

Minutes of a Meeting of the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board
Held on December 15, 2014 at 8:00 a.m.
DMR Conference Room, 1000 E Calgary
Bismarck, ND

DRAFT

Present: Wade Moser, OHF Advisory Board Chairman
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
Kent Reiersen, 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: Members of the Public (A list is available in the Commission's files.)

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

Mr. Moser asked for any additions or deletions to the December 15, 2014 agenda. Mr. Reiersen requested the addition of a discussion of program marketing--some brochures, handouts, etc. When people ask, he directs them to the website but if they had something in hand, it would be useful. Mr. Moser said it would be added to the agenda.

Mr. Moser thanked the Technical Committee for their help in the review process.

The May 13, 2014 meeting minutes were presented. (Copies are available in the Commission/OHF files.) It was noted that the September 5, 2014 meeting minutes were not completed.

It was moved by Mr. Kuylen and seconded by Mr. Hutchens to approve the May 13, 2014 minutes as presented. The motion carried.

It was requested that if an application had previously been considered that the action of the Board be noted in the summary sheets of the new application.

Ms. Karlene Fine, Industrial Commission Executive Director, presented the financial report as follows: (Detailed statements are available in the Commission's files.)

Outdoor Heritage Fund (294)
Financial Statement
2013-2015 Biennium
December 15, 2014 Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board Meeting

	<u>Cash Balance</u>
July 1, 2013 Balance	\$ 0.00
Interest Revenue through October 31, 2014	\$ 3,197.61
Revenues through October 31, 2014	\$12,933,023.20
Grant Expenditures through October 31, 2014	\$ (842,553.72)
Administrative Expenditures through October 31, 2014	<u>\$ (83,016.19)</u>
	\$12,010,650.90
Outstanding Project Commitments as of October 31, 2014	<u>\$(13,267,846.22)</u>
Balance	\$(1,257,195.32)

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	<u>\$15,000,000.00</u>
	\$30,020,000.00
Administration Expenditures	\$ (300,000.00)
Project Commitments 2013-2015	<u>\$(14,110,400.00)</u>
Available Funding	\$15,609,600.00

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; ...

In response to a question, Ms. Fine stated they were still authorized for the full \$30 million. Disbursements are spread over a lengthy period of time, some as long as ten years. If the Board wishes to do so, they can make commitments up to the full \$30 million.

In response to a question regarding if anyone is spending less than the grant awarded, Ms. Fine stated no but it is early yet and many of the applicants are just starting to draw down funds. Only \$842,000 has been disbursed so far.

Mr. Moser provided an overview of the process and stated that it will be similar to last time. Ms. Fine asked that if any Board member has a conflict of interest they fill out the form and turn it in.

The Board then heard presentations on the following applications:

GR4-16 - Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center Native Prairie Restoration - ND Parks and Recreation Department & Lewis & Clark Fort Mandan Foundation - \$33,250 - Directive C – Summary: Reestablish native prairie grass and forbs at the 1.85 acre Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center; installation of interpretive signage/brochure. Presentation made by Ms. Kathy Duttonhefner. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) In response to a question, Ms. Duttonhefner said the 1.8 acres were all disturbed during construction of the Center. She said the contractor did not put the top soil back because, she thought, the money ran out.

GR4-20 - North Dakota Waterbank Program - ND Department of Agriculture - \$1,200,000 - Directive C – Summary: Provide funding for Waterbank Program. Obtain a number of waterbank agreements; complete land treatments; upland seeding and identified wetland restorations; monitor tracts; provide alternative incentive to landowners for flooded cropland. Presentation made by Ms. Carrie Larson. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) Ms. Larson responded to a number of questions regarding the determination of what is a wetland; the number of acres that will be paid for; involvement of these acres in the PLOTS program (based on prior program approximately 50% of the landowners participated in the PLOTS program) and there cannot be a requirement for public access under the Waterbank Program; PLOTS payments would be in addition to the Waterbank Program payments; weed control--old program said you couldn't do a burn--weed control is something they will be looking at in the new

program; previous source of funding was the EPA 319 program with a minimal amount of state dollars provided through staff salaries; both the Game and Fish Department and Agriculture Department would be promoting the program; no particular part of the state would be targeted with the program; and landowners cost share rate is based off NRCS specifications - normally 50/50%. She noted that there are 6 or 7 contracts still in the old program -- in the 90's there were between 6,700 to 6,900 acres involved in the program -- now it is 300-400 acres.

GR4 -14 - Sheyenne River Bank Stability Restoration Project - Phase 1 Bjornson Golf Course - Valley City Parks and Recreation Department - \$197,550 - Directive C – Summary: Utilizing bioengineering techniques restore and stabilize 1,113 feet of riverbank. Will also result in improved aquatic biota. Presentation made by Mr. Tyler Jacobson. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) Mr. Jacobson commented on the efforts that had been made in 2005 to stabilize the riverbank with a willow wall and willow stakes. Has been working somewhat but with rates of flows going up due to Devils Lake - 2009 and 2011 were devastating years. Result is increased repair expenses and loss of revenue. He reviewed the budget and identified the engineering costs and also the other funding sources that have been requested (not confirmed yet) -- State Water Commission is one source in the amount of \$548,000 from Devils Lake mitigation funds, EPA 319 dollars are not yet confirmed, \$50,000 cash is from Park District - Valley City is not providing any funding for the project. He noted that the golf course produces 10,000 rounds annually. He stated that they would be considering native grasses -- lower maintenance species is better for them.

GR4-19 - Fox Island Boat Ramp Bank Stabilization - Bismarck Parks and Recreation District - \$215,374 - Directive A – Summary: Stabilize river bank along the Missouri River at Fox Island Boat Ramp. Reshaping approximately 300 feet of the shoreline at a 2:1 slope, installing geotextile fabric and placing rip rap; and installation of an accessible fishing platform. Presentation made by Mr. Greg Smith, Bismarck Parks and Rec., and Mr. David Mayer, KLJ. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) Noted that there is no ADA fishing platform at the location now. This application includes a railing with fishing pole holders and some features for those that are wheel chair bound. Bismarck Parks & Recreation would be paying for the curb and gutter work--not part of the application. If this work does not get done a portion of the parking lot will have to be shut down. This application deals with the critical need for turnarounds when putting boats in the water. He noted that even though the land belongs to Bismarck Parks and Recreation they will have to get permits from the Corps of Engineers (conversations have been very positive) and possibly the State Water Commission. In response to questions he noted that the rock size would vary in size; first very large 3 to 4 foot diameter then progressively smaller as it comes out of the water; last riprapping was done prior to 1994; and what they are seeing now is the result of an eddy that formed in the water and kept pushing into the river bank.

GR4-18 - Western ND Habitat Enhancement Projects - Mule Deer Foundation - \$480,900 - Directive A – Summary: Employ at least six habitat enhancement/restoration projects on over 2,000 acres involving prescribed burns, native grass/shrub plantings, invasive/noxious weed control, fencing and wildlife food plots. Presentation made by Mr. Marshall Johnson. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He stated that they currently do not have specific sites selected. Because of that they do not have the exact plans they would be implementing. A plan will be developed once the site is selected. Hess Corporation has indicated that they are willing to provide \$5,000 per project. Program will be administered solely in the western part of the state. Landowner gets better grazing, sportsman wins with better access.

Mr. Johnson responded to a series of questions:

Q: Are there is currently enough PLOTS acreage in the targeted area? A: Yes

Q: Would participants have to be enrolled in PLOTS? A: Yes. Game & Fish and Mule Deer would work together to select sites that are eligible for PLOTS. We have subsidized 27,000 acres just in western North Dakota predominantly south of the interstate.

Q: Like the concept of the project, but last time and this time it isn't very definitive. How would it work if we cut back the funding request to a pilot project level so we could see some results? A:

looking for any support they could get and any money from the Fund would be positively put to use. We'd like to do 2,000 acres in 3-4 years. Length of time depends on the moisture.

Q: Based on interest so far, what do you anticipate for participation in program – will you be able to allocate the funds in 2-5 years? A: That is our goal and expectation. There are plenty of landowners enrolled in PLOTS that have interest. We will approach landowners to do it in appropriate areas. Two landowners have already expressed interest in White Earth Valley.

Q: There is a need for more detailed habitat restoration plans following end treatment, how are you going to develop them? A: They contacted the local and state NRCS in the area and they will participate up front. Post treatment monitoring for years. If additional work is needed, Mule Deer Foundation will do fundraising or volunteer for it.

Q: This is an area where there is cedar/juniper overgrowth and it is occurring naturally. How will you deal with it? A: It is an aggressive species that must be dealt with.

Q: Where are you at in obtaining the matching funds? A: It is an ongoing process – we have \$65,000 already. Industry partners have indicated \$5,000 here and there. As funds are secured we'll do the project.

Q: You referenced a loss of habitat due to ag processes, what ag processes were you referring to? A: The removal of shelter belts and CRP acreage.

Q: Who would you be approaching to be your partners? A: On the last project the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation participated in it as well as the Bighorn Sheep Foundation. Oil producers and the Petroleum Council want funds to go to the areas they're working in.

GR4-21 - Handicap Accessible Fishing Pier at Sheep Creek Dam - Grant County Water Resource District - \$20,902 - Directive A – Summary: Provide handicap accessible fishing pier, accessible sidewalk, plant trees, bank stabilization & improve water quality & wildlife habitat. Presentation made by Mr. Stephen Schadler. (Handouts are available in the Commission files.) Board members stated they had put together a great budget--you know what will be done with the dollars and at what cost.

GR4-5 - Cliffs Park and Water Access Development Project - Cliffs Subdivision - \$110,866 - Directive A – Summary: Remove trees & debris, stabilize shoreline, tree planting, purchase playground equipment, establish picnic area. Presentation made by Mr. Clay Smaaladen. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He reviewed where this project would be located, why it was needed, what efforts they have already made to try and resolve the access issue, and the commitment of the local people to do volunteer work on this project. In response to a question regarding if this area would be open to the public or just for the subdivision residents, Mr. Smaaladen said it is for the subdivision residents. If it was opened up to the public there would be liability concerns.

GR4-1 - Harmon Lake Campground Expansion - Morton County Water Resource District \$150,000 - Directive D – Summary: Develop 20 camper pads, 20 electrical hookups, interior roads, signage and security lighting. Presentation made by Mr. Tim Nilson. (Handouts are available in the Commission files.) In response to a question regarding if the request is just for camping sites or is the road included, Mr. Nilson said the road on 3rd page in dotted line is included in budget but only for site development.

GR4-13 - Grant County Area: Cover Crops for Wet Soils and Prevented Plant Ground - Grant County Soil Conservation District - \$488,895 - Directive B – Summary: Initiate sustainable planting of cover crops; provide tools to measure the impact of cover crops with focus on wet soils and prevented plant areas. Presentation made by Mr. Daniel Devitt. (Slides are available in the Commission files.)

Mr. Devitt responded to a number of questions:

Q: Is grazing allowed prior to November 1? A: No, crop must remain in place until November 1

Q: How did you arrive at \$75/acre? A: NRCS cost rates

Q: What does it include? A: A 60/40 split on seed, labor equipment, etc. \$30 /acre for seed is low.

Q: Is it only for prevent plant acreage? A: Yes - land can only qualify for prevent plant acreage for a few years so this program would cover that. The hope is that once the landowner has seen the benefits from having cover crops they will continue to implement that practice.

Q: What are they using to seed these areas? A: Four-wheelers, broadcasting, air drills, rollers, etc.

Q: What seeds are you using? A: Up to the producer, generally about 6 to 8 different crops. Turnips, radishes, soybeans, millet; fracturing the soil to let it drain and tap roots bring up nitrogen levels.

GR4-23 - Private Land Aquatic Habitat Creation and Infrastructure Enhancement - Ducks Unlimited, Inc. - \$495,000 - Directive B – Summary: Restore, develop and enhance 12 aquatic and grassland habitats (4,320 acres) on privately owned and managed lands in Emmons, McLean and Sioux Counties - 12 stock dam wetland impoundments (132.4 acres) and 1 water-spreader, irrigation wetland system. This is Phase II of an on-going, longer-term program. Presentation made by Mr. Rick Warhurst. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He said landowners will pay approximately 10% of construction costs or approximately \$55,000. DU will pay all non-construction contract costs and amortize the project over 20 years. Mr. Warhurst responded to a series of questions:

Q: How were the 9 landowners selected? A: Landowners contacted them. Fish and Wildlife hasn't been able to do work in Sioux County. There are other landowners interested if the current projects do not move forward.

Q: Who constructed the prior dams; shouldn't they be repairing them? A: Some of the prior work was done by either the landowner, Fish and Wildlife Service and possibly NRCS. Most of the dams were not engineered well and very few have primary spillways.

Q: What all is included in the agreement with the landowner? A: The work that Ducks Unlimited will do is identified; what the landowner will contribute is identified; how the project will be managed; landowner has to keep grass in place; ultimately the landowner will be managing the project for many years.

Q: Are these permanent easements? A: They are 20-year agreements.

GR4-17 - Riparian Grazing Systems Project - Stutsman County Soil Conservation District - \$253,500 - Directive B – Summary: Restore proper vegetative balance in riparian areas; proper rotation of grazing animals through use of a multi-celled grazing system; restore and maintain water quality. Presentation made by Mr. Ryan Odenbach. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He said they would be focusing on landowners that are located on the James River. Most grazing land in Stutsman County is located on stream areas. They would install 150,000 linear feet of fence, 30 water tanks, 20,000 feet of pipelines, 10 wells or rural water hookups (plus electrical). He stated that the purpose of the request is to clean up waterways. They have seen an improvement in water quality on a previous project -- The Pipestem Project. In response to a question Mr. Odenbach said that the producer is responsible for maintenance of the project and at the end of the contract the producer will own it. This application is for the funding of 10 projects -- about 10 square miles will be the average size.

GR4-08 - Crooked Crane Trail Exercise & Fitness Loop - City of Dickinson - \$975,000 - Directive D – Summary: Creation of a 1.8 mile fitness trail on north side of Patterson Lake, including paving of trail and purchase of fitness machines & playground equipment & lighting. Presentation made by Mr. Shawn Kessel along with James Kramer, Brett Gurholt and Representative Vicky Steiner. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He said the lake and land surrounding it is all federal lands. Dickinson Parks & Rec manages a great majority of it. The trail is an existing trail about 17 miles in circumference. It is used, but they'd like to maximize utilization. Currently it is a mowed pathway. It's a 1.8 mile fitness trail. Birding towers for NW trail. The trail will connect to the city. Parks District has a management agreement with Bureau of Reclamation. They have approved the project, and that agreement will continue in the future.

The presenters responded to a series of questions:

Q: Any numbers regarding usage of existing area? A: They track entrance at the gate - 3800 vehicles annually.

Q: Does it connect to the community? A: Currently can be by primitive means, future phases will connect better.

Q: Do they groom for cross country skiing? A: Currently on the golf course and are discussing whether they should in other areas.

Q: Is the match committed? A: \$201,000 to \$215,000 has been collected already; the private side fundraising will begin in January.

Q: Will they be coming back for funding for future phases? A: Yes, for the northwest and southwest trails. They will not be as expensive as this first phase.

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

GR4-3 - LaMoure County Memorial Park Streambank Restoration Project - LaMoure County Soil Conservation District - \$695,424 - Directive D – Summary: Stabilization of three critical riverbanks and a small portion of a road raised to create a new park entrance trail. Approximately 2,000 linear feet will be graded and stabilized to preserve the Memorial Park. Presentation made by Mr. Bob Flath. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He said other match sources have been confirmed. They need to pursue some permits yet. SHPO does require a Class 3 investigation. UND has helped with this in the past. All other NEPA requirements will be yielded to State Water Commission. In response to a question Mr. Flath stated that the Water Commission funding is not contingent on funding from the OHF. OHF funding may impact the amount that the Water Commission provides. In response to a question, he stated that the full funding would take care of all three banks within the park. He did provide a breakdown on the costs for each bank and indicated how they would prioritize them.

It was pointed out that they may want to make one change on the handout, the OHF request and total project costs should be swapped.

GR4-4 - Sargent County Silver Lake Park “Playplaces and Gathering Spaces” Renovations Project - Sargent County Park Board & Commissioners - \$13,708 - Directive D – Summary: Replacement of playground equipment and pavilion benches, etc. new shelter. Presentation made by Ms. Paula Hansen. (Flip chart handouts are available in the Commission files.)

GR4-7 - Norsemen Outdoor Education Center - Norsemen Archers, Inc. - \$216,781 - Directive D – Summary: Demolish existing facility & construct new facility with indoor range & meeting rooms. Presentation made by Mr. Ross Thyheson and Mr. Greg Thyheson. (Slides are available in the Commission files.)

The presenters responded to a series of questions:

Q: Do they own the building and land? A: Yes.

Q: What is the dollar amount collected and pledged? A: \$4,000 in hand and \$30,000 pledged.

Q: What are the outdoor range improvements? A: Tree trimming and dirt work will be done by volunteers. They will need money for targets.

GR4-2 - Dead Colt Creek Recreational Playground Project - Ransom County Water Resource District - \$45,174 - Directive D – Summary: Installation of playground equipment and basketball court. Purchase of playground equipment. Presentation made by Mr. Jim Lyons. (Handouts are available in the Commission files.) He thanked Mr. Steinwand for his support. Mr. Steinwand indicated that the Ransom County Water Resource District is a great group to work with. Mr. Lyons indicated that the 25% match is all from the Garrison Diversion District and if it doesn't come through they have 4 mills to fall back on.

GR4-9 - Green Acres Property Owners' Association Neighborhood Play Area Project - Green Acres Property Owners' Association - \$37,786 - Directive D – Summary: Add a playground system for younger and older children, a swing set and other small play structures. No one gave a presentation.

GR4-11 - Drayton Campground - Drayton Park Board - \$180,000 - Directive D – Summary: Installation of electrical hook ups and site development for the 70-site campground. (Request for additional funding from OHF). Presentation made by Mr. Ross Lambert. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He said camping is the best source of income for the park. They take money from the camping and fund the improvements in the park to keep it going. They have a \$110,000 donation but there are no stipulations by

American Crystal. Their harvest lasts 10 days out of the year, if they ever would use it. That's not what this project is for. In response to a question, Mr. Lambert said that 30% of the campers come from Winnipeg for golfing and 30% for hunting and fishing. In response to a question, Mr. Lambert stated that they do not restrict the number of days of use on a campsite. They do have people come and stay the whole summer; about 30% do stay for the entire summer. He indicated that they have not expended any of the money from the first grant -- they were on hold until they raised more money.

GR4-22 - Stump Lake Park Bank Restoration - Nelson County Park Board - \$472,912 - Directive D – Summary: Sloping and rip-rapping of 200 feet on the north bank and 1,800 feet on the south bank at a 3:1 slope on Stump Lake. Presentation made by Ms. Dawn Keeley. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) She said Stump Lake Park is 166 acres est. in early 1900s. The county currently generates \$69,000 on a 3 mill levy to the \$160,000 annual budget and within that budget they are budgeting about \$20,000 per year for annual upgrades and maintenance projects. Currently the park has 5 campgrounds accommodating 130 campers with a long standing waiting list of over 75 people. In the past 30 years 515 feet of shore line has been lost – since 1981. In response to a question about the Water Commission helping with the cost for the riprapping, Mr. Davidson said they have a request in but have not heard if any funding is awarded--if funding is received from the Water Commission it may reduce the amount required from the OHF. It was noted that the matching funds would be in the form of cash.

In response to a question about the \$10,000 bond, Ms. Fine indicated that it is a type of insurance policy on the work that is being done on the project and it getting done on time. Mr. Moser pointed out that they are also providing an estimated \$95,000 in engineering expenses which is not reflected in the budget.

GR4-6 - Beach City Park Northside Playground - Beach City Park Board - \$41,000 - Directive D – Summary: Purchase of playground equipment & landscaping to develop a park in Beach. Presentation made by Ms. Jennifer Erickson. She said currently the land is an empty city block. Beach has new homes, they aren't necessarily oil field people, but people coming back to raise their families. Beach has 4 playgrounds including the school. You need to go across the State Highway 16 to access other playgrounds.

GR4-10 - TMBCI Sky Chief Park Fishing Pier Project - Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians - \$60,000 - Directive A – Summary: Purchase & installation of 4 piers on Gordon & Wheaton Lakes. Presentation made by Mr. Les Thomas. He distributed a revised version of their request. (Slides are available in the Commission files.) It was noted that the Gordon and Wheaton Lakes get a lot of fishing activities - very popular among the residents. Mr. Steinwand stated that the Game and Fish Department doesn't manage these lakes so he did not know if they were good fishing lakes but he knows that they are popular lakes.

GR4-15 - Little Missouri Grazing Association Noxious/Invasive Weed Control - Little Missouri Grazing Association - \$875,000 - Directive B - Summary: Control ND noxious and other invasive weeds by treating 1,160 acres. Presentation made by Mr. John Hanson (because of the weather he was the only person from the Association that was able to make it). (Slides are available in the Commission files.) He said additional information not included previously is in 2008 there were 181,000 recreational users on the National Grasslands of that 75% were state residents and of that 75% about half had activities related to hunting. He said they do not have a partnership with the Slope County Weed Board.

Mr. Hanson responded to a number of questions:

Q: Is the 1,160 acres per year the same for five years? A: It is difficult to answer. If you have control where you didn't expect it you would have less acreage. There are other times you don't have control where you expect it and then you do more acres.

Q: How many times do you have to go back and spray this? A: Did not respond to this question.

Q: How much help do you get from the Forest Service? A: They have received approximately \$50,000 as a grant per year for the last 4 or 5 years. They are uncertain about how that funding will

continue and at what level. Members have in-kind contributions and they had cash contributions which qualify as matching funds. He was uncertain of how much.

Q: Can PILT be spent for weed control? A: Did not know.

Q: What amount is available from the Weed Board? A: Did not know

GR4 - 12 - Saving the Minot Retriever Club for Future Generations - The Minot Retriever Club - \$177,000 - Directive D – Summary: Construction of two dikes to separate current ponds from Des Lacs River. No one gave a presentation (for medical reasons).

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

The Board took a break for lunch and resumed the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

The Board completed and compiled the scoring, ranking and funding sheets as they reviewed each of the applications.

There was general discussion by the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board on all of the applications as follows:

GR4-16 - Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center Native Prairie Restoration

- A good project and would fit in with the Lewis and Clark theme.
- Concern about bringing in topsoil that may include noxious weeds and ending up with a weed pile.
- Can't support the project - it should have been completed. It is an existing project that has not been finished. Noted that it wasn't Parks and Recreation that ran out of money but the Foundation that did not complete the landscaping.
- There is value in supporting this project and doing it right. Also would be good recognition for the Outdoor Heritage Fund -- a lot of visitors go through the Center.
- This is a project that needs to get done and it fits with the directives of the Fund. It is so conspicuous right beside the building and does not reflect well on the facility - at least plant some grass.
- Was not included in the Governor's budget.

GR4-20 - North Dakota Waterbank Program

- Program worked fairly well in the past. It is a proactive approach to wetland management. There is a great partnership going.
- Farmers view this program favorably as well as the Delta project. Needs to be more awareness of these types of programs.
- The wetlands will go through a scoring process by the Game and Fish Department and the Agriculture Department. It is going to be for the prevent planting acreage that has been really wet for the last ten to fifteen years.
- Needs to have weed management. Previous waterbank program had a requirement that it was the landowner's responsibility to control noxious weeds on the property. Would be good to have some "teeth" involved in assuring that noxious weed control is done.
- CRP acreage also had requirements for weed management and the landowner was paid every year to manage that acreage and there were no repercussions for the landowner not doing the weed control management. That needs to be a factor in funding this program.

GR4 -14 - Sheyenne River Bank Stability Restoration Project - Phase 1 Bjornson Golf Course

- Appreciated the effort the applicant had made to find the match funding.
- A highly used area where recognition for the Fund would be good.
- A project that needs to be done.

GR4-19 - Fox Island Boat Ramp Bank Stabilization

- Was not included in the Governor's Budget.
- Fox Island is a heavily used area and very popular for shore fishing. Vast majority of people are shoreline fisherman in North Dakota--last year there were 160,000 licenses sold and 70,000 registered boats--majority of fisherman are fishing from the shore.

GR4-18 - Western ND Habitat Enhancement Projects

- Good project with collaboration between stakeholders.
- Even though there are some questions about the reseeding of these areas that is something they can resolve.
- There is a great deal not specified. Perhaps partially fund it and then come back for more when they have projects and landowners identified. It has lots of good potential.
- As we have done with other projects we can trust them to do the right thing. Going to fully support it.
- Applicant is working with experts in identifying the areas that need enhancement and following NRCS specifications.
- Good for western North Dakota.
- Type of project the Fund should be supporting. Organizations are getting together working with ranchers and farmers and making the habitat better. If they can make habitat better out there for the mule deer it is going to be good for all wildlife out there.
- We need to spend money in this part of the country. Difficult to develop all the details of a program and how it is going to work because you will find things out in the Badlands that you never knew existed.
- Besides statewide projects, limited funding has been awarded to projects out west in the oil patch.

GR4-21 - Handicap Accessible Fishing Pier at Sheep Creek Dam

- Provided a detailed budget - great job
- Didn't go through the Game and Fish dock program, are we setting a precedence by not requiring them to first to go to the Game and Fish Department? Mr. Steinwand stated they hadn't applied this year and the Department has limited funding available--no guarantee it would be funded. He thought it was a good project.

GR4-5 - Cliffs Park and Water Access Development Project

- No public access; limited to only the residents of that area.

GR4-1 - Harmon Lake Campground Expansion

- Good project, site is well planned out. The surfacing or gravel road going into it is \$30,000 do we want to fund this? It is a great area and would be a nice improvement.
- Well planned and put together and very useful. It gives a lot of people access. You can't get there if you don't have a road to it.
- This project has progressed well. You hear a lot of people in community talking about it.
- Was not included in the Governor's budget for parks.

GR4-13 - Grant County Area: Cover Crops for Wet Soils and Prevented Plant Ground

- Looks like a demonstration project but not sure.
- Something that NDSU should be doing. It could be of benefit to North Dakota farmers because they are all having problems with prevent planting. Has merit but not sure if it should be done with Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars.
- Probably is a demonstration project, but it is beneficial. Could be good habitat for wildlife so that is a way it might fit for OHF funding.
- Will nesting birds be able to use this because of the late planting? Probably not because nesting season is going to be over by the time the land would be planted. However, there is feed value

for both wildlife and livestock. Also if you don't plant anything then next year it is going to be wetter.

- This is a demonstration project.
- Requesting funding for Soil Conservation staff and education and outreach of about \$16,500 – if we do fund the project, based on policy these costs should not be included.
- If it is a demonstration project, is it feasible to fund only a portion of it?
- We haven't funded other demonstration projects.

GR4-23 - Private Land Aquatic Habitat Creation and Infrastructure Enhancement

- This project has been brought back with a greater buy-in by the landowner. This reemphasizes that the cost for these projects are significant, but they will last 20 years plus. It gives a great benefit. These are great places where ducks can be raised and occasionally be hunted. It is really about doing a good turn for the rancher; enhancing what is good for the soil by controlling erosion. The ducks are a by-product from that. Will support the project.
- Since the first application the applicant can now show producer interest.
- The cost is high - 9 landowners at \$839,000; a significant cost per acre.
- The cost for fixing dams was high -- \$60,000 to repair a dam is a lot of money. Where did the bids come from to do this work?
- Costs are similar to the Grant County request.
- You need to include in your calculation of acres the grass acres that go with these water acres because of the nature of the ranch. When you do that calculation the number of acres is almost 3500 acres; a lot of land and a 20 year life on this reliable water for ducks. A great investment.
- The water acres cost is over \$6,300 per acre for the water.
- Sioux County is not very reliable for rainfall--we could end up with a lot of dry holes.
- Costs for dams and dugouts in the southwest part of the state have been running at \$20,000 or less -- not the \$60,000 to \$100,000 cost included in this proposal.
- Suggestion was made that the landowner should look at installing a grazing system with dependable water and a pipeline. -- develop a reliable freshwater source.

GR4-17 - Riparian Grazing Systems Project

- Ryan has a good program in Stutsman County. Gets an amazing amount of work done by using the resources from 319 and landowner input. He is impressed with the projects he has put on the ground, not only through the OHF but through 319, he gets results.
- A high number of acres being affected with the number of dollars – it's a good project.
- Ranchers like these grazing systems; keeps the cattle from milling around in the water and tearing up the water banks. Helps to keep our water clean. Keeps the cattle out of the water especially in the summers when they mill it up and it all goes downstream. The freshwater in the tanks is better than the water in the dams because you don't have the algae problems in the fall when the dams have lower water levels.
- Is it standard for the landowner to own the fence and tanks? Yes. The landowner puts in 40% of the cost of all the projects and then has the responsibility for maintenance.
- When the word gets around how well these work there will be a snowball effect with more demand for this type of project. Pastures are good for wildlife.
- With the limits on how much grazing will be done in each cell, there is plenty of time for grass to grow which is good for ducks and other wildlife; less risk of overgrazing and having washouts.

GR4-08 - Crooked Crane Trail Exercise & Fitness Loop

- A great project, nice plan and presentation. In western North Dakota – Patterson Lake is a nice area. Would be good to get a project like this done that the OHF could show and promote.
- Support the project including the fitness equipment.
- A lot of people moving into the area with young families. These people need established things for recreation. This would be a showcase project.

- Concerns about how far we are going to go with paved trails and exercise equipment. Is that our mission or is that a recreation that a city or park district should cover versus the OHF Fund? The second phase of the project which is going to be an unpaved trail – aggregate trail that gets away from the paved trail -- better fits the vision of the OHF. This is a fantastic project; we need projects like this but is this the right place to fund it with the limited dollars?
- A portion of the OHF funding is to be used for recreation. This falls within that category. It is our job to balance that urban outdoor recreation versus the conservation. Where is the line drawn? This has the potential to be another good banner project for the OHF that would be highly used, highly recognized and celebrated and it draws into that phase two and three where it gets us more into that traditional hiking – this piece will draw other people getting exposure to that area.
- The applicant is upfront with a plan and that they'll be back two more times. They have a comprehensive plan.
- This site has public access and is highly used.
- Impressed with the passion the people have for the project and that passion has developed cooperation. The public and private sectors working together in many of these cases and that is what we want – your dollar gets stretched further if you have multiple agencies working together and this is a good example of that.

GR4-3 - LaMoure County Memorial Park Streambank Restoration Project

- Ms. Fine said they did provide a breakdown for each of the banks if you are doing Site 1, Site 2 and Site 3. Their priorities are Sites 1 and 2 - so if you did want to do some reducing she does have a breakdown on some numbers.
- There is a dramatic difference in cost for bank restoration projects for roughly the same amount of footage. Why? Ms. Vetsch said it depends on the estimate that you get – you have some contractors that will do the job cheaper. That is more than likely going to be the cost difference. If they are getting funding through EPA 319 – there are maximum rates that the 319 program has established for each component so anything above that would be the liability of the individual doing the practice. Mr. Kotchman said keep in mind when looking at bank stabilization restoration projects - some use bioengineering practices which are likely to run probably less expensive than some of the hardscape type engineering things like heavy construction.

GR4-4 - Sargent County Silver Lake Park “Playplaces and Gathering Spaces” Renovations Project

- The current equipment isn't safe, it needs to be removed. Struggles to not fund it when you look at what equipment they have or what has been removed – the kids deserve a safe place to play. If the OHF can play a role in that, we should.
- They have passion for getting this project done. Good investment of our funds. We should look at these on a case by case basis, some may fit and some may not.
- Hopefully in the next legislative session we can get some guidance on this issue. We send a mixed signal to the general public when we fund one and don't fund another. We need more direction.
- Land and Water Conservation Fund is 50 years old and most playgrounds were funded by that. We're going to see a lot more of these requests. We do need clarity because the need is high.

GR4-7 - Norsemen Outdoor Education Center

- Fits within our mission and fits all four of the directives. They have a substantial match, most of which is in-kind but that is the kind of work this needs to have done. This provides something for the entire region and that community.
- Concerned about funding buildings. We are wrestling with playgrounds which are outdoor and now we are going to indoor buildings – even though they are tied to an outdoor activity--archery. Not sure we have the funding or direction to fund buildings. On this one, they do have an outdoor component with their outdoor archery range and looked like that was in the range of \$20,000 to \$25,000 so would encourage that kind of development. Could support doing a fair amount of their outdoor portion but has trouble with the building.

- This is a facility that supports outside activities. This is our opportunity to meet the needs we have been hearing about--that facilities are needed that promote outside activities. We are the only ones limiting us. The Legislature has given us that flexibility This is precisely what this organization should be doing and can to help the communities especially when it hits all four of the directives. We have funded many other things that haven't hit four directives and this one does, that's why it's important.
- Concerned because we didn't fund other projects previously because they were buildings but they also promoted outdoor education activities. Long term costs of maintenance of these types of facilities should be considered.
- We haven't funded buildings, but in this case we should. In that part of the state you have months you're not going to do anything outdoors. You want kids to be archers, you going to let them shoot indoors.
- Look at the age of the two young gentlemen that came and gave the presentation. You don't see passion in the youth very often anymore. He applauds them for doing what they did.
- Community should provide more support. Willing to support partial funding not the entire amount.
- Concerned that they don't have all the match funding raised yet.
- They have considerable volunteer and in-kind labor. So they do have a commitment. -- Shows a 27% match.

GR4-2 - Dead Colt Creek Recreational Playground Project

No comments.

GR4-9 - Green Acres Property Owners' Association Neighborhood Play Area Project

- Unclear if it is just for that neighborhood or if it is open to the public. If someone drove up and wanted to use it, that is fine with them but it isn't a public park. It is policed by the local people who live in the subdivision.

GR4-11 - Drayton Campground - Drayton Park Board

- It is a good location and a good opportunity for that community to take advantage of some things for not that big of a cost.
- Glad that the American Crystal participation is cleared up.
- Concern that some campers can stay at the campground all summer.
- We want some share of the buy in from local sources - if we fully funded this plus the other grant; we'd be funding 65% of the project – it would total \$305,000 of the total \$463,000.
- Concerned about maintenance issues.

GR4-22 - Stump Lake Park Bank Restoration - Nelson County Park Board

- Stump Lake has been rising and they had already built their facilities. It's not their fault. The problem will just get worse.
- Has the lake reached it limit? Mr. Steinwand said no, it can go at least 6 more feet and typically, you get to the west side of the lake where most of the water comes in, it's going to be at least six feet before it overflows.
- There is a great amount of use on Stump Lake and Devils Lake for fishing. They get a lot of out-of-state visitors. They are great fisheries and it's a worthwhile project.

GR4-6 - Beach City Park Northside Playground

- They already purchased one of the playground sets prior to the grant being awarded, so if we do fund this, that should be taken off the request in the amount of \$16,000.
- This is being developed in response to growth in the community in western North Dakota. There is need out there and it would be good to support it.
- Wouldn't take half off because they gambled they could do it and get it at a better price. They still have the same kids and same community to deal with. Give them the full \$41,000.

- Playgrounds rank high in the State's planning process. Communities consistently rank playgrounds as a high priority for them--outdoor recreation.

GR4-10 - TMBCI Sky Chief Park Fishing Pier Project

- Is it true that there is only one manufacturer that they can get a bid from? Mr. Steinwand said yes, in North Dakota. The Game and Fish Department is trying to develop their own because the piers are getting pricey.
- They have applied every round. The lakes are popular and heavily used, and it is within the ball park for price.
- They have been back several times and we talked about their projects not meeting the scope but this one does fall within the scope we are looking at. This is a great chance to support tribal applications.
- Bid doesn't meet the \$60,000. Mr. Moser said they added the \$29 – the actual bids were you take the \$29 off, that's what the actual bid was. He is assuming they bid it and didn't bid the actual installation because they are going to do that and that is what they are looking at for those additional dollars – it's a guess.
- They don't have a 25% match and everyone else did. Supports the project but if we recommend a 25 percent match, that is the way we should go when we decide on funding.

GR4-15 - Little Missouri Grazing Association Noxious/Invasive Weed Control

- Normally spraying is \$20-30 per acre, They are at \$200/acre. Out west, labor costs are different but it seems high.
- Someone else needs to step in with a Weed Board that won't cooperate with their landowners. The weed boards serve at the pleasure of the county commission but something is going awry out there and somebody needs to step in.
- Noxious weed control is a state issue. Everyone deals with it. Something is amiss if we can't work with it on a local level. Is it the role of the OHF to step in and provide a solution?
- Primary responsibility for weed control is the landowner. It isn't the Fund's obligation to control all the weeds in western North Dakota.
- The Legislature needs to put some teeth in the noxious weeds law. There is a law that says you are supposed to but no teeth in it and until that happens this problem will not go away no matter how much money you provide. Right now, county weed boards know there is a problem but can't do anything about it. They can't legally spray it and put it on someone's taxes which should be done if people don't spray it themselves. That law is not here now and until it is, there isn't anything we could do about it.
- If I had cattle on federal land am I responsible for spraying the weeds or is the federal government? If it were BLM land probably whoever leases it. Forest Service should be responsible.
- The Federal Government hasn't stepped up to control the noxious weeds on their lands and the problem is getting worse every year. We should not be funding noxious weed control but it is an issue that is getting worse and worse.

GR4 - 12 - Saving the Minot Retriever Club for Future Generations

- Last grant round request was for \$65,000 so it has almost tripled in cost.
- Looks like now they do have permission to build the dams that were in place and got some numbers of what it would cost them to put in the dikes and dams.
- This is a private club with little match. If we go down this road every project that wants money for their private access to a lake will be looking for money
- It is a private area. There is a cost benefit from a habitat standpoint; you have the marshes that you are creating adjacent to the river; you have wetland habitat creation. That is one way to look at it.

Mr. Moser asked the Board to complete the conflict of interest form if there are any. He asked the Board to complete the Ranking Sheets and for the compilation of proposed funding awards. (While the ranking sheets are being compiled the Board will take up other business.)

Following a short break Chairman Moser reconvened the Outdoor Heritage Fund Board meeting.

Ms. Fine gave a summary report on projects. (A copy of the report is available in the Commission files.) She discussed and showed what was designed for the OHF website. Mr. Moser asked if it were possible to note on the website that the project is complete. Ms. Fine stated yes, Ms. Campbell will figure out a way to denote those.

Ms. Vetsch updated the Board regarding the Statewide Tree Planting Project. There is considerable demand for the project. It is going well.

Ms. Fine pointed out two projects because it does involve a policy decision. The two projects for the Spirit Lake Nation Fish and Wildlife Department. She pointed out last meeting the difficulty they were having because they could not go out and purchase the equipment they needed and needed to be reimbursed – does not work for them. We tried to figure out a way to handle it through the State but it was not going to work very well. They are not going to be able to proceed with those projects unless she has the ability to give them all the money up front. We have been reluctant to do that – it has not been our practice. She did not know if the Board wanted her to make exceptions. She said the first one was for \$5,565 and the second one was \$8,568--one was for them to put a webcam on an eagles nest, building some hen houses that was going to involve the community college and the second involved mapping – buy the computer and programs they needed to develop the maps. She indicated that the Commission would like the Board's recommendation on whether there should be an exception. After discussion and hearing how the State Parks and Recreation and the State Forester manage their funds, it was decided not to disburse all the funds upfront.

Mr. Moser discussed scheduling of next meeting date (May, 2015) and discussion on future meetings/agenda items/schedule for 2015-2017 biennium as Ms. Fine put together:

Schedule/Agenda

Questions:

- 1) Do you want to stay with three rounds?

If we kept the same application deadlines they would be:

April 1 (Meeting will be in May)

May June July

August 1 (Meeting will be in September)

September October

November 1 (Meeting will be in December)

December January February March

In non-legislative years do you want to change it

November 1 (Meeting would be in December)

December January February

March 1 (Meeting would be in April)

April May June

July 1 (Meeting would be in August)

August September October

Potential Agenda items

Do you want to have applicants start coming in to the meetings and giving reports on their projects? When they are in progress or when they are completed? Leave perhaps a certain amount of time for each meeting to hear from applicants rather than just getting a written status report? Do you want to identify projects and let me know that this is one you have a particular interest in and arrange to have the applicant make a presentation? Do you want to tour a project? Perhaps we could put a few together if they are in one part of the state and you could view more than one project?

Do you want some time on the agenda for presentations about other programs - Have someone from the 319 program speak to the group for 15 minutes? Have Game and Fish or Parks & Recreation talk about their grant programs? Perhaps someone talk about the NRCS programs that are available that are being done in conjunction with some of the programs we are funding?

Ms. Fine said the schedule had been set up basically because of the legislative session so there is a bigger gap than the other grant rounds – if they are going to have two or three grant rounds per year.

The Board discussed the pros and cons of having two rounds versus three rounds a year.

- Two rounds a year; four a biennium are adequate.
- Two rounds a year would streamline the process - there is still a lot of work with each round - processing of summaries, to the technical committee, to the following up and then to contracts.
- Having only two rounds a year may require longer meetings - perhaps 2 days each round (4 days) rather than 1 day per round (3 days in one year) Easier to schedule 1 day meetings than 2 day meetings.
- Three rounds a year may be better for planning for planting of trees and seeding.
- Maybe should look at three rounds but have two large grant rounds and one small grant round (need to determine what amount is a “large” project). It takes longer to put together a good large project - often six to eight months.
- Encourage us to stay with 3 a year until after the legislative session when we know how much funding will be available.
- Board members are busy and it would work better if there were just two rounds a year.
- Generally an applicant will set their budget for the year and they know what their match dollars are so they won't be submitting more than one application a year.
- They have been very fortunate to this point to only have a Board member missing here and there. If we get too many grant rounds, people are going to say I will miss this one. It is very valuable to have all twelve members here.

It was moved by Mr. Wogsland and seconded by Mr. Bina that they set two grant round deadlines per year--four in a biennium. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Melchior, Moser and Wogsland voted aye and Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Reiersen and Stockdill voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

Mr. Moser asked if they were satisfied with the months of the year we had before. We will need to eliminate one because we had five this biennium. April would be the beginning one and one in the fall. Ms. Fine said previously there had been a request to have one earlier in the fall because of ordering trees etc... they wanted one by November; December and January was too late – that is why we ended up with November. She thought maybe it should be October. Mr. Kotchman said originally we talked about getting ahead of the tree planting season but now that this has gotten in place, it is not an issue anymore. In his organization they have settled into a spring and fall cycle which works well. Mr. Godfread said make it April and October beings they are six months apart and you have spring and fall.

Ms. Fine said they did not need another motion regarding the specific deadline dates. She would inform the Commission that the Board is recommending two grant round deadlines a year in the months of April and October.

In response to Ms. Fine's memo, the Board discussed future agenda items and the reporting. The consensus was to leave it flexible and continue the reporting as Ms. Fine has done in the past. If there are specific projects Board members want to hear about, they can let staff know and the appropriate arrangements can be made.

Mr. Moser said each Board member handed in their funding pages and the results were compiled. Those applications that had six or more zero funding were identified. If anyone desires, they can be pulled off to be discussed separately. Mr. Moser listed the projects that did not get the required votes and will be handled as one motion and they are 5, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 23 so there is a total of six projects that will be dropped. They will vote on 16 projects separately.

It was moved by Mr. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Melchior that the following applications not be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Grant Round 4 funding:

GR4-005 - Cliffs Park and Water Access Development Project

GR4-009 - Green Acres Property Owners' Association Neighborhood Play Area Project

GR4-012 - Saving the Minot Retriever Club for Future Generations

GR4-013 - Grant County Area: Cover Crops for Wet Soils and Prevented Plant Ground

GR4-015 - Little Missouri Grazing Association Noxious/Invasive Weed Control

GR4-023 - Private Land Aquatic Habitat Creation and Infrastructure Enhancement

On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reieron, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

Mr. Moser said the Board will vote on funding award recommendations in the order they were presented.

It was moved by Mr. Bina and seconded by Mr. Wogsland that the Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center Native Prairie Restoration application submitted by ND Parks and Recreation Department & Lewis & Clark Fort Mandan Foundation be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$33,250 (Application GR4-016) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project.

Mr. Godfread said it would be contingent upon some kind of signage and get some credit for it. Mr. Moser said he had no problem with that but it is part of the grant process now that they have to provide some type of recognition when the project is completed. Ms. Fine said in the application we have been asking that they indicate how they are going to recognize it and if there isn't anything in the application, she will add the requirement to the contract.

Mr. Reieron said this is \$15,000 an acre for some remediation for landscaping for a project that should have been taken care in the first place. He missed some of the discussion earlier and has some concerns about this project.

Mr. Moser said he funded it at the level he did because he thought it was a project that whoever was in charge of it didn't complete it and they needed to. One thing is to put native grass out there but at least get the top soil back where you mow it every week and then if you want to change it over, come back to us at that time.

Mr. Melchior said under our policy there is "no consideration for projects that are ongoing" and this project – the landscaping around the building is part of the original project and it should have been done at that time.

On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, Hutchens, Kuylen and Wogsland voted aye and J. Godfread, Hoffman, Melchior, Moser, Reieron and Stockdill voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion failed.

It was moved by Mr. Hutchens and seconded by Mr. J. Godfread that the North Dakota Waterbank Program application submitted by the ND Department of Agriculture be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$1,200,000 (Application GR4-020). On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. J. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Bina that the Sheyenne River Bank Stability Restoration Project - Phase 1 Bjornson Golf Course application submitted by the Valley City Parks and Recreation Department be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$197,550 (Application GR4-014) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye and Reierson voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Melchior and seconded by Mr. Hoffman that the Fox Island Boat Ramp Bank Stabilization application submitted by the Bismarck Parks and Recreation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$215,374 (Application GR4-019) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Ms. Stockdill and seconded by Mr. J. Godfread that the Western ND Habitat Enhancement Projects application submitted by the Mule Deer Foundation be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$480,900 (Application GR4-018). On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Bina and seconded by Mr. Melchior that the Handicap Accessible Fishing Pier at Sheep Creek Dam application submitted by the Grant County Water Resource District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$20,902 (Application GR4-021) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Wogsland and seconded by Mr. Melchior that the Harmon Lake Campground Expansion application submitted by the Morton County Water Resource District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$150,000 (Application GR4-001) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Ms. C. Godfread and seconded by Mr. Hoffman that Riparian Grazing Systems Project application submitted by the Stutsman County Soil Conservation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$253,500 (Application GR4-017). On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye, no one voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Bina and seconded by Mr. Kuylen that Crooked Crane Trail Exercise & Fitness Loop application submitted by the City of Dickinson be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$975,000 (Application GR4-008) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye and Reiersen voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Melchior and seconded by Mr. J. Godfread that LaMoure County Memorial Park Streambank Restoration Project application submitted by the LaMoure County Soil Conservation District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$695,424 (Application GR4-003) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reiersen, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye, no one voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Bina and seconded by Mr. Wogsland that Sargent County Silver Lake Park "Playplaces and Gathering Spaces" Renovations Project application submitted by the Sargent County Park Board & Commissioners be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$13,708 (Application GR4-004) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project.

Mr. Melchior said he still has difficulty funding replacement playground equipment in existing parks. He could see it if we were building an outdoor recreation project somewhere like the Dickinson one where the playground equipment is new and it is part of a comprehensive plan for outdoor recreation – just to replace playground equipment he has trouble with that. He doesn't think that was the purpose of this fund.

Mr. Reiersen said he differentiates on this one and was favorable is the fact that it is associated with campgrounds versus a strictly city type of park. People are at least getting their kids out, at least camping and doing those activities and that is his reasoning for supporting this one.

Mr. Moser said he would really like to see the legislature get involved in this. He would like to see the playground issue addressed through State Parks.

On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Reiersen and Wogsland voted aye and Kuylen, Melchior, Moser and Stockdill voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Wogsland and seconded by Ms. C. Godfread that Norsemen Outdoor Education Center application submitted by the Norsemen Archers, Inc. be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$216,781 (Application Gr4-007) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project.

Mr. Reiersen amended the motion to an amount not to exceed \$21,000 because he is concerned with building buildings and this is a precedent he didn't know how we step back from. The reason for the partial funding would be to fund their outdoor course in terms of what they have outside.

It was moved by Mr. Reiersen and seconded by Mr. Hoffman that Norsemen Outdoor Education Center application submitted by the Norsemen Archers, Inc. be recommended to the Industrial

Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$21,000 (Application GR4-007) on the condition it is spent outside and not on the building.

Mr. Wogsland said we have discussed the building things many times but he opposes this motion and thinks the Norsemen have come in and made the case to us actually twice and he hopes we would defeat the amended motion and go to the underlying motion.

On a roll call vote Hoffman, Melchior, Moser, Reiersen and Stockdill voted aye and Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hutchens, Kuylen and Wogsland voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The amended motion failed.

It was moved by Mr. Wogsland and seconded by Ms. C. Godfread that Norsemen Outdoor Education Center application submitted by the Norsemen Archers, Inc. be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$216,781 (Application GR4-007) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hutchens, Kuylen and Wogsland voted aye and Hoffman, Melchior, Moser, Reiersen and Stockdill voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Wogsland and seconded by Mr. Hutchens that Dead Colt Creek Recreational Playground Project application submitted by the Ransom County Water Resource District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$45,174 (Application GR4-002) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Reiersen and Wogsland voted aye and Kuylen, Melchior, Moser and Stockdill voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. J. Godfread and seconded by Ms. C. Godfread that Drayton Campground application submitted by the Drayton Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$180,000 (Application GR4-011) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reiersen, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye, no one voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Kuylen and seconded by Mr. Bina that Stump Lake Park Bank Restoration application submitted by the Nelson County Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$472,912 (Application GR4-022) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project.

In response to a question regarding if it is expected that Stump Lake will continue rising to the six feet, Mr. Steinwand said if you believed the Corps of Engineer's prediction back in 2001, there is a one percent chance of getting to where we are now, so yes.

In response to a question regarding the lodge being above that six foot level, Mr. Steinwand said yes, 1,458 is the overflow level and he is assuming it is well above that. Mr. Bina said it is at 1,460.

On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye and Reiersen voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Bina that Beach City Park Northside Playground application submitted by the Beach City Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$25,000 (Application GR4-006) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hoffman, Hutchens and Wogsland voted aye and Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson and Stockdill voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

It was moved by Ms. Stockdill and seconded by Ms. C. Godfread that TMBCI Sky Chief Park Fishing Pier Project application submitted by the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$60,000 (Application GR4-010) with the contingency that the applicant will provide signage to be displayed on site recognizing the Outdoor Heritage Fund's contribution to the project. On a roll call vote Bina, C. Godfread, J. Godfread, Hutchens, Kuylen, Melchior, Moser, Reierson, Stockdill and Wogsland voted aye and Hoffman voted nay with Aasmundstad absent and not voting. The motion carried.

Mr. Moser reported on upcoming legislative session. (A proposed bill draft was distributed for review and comments. A copy is available in the Commission files.) He said it includes the dollar amount Governor Dalrymple included in his budget and puts into statute some of the issues we discussed at our very first meeting setting policy which the Industrial Commission enacted and we have been operating under. There are some other provisions legislators requested to be put in. This is a starting working document which is all subject to change. It somewhat clarified our purpose which is to enhance the outdoor experience.

Mr. Godfread suggested if there is any willingness on the bill drafter to separate Section 3 into its own separate bill so we have a policy bill and a funding bill and include this into the Industrial Commission's budget. Ms. Fine said the language to take the percentage out was in the Governor's budget so that is being proposed. It is actually going to show up in the University School Trust Lands bill because that is where they are dealing with percentages on these dollars so we will be monitoring three or four bills on the same topic.

Mr. Moser said he intends to visit with Representative Porter and tell him what the Board's thoughts are. Mr. Melchior said he would like buildings addressed. Mr. Bina said regarding the time frame – can we have a few days? Mr. Moser said yes, that would be very good. He requested that any additional comments be provided to him by Friday.

Mr. Godfread said he assumed Mr. Moser would speak and testify for the Board and said he likely will as well. Should we have a few successful project examples? Mr. Moser said he did give a report three or four months ago and we could update that report. Ms. Fine said she'll do a summary and include the map.

Mr. Moser noted that a white paper on building had been prepared by Ms. Fine and distributed to the Board. (A copy of the white paper with attachments is available in the Commission files.)

Mr. Melchior asked what happens if Norsemen Archers go defunct? Who owns the building? Does it go back to the city? Mr. Reierson said if that entity owns it and if they go bankrupt, it's an asset; if they quit, they can just sell it. Mr. Zimmerman said he didn't know if he heard Mr. Reierson correctly regarding a building sitting on county or city property - if Dakota Zoo would close – it is sitting on park district property, the park district owns those buildings because they are on park district land. In state parks where we have foundations, that building is on state land and for same reason – to clarify it, if they would go belly up, those are the state's buildings because they are on state land. Mr. Reierson said the Norsemen Archers said they own the land.

Mr. Zimmerman said we have organizations that have property on state land, and they can't maintain it, so now it is the state's responsibility. Can the county, etc. come back to OHF for maintenance costs? Mr. Reiersen said he is not sure who owns the building, if OHF owns it or the Norsemen own it. That was one of the concerns with buying equipment, who really owns it. The only difference is the building is attached to the ground and it is going to need to be maintained.

Mr. Godfread said this fits with playground discussion and it would be good to get some guidance or input from Representative Porter. This Board would be amenable to legislative direction.

Mr. Moser said the difficulty is people applying in April will need direction. Legislation would be effective in July. We need to give direction to people asking where they should go on this, we need to keep our ear to the ground on the legislative discussion to tell them where it is going. Mr. Godfread said that is another reason for separating the bills out.

Mr. Moser asked for discussion regarding marketing. Mr. Reiersen said as he has attended some meetings and you are trying to promote it, we refer them to the website which is excellent – all the information is there and everything they need but for a lot of people, they like that personal contact and something they can have as a take away in hand and refer back. He wondered if we could come up with some sort of brochure to hand out, he could put his business card or some contact information on it and a decal with the logo.

Mr. Moser said we should be able to design a brochure or business card type. Ms. Fine said Ms. Pfennig did one for the Renewable Energy Program so we will start putting together something. She said she would mail all of the Board members a few logo decals.

Mr. Moser reminded everyone to turn in their sheets to Ms. Fine. He said the next meeting will be set after May.

Being no further business, Chairman Moser adjourned the meeting.

Wade Moser, Chairman

Karlene Fine, Executive Director