program in four years. They need the OHF dollars to get the program going along with the $50,000 of funding from the University of North Dakota but hopefully they will be able to obtain the funding for the on-going administration of the project.

001-AAA – Enhanced Grazing Lands & Wildlife Habitat (Phase 1) – Ducks Unlimited, Inc. - $1,500,000 – Directive B - Presentation was given by Eric Lindstrom - A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Mr. Lindstrom stated that the management of the lands would be determined on an individual basis based on best management practices. In response to a question he clarified how the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars would be used in conjunction with NRCS funding. The OHF dollars would augment the funds that NRCS offers through EQIP. If NRCS runs out of funding for EQIP then the OHF dollars will be used to provide the incentive for the landowners to use the program.

001-DDD – Working Lands Partnership – N.D. Natural Resources Trust, Inc. - $3,750,000 – Directive B - Presentation was given by Terry Albee. A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a series of questions Mr. Albee discussed several aspects of the proposed program -- the type of acreage that would be eligible; public access to the lands; rental rates (cropland and rangeland); length of land agreements; and how projects would be ranked.

001-YY – ND 4-H Camp – ND 4-H Foundation - $143,596 - Directive D. The presentation was made by Duane Hauck. A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files.

The Board took a short break and reconvened at 3:20 p.m.

001-KK – Warwick Dam – Modification & Rehabilitation (State Water Commission Project No. 0240) – Eddy County Water District - $95,002 – Directive C. The presentation was made by Pete Larson. Copies of his presentation were distributed to the Board members and a copy is available in the Commission files. In response to questions, it was indicated that the type of fish passage feature being proposed works very well according to the Game and Fish Department although they can't say how long the feature will last; fish that utilize this type of passage are

northerns and walleyes; Eddy County Water District is able to pay approximately $40,000 so they need to find additional funding.

001-MM – Mt. Carmel Dam Recreation Area Bathhouse – Cavalier County Water Resource District - $50,000 – Directive D. The presentation was made by Kenneth Nelson. In response to a question Mr. Nelson indicated that they would use their user fees and, if necessary, borrow monies for the operation and maintenance of the bathhouse. In response to a question Mr. Nelson indicated that this is the only water recreation site in Cavalier County.

001-CC – Golden Ridge Neighborhood Community Garden – Golden Ridge Lutheran Church - $4,680 – Directive D. The presentation was made by Joan Bachman. She provided the Board with a handout and a copy is available in the Commission files. It was noted that there might be resources at the federal offices (NRCS and Department of Agriculture) and the State (Department of Agriculture) that would have funding for this type of application.

001-XXX – City of Munich Playground Equipment Fund – City of Munich - $45,000 - Directive D. The presentation was made by Terry Bibe, representing the City Park Board. He provided the Board with a handout and a copy is available in the Commission files. In response to a question regarding liability, Mr. Bina indicated that with other grant programs when an entity is awarded funding the playground equipment becomes the property of that entity and that entity assumes the liability as well as the maintenance. He noted that the pictures provided by Mr. Bibe show equipment that in the playground equipment industry would be classified as Class One hazards and should be removed immediately.

001-U – Old Settlers Sewer and Water Hookups – Ward County Park Board - $7,500 – Directive D. The presentation was made by Steve Fuegmann.

001-H – Minot to Velva Multi-Use Path Phase 1 – Ward County Park Board - $700,000 - Directive D. The presentation was made by Steve Fuegmann. In response to a question, Mr. Zimmerman indicated that the funding that comes through the State Parks and Recreation Department has been reduced over the years and there would not be sufficient funding available for this one project. In response to a question, Mr. Fuegmann stated that the trail Ward County has between Minot and Burlington is used by 50 to 100 individuals every day depending on the weather. He thought the usage on the proposed trail would be in the thousands--at least certain portions of the trail. He noted that individuals that have tried to ride bike on the highway in this area say it is very dangerous and an alternative is needed. He stated that other trail systems will hook into this trail. There was discussion about who would be responsible for doing the annual upkeep and maintenance and what type of maintenance would be needed. In response to a question Mr. Fuegmann stated that the Burlington Trail had been funded by the Ward County Highway Department. In response to a question Mr. Fuegmann stated that they could go back to the Department of Transportation for funding again but it becomes a challenge lining up all the different funding sources because the awarding of funds is done at different times of the year. There was discussion about the number of entities that are involved in the 27-mile trail project (this is only Phase 1) and the responsibility of each of those entities to find the funding to build their portions of the trail.

001-B – Community Outdoor Fitness Park – Minot Family YMCA - $50,000 – Directive D added Directive C. The presentation was made by Amy Moen. A copy of her presentation is

available in the Commission files. In response to a question Ms. Moen stated that the YMCA would be keeping ownership of the land. At this point in time the Minot Park Board does not have the time or resources to take on this project. In response to a question, Ms. Moen stated that this is the only park on the southwest side of the city. In response to a question, Ms. Moen stated that this project would be complete this summer--what remains to be done is the game court, the walking path and the planting of the trees and shrubs. The majority of the funding has been raised and it will be done. In response to a question Ms. Moen stated that the native species trees and shrubs would be purchased locally. The local entity that was awarded the bid has indicated they will guarantee the trees and the shrubs.

001-C – Wildlife Education & Recreation Center – Minot Indoor Rodeo, Inc. - $75,000 – Directive D - The presentation was made by Paul Kramer. He provided a handout and had a presentation - these materials are available in the Commission files. He noted that the project is under construction; they had secured a loan so it could move forward. Funding would be used to repay the loan.

001-SS – Centennial Park Woodland Trail & Souris River Recreational Access Plan – Minot Park District Foundation - $634,000 - Directive D. The presentation was made by Elly DesLauriers representing the Minot Park District and the Minot Park District Foundation. Ron Merritt was also in attendance and available to answer questions. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Ms. DesLauriers stated that KLJ had provided the quote for the dock system. It was noted that there may be other sources of funding such as the Game and Fish Department since this project includes wildlife trails and shore fishing.

Mr. Moser noted the following applications that did not have presentations today and asked if there were any questions from the Board members on these two projects:

001-K – Carrington CrossRoads Golf Course Shelter / Restroom – Carrington CrossRoads Golf Course - $13,000 - Directive D. The applicant was unable to make a presentation. It was noted that it is a nice golf course and is open to the public.

001-D – Nelson Lake West Side Boat Landing – Sporting Chance - $20,000 – Directive A - Unable to attend because of illness.

He noted that there were three applications that were not making presentations and reviewed what each of these applications included:
001-X - Rebuild the Tioga Pool - Tioga Park District - $750,000 - Directive D
001-PP - Tinta Tawa Park Pavement Renovations - $17,500 - Directive D
001-BB - Hankinson City Park Restroom Replacement & Playground - $26,750 - Directive D

An opportunity was given for public comment. No comments were made. Mr. Moser stated that because they were a little ahead of schedule as noted on the agenda if someone missed the opportunity to comment on today's applications they could come tomorrow and give their comments.

There was discussion on when the Board should discuss the policy issues (see white papers) and the comments made by Representative Porter. Decision was made to have that discussion after

all the applications have been heard. After that discussion has taken place then the Board would go back through all the applications and have discussion by the Board members. That will be followed by the completion of the worksheets and the voting on the projects. It was suggested that the Board members take the white papers with them this evening and make sure they have gone over them before tomorrow morning.

In response to a question, Ms. Fine stated that the scoring sheets must be kept--if the Board members did not want to maintain them they should turn them in to her at the end of the meeting and she will keep them for the required period of time.

Chairman Moser recessed the meeting for the evening.

Chairman Moser reconvened the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board at 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 14, 2014

It was moved by Bob Kuylen and seconded by Randy Bina that the October 17, 2013 meeting minutes be approved as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

001-TT – ND Game & Fish Department Outdoor Heritage Habitat Initiative – ND Game and Fish Department - $2,000,000 – Directive A. Presentation was made by Kevin Kading. A copy of his presentation and the handouts he provided are in the Commission files. In response to a question Mr. Kading indicated that the current biennial budget for PLOTS is $12 million which includes all program payments, salaries and indirect costs--approximately $4 million a year for payments. He indicated that there were 760,000 acres currently in the program which is down from the 1,000,000 acres they had a few years ago. In response to a question he stated that the Save Our Lakes program is not tied to access because the acres often do not fit well for access--it depends on each location. In response to a question he indicated that of the $2 million requested $1.5 million would be used for PLOTS and the remaining amount for Save Our Lakes. The Save Our Lakes would be distributed over two biennia--those dollars would be distributed much quicker. There is a backlog of interest for the Save Our Lakes dollars. The PLOTS dollars could also go out quicker than the 10-year period discussed in the proposal. In response to a question he indicated that Game and Fish works with the other entities and share information on programs, prioritizing of areas so they are not competing. They do this every day so that they can leverage and stack programs to make them work for the producers. In regards to a question on sustainability beyond OHF funding, Mr. Kading stated that they work with the producer to help them find another USDA program--whatever is available. He noted that the producers, once they have made a commitment to the program may often leave portions of the field in grass or where they have put in more permanent habitat such as trees they will leave it in place. In response to a question Mr. Kading indicated they had estimated with this funding they could impact 3,000 acres ($50 an acre on average) for the PLOTS program and 1600 acres ($75 an acre on average) for the Save Our Lakes program. In response to a question, Mr. Kading said the PLOTS program guarantees that there will be access for hunters for legal hunting with no restrictions. In response to a question, Mr. Kading stated with this application they will utilize the PLOTS dollars for habitat improvements as long as there is public access. This is an extension of the PLOTS we will use these dollars to do the habitat improvements and then the other PLOTS funding will be used for access. In response to a question, Mr. Kading stated the funding could be used for wetlands restoration but that had not been built into the budget. This

application's primary target is expiring CRP acres. If there is a wetland component on that expiring CRP acreage that needed to be restored it certainly could be considered.

001-FFF – McDowell Dam Water Access and Fishing Improvements – Burleigh County Water Resources District - $10,407 – Directive A. Presentation was made by Gordon Weixel, member of the Burleigh County Water Resources District. His handout is available in the Commission files.

001-O – Bismarck Rotary Arboretum Accessibility, Conservation and Interpretive Improvements – Bismarck Rotary Club - $74,988 – Directive D. Presentation was made by Ken Schiele with the assistance of Tom Jones. His handout depicting the current status of the Arboretum and is available in the Commission files.

001-T – Trailhead/Neighborhood Park – Bismarck Parks & Recreation District - $313,960 – Directive D. Presentation was made by Greg Smith, Operations Director of the Bismarck Park and Recreation, with the assistance of David Mayer (KLJ). In response to a question Mr. Mayer stated that the costs for paving the parking lot are approximately $30,000 and the playground equipment is between $80,000 and $90,000.

001-OO – Restoring Public Use of the Port of Bismarck on the Missouri River – Fort Abraham Lincoln Foundation - $50,000– Directive D. Presentation was made by Tracy Potter, President of the Foundation. A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files.

001-TTT – Recreational Trail Reconstruction in Response to Mineral Development at Little Missouri State Park – ND Parks & Recreation Department - $77,006 - Directive D. Presentation was made by Jesse Hanson, Parks & Recreation Department. His presentation and handouts are available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Mr. Hanson stated that Conoco did convert one trail into an oil road--the trail had been used by ranchers so it was the logical path for the company to use to build an oil road. He indicated that the State holds the leases on the property for trails so the oil company is obligated to work with the Department. In response to a question, Mr. Hanson indicated that the upkeep of the trails is in the Parks and Recreation Department budget.

001-G – Beulah Park District Lions Park Renovation Project – Beulah Park District - $35,000 – Directive D. The presentation was made by Bridgette Martens, Director for the Beulah Park District. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files.

001-JJ – Beulah School & Community Outdoor Project – Beulah Public School District #27 - $310,747 - Directive D. The presentation was made by Todd Kayler and Todd Wolstenholm. In response to a question, Mr. Kayler indicated that the cost of the playground equipment at the two locations -- elementary and middle schools -- would be $170,000.

001-JJJ – Trail Restoration & Improvement Program – ND Parks & Recreation - $132,456 – Directive D. The presentation was made by Matthew Gardner, Recreation Division Manager, Parks & Recreation Department. A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files. He also distributed copies of the 2013-2017 North Dakota State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. In response to a question, Mr. Gardner indicated that the easements would be no longer than 20 years. They will be for a 10-foot wide corridor. Special provisions requested

by the landowner can be written into the easements. In response to a question, Mr. Gardner stated that at this point they only have approximately 30 miles of easements for the North Country Trail. The focus of the North Country Trails Association has been on public lands and now they are beginning their work with private lands. The easements will be held by the North Country Trails Association. It is the Association that makes the contact with the landowner and negotiates the easement. The Association is a North Dakota non-profit organization. In response to a question, Mr. Gardner stated that the Maah Daah Hey Trail had not been included as the Department had been working on these other trails. He indicated that would be an option in the future.

001-QQ – Natural Resource Stewardship in North Dakota's Parks, Preserves and Natural Areas – ND Parks & Recreation Department - $274,344 - Directive C. The presentation was made by Kathy Duttenhefner with the ND Parks & Recreation Department. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Ms. Duttenhefner indicated that the cost for staffing of the one technician for five years was $71,000.

The Board took a short break.

Mr. Moser reconvened the meeting of the Board and they continued hearing the presentations.

001-WWW – Conservation of Long-billed Curlews on Private Lands in SW ND – American Bird Conservancy - $41,994 - Directive C. Presentation was made by Dan Casey. A copy of his presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Mr. Casey stated that the 1280 acres referred to in the application are all private lands.

001-ZZ – Pheasants Forever Bismarck Chapter Tree Equipment – Pheasants Forever Dakota Chapter, Bismarck, ND - $24,500 - Directive C. Presentation was made by David Nehring, Habitat Chairman of the local Pheasants Forever Chapter, and Matt Olson. He had one handout which is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Mr. Nehring stated the life of the tree planter would be in the 25- to 30-year time frame. He noted that the Game and Fish Department had offered them space to store it indoors when it isn't being used which should extend the life of the equipment. They also have annual maintenance built into the budget. In response to a question, he indicated that it wouldn't be just one person using the equipment, although that has been discussed. They are developing a DVD that would explain the proper use and maintenance of the equipment. The equipment would be used on a check-out and check-in basis with the understanding that whoever checks it out is liable for any repairs if it is damaged while they have it checked out. In response to a question, Mr. Nehring indicated that because of the demand in this area it would be used just in the region--at least for the next few years. He indicated that the costs of the trees and the barrier would be the responsibility of the cooperator. They have arrangements with the Towner and Lincoln Oakes nursery and with a company that provides barriers and they anticipate the costs would be lower for the cooperators than what they would find with other programs.

001-AA – Forest Stewardship Initiative – ND Forest Service - $633,468 - Directive C. The presentation was given by Liz Smith. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to questions, Ms. Smith indicated that all counties would be eligible and the payments made to the counties would not be restricted on how the counties would use the payments. This issue is currently being looked at by an interim committee but they have not

taken any action at this time. The law does not require the reimbursement to the counties and the eight participating counties are not receiving payments at this time. This deals with private lands and does not apply to wildlife management areas. She stated that the law states that grazing would not be allowed on these lands. She indicated that this would not prohibit energy development--the lands could be withdrawn from the program. Even though there is a five-year agreement, lands can be withdrawn from the program with no penalty.

001-RRR – Mapping of Tribal Land for Sportsmen – Spirit Lake Nation Fish and Wildlife Department - $8,568 – Directive A. Presentation was made by Carrie Duafala. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a series of questions, Ms. Duafala indicated that if you are hunting on tribal lands you need to have a tribal license. If you are hunting on non-tribal lands you need to have a state license. If you are a tribal member you do not need a tribal license to hunt on tribal lands. The reservation lands are open to non-member hunters but you need to have the appropriate license. In response to question, she indicated that there is more rifle hunting than archery hunting even though the rifle hunting is for a shorter period of time. She noted that the waterfowl hunting is growing the fastest. She discussed the locating of the signs and how that will be done when many of the tribal lands border on lands being farmed. She stated that signs would not be placed in the middle of a plowed field but there may be signs placed near tree rows and by access roads. She said they had estimated they would need 800 signs.

001-W – Artificial Nesting Habitat Improvement – Spirit Lake Nation Fish and Wildlife Department - $5,565 – Directive C. Presentation was made by Carrie Duafala. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Ms. Duafala indicated that although her staffing is limited she has had a number of volunteers express an interest in assisting with this project and tending to the platforms and boxes. She indicated that the Tribal Council has expressed an interest in the project and are supportive of her moving forward with it but did not provide her with any funding. They were especially interested in the establishment of the eagle platforms. In response to a question she indicated the cost of the cameras is included in the budget. These cameras would not have the capability to do webcasts--she did not include that in the budget because the technology is not available in all the areas. She intends to post pictures on a regular basis on their Department's Facebook page.

001-MMM – ND Hen House Project 1 – Delta Waterfowl - $60,530 - Directive C. Presentation was made by Joel Brice and Matt Cholinard. A copy of their presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Mr. Brice indicated that the success rate in North Dakota over the past 5 to 6 years is lower than what they have seen in Manitoba. They are seeing nest success at the 7% rate. In response to a question he indicated that these would be placed on both public and private lands. To reduce the cost of maintenance they are put in somewhat close proximity so you don't have to travel so far between hen houses and that generally involves both public and private lands. It was noted that because mallards are territorial they are looking at only two hen houses per wetland and then that is replicated again and again until you have a supersite.

001-EEE – Restoring an Urban Riparian Forest – River Keepers - $153,100 - Directive C. The presentation was made by Christine Laney and Bob Backman. A copy of her presentation is available in the Commission files. In response to a question Ms. Laney indicated that the distance they are talking about in linear miles is 25 miles. In response to questions she indicated

that they would be working with the local forestry experts to determine which trees should be planted and the location of those plantings. With the experience they have had in the past they know which trees will grow well. In response to questions about future flooding, she indicated that future flood could impact their plantings and that is why they are only doing smaller plantings each year. In regards to signage based on their experience they have a good idea of where and how signage should be placed and how it should be maintained. The trees are being placed near the river so they should not be impacted by any dikes that the city should build because the dikes will be placed further away from the river.

001-BBB – Turtle Mountain Chippewa Outdoor Heritage Fund – Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians - $508,600 - Directive C. The presentation was made by Kane Ferris along with Lyle Poitra, Les Thomas, and Tribal Councilwoman Christine Malaterre. A copy of his slides is available in the Commission files.

001-NNN – Kitchen Table Conversations for Private Land Conservation – Pheasants Forever, Inc. - $316,000 – Directive C. The presentation was made by Matt Olson, North Dakota Regional Director for Pheasants Forever, and Matt Holland, Grant Development Director, Pheasants Forever. They distributed a handout. A copy is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Mr. Olson indicated that they had not identified any of the ten pollinator plots to be on US Fish and Wildlife lands. He indicated that there is a great deal of flexibility on where these plots might be located--could be US Fish and Wildlife lands; it could be local parks. They would like to be close to communities so they could get local interest and involvement in these pollinator plots. In response to a question, Mr. Olson stated that the size of the pollinator plots could be anywhere from 1 to 26 acres. The plots are made up of as many species of pollinators as possible with the blooming of the plants to be throughout the season. In response to a question of doing removal of trees at a time when there is a need for more tree plantings Mr. Olson stated that the budget as currently developed does not include replacement trees. Some native species shrub plantings are allowed under the Wetland Reserve Program but they would not be planted down the middle of the plots; they would be planted along the edges of the plots. In response to a question, Mr. Olson stated they have identified between 50 to 75% of the sites for the Westland Reserve Program. In response to another question, Mr. Olson said of the three components included in their proposal the funding for the Farm Biologists would be the top priority--it has been successful in the past, has match funding, and you get the most value from the work they would be doing. In response to a question, Mr. Olson said the farm biologists usually work with farmers in the 40 to 50 years old age group although they are beginning to see more and more young farmers coming in with their fathers. There was discussion on the maintenance of the acres held by the Wetland Reserve Program easements -- what has been required in the past and what the requirements are now. The contracts have better management practices outlined and required. In response to the question of why USDA isn't paying for the costs of fixing up the Wetland Reserve Program easement acres, Mr. Olson stated it was a lack of funding. In response to a question, Mr. Olson stated that the match contributions coming from the Game and Fish Department and NRCS are cash contributions.

001-PPP – Public Land Enhancement Program – Pheasants Forever, Inc. - $808,000 - Directive C. The presentation was made by Matt Holland, Grant Development Director with Pheasants Forever. Mr. Holland distributed a handout; a copy is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Mr. Holland stated that they would be working with any public land agencies. They have identified some sites they would like to work with. In response to a

question, Mr. Holland stated that a match from the public land agency would not be required but they would try to leverage as much funding as possible. They would be developing partnerships and relationships with these public land agencies and also with the sportsmen. In response to a question, Mr. Holland stated the purpose of this funding would be to accelerate best management practices on the public lands; assist the public land agencies by supplementing their budgets to allow them to implement the best land management practices possible. He indicated that these public lands are very important to having habitat available. In response to a question, Mr. Holland stated that public access would be one of the factors they would consider but it is not a requirement to be a part of the program. In response to a question, if the lands are currently in production agriculture it could remain in production agriculture if it is meeting the goals of the program; they would be working with the cooperators to accelerate the best practices.

001-FF – LSC 20,000 Trees by 2020 – Ludden Sportsmen Club - $130,000 – Directive C - No presentation was made. The Board reviewed the summary sheet. There were no questions.

The Board took a break and had lunch. Chairman reconvened the meeting and the Board heard the following presentations:

001-M – Wild Rice Restoration and Riparian Project Phase II – Wild Rice Soil Conservation District - $26,500 - Directive B. Presentation was made by Trace Hanson. A copy of her slides is available in the Commission files. In response to a question she indicated that she has landowners in place ready to move forward. Currently the program is at a standstill because of the needed match of $26,500. In response to a question she stated that the easements are for 10 to 15 years, are held by the soil conservation district and range from 100 to 300 feet. It was indicated that where there was an easement they would stop farming in those areas. It would be up to the landowner to maintain the land although the Soil Conservation District would be checking to see that it was done. In response to a question, Ms. Hanson stated it would be up to the landowner as to whether there would be public access.

001-UUU – Habitat Enhancing Biofuel Crops – NDSU - $147,954 – Directive B. Presentation by Jay Fisher. He distributed a booklet that he asked be returned. In response to a question, he indicated that it could be either the winter or spring crop with the harvesting to be done at a time that would be appropriate for maintaining good habitat and ground growth cover. Mr. Fisher indicated this project does not deal with woody biomass; this project is focused on crops.

001-VVV – ND Wetlands Certification Review Initiative – ND Department of Agriculture - $1,987,350 – Directive B. Presentation was made by Tom Bodine, Deputy Agriculture Commissioner. A copy of his slides is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Mr. Bodine explained how the wetland credits work and how this program would assist in linking producers together.

001-S – Optimizing Crop Rotation Strategies to Improve Disease Management and Increase Crop Yields in ND Wheat and Field Pea Production – NDSU - $10,737– Directive B. Presentation was made by Michael Wunsch. Copies of his handout and slides are available in the Commission files.

001-GGG – Resistance to Invasion by *Poa Pratensis* in North Dakota Prairies – NDSU – $88,925 - Directive B. Presentation was made by Steve Travers. A copy of his slides is available in the Commission files.

001-NN – Selection & Evaluation of Ornamental Woody Plants Suitable for Parks, Recreational Areas & City Plantings for Western ND – NDSU - $633,236 - Directive B. Presentation was made by Todd West. A copy of his slides is available in the Commission files. He indicated that he is proposing that the size of the proposal be reduced to $498,000. In response to a question Mr. West indicated that all the funding would go to the project--no funds would be kept by the NDSU Research Foundation.

001-WW – Management Strategies to Improve Conservation Reserve Program Habitat Quality and Livestock Grazing Value – NDSU - $1,013,631 – Directive B. Presentation was made by Ryan Limb. A copy of his slides is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Mr. Limb stated that this study is a preliminary study to the actual grazing phase. In response to a question he indicated that this study would be conducted on existing CRP acres that have been identified to be available for the full duration of the study. In response to a question, he indicated they would need to seek permission to do this work on CRP acres but that permission has already been given on other similar studies in the region so it should just be a formality.

001-HHH – Spring Creek Watershed – Cross Fencing for Grazing Management – Spring Creek Watershed, Mercer County Soil Conservation District - $14,400 - Directive B . Presentation was made by Kasha Hansen. A copy of her slides is available in the Commission files. In response to a question she indicated that this funding would help with 10.1 miles of fencing. In response to a question she indicated that public access is not required if a producer participates in the program although that is something they could look at in the future. She also responded that some of the producers are in place but with the additional funding she hoped to get new producers involved and implementing best management practices. In response to a question she indicated that the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars would be used to reduce the producers share -- would reduce it to 20%.

001-Y – Enhancing Stewardship and Agronomic Benefits of Seasonal Wetlands for Producers and Wildlife in ND: the Role of Beneficial Insects and Plant Diversity - NDSU - $499,578 – Directive C - The applicant was unable to make a presentation but did provide a PowerPoint presentation that is available in the Commission files. The Board reviewed the summary of the application.

001-I – Behavioral Attractants for Monitoring Important Insect Pollinators of N.D. – NDSU - $197,220 - Directive B. The applicant was unable to make a presentation but did provide a PowerPoint presentation that is available in the Commission files. The Board reviewed the summary of the application.

Upon completion of hearing all the presentations, Chairman Moser opened the meeting for public comment on any of the projects. No comments were made.

Following a break Chairman Moser reconvened the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board meeting and the Board took up the motion that had been tabled.

It was moved by Mr. Reierson and seconded by Mr. Aasmundstad that the tabled motion be placed before the Board for consideration. On a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fine restated the motion to be that the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board establishes a target of $8,000,000 for Grant Round 1. After discussion, **it was clarified that the motion had been that the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board establish a funding limit of not to exceed $8,000,000 for Grant Round 1.**

Mr. Aasmundstad stated that we may want to set a goal for future rounds but at this time when we are still in a learning curve and haven't dealt with the policy issues based on legislative intent he did not think establishing a funding limit for this round was a good use of the Board's time. Mr. Wogsland concurred with Mr. Aasmundstad's comments.

On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, Hutchens, Moser voted aye; Aasmundstad, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland voted no. The motion failed.

The Board members discussed what they had heard from Representative Porter the previous day and also the white papers that had been prepared based on the technical questions raised by Board members that had been discussed by the Technical Committee.

Mr. Aasmundstad stated that what he heard Representative Porter state the previous day and what he had understood while being involved in the legislative process is that we should be funding projects that are ready to go; staffing and research is probably not something we should be funding; and probably not equipment although there could be something for parks and recreation. In regards to paving he didn't think we should go there because of the costs of maintenance. We need to stick to projects that involve conservation, tree plantings, water quality issues, and wildlife. He indicated there needed to be more discussion on the things we don't feel we should fund in fairness for future applicants. He stated his sincere apologies to those individuals that put a lot of time and work into grant requests that we now don't feel right in funding.

Mr. Reierson indicated that he appreciated Representative Porter's frank comments on what his thoughts are. But we also need to rely on the language that is in the statute--that is what the entire legislature passed. It is up to us to decide what we think fits within that language. Instead of prejudging those issues let our discussion on the applications help form the policy that we want to convey on to future grant applicants as well as the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Moser listed for the Board the white papers that had been developed:

- Research Projects
- Staff Funding
- Equipment (purchase of)
- Paving
- Funding of completed projects or on-going projects
- Greenways (funding of projects that may be ahead of a flood control project to some degree)
- Religious affiliation

- EPA 319 funding - what level of buydown should we fund

He indicated that the Board needs to keep these issues in mind as we go through this process and their discussion and votes will help sort these issues out on this round and then we need to recommend a policy to the Industrial Commission for future rounds.

Mr. Bina stated that we should go through the process and discuss each application. We need to be aware of the policy concerns. However to make policy decisions at this time, after the applications have been submitted, seems a bit unfair. After the first round we do need to look at definite criteria for the next round.

The Board discussed the issue of funding completed projects. In response to a question Mr. Steinwand, Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Kotchman noted that the programs they administer do not fund completed projects. Their reasons were if it involved federal dollars they were not allowed to do so and by funding completed projects they lose their influence in ensuring that the best possible project will be completed.

In response to a question about the issues involving the 319 Program, Ms. Vetsch gave a brief overview from her perspective as to how the Soil Conservation Districts seek funding from the 319 program. The State Health Department oversees this program and it gets its funding from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The process for obtaining an award is similar to the process the Outdoor Heritage Fund is following. Applications are submitted and reviewed by a committee and awards are made on a cost/share basis. The State Health Department has determined that the maximum amount they will reimburse the applicant is 60% of the project.

The 319 issues that are involved in the Grant Round 1 applications fall into a couple of areas:

- Some of the applicants are requesting additional funding so they can reduce the amount of funding that the producer has to contribute to a project;
- Some of the applicants are requesting additional funding because the demand in their area is greater than the funding that is available from the 319 program. They aren't requesting dollars to lower the percentage--will keep it at the 60/40 level--but just need more money because the need is great.

Mr. Steinwand indicated that the Game and Fish Department sits on the 319 Task Force that reviews applications. He stated that their Department rarely puts money into a 319 project because a lot of the 319 funding goes for outreach and education. There are wildlife values in the projects that receive 319 funding but they aren't as high as other projects that the Department funds.

Mr. Moser noted that on 319 projects that deal with stock waste management facilities they are maxed out at $175,000 per project. All the different entities that are involved in 319 projects have agreed to that level of funding for those types of projects.

In response to a question, Ms. Vetsch stated that a 319 award isn't contingent upon receiving other funding but, as with the Outdoor Heritage Fund program, it looks better if you have other funding for the project.

Mr. Moser reminded the Board that Representative Porter had talked about the leveraging of dollars and when the Governor announced the Board's appointment he stated that it was his hope that all of these projects would have skin in the game so that this $30 million would turn into a $100 million or more. Mr. Aasmundstad stated that was also a discussion during the legislative process -- how do we take the monies that are appropriated and leverage them into something greater. Legislative intent certainly was to make certain that these dollars are leveraged.

Mr. Moser indicated that the process they would now go through is to have a discussion on each of the projects. Then the Board members will fill out their scoring sheets and indicate the amount of monies they would award for each project and then we will put that information up on the screen and then make motions on the amount of funding, if any, to be awarded to the applicant. He called for discussion on each of the applications as follows:

Project 001-SSS - Measurable and Sustainable Agricultural, Economic, Watershed and Wildlife Impacts with Cover Crops Along the 49th Parallel - Submitted by Northern Plains Resource Conservation and Development Council. The representatives from the agriculture groups were asked to comment on the application in regards to what farmers and ranchers need to know--is this research important? The following points were noted:

- This is more demonstration than research.
- The research has been done. Cover crops have been used for a long time. The research centers have had demonstration plots; groups have been asked to come and see the plots.
- What is different here is the geographic area; there may be some differences between the eastern side of the state versus the western side of the state as to the type of plant.
- This is more an outreach project. We know that cover crops are beneficial. Do they work for everyone? No.
- EQIP dollars have been used for this - a lot of farmers paid for their disc drill with EQIP dollars. They had to plant so many of their acres to get the EQIP funding.

There was a brief review of how the dollars in the proposed budget would be used.

Project 001-P - Implementing a Holistic Approach to Rangeland Management and Land Conservation through Mentoring and Education - Submitted by ND Grazing Lands Coalition - The following comments were made:

- Well managed grazing land gives you good wildlife land.
- I like seeing it go into private education practices; I think it is a good thing.
- The individual that was given the Environmental Stewardship Award by the Stockmen's Association was a part of the presentation so it does work.
- Budget is primarily for personnel.
- This is a tremendous group that has reached a lot of people and has made a big impact.
- They are capable of identifying projects that need funding to put systems on the ground and implement the practices that they know work. That is what they should bring to the Outdoor Heritage Fund.
- Not sure the purpose of the Outdoor Heritage Fund is to pay for education and outreach.

Mr. Reierson stated that he wanted to go on record that the presentations and applications that they have seen and heard have been incredible. The enthusiasm of the presenters has been great. Even if you didn't think this is the right place for them to get their funding you wanted to write out a check and say I want to help out. He asked that we somehow convey that message to the applicants even if they don't get funding. Let them know that this is a pretty narrow funding

source that the Board is responsible for and, if we know, inform them of other funds available. He didn't see a bad project in any of the applications.

Project 001-J - Antelope Creek Wild Rice Corridor Watershed Restoration Project - Submitted by Richland Soil Conservation District. - In response to a question it was clarified that this 319 project is a buydown that will reduce the producers share to the 10% level.

Mr. Aasmundstad stated that he believes the watershed improvement applications are the poster child for the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars. It is work that truly needs to be done and it does good things for the environment. It demonstrates that with cooperation and the implementation of proper practices agriculture and industry can coexist and both can benefit from the practices that need to be put in place. These are very important projects that go right to the heart of what we were trying to accomplish with the establishment of the Outdoor Heritage Fund. The 319 buydowns are dollars that go right to the ground--dollars that make instant improvements to the environment and to the rivers and lakes.

In response to a question on 319 grants, Mr. Moser stated that the applicants generally request funding for five years. They generally have a handful of projects that they can begin working with immediately but they are also planning ahead and getting the funding so they can react to where the need is rather than waiting for a year. Under the 319 program you do not get the dollars and expend them, you make a request for payment from the Health Department.

Mr. Kuylen stated that part of the funding under the 319 projects is education. An example would be to educate producers not to feed their cattle on the ice all winter long. Feed the cattle out in the fields away from the rivers so you don't have the runoff into the rivers. He stated that the field manure systems are the most expensive because you have to build the pools to hold the manure and install pumps and water tanks so the cattle aren't digging into the riversides. A lot of the funding is well deserved and it is an excellent project.

Mr. Reierson stated the issue here is having the availability of money so you can implement best management practices as soon as possible. If we can accelerate and implement these practices sooner and get projects on the ground and show this need then maybe we can get more funding from future legislatures.

Project 001-N - Ransom County Water Quality Improvement Project - Submitted by Ransom County Soil Conservation District. In response to a question, it was indicated that the entire project didn't have to be funded--the Board members should indicate the amount of funding that they feel is appropriate. Since the applicant wouldn't be using all the money they were requesting in the first year, the applicant could be encouraged to come back and request more funding in a future round.

Project 001-QQQ - Perennial Grass Establishment with Grazing Plan - Submitted by Stutsman County Soil Conservation District - It was clarified that during the presentation the applicant adjusted the total costs of the project to over $100,000 but the OHF funding request stayed the same. The project would be for one producer.

Project 001-A - Sheyenne River Sedimentation Reduction Project - Barnes County Soil Conservation District - This is another 319 project. It was not a request for a buydown but to

obtain funding for additional projects. Ms. Vetsch stated that the demand in Barnes County through the 319 program has increased immensely and has come to the point where the projects are exceeding what they are able to receive from the Health Department. This funding would be disbursed on a 60/40% basis for the producers.

Project 001-R - Valley City Riverfront Greenway and Restoration project - Submitted by City of Valley City - The Board discussed the application and noted that during the presentation the applicant had indicated that of the three areas being proposed Area 2 at a cost of $595,000 ($523,500 OHF funding) could be accomplished more quickly and for that reason the applicant gave it the highest priority.

There was general discussion on the topic of whether Outdoor Heritage Funds should be used for greenways. It was noted that there are other funding sources for greenways--although those sources might take longer to obtain. Concerns were expressed on providing funding for projects that may be destroyed during the next flood. It was noted that some of the items being requested could be removed before a flood such as fishing piers but some could not such as excavating and asphalt. It was also noted that the project being proposed touches on three of the directives--it is a good plan. Unfortunately it is on the wet side of a dike and is suspect to annual flooding. Because the applicant reduced their funding request from $1,863,500 and offered another alternative at $523,500 it was recommended that the Board should give them further consideration and look at the directives that are impacted positively.

It was noted that 15% of the costs is for engineering which seemed high and there was discussion on whether the Fund should be paying for engineering. It was noted that some cities and counties have engineers on staff and the question was asked if the Fund should be paying for engineering costs when there are engineers on staff to do that work. When is it appropriate for Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars to be used for engineering?

Mr. Reierson asked a procedural question of what information would be conveyed to the applicants. He agreed with the discussion that had taken place on greenways and wondered if rather than funding a smaller dollar amount of the big project and telling the applicant where they should be applying it, can we indicate that we saw some real benefits to these portions of the project and encourage them to reapply during future grant rounds? He suggested that there might be some portions of the greenways that the Outdoor Heritage Fund should fund.

Ms. Fine indicated that she will convey to the applicants whatever was directed by the Board. If the Board wanted staff to try and capture your comments and convey them to the applicants they would do so. She has already noted the general statement made earlier about the excellent presentations and that is something she would include in a letter. If the Board wishes to have their comments on the specific projects included in her letters to the applicants she will also try and capture those and send them to the applicant. It was the consensus of the Board that the Board comments should be provided to the applicants.

Project 001-VV - ND Statewide Conservation Tree Planning Initiative - Submitted by ND Association of Soil Conservation Districts. Several comments were made on this application:

- This is a good application because it reaches those individuals that fall through the cracks when they go through the NRCS ranking process. Some landowners can never get enough points to be awarded funding under the current programs.

- Does this need to be funded for 3 years--would 2 years be sufficient with the idea that they could come back and ask for more funding?
- This is a good program that can reach a lot of landowners; there are people that want to do the right things and have a patch of land that they want to use for trees but are unable to qualify for any program. There is a need for this type of funding.
- The reason for the 3-year duration is being able to put the right tree and in the right place and the planning that is required to do that to insure sustainability of the planting.
- Mr. Steinwand noted that the Game and Fish Department has just completed a technical study that shows 65% to 70% of white tail fawns are dropped in trees in the NE part of the state. That shows the importance of trees and that is just deer; not even talking about upland game or tree nesting birds.
- It was noted that the applicant has the ability to deliver this funding on a statewide basis through the 55 soil conservation district. With the collaboration of a wide network of conservation partners starting at the local level this project will reach a lot of people and will make a difference.
- Everybody likes trees--farmers like trees. If there is a program that has been talked about that farmers can buy into it is planting more trees, not just farmers but everybody. ND needs trees. There is great merit in this application; very worthwhile and benefits the state greatly.

Project 001-III - Food Barley - Adding Value & Diversity to Western ND Farms - Submitted by ND Barley Council - Mr. Wogsland stated that this is the first of the research initiatives and there are some he will support and some he will not support. He indicated that you can't have adequate projects if there is not the necessary and adequate research to carry out the mission of those projects. That is why he thought it is important that Board members look at each of these research projects and make individual decisions on each of the proposals. He stated that he was supportive of this application and thought that it was good for farmers and is far reaching and opens up a new avenue. As the Board looks at research in its entirety he suggested that the Board look at each of the applications and see how it is going to benefit the state. It was noted that this application included staffing and equipment and also some funding for work to be done in Arizona which would not comply with the law--need to determine what dollar amount is involved in that Arizona work.

Mr. Reierson expressed a concern about the royalty program going to a private producer and how that was going to work. Ms. Godfread indicated that she had raised the issue, not because she was opposed to the application but rather because she wanted to know how royalties were handled. Ms. Fine stated that this is something the Board needs to keep on its policy decision list. Because she did not know this would be an issue she had removed from the sample contracts any references to royalties.

There was a discussion as to whether there is a difference in funding a project where there is the possibility of a royalty payment going to a private entity and directly funding a private entity? Not sure if we want to prohibit the possibility of a royalty payment. If we don't fund an application just because there might be a royalty payment then should we be directly funding private entities? This might eliminate a number of parties from submitting applications. It was noted that many of the applications being considered for funding are for payment for services and not for profit. It is not the same as getting a royalty payment.

Mr. Moser noted that some of the applicants had suggested that there be some changes to the contract language and the Board should also look at what is included in those suggestions.

Project 001-L - Winter Cereals Sustainability in Action - Submitted by Ducks Unlimited, Inc. Several Board members spoke on this project:

- This is a practice that has proven to be successful. Spring nesting cover is better than broken ground and is better than what covers a lot of North Dakota each spring. It is an expansion of the current program and is a very worthwhile project.
- This program is very well subsidized by the private sector.
- This program has been going on for a number of years without Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars.
- There are initiatives at NDSU where winter wheat has a program that is on-going.
- $3 million for five years or $600,000 per year, just wondering if we would hurt this program if we were to fund it for a couple of years and suggest they come back at a later time. Do they need a five-year commitment? The response that was given by a Board member was that the program runs from year to year and anything is appreciated.
- This is a good ongoing program and wondered if the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars should be used now for an ongoing project when we might have some new projects and some other applications that couldn't be done without OHF funding. Would encourage the applicant to come back in another grant round. We need to be careful with our dollars this first round.
- The $3 million will be used for outreach, education and communication which results in primarily staffing and expenses. This is very similar to the Grazing Association application. Doing great work but would rather spend the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars for on-the-ground projects.
- There is $1.1 million in research development of new varieties of winter wheat that NDSU is doing and this is replicating another service that we already have in the state.
- The Board doesn't need to fund the entire amount - whatever the applicant is awarded they would take. The Board does not have to fund 100% of any of the applications.

Project 001-Z - Trail Administrator - Submitted by Maah Daah Hey Trail Association - Several Board members spoke on this application:

- This is all staffing. This is a great trail; wish the North Dakota Parks and Recreation Department and the Association was working together. The State has trails they are overseeing and there isn't a need to replicate what the state already has in place.
- This is an example of why we shouldn't have hard and fast rules. This is an all-volunteer project and need a little help. This is a five-year application. Would be supportive of a declining kind of funding. Get the administrator in place that could work on future funding sources and work with the North Dakota Parks and Recreation. Even though it is staffing, provide some funding so they can get this effort moving forward.
- On the opposite end. The Trail was built and is supposed to be maintained by the US Forest Service. That still needs to be done.

In response to a question, Mr. Zimmerman stated that since the inception of the Trail the North Dakota Parks and Recreation Department has been involved. The Association has applied for grants through the Recreation Trails Program (RTP) and has been awarded some funding. From the Department's standpoint they believe that it is the US Forest Service's responsibility to maintain it. The Forest Service needs to be doing more. The North Dakota Parks and Recreation Department will continue to work with the Association and when they make application to RTP their funding request will be considered.

Project 001-F - Outdoor Adventures Initiative 2014 - Submitted by The Outdoor Adventure Foundation Inc. It was noted that this application had some errors - one place referred to $25,000 and in another referred to $22,000. It is primarily for just equipment. Mr. Moser noted that we haven't addressed the questions of ownership, taking equipment back at the end of a grant period, government surplus property, liability all those issues that come with providing funding for equipment. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that when the Game and Fish Department provides funding for equipment, the Department retains ownership and the applicant has to turn the equipment back to the Department. He stated that this is a good group that does good work. However, the Board needs to make a decision about what they want to do in regards to equipment.

Project 001-D - Nelson Lake West Side Boat Landing - Submitted by Sporting Chance - There were no comments or questions on this application.

Project 001-DD - 2013 Paving Project, McKenzie Bay Recreation Area - Submitted by Watford City Park Board - Several Board members spoke on this project:

- Have a real problem with using this money to pay down the debt on a project already completed. This is not what the Fund was intended for. The Fund is for shovel-ready projects not projects that are already completed.
- The semi-truck traffic in this area is terrible -- there is a non-stop semi-truck traffic all day long. Gravel roads have to be repaired all the time -- they are wearing out the roads. The applicant did what they thought was the right thing -- Highway 22 was being paved and the contractor had extra product on hand and something needed to be done before the road was totally ruined. So instead of waiting for the funding they did what they needed to do and now are asking for the money. They have had to put up gates so the trucks don't come in there all winter ruining the road. The drivers are unfamiliar with the area and without road signs are getting lost and needing to turn around. Truck traffic is a serious issue in this area.
- Understand the issue they faced but if we fund this project it is going to open a can of worms for all the other past projects that have been done and there is outstanding debt.
- A decision on this project won't impact the Board's consideration for a future project.
- This may not be the funding source for repaying this loan. On these special road fund projects around the lake and other areas across the state the group needs to go to DOT and request monies for these types of projects. Indian Hills is another area where they may be requesting funding for their roads as well. If the Outdoor Heritage Fund provides funding for this project it could see huge projects in the future. The funding of these road projects needs to be handled by the Legislature. Pavement is expensive and regardless of how well they maintain it with the traffic they are experiencing they would be back asking for more money.

Project 001-V - Project LL Paving - Submitted by Williams County Water Resources District - It was noted that this a project where the applicant has not provided any matching funds. Perhaps they need to seek other sources of funding. It was stated that the paving would not increase accessibility off the highway. It is a great site; the applicant has made some great improvements to enhance the fishing but as far as paving it isn't a necessity.

Project 001-LLL - Schatz Point South Side Boat Ramp - Submitted by Tri-Cities Joint JDA at Lake Tschida - There was discussion of access and a comparison was made that Lake Tschida

has 8 ramps for a 3700 acre lake where Devils Lake has 30 ramps for a 200,000 acre lake. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that the Game and Fish Department has approximately $800,000 a biennium for boating development. He did not recall if this group had requested funding. Typically they would have requested funding. In response to another question, Mr. Steinwand stated that there are water fluctuations at Lake Tschida although not as great as the fluctuations on Lake Sakakawea. The boat ramp currently in place on the north side of Lake Tschida is pretty much an all-water level ramp with the fluctuations experienced at that location. It was noted that the project applicant is not providing much money; generally the state programs require a 75-25% cost share. Very seldom is someone awarded 100% financing.

Project 001-HH - Spring Creek & Iglehart Subdivision's Concrete Boat Ramp (Spring Creek Landing) - Submitted by Heart & Lung Clinic Foundation - Additional information about visitation that had been provided today was distributed. A copy is available in the Commission files. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that the applicant had not requested funding from the Department. They had visited with the Game and Fish Department boating access staff but had not requested funding. If they had the Department would not have likely funded it because there are two other boat ramps in the area. It was noted that they had requested all but $9,000 of the total project. It was noted that the bid that came from Northern Improvement referred to an amount of between $435,000 and $450,000 and didn't provide detail as to labor costs, price or amount of concrete, etc.

Mr. Moser noted that this is something for the policy discussion--whether we allow applications from entities where it appears that they are a pass through entity--they have no "skin in the game." This may be an isolated case but he was concerned about this being allowed.

Project 001-UU - Riverside Park Enhancement Project - Submitted by City of Washburn - It was noted that there were two parts to this project -- a road through Riverside Park and a road to the boat ramp. If the total project couldn't be funded, their priority would be Priority A which totaled $405,000. There was discussion on whether any of the other funding sources have been approved. It was noted that the application states the applications to the Department of Transportation and the Game and Fish Department were pending. It was commented that perhaps the applicant should reapply after the other funding sources have been clarified.

Project 001-KKK - Devils Lake Winter Ice Fishing Trail System - Submitted by Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce - The question was asked about the amount of funding being requested. Over the last 7 years they have average $6,000 a year and now they were requesting $50,000 for two years. Even though they wanted to expand what had been done in the past, it was stated that this was a large jump from the past history. In response to a question about what other lakes do, Mr. Steinwand stated that this is a great project but if the Board funds this project there will be 446 other lakes that are going to be asking for the same thing. The Game and Fish Department has dealt with this for years--when you have heavy snows you can have a perfectly plowed trail one day and the wind comes up and you won't be able to see it the next day. The Game and Fish Department has worked with the Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce and any proceeds or fees from winter tournaments go into a fund for clearing trails. There was discussion about sustainability. It was noted that the Woodland Resort makes these trails and they do a really good job and everybody uses them. Would additional funding help? Certainly.

There was discussion about charging fees for access. How it compares to what is done in Minnesota where you have to pay a fee to a resort in order to get on a lake. Mr. Steinwand indicated state law is that everyone can access the waters of the state. It was noted that if you cross someone's private property to access a lake that you can charge a fee.

During this discussion it was noted that another policy issue is whether the Outdoor Heritage Fund should provide funding for annual maintenance -- where does it start and where does it stop. Everyone could put in annual maintenance on every budget because you have to do it.

Project 001-E Tallgrass Prairie Seed Source Program - Submitted by Save The Hens Foundation, Inc. - There was discussion on how this program works, who was going to get the seed and at what cost, what acreage would be used to develop the native seed (expired CRP acres or existing CRP acres), the length of time it would take to develop a mature stand (3 to 4 years), what is required of the landowner in maintaining that native seed stand and what the requirements would be for the entities that are receiving the low-cost seed. Ms. Godfread indicated that some funding would be good because native seed is expensive. What prevents a lot of people from putting in native species of grasses is the high cost of buying seed. In response to a question it was indicated that the applicant envisioned doing a number of community and small plots.

Project 001-Q - Bowman County Conservation Grazing Project - Bowman County Weed Board - In discussing this application the following was noted:

- The majority of the funding is for equipment - $11,000.
- Key to controlling weeds is better management. There wouldn't be a weed problem in that area if they had controlled the weeds as required by law.
- There was a question as to whether a single wire electric fence would be sufficient in controlling the cattle.
- This falls in the area of research.
- It was noted that if the neighbor doesn't control their weeds no matter how well you control the weeds on your property, you will have a problem because of seed floating in from the neighbor's property.
- In response to a question Mr. Moser stated that he had been aware of this practice. Ms. Godfread stated that early in the season cattle sometimes prefer to eat weeds. However, that is not the case for Canadian Thistle.
- In controlling weeds a lot has to deal with timing.

Project 001-II - The Marcus Friskop Nature Center - Submitted by Hankinson Public School - In discussing this application the following points were made:

- The applicant should be commended for what they have accomplished. Like the collaboration and partnerships that have taken place.
- The Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars should only be used for outdoor projects. Namely, outdoor amphitheater, access to Lake Elsie, picnic area, outdoor classroom, high tunnel, primitive campground and establishment of the wildlife enhancements. (Total costs of those projects are $67,850 -- 50% would be $33,925.)
- The purpose of the Outdoor Heritage Fund is not to fund school facilities. If we open this door we will be funding facilities at every school in the state.
- The key question should be if the facilities, whether they are located at a school or elsewhere, allow public have access to them.

- The question of partially funding an application was raised. Is that the correct way to handle this request?

There was a general discussion as to whether the Board should be picking portions of an application and partially funding the application or whether the suggestion should be made to the applicant that they bring back a revised application for the next round. In response to a question, Ms. Fine indicated that the Board could pick portions of a project and fund it. The contract would be drawn up in that manner. Mr. Zimmerman stated that if their Department doesn't fully fund an application under their programs, they will select what parts of an application they will fund and direct it that way. It hasn't been a problem for their funding programs.

Project 001-RR - Red River Riparian Project - Submitted by Red River Regional Council - It was noted that this was the application where the applicant indicated that if this funding was not provided they would be out of business. It appears that they are counting on this money bringing in the rest of the money they need for their projects. The Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars would be their "skin in the game" rather than their bringing some match for our funding. It was noted that the monies would be used to partially buydown additional 319 funding and it also paid for the match that is required for program staffing.

Project 001-GG - Stump Lake Park Improvement - Nelson County Park Board. This application had two parts--playground equipment for $15,000 and resurfacing of the tennis court and volleyball court for $5,000. It was stated that this application is for either equipment or resurfacing and there is a question as to whether the Outdoor Heritage Fund is the right place to fund these types of projects.

Project 001-LL - Aquatic Habitat Infrastructure Enhancement - Submitted by Ducks Unlimited, Inc. Several members of the Board provided comments as follows:

- There are a number of aquatic infrastructure needs in the state--on public (state or federal) and private lands. There are no other monies available to do this work. This is a reasonable project.
- The life span of one of these projects is 50 years and at $1,500 per acre over that 50 years it is a good investment of dollars. Support at any level would be appreciated.
- Would be supportive of funding for projects on state or private land but not on any US Fish and Wildlife lands. If the Fish and Wildlife has not properly managed their projects they should not expect Ducks Unlimited with funding from the Outdoor Heritage Fund to come in and clean up what they failed to manage. If work is done on private land the landowner should have some "skin in the game."
- In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand indicated that the project that is on Game and Fish land, he didn't know how much their Department was contributing. Generally what they ask is that Ducks Unlimited provides the engineering services because they do a great job and frankly do it at a lower cost than private contractors. He was pretty sure that Game and Fish had some "skin in the game."
- It was suggested that the Board could direct on which projects the Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars could be spent.
- It was noted that $650,000 of the applicant's request was for construction costs and $150,000 was for professional services which was thought to be for engineering costs for the Ducks Unlimited engineering staff.

The Board reviewed the five projects listed in the application, where each one was located and which ones were on private, federal or state lands:

Bowman Haley - Alkali Creek Impoundment (58 acres) owned by U.S. Army Corps of engineers and managed by Game and Fish Department in Bowman County;

Magnolia Dam (25 acres) owned and managed by Game and Fish Department located in Cass County;

Long Lake National Wildlife Refuge - Unit II Marsh (444 acres) owned and managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service located in Burleigh County;

Long Lake National Wildlife Refuge - Unit G19 Wetland (10 acres) owned and managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service located in Kidder County;

Jim Ehlert Dam (12 acres) owned and managed by Jim Ehlert located in Mountrail County.

Mr. Moser reminded the Board members that when the Board was determining the final funding amount for each application that would be the time to suggest any restrictions or contingencies they would like to place on the funding.

Project 001-XX - Documenting Aquatic Organisms of ND Rivers - Submitted by Valley City State University - It was noted that this would primarily fund staff and is research. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated there is a big need. He really like the project but isn't sure if the Outdoor Heritage Fund should be the source for providing the funding.

Project 001-OOO - Enhancing the Wildlife Value of Working and Public Lands in the Grand Forks Prairie Project Area through Demonstrated Land Management - Several Board members commented on the application:

- This was an awesome program with the partnership between the Game and Fish Department and the private sector for an eastside grassland type of project
- Mr. Steinwand indicated that they are in the early stages of the cooperative management agreement on the UND properties. He noted that the Department would like to do a burn on the properties but you need to work with the adjacent landowners and get agreement. With the assistance of UND through this cooperative agreement they would hope to see improved management on these lands.
- This is predominantly staff and research. Dr. Yurkonis had indicated that the landowner does a good job in managing the land and we should let the landowner do that.
- Liked the idea of the grassland management. Not sure if there is sufficient justification for a full-time person.
- Mr. Moser reviewed the breakdown of the dollars in the budget and noted that they include some categories that the Board is going to be deciding whether or not they will fund such as equipment and staffing.

Project 001-AAA - Enhanced Grazing Lands & Wildlife Habitat (Phase I) - Submitted by Ducks Unlimited, Inc. - Several Board members commented on this application as follows:

- This application is to try and enroll 20,000 additional grassland acres in the Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) with, hopefully, 3750 acres for increased public access. They would be looking at expiring CRP acres. It is one of the solutions for keeping grass on the ground. It is a great project.
- Mr. Steinwand noted that this has some staffing issues associated with it. He pointed out that when the Game and Fish Department started the PLOTS program the Legislature gave them

8 positions to meet the one million acre goal. It is a capacity issue. Game and Fish is at 760,000 acres and we can help a little bit to deliver the program on the ground to the landowners. In response to the question of whether it would be unreasonable to ask for a higher percentage of these enrolled acres go into the PLOTS program; would that put too much of a burden for Game & Fish, Mr. Steinwand stated that would be a committee issue. The Game and Fish Department cannot mandate because PLOTS is a voluntary program. Mr. Steinwand was asked the question: Are there some instances where there are some people that want to enter into PLOTS but because of the type of acreage may not even qualify even if they wanted to because Game and Fish isn't going to invest money on that type of acreage? Mr. Steinwand indicated that is true. Mr. Steinwand stated that the Department tries to make PLOTS as attractive as possible for the landowner but not compete with other land uses.

- Keep in mind that North Dakota out of the four-state region had the lowest re-enrollment rate of CRP. Why is that? There are landowners that have tried to re-enroll in CRP because the land was good enough for the last 10 or 20 years and now they can't. If there were sufficient federal dollars for CRP this Fund and others like it wouldn't have to use their resources and the dollars could be used in other areas. It was noted that part of the Environmental Benefits Index requires pollinator habitat and if you don't get enough points you don't qualify for re-enrollment. Only 60% of the applicants were re-enrolled the last general sign up. Because of the changes in the rules North Dakota lands don't compete very well.
- Mr. Moser noted that of the $1.5 million request about $95,000 is for outreach, communication and staff. The rest would be for on the ground projects.
- It was noted that if we partially funded the project we could direct what those funds could go to. Then it would be up to them if it still fits within their parameters.
- There was discussion on public access. In response to some questions, Mr. Steinwand indicated that there is acreage listed in the PLOTS booklet, even though it is considered PLOTS, it is really throw-in acres from the private landowner. With the posting laws there are a lot of landowners out there that do not post their land and if you knock on their door they are willing to let you hunt on their land.
- One Board member stated that of all the cost share grazing applications they liked this one the best. You get a little more landowner participation and landowners will be more reception to this one than some of the others. Most of the CRP is in grass and anybody that wanted to hunt on it can hunt on it. Goal is to keep it in grass. Lots of lands are being tilled up because they are coming out of CRP and some of them shouldn't be tilled.

Project 001-DDD - Working Lands Partnership - Submitted by the North Dakota Natural Resources Trust, Inc. - It was noted that this application includes $80,000 for staffing - Several comments were made regarding this application:

- There are multiple applications with similar objectives and it would be great if they would work together. Overall goal is to get more habitat and create more access. Would partial funding accomplish that?
- The prior project had more clarity to it and more "bang for the buck".
- Suggest the applicant further refine their proposal and come back in a future round.
- Concerns were expressed about the high costs of rents and whether we should be spending the Fund's dollars on those higher rents. Perhaps we should wait until the rent levels are lower.

- This program is just continuing the CRP - Paying the landowner to continue the CRP program and not enhancing the acreage.
- This program works well for the landowner that has grass that was never in CRP or never would qualify for cropland. It is an odd piece; it is not easy to graze or hay. There is flexibility in the number of years you can contract for--10 years to 20 years which is a nice long time for the landowner to receive something for the irregular parcel of land. This program works for old water bank and soil bank lands that are irregular acres.
- In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that this program offers some options for irregular parcels of land and fits with the Department's philosophy "farm the best and leave the rest".
- This program has value and if the entire amount could not be funding, some funding would be good.

During the discussion on this application Mr. Aasmundstad provided some history on the CRP program.

Project 001-YY - ND 4-H Camp - Submitted by ND 4-H Foundation - It was stated that this is one of those great project but the wrong venue. It doesn't fit the objectives of the Outdoor Heritage Fund. Mr. Steinwand indicated that they have $96,000 for a fishing pond. He suggested that the National Guard might be able to help them out. When the Game and Fish Department built their pond the National Guard built it as part of a training project. All it cost the Game and Fish Department was fuel costs. Mr. Kuylen commented on how the National Guard helped their area out when the South Heart golf course was constructed. It was suggested that they look at other funding sources and come back at a future date. It was noted that the budget did not add up right. They indicate $143,596 for the requested amount but when you add up the numbers it is $176,599. If they could find some other funding source for the fishing pond and then come back with items such as walking trails that would fit better into the directives. It was stated that this is a great program and everyone in the State believes in what the 4-H does. With the good reputation of the 4-H Camp this will be taken care of.

Project 001-KK - Warwick Dam - Modification & Rehabilitation (State Water Commission Project No. 0240) - Submitted by Eddy County Water District - It was noted that if we fully fund their request the County Water Resource Board would not have to put any money into it. The difference is $55,000.

Project 001-MM - Mt. Carmel Dam Recreation Area Bathhouse - Submitted by Cavalier County Water Resource District - The question was posed that this is the Outdoor Heritage Fund and are we interested in building buildings of any sort or is there an exception? One comment was made by a Board member that they had not seen one yet. Mr. Zimmerman stated that this type of project would qualify for consideration under the Land and Conservation federal funds that are administered by the ND Parks and Recreation Department on a matching grant basis. Also with 150 seasonal sites the campers are paying fees for the season to have their campers there and there are overnight and weekend campers, perhaps they could be asked to help fund some of this if they want a new shower house. If the applicant doesn't do well in the competition for the Land and Water Conservation funds they could come back.

Project 001-CC - Golden Ridge Neighborhood Community Garden - Submitted by Golden Ridge Lutheran Church. It was noted that this would be a candidate for including in their letter

information on how to access some other funding sources. Provide information on the resources that are available.

Project 001-XXX - City of Munich Playground Equipment Fund - Submitted by City of Munich - Mr. Zimmerman stated that this is a project that would qualify for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. They have not applied for these funds over the past seven years.

001-K - Carrington CrossRoads Golf Course Shelter/Restroom - Submitted by Carrington CrossRoads Golf Course - there were no comments on this application.

001-U - Old Settlers Sewer and Water Hookups - Submitted by Ward County Park Board - This is a project where a building needs to be completed. There were no comments on this application.

001-B - Community Outdoor Fitness Park - Submitted by Minot Family YMCA - Several Board members commented on this application as follows:

- Like what they are doing. Project fits within the directives and what we are doing here.
- They have a lot of "skin in the game." They have done their work and the park is in the part of the town that doesn't have established parks. This is in a community that has a lot of issues to deal with since the flood. It is good that the YMCA came forward to put this together. Good project.
- It was pointed out the high level of matching funds that they had acquired. It is hoped that future applicants will look at this application and realize that if they want to make a request they should come to the table with some partners and some money in hand.
- One aspect of this proposal that was appreciated was that the YMCA is going to maintain the maintenance and assume all the ongoing costs. This isn't a park that the park district will have to maintain. It will not be maintained by the taxpayers.
- Mr. Kotchman noted that their plans for trees and shrubs are excellent. They have looked at the technical aspects and are working closely with a reputable local nursery to get the right trees in place.

001-C - Wildlife Education & Recreation Center - Submitted by Minot Indoor Rodeo Inc. - It was noted that it is for a building that is already under construction. There were no other comments.

001-SS - Centennial Park Woodland Trail & Souris River Recreational Access Plan- Submitted by Minot Park District Foundation - It was indicated that the quality of the planning for the project was very good, however, they have not put any local dollars towards the project. It would be rated higher if they had matching dollars. It was stated that the City of Minot has been under a lot of stress but matching funds would make a difference.

001-H - Minot to Velva Multi-Use Path Phase I - Submitted by Ward County Park Board - Several Board members made comments as follows:

- Concern about having a walking trail in a highway right-of-way. Uncertain that this is the appropriate Fund to provide dollars for the project.
- In response to a question, Mr. Bina stated they can access funds for trails in highway rights of way. It is done all the time. There are two sources of funding for trail programs -- TAP and RTP are the two programs. They are 80/20 match programs and the dollars are only

provided for the construction costs. The engineering and design of the projects are the responsibility of the project applicant. There are some funds available. Mr. Zimmerman added that the TAP funds would allow for that; RTP would not allow it in the right of way. TAP is accessed through North Dakota DOT. It was noted that the applicant had previously received some funding from DOT but had been unable to get the matching dollars so the funding they had been awarded had to be returned to DOT.

The Board took a short break. Mr. Moser reconvened the Board and they took up the remaining applications for discussion.

001-TT - ND Game and Fish Department Outdoor Heritage Habitat Initiative - Submitted by ND Game and Fish Department - Several comments were made about this application:

- Even though it may look similar to other projects it is administered under the philosophy of "farm the best and leave the rest." Landowners are given a lot of options under this program.
- Is the entire amount of funding needed; would the Department be able to administer it with less money? There was discussion on how the dollars would be committed if only partial funding was awarded.
- In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that there is enough interest that the Department could commit the full $2,000,000.
- With this program hunting access is guaranteed.
- This is the meat is of what we are here for. We need to fund this project
- This is the one thing that we can do for sportsmen that makes a difference.

001-FFF - McDowell Dam Water Access and Fishing Improvements - Submitted by Burleigh County Water Resources District - It was noted that the paddleboats need to be replaced but this isn't the right fund to provide the dollars. This type of equipment is more portable; it is not permanent equipment. The season is so short there are other projects that are more year round and more people benefit from them. It was noted that they are going to rent out the paddleboats and they should use that rental income to pay for the paddleboats.

001-O - Bismarck Rotary Arboretum Accessibility, Conservation and Interpretive Improvements - Submitted by Bismarck Rotary Club - It was noted that this includes a shelter. Is this considered a building? Ms. Godfread indicated that if there was a question about the shelter for $20,000 that could be eliminated and focus on the improved path which involves exercise. She pointed out that this is a good jogging path; school children do use this area; they come and look at the trees which are marked; some of it is native grasslands and some of it is invasive and needs conversion to truly native grasslands. Just for the exercise part it is really nice but the shelter could be removed from consideration. A point for consideration was raised as to whether this Fund should be used to renovate things that are in the middle of a city. Not sure if it fits the purpose of the Outdoor Heritage Fund. A brand new park somewhere else maybe fits the purpose but the applicant should seek funding elsewhere.

001-T - Trailhead/Neighborhood Park - Submitted by Bismarck Parks and Recreation District - Mr. Moser noted that the budget includes paving of the parking lot which is $30,000 and playground equipment between $80,000 and $90,000; a total of $120,000 for playground equipment and paving. There were no further comments.

001-OO - Restoring Public Use of the Port of Bismarck on the Missouri River - Submitted by Fort Abraham Lincoln Foundation - It was noted that this was to fund a feasibility study and pay consultants to do the study. There were no further comments.

001-TTT - Recreational Trail Reconstruction in Response to Mineral Development at Little Missouri State Park - Submitted by ND Parks and Recreation Department - Mr. Zimmerman provided some additional information about what had been discussed during the presentation. The following comments were made about the application:

- This is a good example of industry and the state working together.
- A good project that should be funded by Conoco Phillips,
- If the Department does not receive this funding, the Department will not be able to do something this spring. This is a significant portion of the Department's budget and they won't be getting any additional funding until the 2015 legislative session.
- We should go ahead and fund this and if we get reimbursement from Conoco Phillips that money can come back to the Fund. It was clarified that the Outdoor Heritage Fund can receive donations.

001-G - Beulah Park District Lions Park Renovation Project - Submitted by Beulah Park District There were no comments.

001-JJ - Beulah School & Community Outdoor Project - Submitted by Beulah Public School District #27 - This involves playground equipment, recreation equipment, walking path. It was noted that the playground equipment costs were $170,000. In response to a question, Mr. Bina stated that they have some match but not a lot of match. He would look at it differently if they had a 50% match.

001-JJJ - Trail Restoration & Improvement Program - Submitted by ND Parks & Recreation Department - Several comments were made by the Board members as follows:

- Trails are good; you get people outside and they get exercise.
- A good document for the Board members to look at is the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. That documents talks about outdoor recreation. There is a lot of support and interest around the state in outdoor recreation. 90% think that outdoor recreation is needed. Trails rate very high; playgrounds rate high. Those are the primary needs for outdoor recreation around the state. The reason people are coming to this program is that the other sources for funding do not have enough money to meet the needs and they are applying where they can.
- As a hunting and fishing guy if I go for a walk I will have a weapon in my hand. That isn't for everybody. We need to have a trails system for everyone. It is a good program.

During the discussion on this project it was noted that the Board needed to look at having a match and determine what the appropriate level should be for a match and how that level compares with other programs.

001-QQ - Natural Resource Stewardship in North Dakota's Parks, Preserves and Natural Areas - Submitted by ND Parks and Recreation Department - It was noted that the budget includes $71,000 for a technician. The budget also includes monies for building a data base ($15,000 annual fee) and supplies. There was discussion as to whether chemical supplies should be considered a maintenance issue.

001-RRR - Mapping of Tribal Land for Sportsmen - It was noted that they are doing a lot of work for a little bit of money. What they are proposing would be helpful to hunters. It was pointed out that tribes are listed in the law as potential recipients of these funds. It was stated that an issue we look at is sustainability and should we be concerned about that.

001-00W - Artificial Nesting Habitat Improvement - It was noted that this project includes some equipment. As with the previous project some concerns regarding sustainability. Support for the project was expressed noting that they are not requesting much money. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that the artificial nests need to be in place by early spring.

001-MMM - ND Hen House Project I - It was stated that this applicant has a lot of experience in putting out nests and they have a minimal footprint on the landscape and really make a bunch of ducks. Whenever you can make a duck for less than $20 you are hitting a grand slam. Based on conservative estimates they are looking at $13.33 a duck. This is a good project. It was pointed out that this is a ten-year project with 9 years of it being maintenance. It also includes $1,000 for equipment. There has been some policy discussion of whether or not the OHF should be funding annual maintenance. It was stated that anything that makes birds will have some maintenance per year whether it is this project or CRP. With these Hen Houses you have to do some patching; it is minimal maintenance if the ice doesn't taking out your structures. There isn't a cheaper way to make ducks.

001-WWW - Conservation of Long-billed Curlews on Private Lands in SW ND - It was noted that this project includes salary dollars of $26,550 and travel expenses of $3,300 so about $30,000 of the $41,994 request is tied to personnel and travel. The on the ground project of approximately $12,000 is for fencing, etc. It was stated that this is a project where you do need the outreach which requires staffing. This is a species that has been declining. We tend to wait until we are in crisis mode, when things have gone down the tubes, and then we are going to spend money on fixing it. This would be proactive and sometimes that takes management or outreach and the fencing. There was discussion about this area being Forest Service ground and that there are stipulations on those lands regarding these birds. It was stated that there are also private lands in the area and there needs to be some outreach to the landowners about how they might manage the lands for the curlews; you can manage the land for the curlews and not have it impact your crops or the grazing for cattle. In response to a question, it was stated that the on-the-ground project (fencing) will be in North Dakota but the area the staff will be covering is for more than North Dakota. It was indicated that the partners in the project would be providing matching dollars to cover a portion of the staffing costs.

001-0FF - LSC 20,000 trees by 2020 - This application did not have a presentation. The Board reviewed what the applicant was asking for. Mr. Kotchman stated that when the Technical Committee looked at this application they thought it had merit. However, the committee thought they had doubled up on their tree planting and fabric application costs. It appeared to us that the costs could be reduced by $62,000 and they would still be able to plant the 23,000 trees.

001-0ZZ - Pheasants Forever Bismarck Chapter Tree Equipment - It was noted that this application includes equipment -- a tree planter and the fabric applicator. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that the Game and Fish Department could seek an appropriation to buy this type of equipment and lease the equipment out but their experience with doing that

has not been good. They did it with no till drills and basically had to scrap one of the drills for parts to keep the other drill going. The Department has a tree planter but it is not in good shape and it isn't very old. Ms. Vetsch stated that there clearly is a demand for tree plantings. She would encourage a working partnership between the Soil Conservation Districts and the Pheasants Forever Chapter in getting this done. The Districts have the equipment and are responsible for providing the personnel to get the plantings done. If this gets funded with the purchase of equipment, great, there is the demand. However, she would hope that the focus would be broadened to encompass a partnership between both entities. It was stated that there is a definite need because of the narrow time frame for planting. This would be a quick way to get a bunch of trees into the ground this spring and it is a lot of return for the dollars.

001-0AA - Forest Stewardship Initiative - There was discussion about what this application would do; who would benefit from it; how it would work; the role of the local tax assessor; why it was needed; and whether this is a legislative issue that needs to be dealt with by the Legislature and whether this is an appropriate use for the Outdoor Heritage Fund. It was noted that the overall goal to encourage counties and landowners to utilize the forest stewardship law to get more trees on the landscape is very important.

001-EEE - Restoring an Urban Riparian Forest - $153,100. There were no comments.

001-BBB - Turtle Mountain Chippewa Outdoor Heritage Fund - It was noted that this is a project where we would send them the dollars and they will find and fund the projects. Not so sure we would be stepping out a little further than we should. There wasn't much explanation of specifically how they would use the dollars. It is a duplicate fund of what the Board is charged with doing. Not sure how it fits into the directives.

001-NNN - Kitchen Table Conversations for Private Land Conservation - A $316,000 two year program with $186,000 of that would be for staff. Mr. Steinwand stated that the Game and Fish Department has partnered with Ducks Unlimited and Pheasant Forever on Farm Bill biologists and received numerous landowner comments--Thank you because the Farm Bill is so complex.

001-PPP - Public Land Enhancement Program -- This is an $808,000 project that has $12,000 of personnel costs. It was stated that this program will fix things on public lands that should have been done by the entity holding the property rather than through this Fund. It was noted that one of the potential users could be the State Land Department; you could have a project on state lands that would be beneficial to the producer who leases the land and the State. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand did not see anything unique or special other than it was just on public lands. He noted that whoever owns the land should be taking care of it. The federal government requires that on CRP and WRP lands. In response to a question as to whether or not there is a program that is available to encourage rotational grazing on State School Lands on a cost share or less costly manner, Mr. Moser thought that you could go through EQIP. The issue there is whether you will qualify--it is very competitive. There may be some other programs coming around but they are all competitive--it comes down to whether you score enough points and for NRCS programs they go by the book -- you don't score enough points -- you don't get the funding.

001-VVV - ND /Wetlands Certification Review Initiative - Mr. Wogsland spoke in favor of this project and stated that it was the most important application that the Board was considering.

There was discussion on a number of points such as why there is a need for the third party verification for wetlands; what the legislative history is on this issue; whether this should be considered by the legislature next session and an appropriate made directly for this purpose; this funding request is primarily for staffing; how this application meets the directives of the Fund; and the benefits for farmers and conservationists.

001-00S - Optimizing Crop Rotation Strategies to Improve Disease Management and Increase Crop Yields in ND Wheat and Field Pea Production - It was noted that this is a research project. There were no comments.

001-GGG - Resistance to Invasion by *Poa pratensis* in North Dakota Prairies - Blue grass. There were no comments.

001-00Y - Enhancing Stewardship and Agronomic Benefits of Seasonal Wetlands for Producers and Wildlife in North Dakota; The Role of Beneficial Insects and Plant Diversity - No presentation had been given. It was all research. Ms. Fine stated that the applicant had sent a presentation that the Advisory Board could go through but because that opportunity had not been given to all the applicants, it wasn't appropriate to allow it for just one or two applicants.

001-UUU - Habitat Enhancing Biofuel Crops - There were no comments.

001-00I- Behavioral Attractants for Monitoring Important Insect Pollinators of ND - No presentation had been given. Ms. Fine noted that this applicant had also sent a presentation.

001-0NN - Selection & Evaluation of Ornamental Woody Plants Suitable for Parks, Recreational Area and City Plantings in Western North Dakota. This is an application where they changed the amount of what they were requesting and dropped it to $498,000. In response to a question, Mr. Kotchman stated that one of the issues in many of the Great Plains states is that we have low population so there is not much of an incentive for large commercial nurseries who are based in western US to produce tree stock that is acclimated for North Dakota because there is not much of a market. So the way NDSU often works to accomplish this is to do the tree improvement work to identify superior plant materials and then that is moved directly into the nurseries here in North Dakota -- Lincoln Oakes Nursery and Towner Nursery.

001-0WW - Management Strategies to Improve Conservation Reserve Program Habitat Quality and Livestock Grazing Value. There were no comments.

001-M - Wild Rice River Restoration and Riparian Project Phase II - It was noted that this application was basically to buy easements. It was noted that this is quite rare for soil conservation districts to buy easements. Ms. Vetsch indicated that conservation districts tend to stay away from easements just simply because of the legality issues. In this situation the easement might be necessary in order for the project to get to the implementation stage. If there are willing participants with the producer and there is a cooperating agreement with the soil conservation district she didn't see a problem with it. Historically the districts stay away from easements.

HHH - Spring Creek Watershed - Cross Fencing for Grazing Management - It was noted that this is a 319 buydown. It was noted that of the 319 projects the cross fences are the cheap ones. You

can do hot wires pretty cheap. Not sure a buydown is needed to accomplish a project. Mr. Moser stated that all his cross fences are hot wires and they are easy to put up and easy to maintain.

001 - X - Rebuild the Tioga Pool - There was no presentation on this application. There were no comments.

001 - PP - Tinta Tawa Park Pavement Renovation - This was a project to pave the parking lot. There was no presentation on this application. There were no comments.

001 - BB - Hankinson City Park Restroom Replacement & Playground. There was no presentation on this application. There were no comments

Each Board member handed in their funding pages and the results were compiled while the Board was on their break. Those applications that had six or more zero funding were identified. (A copy of the listing of the funding scores is available in the Commission files.) Mr. Moser asked if any of the Board members wanted any of these identified projects pulled for further discussion. No one requested that an application be pulled.

It was moved by Mr. Aasmundstad and seconded by Mr. Wogsland that all proposals with six zeroes or more be acted on with one motion. On a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Kuylen and seconded by Mr. Bina that the following 56 applications not be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Grant Round 1 funding:

1. **001-SSS - Measurable and Sustainable Agricultural, Economic, Watershed and Wildlife Impacts with Cover Crops Along the 49th Parallel - Northern Plains Resource**
2. **001-P – Implementing a Holistic Approach to Rangeland Management and Land Conservation through Mentoring and Education – ND Grazing Lands Coalition**
3. **001-QQQ – Perennial Grass Establishment with Grazing Plan – Stutsman County Soil Conservation District**
4. **001-R – Valley City Riverfront Greenway and Restoration Project – City of Valley City - $1,863,500**
5. **001-III – Food Barley – Adding Value & Diversity to Western ND Farms – ND Barley Council**
6. **001-L – Winter Cereals Sustainability in Action – Ducks Unlimited, Inc.**
7. **001-Z – Maah Daah Hey Trail Administrator – Maah Daah Hey Trail Association**
8. **001-F – Outdoor Adventures Initiative 2014 – The Outdoor Adventure Foundation Inc.**
9. **001-D – Nelson Lake West Side Boat Landing – Sporting Chance**
10. **001-DD – 2013 Paving Project, McKenzie Bay Recreation Area – Watford City Park Board**
11. **001-V – Project LL Paving – Williams County Water Resources District**
12. **001-LLL – Schatz Point South Side Boat Ramp – Tri-Cities Joint JDA at Lake Tschida**

13. **001-HH – Spring Creek & Iglehart Subdivision's Concrete Boat Ramp (Spring Creek Landing)**
14. **001-UU – Riverside Park Enhancement Project – City of Washburn**
15. **001-KKK – Devils Lake Winter Ice Fishing Trail System – Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce**
16. **001-E – Tallgrass Prairie Seed Source Program – Save The Hens Foundation, Inc.**
17. **001-Q – Bowman County Conservation Grazing Project – Bowman County Weed Board**
18. **001-RR – Red River Riparian Project – Red River Regional Council**
19. **001-GG – Stump Lake Park Improvement – Nelson County Park Board**
20. **001-XX – Documenting Aquatic Organisms of ND Rivers – Valley City State University**
21. **001-OOO – Enhancing the Wildlife Value of Working and Public Lands in the Grand Forks Prairie Project Area through Demonstrated Land Management – University of North Dakota**
22. **001-DDD – Working Lands Partnership – N.D. Natural Resources Trust, Inc.**
23. **001-YY – ND 4-H Camp – ND 4-H Foundation**
24. **001-MM – Mt. Carmel Dam Recreation Area Bathhouse – Cavalier County Water Resource District**
25. **001-CC – Golden Ridge Neighborhood Community Garden – Golden Ridge Lutheran Church**
26. **001-XXX – City of Munich Playground Equipment Fund – City of Munich**
27. **001-K – Carrington CrossRoads Golf Course Shelter / Restroom – Carrington CrossRoads Golf Course**
28. **001-U – Old Settlers Sewer and Water Hookups – Ward County Park Board**
29. **001-C – Wildlife Education & Recreation Center – Minot Indoor Rodeo, Inc.**
30. **001-SS – Centennial Park Woodland Trail & Souris River Recreational Access Plan – Minot Park District Foundation**
31. **001-H – Minot to Velva Multi-Use Path Phase 1 – Ward County Park Board**
32. **001-FFF – McDowell Dam Water Access and Fishing Improvements – Burleigh County Water Resources District**
33. **001-O – Bismarck Rotary Arboretum Accessibility, Conservation and Interpretive Improvements – Bismarck Rotary Club**
34. **001-OO – Restoring Public Use of the Port of Bismarck on the Missouri River – Fort Abraham Lincoln Foundation**
35. **001-G – Beulah Park District Lions Park Renovation Project – Beulah Park District**
36. **001-JJ – Beulah School & Community Outdoor Project – Beulah Public School District #27**
37. **001-WWW – Conservation of Long-billed Curlews on Private Lands in SW ND – American Bird Conservancy**
38. **001-ZZ – Pheasants Forever Bismarck Chapter Tree Equipment – Pheasants Forever Dakota Chapter, Bismarck, ND**
39. **001-AA – Forest Stewardship Initiative – ND Forest Service**
40. **001-EEE – Restoring an Urban Riparian Forest – River Keepers**
41. **001-BBB – Turtle Mountain Chippewa Outdoor Heritage Fund – Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians**
42. **001-NNN – Kitchen Table Conversations for Private Land Conservation – Pheasants Forever, Inc.**

43. **001-PPP – Public Land Enhancement Program – Pheasants Forever, Inc.**
44. **001-VVV – ND Wetlands Certification Review Initiative – ND Department of Agriculture**
45. **001-S – Optimizing Crop Rotation Strategies to Improve Disease Management and Increase Crop Yields in ND Wheat and Field Pea Production – NDSU**
46. **001-GGG – Resistance to Invasion by *Poa Pratensis* in North Dakota Prairies – NDSU**
47. **001-Y – Enhancing Stewardship and Agronomic Benefits of Seasonal Wetlands for Producers and Wildlife in ND: the Role of Beneficial Insects and Plant Diversity - NDSU**
48. **001-UUU – Habitat Enhancing Biofuel Crops – NDSU**
49. **001-I – Behavioral Attractants for Monitoring Important Insect Pollinators of N.D. – NDSU**
50. **001-NN – Selection & Evaluation of Ornamental Woody Plants Suitable for Parks, Recreational Areas & City Plantings for Western ND – NDSU**
51. **001-WW – Management Strategies to Improve Conservation Reserve Program Habitat Quality and Livestock Grazing Value – NDSU**
52. **001-M – Wild Rice Restoration and Riparian Project Phase II – Wild Rice Soil Conservation District**
53. **001-HHH – Spring Creek Watershed – Cross Fencing for Grazing Management – Spring Creek Watershed, Mercer County Soil Conservation District**
54. **001-X Rebuild the Tioga Pool - Tioga Park District**
55. **001-0PP - Tinta Tawa Park Pavement Renovation - Casselton Park District**
56. **001-0BB - City Park Restroom Replacement and Playground Addition - Hankinson Park District**

On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

The Board then discussed how to proceed with the 18 remaining applications. The Board took up the first application on the list.

It was moved by Mr. Aasmundstad and seconded by Mr. Hoffman that Antelope Creek Wild Rice Corridor Watershed Restoration Project submitted by Richland Soil Conservation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $165,000. After discussion the motion was withdrawn.

In response to a question as to why the amount of $165,000 was determined, Mr. Aasmundstad stated that he looked at the number of zeros and the funding amounts on the list and calculated a number. There was discussion about being consistent in how the Board determines the amount. It was suggested that an average of the recommended funding be calculated and then the Board could look at each application to determine if that was the appropriate amount. One option was to take out the high and low and then take the mean average of the rest. After further discussion it was decided to do a straight average. Add up the total amount of the funding scores and divide the total by twelve. Chairman Moser indicated that when considering each of these applications the Board should also consider whether any conditions should be placed on the recommended funding. The staff determined the averages and the spreadsheet with the 18 remaining

applications was distributed. (A copy of the spreadsheet with the averages is available in the Commission files.) The Board then took up each of the applications as follows:

It was moved by Mr. Aasmundstad and seconded by Mr. Hutchens that the Antelope Creek Wild Rice Corridor Watershed Restoration Project application submitted by Richland Soil Conservation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $105,000. On a roll call vote 11 - 1 On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland voted aye and Moser voted no. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Kuylen and seconded by Mr. Wogsland that the Ransom County Water Quality Improvement Project application submitted by the Ransom County Soil Conservation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $115,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland voted aye and Moser voted no. The motion carried.

Mr. Moser stated that the reason he had voted no on these two applications was because he thought there should be consistency on the 319 projects.

It was moved by Ms. C. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Hutchens that the Sheyenne River Sedimentation Reduction Project application submitted by Barnes County Soil Conservation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $126,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Bina and seconded by Ms. Stockdill that the ND Statewide Conservation Tree Planting Initiative submitted by the ND Association of Soil Conservation Districts be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $1,878,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. J. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Hutchens that the Marcus Friskop Nature Center application submitted by the Hankinson Public School be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $30,000 with the condition that the funding only be used for outdoor projects. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Reierson, Stockdill, Moser voted aye and Melchior and Wogsland voted no. The motion carried.

There was some discussion about moving away from using the average. Mr. Godfread stated that he had looked at the level of funding that had been indicated and the number of zeros and thought that should be given some consideration in determining the amount of funding. Ms. Stockdill stated that even though she had indicated zero funding for this application she is supportive of funding it at this level. When looking at all the applications she had to give some

of the applications zeros even though she thought they were good projects because she wanted to keep her overall number at a certain level.

It was moved by Mr. Hutchens and seconded by Mr. Hoffman that the Aquatic Habitat Infrastructure Enhancement application submitted by Ducks Unlimited, Inc. be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $322,000.

It was moved by Mr. Aasmundstad and seconded by Mr. Wogsland that the motion be amended to stipulate that the funding be used only on land in private ownership or owned or managed by the State.

Mr. Hutchens stated that by approving this amendment it might set a precedent when we are talking about trees and forest lands and other federal holdings in the State and it may or may not be what we want to carry forward.

On a roll call vote on the amendment Aasmundstad, J. Godfread, Kuylen, Melchior, Wogsland, Moser voted aye and Bina, C. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Reierson, and Stockdill voted no. The amendment failed on a 6 to 6 vote.

Ms. Stockdill stated that when you discuss federal lands you need to consider that there are many different federal lands--lands along the river, lands in the WMA's leased to the Game and Fish Department and you also have public lands along the lake where you would want to do enhancements through this program. There are habitat opportunities available on some federal lands. In response to a question, Mr. Steinwand stated that on the lands that Game and Fish leases from the federal government the Department is responsible for the management of the lands -- it is a 25 year lease. Mr. Aasmundstad stated that is why his motion was worded to include those lands managed by the State and not those lands owned and managed (or mismanaged) by the federal government. Ms. Stockdill stated there are federal lands that with the assistance of local wildlife groups and Ducks Unlimited (DU) could be managed for habitat and you could leverage these dollars with those other dollars by bringing in DU funding and other funding. She indicated that from personal experience their local Pheasants Forever Chapter works very closely with the Corps where the Chapter is even considering entering into a management lease. There are opportunities for partnerships like that. Mr. Hoffman stated that his reason for voting no is that if we had limited the funding to certain lands there was the possibility of limiting public access for sportsmen.

On a roll call vote on recommending funding for the Aquatic Habitat Infrastructure Enhancement application in the amount of $322,000 Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Moser voted aye and Wogsland voted no. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Hutchens and seconded by Mr. Melchior that the Enhanced Grazing Lands & Wildlife Habitat (Phase 1) application submitted by Ducks Unlimited, Inc. be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $828,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Moser voted aye and Wogsland voted no. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Wogsland that the Warwick Dam – Modification & Rehabilitation (State Water Commission Project No. 0240) submitted by Eddy County Water District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $54,279.

Mr. Godfread noted that the reason for the amount is that it is the difference between the maximum amount of match that the Eddy County Water District Board has been approved to provide and what is needed.

It was moved by Mr. Reierson and seconded by Mr. Hoffman that the amount be amended to $55,000. On a roll call vote on the amendment, Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

On a roll call vote on the motion as amended, Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Melchior and seconded by Mr. Aasmundstad that the Community Outdoor Fitness Park proposal submitted by the Minot Family YMCA be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $45,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Bina and seconded by Mr. Kuylen that the ND Game & Fish Department Outdoor Heritage Habitat Initiative submitted by the ND Game and Fish Department be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $1,900,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Wogsland and seconded by Mr. Hutchens that the Trailhead/Neighborhood Park application submitted by the Bismarck Parks & Recreation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $105,000.

There was considerable discussion about whether the Board wanted to direct where the funding is to be used. They reviewed the application and the dollar amounts for the different aspects of the application. It was suggested that the playground equipment, paving and shelter be excluded from the funding. The point was made that the Board is considering only half of the funding that was recommended and that the applicant would have the expertise to determine how best to use the funding. There was discussion on whether the Board was being consistent in funding this project when it had already voted down a number of projects that included paving, playground equipment, and buildings. In response to a question, Mr. Bina indicated that they would have to revise their plan with the lower amount of funding or perhaps do the park in phases.

It was moved by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Aasmundstad that the motion be amended to restrict the funding from being used for paving. On a roll call vote on the amendment, Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen voted aye and Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, and Moser voted no. The motion carried.

In response to a question, Mr. Reierson stated that he voted no because this looked like an urban project and the objective of the Fund is to get people into the State's outdoor heritage and not into urban parks and playgrounds. That is why he has a problem with playgrounds. Do they deserve to be funded? Absolutely; but the objectives of the Outdoor Heritage Fund are for something different than urban playgrounds and parks. Ms. Stockdill stated that we just basically told the kids in Munich and Beulah and Stump Lake that their playground doesn't count but this one does. We are going down a slippery slope and not being consistent. Mr. Moser stated his reason for voting no is the consistency on the issue of playground equipment.

On a roll call vote on the $105,000 funding as amended Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Wogsland, voted aye and Aasmundstad, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, and Moser voted no. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Kuylen and seconded by Mr. Hutchens that the Recreational Trail Reconstruction in Response to Mineral Development at Little Missouri State Park submitted by ND Parks and Recreation Department be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $73,000.

There was discussion of whether the motion should be amended to clarify what would happen if Conoco Phillips agrees to provide the $73,000 for the trail reconstruction. Mr. Hoffman stated that he would hope to have an answer in the near future on whether or not they will do so. Mr. Reierson stated that if they did pay for all the reconstruction costs, then there would never be a request for funding from the Outdoor Heritage Fund and we don't have to worry about putting monies back into the Fund. Mr. Hoffman stated that he would hope to have an answer from Conoco Phillips prior to the Industrial Commission meeting.

There was a brief discussion of spending authority for the Department of Parks and Recreation.

On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Ms. C. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Kuylen that the Trail Restoration & Improvement Program submitted by ND Parks & Recreation be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $112,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Aasmundstad and seconded by Mr. Melchior that the Natural Resource Stewardship in North Dakota's Parks, Preserves and Natural Areas application submitted by ND Parks & Recreation Department be recommended to the Industrial

Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $129,000 with the conditions that none of the funding be used for annual maintenance or staffing. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. J. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Wogsland that the Mapping of Tribal Land for Sportsmen application submitted by Spirit Lake Nation Fish and Wildlife Department be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $8,568. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland, Moser voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Melchior and seconded by Mr. J. Godfread that the Artificial Nesting Habitat Improvement application submitted by the Spirit Lake Nation Fish and Wildlife Department be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $5,565. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Wogsland voted aye and Moser voted no. The motion carried.

After a motion and an amendment it was noted that there was an error on the funding score sheet that needed to be corrected and after that correction the average amount was $33,924.

Mr. Hutchens restated his motion which was seconded by Mr. Aasmundstad that the ND Hen House Project 1 application submitted by Delta Waterfowl be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $34,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Moser voted aye and Wogsland voted no. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Aasmundstad and seconded by Mr. J. Godfread that the LSC 20,000 Trees by 2020 application submitted by the Ludden Sportsmen Club be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of $50,000. On a roll call vote Aasmundstad, Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Reierson, Stockdill, Moser voted aye and Wogsland voted no. The motion carried.

It was stated that the total amount being recommended for funding was $5,921,133.

Mr. Wogsland stated that of the 18 applications being recommended for funding 11 came from around this table. He wanted to point that out in case there were questions from the press. Mr. Godfread stated that when this Board was proposed by the groups that came together to create this Fund and help carry it legislatively the membership was selected for a reason. The Board members are experts in their field either in conservation or agriculture. The Board members represent well established long term organizations that were picked for very good reasons to be at this table. Mr. Moser stated that this is the first round and those entities that had an idea of what was coming were probably a little more prepared and hopefully the next round we will see some additional good applications.

Mr. Aasmundstad thanked all the entities for bringing their applications whether they were chosen or not. He encouraged those that did not get funded this time to come back. He also thanked the people around this table and the groups they represent for being able to come together like this. He didn't really know what to expect; if it was going to be amiable or confrontational. We have demonstrated to all the groups involved in the future of North Dakota that things like this are very possible, very doable and nothing but good can come if we keep the dialogue open and approach the issues honestly.

The Board discussed a meeting date and time for their next meeting to take up policy issues to be presented to the Industrial Commission on January 29, 2014. After discussion the time set was January 22, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. with a call-in number being made available to Board members who cannot travel in for the meeting. It was indicated that the agenda for that meeting should include a discussion about an Outdoor Heritage Fund logo and about signage that would recognize the Outdoor Heritage Fund as providing funds for the project.

The Board thanked Ms. Fine and Ms. Campbell for their work in putting the meeting together. The Board also thanked the Chairman for all his hard work.

Ms. Fine reminded the Board members of what they were required to hand in--their scoring sheets and funding score sheets.

Being no further business, Chairman Moser adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

_____
Wade Moser, Chairman

_____
Recording Secretary