

Minutes of the
51st ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION PROFESSIONALS

26 February 2010

**The Initiative Foundation
 Little Falls, MN**

Ray Norrgard called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. Ray shared background into the history of the MACP, as well as a tribute to Harvey Nelson's distinguished career as a professional conservationist. Harvey's wake was today, and many of our members knew and worked with him. Harvey's passing should remind us not to take our colleagues for granted; also highlights the need to pass the baton to the next generation of professionals before we lose the vast storehouse of experience and knowledge that our outgoing colleagues possess. Ray also requested attendees think about nominees for professional awards through MACP.

With that, Ray introduced the theme of today's meeting, "Dialog on Conservation Funding"

Session I: Conservation Funding Updates

Steve Morse, Executive Director, Minnesota Environmental Partnership: Environmental & Conservation Funding: Past, Present & Future

- Has worn many hats, and experiences have taught him to look outside the box.....feels that is the value that organizations such as MACP bring to the table.
- Purpose today to provide overview of MEP, as well as general overview of conservation funding over the past decade or so, then turn to current and future trends in light of passage of the legacy amendment.
- MEP is a coalition of over 80 non-profit organizations committed to protection, restoration of Minnesota's lakes, rivers, forests, natural areas, parks & trails for future generations.
- Historically there was little guiding light and hard for groups to come together due to competing priorities – this shortcoming spawned the need for MEP, an organization to focus priorities on certain issues at a time to improve effectiveness.
- Offices located in Duluth and St. Paul.
- 2010 legislative priorities
 - Protect & defend MN's outdoors legacy & upholding the legacy amendment (bonding & budget priorities)
 - Complete safe streets/roads – planning so they work for everyone, not just cars; working with development groups and MnDOT
 - Safe mines – protecting water from pollution
 - Defending MN's environmental policy foundation – this session focusing on maintaining moratoriums on new nuclear and coal power facilities.

- Conservation Funding Issues

- Before legacy funding, general fund direct spending on conservation & environmental issues has consistently gone down from 2% to 1% of states budget (\$2 mill in FY01 to ~\$1.4 mill in FY06). These estimates do not correct for inflation, thus declines are actually greater than they appear on the surface.
- Cuts spread across all agencies & programs
- Biggest hit came in FY02, but decline has continued at a lower rate since – essentially anything that was not constitutionally protected was raided.
- Budget recouped some in FY07-08, but >80% of this was only one-time influx.
- Thus, in bad times conservation & environmental funding gets cut disproportionately more, and in good times gets restored disproportionately less.
- Currently less than 1% of general fund expenditures are allocated to this important area.
- Important lesson that many in this room have experienced: legislature has a terrible track record in regards to cons. & env. funding and how they approach these issues in general..... perform quite poorly when dealing with chronic problems. The system is responsive to popular crises only.....long-term issues are difficult for politicians to address.
- Conservation/Natural Resources/Environment will never be top tier political issues (like health care & education), and we'll be doing really good if we can ever get them elevated to a 2nd tier along with transportation, corrections/enforcement, etc. Usually relegated to tertiary tier, a sobering reality that we must recognize, and highlights the challenges we face.
- Competition for \$\$ among tier issues will intensify as costs go up and availability of funds drop. Why legacy amendment is so important, and demonstrates that conservation groups are ahead of politics. Perspective on how profound this was: 600,000 more Minnesotans voted for it than voted for Obama, and 400,000 more voted for it than it takes to become a U.S. senator for Minnesota.
- Emphasized that during difficult economic times, elected officials must be reminded that Minnesotans want to protect the state's great outdoors over the long-term (70%); only 21% would allow raiding of existing environmental funding & dedicated funds; only 9% were neutral on the issue; thus strong opposition to raiding environmental funding to solve short-term budget issues.
- MEP is watch-dogging current and proposed spending for conservation from general fund and bonding, in large part due to the constitutional language to not supplant existing conservation funding....is measuring politicians performance in committing to the legacy amendment based on proportional spending on the environment
 - Bonding – 10-yr average of 22% spent on the environment; goal is to sustain this over the long-term for environmental programs & projects.
 - Fortunately, governor, house & senate conference committees' performance have equaled or exceeded 22% through last session.
 - MEP member groups have requested up to 50% allocation for 2010 and challenged elected officials to remain faithful to the amendment.
 - MEP is working on general fund/operating fund budget cuts.
 - Some programs being shifted to general fund
 - Big concern that one-time cuts will occur and roll into bigger, long-term cuts down the road and further aggravate the proportional reduction for env. funding. Some red flags have come up – MEP will raise objections.

- MEP has commitment that constitution is upheld, and will oppose any supplanting that might occur.
- Upshot: While times are tough, MN is in much better shape than the vast majority of states. Legacy amendment represents twice the amount of total money allocated through operational funds for the environment.
- Challenge: also means that eternal vigilance will be required to make sure things don't revert or worsen.
- Q: Is MEP watching conservation agency reorganization discussion? A: Not on their priority list right now; doesn't feel it will gain traction, but are keeping an eye out in case things change.
- Q: What about attempts to use amendment funds to deal with emerald ash borer? A: not consistent with constitutional language, are watching it and hopeful that bonding \$\$ will be used for this effort instead.
- Q: How can advocates deal with supplanting/supplementing issues? A: Visit www.outdoorlegacy.mn -- this site addresses this topic specifically; we can monitor the legislative process; monitor the media; be vigilant – non-profit groups can have an influence.

Jim Cox, Vice-chair, LSOHC: Update on Council Issues

- Significant change over past year
- Hired executive director (Bill Becker)
- More operations staff to assist with administering funding, process & projects
- Housed in State Office Building
- Excepting legislative members, council mostly comprised of folks who've not worked in the public sector before
- Often overwhelmed by squeaky-wheel lash-back, etc.
- Really value conservation groups and especially state agency professionals since they validate and support the council and many of the decisions they've made on appropriating funds.
- Current recommendations were supported by council, governor & senate, but a few monkey wrenches in the house – tried to encapsulate \$\$ into legislative appropriation guides and are trying to change definitions of restore, enhance and protect.
- Have hired environmental consultants to interview professional conservationists by ecological regions (professional workshop process last year).
- Was a huge eye-opener to the council and they received constructive criticism as well
- Reality check in terms of the scope of the problem, \$\$ needed, and what the largest priorities need to be
- Used to develop current year's & long-term criteria for allocating funds
- Resulted in more comprehensive process for bringing projects forward & making allocations
- Received 42 proposals for \$185.5 mill for FY11
- Transparent ranking & allocation process – available on LSOHC website (<http://www.lsohc.leg.mn/>)
- 25 projects funded in FY11, totaling \$58.9 million. Additionally, 5% set aside for fund management/administration, \$5 million for CPL grant program, and about \$20 million carry-over from last year's forest legacy easement project (committed to in FY10)
- To date funded projects have equated to >15,000 acres protected, 42,000 acres enhanced, 4,700 acres restored, and 100 miles shoreline protected in 82 of 87 counties. Approximately \$0.63 for every \$1 of LSOHC funds allocated have been leveraged/matched by other funding sources.
- Q: Will FY11 \$\$ be allocated to emerald ash borer projects as was done last year?

- A: that particular project from FY10 was brought to council from legislature who requested 430 million (got \$2 million); council did not go for it, but was rammed through the legislative process totally outside the LSOHC process; council does not support any similar expenditure for FY11.
- Q: What is council's position or persuasion this year associated with acquisition of land?
- A: Tons of pressure on council to minimize acquisition. Arguments against it related to total cost as well as PILT/tax issues. Mainly from certain individuals, LGU's and Assoc. of MN Counties, as well as legislators from northern part of state who claim or fear that this will be a big government land grab. Council's position is that acquisition will always have to be an important part of the legacy allocation – public who voted for the amendment do not expect to spend the funds on easements that don't provide access. The best way to do that is through acquisition, and feel acquisition is more important early in the 25-year funding cycle than later, but regardless some acquisition will always be needed.
- Q: What is your perspective on the capacity to spend funds and do work with \$\$, lack of staff, hiring freezes, etc.; and capacity to maintain/enhance land over the long-term, and what is the council's intent with regard to long-term maintenance needs as well as need for monitoring/evaluation.
- A: The administrative \$\$ allocated to LSOHC is only 1%, which is very low, but the council realizes that capacity has to be built, but to be honest we don't know how to do that without looking like we are supplanting or that we are just giving \$\$ to public agencies and how that is received by the public and whether it might supplant agencies' existing funds and staff.....will need to be wrestled with, in a transparent manner, but will definitely be difficult. However, the council knows it needs to be done, and want it to get done.
- Q: Is the council too much on the defensive responding to squeaking wheel sportsman groups and the media; has the council considered outreach/education to get information out and respond to misinformation regarding how money is being spent, allocated, etc.?
- A: No need in Jim's opinion, and no one on council feels that it's only for game species or should be dominated by game/hunting/fishing, etc. They realize there are broader issues, and that the language did not guarantee that it could only be used for certain things. Feels that interest groups are being overprotective over their pet issues/agendas, but is scared how these perceptions get traction in the media and influencing how decisions are made in the legislature.
- Q: When DNR-wildlife works with SWCD's, etc. there is a surcharge groups get for managing a grant (e.g. heritage grants, etc.). Can similar things be worked into LSOHC proposals so that administration and staffing can be built into each project?
- A: Some projects that have been funded have built in some administrative costs; some DNR projects have requested funds for partial funding of a position; but isn't included in most proposals; has been a bit of a grey area and is why they created conservation partner grant program; issue that still really needs to be fleshed out.

Jeff Broberg, Citizen Vice-Chair, LCCMRGeneral/Opening Comments

- Important that citizen-conservationists be involved in government as it pertains to environmental & conservation funding & priorities.
- Concerns about how easy it is to change statutory/constitutional language, therefore highlighting the needs for citizen involvement and watch-dog groups.
- Concerns about hook & BULLY crowd and the fact that conservation efforts could be hampered by squeaky wheel individuals or groups pushing for their single-minded agendas. Most folks who voted for the legacy amendment were not outdoorsmen or conservationists.....the \$\$ is coming from and is to be spent for everyone – public trust resources.

Conservation Capacity

- Short-term nature of most funding sources is not matched with realities on meeting capacity, running agencies, and addressing resource management in a sustainable way. That's why the legacy amendment is so important. Concerned that with influx of money & demand, the capacity is actually declining in terms of staffing.
- Scary since there are only a small pool of folks that can do this type of work on the ground. And many folks getting into the business don't have the expertise. Often rely on existing professionals, but there are fewer experts to draw input from.
- Legislature will likely not commit to increasing conservation agency staff, and F&G fund will not be solvent for very long, hence fees need to be increased, but legislature and governor rarely support increasing fees, let alone to track rising costs and new needs/demands.
- Age issue related capacity, and new generations have different skills, some of which have the potential to increase our small and large-scale efficiency of conservation delivery. Not a very good means to foster mentoring of new generation, and so there is a large disconnect between state of the art tools and its use/implementation. Some agencies do a fair job of keeping up to date, but certainly in the private sector, and certain decision makers are operating in the dark ages – they don't know what tools are available, and who can bring it to the table (e.g. younger generation who are very technologically savvy). Disconnect between the folks who use the tools and folks who need to use the tools.
- The capacity issue can be addressed in part, if folks who retire continue to engage in issues and give of their time in a professional manner, and to mentor the new resource managers to help them succeed.

LCCMR & ETF

- LCCMR and LSOHC are about the only two legislative commissions that have continued over the long-term and meet on a periodic basis throughout the year, and bring some common focus on issues, thereby elevating members knowledge and expertise, which in turn elevates the objectivity of making decisions. Feels important for folks to always apply since even if a proposal doesn't get funded, it can influence commission members, and may result in those projects gaining traction elsewhere, or in the future.
- Statutory language for these councils are important to know
- Biennial & longer-term reports are also important since it guides decisions.
- Supplant issue. LCCMR has statutory language regarding supplant/supplement and are required to report on their projects relating to whether supplanting has occurred.
- Concerned about potential raids to dedicated funds (e.g. emerald ash borer issue).

Filters/Ranking/Prioritization

- Filters - Politicization of science – places where folks don't want professionals/scientists talking about an issue or don't want to give them a seat at the table; handled through political appointments and processes
- Threats: lost funding, lost capacity, lost commitment, lost communication, technology gaps, generational gaps, tensions regarding timing/cycles of funding; partnership tensions (user group/value conflicts)
- But many opportunities relative to the threats, and we have a great resource of professionals in this state. We can improve by using state-of-the-art technologies on the ground, and can ramp up mentoring. Bringing the next generation up-to-speed with knowledge that current practitioners possess is crucial, particularly if future practitioners will be working where the rubber hits the road since the age-gap issue is hard to overcome (e.g. can a 22-year old tell a 55-75 year old farmer what to do?)
- Partnerships are important and crucial, but often require long-term outlook or development and is difficult to do partnerships over the short-term.
- Need good cheerleaders and need to beat your own drum – outreach, and need the right people to do this type of thing.
- Q: Will LCCMR not fund certain projects now w/ LSOHC \$\$.
- A: No as of now. Have tried to coordinate some w/ LSOHC, but are sticking to the long-term LCCMR plan; but there is a great opportunity for better collaboration to improve overall delivery toward priorities and improve efficiency and minimize redundancy.

Session II: Emerging Issues in Conservation Funding**Jean Coleman, CR Planning, Inc., Water sustainability Framework**

- Developing 25-yr plan to protect, conserve, and enhance the quantity & quality of states ground & surface water, that is sustainable, comprehensive, integrated
- State-led planning, led by water resources center (U of MN) w/ oversight from legislature; has project advisors, technical work teams (covering ecol services, domestic use, manufacturing & energy use, agricultural use, recreational/cultural/spiritual use, valuation, education, and policy), synthesis team, citizen/stakeholder advisory groups, and project advising and leadership guidance from headwaters council
- Independent, interdisciplinary
- Scope: drinking water, agricultural needs, integration of surface & ground water policy and mgmt, storm water mgmt, pollution prevention/control.....industrial needs, integrate/interfaces climate change; development and land use.....
- This effort is NOT a spending plan for clean water legacy funds, although it no doubt will be used to help inform or provide guidance on where those funds should be prioritized.

Brad Cobb, The Green Corridor Legacy, Former Fish & Game Fund Budget Oversight Committee Chair

- Has worn a few hats; has been engaged quite a bit on LSOHC, legacy amendment and how it fits in with conservation delivery, etc.
- Many of the issues that Jeff Broberg presented are identical to Brad's concerns & issues concerning delivery as well as funding, capacity, LSOHC, etc.
- One of Brad's messages is that when talking about natural resource conservation work, you're talking about common sense things that can be brought to folks attention – the 3 R's: 1) natural resource part, 2) funding/financial resources and attention/debate associated with jargon of restore, enhance & protect, and 3) human resources – must have the human part to oversee, administer & implement the projects on the ground to do it correctly/the right way. Must have all 3 R's to sustain environment.....
- Definitely need to bridge the human resource capacity disconnect
- Anyone involved with legacy funds needs to be aware there is a tremendous opportunity here above and beyond the legacy funds themselves because of existing backlog of projects and ability to piggy-back on other partner funds to do more than what the legacy funds alone would be able to accomplish – and remember, the LSOHC funds are still a drop in the bucket relative to the total needs, as demonstrated by the outcomes of the LSOCH conservation professional workshops.
- With all this opportunity still need to strategize/prioritize to get the most bang for our buck, and how we do it is important. Also must accomplish something tangible that folks can see and experience directly. An example of something tangible is acquisition – the ultimate protectionism is through public ownership.
- Many referenced plans refer to need for improved access, which by default will mean need for more public land, hence acquisition. Start doing the math, and it's a staggering amount of funds needed to get the job done. Just as staggering how much is involved and how much it will cost to maintain such lands over the long-term.
- Brad has some perspective from non-governmental organizations. NGO's can be vocal advocates (and government programs & agencies biggest advocates) and take actions that public employees cannot. In addition to this, NGO's provide some additional capacity, public policy action, and outreach that is needed to improve delivery.
- NGO's will play a key role in LSOHC, expenditures, and advocacy.
- NGO'S need to do a better job emphasizing that the human resource is the key R that needs to be addressed. For some reason it's hard for almost everyone, including legislators, to understand why we need paid positions to administer conservation, etc. We can't rest on our laurels, need to accept the hard questions and criticisms, and need to remember that there still was a large number of vocal opponents to the legacy amendment.

Session III: Conservation Partnerships & Leadership

LeAnn Buck, Mn Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts: Conservation Partnerships & Delivery

- Provided an overview of SWCD program, approaches, with partnership piece from the traditional SWCD perspective/model.
- SWCD's - Private landowners consultation, "technical guidance"
- SWCD's born out of the dust bowl era – crisis precipitated action
- Today: Soil AND Water, Forestry, TMDL, BMP's

- How do we solve issues today given government, NGO's, industry, citizen players
- What local, state, and federal programs that can assist with meeting local needs
- State funds BWSR, BWSR "funnels" the project dollars to SWCD's.
- Other funding sources
 - General fund
 - Bonding
 - Dedicated funding
 - LCCMR
 - Trend is more competitive process, even amongst fellow SWCD's
- Federal partners drive a lot of work load – Farm Bill but also DNR, PCA, MDA, wildlife organizations such as Pheasant's Forever, farm organizations, contractors, citizens & more
- Q: How do County cutbacks affect delivery with fewer people doing more things?
- A: reorganizations are occurring, and in some counties, elected officials haven't decided what will happen to their SWCD's or even if they will continue as a viable entity
- Q: Dichotomy between falling state budgets, decreasing local-state aid, yet increasing legacy amendment \$\$\$. What's the solution...what are even the alternatives?
- A: No good solution yet.

Don Hickman, Initiative Foundation, Little Falls: Partnerships & Barriers – what works and what doesn't

- Core mission – to create living wage jobs in rural MN from the McKnight foundation. Do lending to small business
- Is an aquatic ecologist/biologist by training – seemingly strange relationship with an organization like this.
- Program he runs is a healthy lakes initiative, and works a bunch with Lake Associations.
- Result of local economic growth discussion
 - Involvement of LGU officials and businesses who realized that the important feature of the community, and greatest economic asset to this part of rural MN is its natural resources, particularly water resources.
- Has focused most work on lakes since they are contained. Flowing water is unique because of dynamics (both biologically, politically and culturally) associated with what's happening above and below you on the watercourse causing problems, etc.
- Work on watercourses has it's greatest potential to be addressed by hook & bullet groups, but unfortunately, they don't see the whole picture – blinders are usually on or don't want to do larger, long-term community-wide type of work – just want someone to regulate for them or don't care what happens so long as they can still hunt or fish.
- Lake associations all too often think it's all about the data
- But it should be about management – hence the healthy lakes initiative.
- Problems/Barriers/What Doesn't Work?
 - Lack of knowledge
 - Pig-headedness, not willing to solve problems or key in on root causes, wanting to place blame, punish
 - Poor organization, planning, bad ideas
 - Won't give up pet ideas or too focused on certain issues (e.g. obsession with invasive species)
 - Folks don't take criticism or encouragement well if being steered in a different direction from what they want or expect
 - Coming in and saying or thinking can only do it a certain way

- Addressing symptoms, not causes (e.g. invasive species and causing more problem in the process)
 - Not using established BMPs, not using good management/science
 - No ownership of problem and implementation
 - Not seeing the big picture, beyond one's own self interest or pet issue
 - Few members, non-holistic
- What works?
 - Performance based criteria is important
 - Good plans
 - Implementation proven, accountability, monitoring.....
 - Sometimes this results in match funding w/out requiring it (they take ownership)
 - Involve multiple groups or planning efforts simultaneously, can feed off of one another, improve dissemination of information & learning, and can lead to innovation and improvement in efficiency and i.d. of additional funds
 - Address causes (keep on point), don't focus on symptoms
 - Base things on good mgmt/science
 - Larger groups, w/ more commitment, look beyond self/ bigger picture outlook
 - Need practical, measurable outcomes
- Q: What about watershed influences on lake problems.
 - A: Must meet people where they are – some people don't know what "watershed" means. Citizens are motivated primarily by the immediate lakeshore – and, greater bureaucratic challenges when you trying to go outside the lakeshore.
 - Q: What is your current guidance on invasives?
 - A: Must work with DNR and must have lake management plan; try to divert attention from invasive control as a silver bullet or "the answer" and steer them back on course to address source of problems
 - Citizens are motivated primarily by the immediate lakeshore – greater bureaucratic challenges when you trying to go outside the lakeshore.

Business Meeting

Old Business

Beau Liddell handed out the 2009 annual meeting minutes. Doug Norris made a motion to accept the minutes, 2nd by Bill Faber. Passed unanimously.

Logo & Letterhead Contest

No progress has been made in designing a logo for MACP. Suggestions were made but no resolution. Board members will take advantage of opportunities as they arise and report back to membership at next year's meeting if any progress is made.

Treasurer's Report – Lee Sundmark

Lee reminded membership that we passed a by-laws last year to establish a fiscal year from January 1st through December 31st for financial status & reporting purposes, and the financial statements handed out reflect this change. Beau has updated the by-laws to reflect this change and sent a copy to John Huber for posting to the MACP website.

Membership Savings (S1) balance of \$1,007.23 (similar to last year); Free Checking (S7) balance of \$1,482.99 (~\$400 less than last year), for total balance of \$2,490.22. Last year's balance was among the best for the organization in some time.

Rob Naplin made motion to accept the treasurer's report, 2nd by Mike Larson, Passed Unanimously.

See financial statements below for FY09, as well as 2010 annual meeting.

Ann Geisen and Anna Lipenga volunteered for the audit committee to review the ledger.

Proposed By-law Change

Proposal to change Section 1 of the by-laws to allow broader membership to non-profits & industry. Board doesn't want to exclude private natural resource consultants.

Paul Stolen was concerned with this due to conflict of interest and/or possibility of prospective members not having professional resource background, experience, education, or training. Anyone w/out the technical background that have served private industry after a period of time would be considered to be a professional by industry standards. True resource professionals give a lot of their own time, are very dedicated and work off the clock.

What motivates the folks who might attend? Industry folks are motivated by profit, not resource conservation necessarily.

Although the organization they work for may be motivated by profit, the employees may not be, and even if some members might be biased, it won't necessarily affect the organization's actions and direction.

Perhaps delete the detail about affiliation after "professional". Motion made by Brad Maas and 2nd by Anna Lipenga to change Section 1 of the By-Laws to read as follows: "Membership of this Association is open to all current or former conservation or natural resource professionals. These individuals, upon payment of dues for the year, or portion of a year ending the following February 1, may be come a member of the Association." – Passed unanimously.

Elections

- nominations were accepted from the members for the vacant positions

President Elect – Anna Lipenga
Treasurer – Ann Geisen

Junior Director – Bill Faber
Junior Director – Jack Lauer
Junior Director – Nicholas Snavely
Junior Director – Dan Steward

- The following positions comprise the remainder of the board and were not up for election in 2010

President – Ray Valley
Past President – Ray Norrgard
Secretary – Beau Liddell

Senior Director – Paul Stolen
Senior Director – Diana Regenscheid
Senior Director – Dean Paron
Senior Director – Doug Norris

- Ray Norrgard made a motion to approve the slate of candidates as listed; Fred seconded the motion.
- The motion passed unanimously.

Audit Committee

- The audit committee reported that the account ledger was all in order
- Bill Faber made a motion to approve the audit report and the treasurer's report; Fred Bengtson seconded the motion.
- The motion was passed unanimously

Position Statement

- President wants to refine a position statement on conservation funding
 - Support Fish & Wildlife license fee increase
 - Can't support more or maintain current accomplishments with less (\$\$ & staff)
 - Need to articulate this stuff so public can understand it, and need to address it to governor, legislative leaders, and publish in papers as editorial; need to include examples of why it's needed.
 - Don't discount the folks who we might offend – especially our partners such as SWCD's who are having their funding slashed and may not be aligned with our needs for a fee increase. Be wary of political climate and political foes.
 - Realize that DNR may not support – since governor may not support it
 - Recognize that if we support a fee increase, it won't happen this session, and Pawlenty won't be Governor. However, that doesn't mean there will be any other support.
 - Should this be broader than our fee increase; something to the effect of improving capacity to deliver conservation, to include a F&W fee increase.
 - Caution: consider doing this issue by issue since it's too easy to dilute a message.
 - Ray Norrgard moves we go on record for increased F&G license fees, 2nd by Dave Pauly (includes that we take action); proposed amendment by Nicholas Snavely that we integrate periodic increase to track inflation so it doesn't have to be addressed again in the future – no 2nd – accepted as a friendly amendment by the motioners -- Passed/Carried
 - President wants to meet soon to start fleshing this out
 - Paul Stolen: do we need to address the capacity to deliver conservation regardless of the \$\$ issue.
 - Ray Norrgard moved that board supports increase in maintenance of conservation delivery capacity commensurate with available funding; John Schladweiler 2nd;

Discussion: you want your capacity or goals to be attainable, thus your capacity has to be in line with funding; PASSED unanimously.

Other Discussion Items:

Emerging Issues

Protect, Enhance, Restore: What does this mean?

- On this issue, unless we have board members who want to really delve into this, there are already players involved, and don't know that this issue is worth our time, unless we are asked by those players to provide support, get involved, etc.
- What is the issue on this one? For some the meaning or definitions are vague. LSOHC language in constitution is pretty restrictive and self-explanatory (e.g. protect was defined as acquisition and permanent easements). The LSOHC is perhaps too restrictive since it wouldn't include enforcement or monitoring/evaluation/research, which is fundamental. Some feel that's why we should use the legislative language that is broader. But certain groups have blinders on and are objecting based on what they interpret or feel the intent is.
- This whole debate has a lot of historical baggage.
- Currently the legislative language in force and changes being considered/authorized by the current legislative session, is broad, and certain members of the media and select groups are leading the charge to have it changed.

Bill to merge Natural Resource Agencies

- Bill formed to form an advisory committee to study reorganization of natural resource agencies, and part of the discussion should be to address/discuss realigning things to better deliver conservation; this could be advantageous so long as it's not tied to funding & cuts.
- Board should at minimum keep informed and track the issue but not necessarily take action until we feel it's needed.
- Sometimes the consolidation in other states has backfired and hasn't helped improve delivery of conservation. Is very costly, but doesn't also improve efficiency, and the level of bureaucracy/filters necessarily increase.
- We should certainly think about pulling together some guidelines to guide board if we're dragged into this in terms of providing input or signing onboard to an existing letter, etc.....
- Paul Stolen makes a motion we right a letter to Sen. Chaudhary that we be on the committee, 2nd by Mr. Liddell. Passed unanimously.

PolyMet Mining EIS

- PCA wrote a scathing review of the project
- Leads into potential theme for next year's meeting

Theme for Next Year's Annual Meeting

- Emerging contaminants in waters (trace contaminants), with speakers knowledgeable in endocrine disruptors, PFOS, mine tailings, etc..... Can be a wildlife issue in addition to fisheries, and potentially more than just aquatic wildlife. Include dust inhibitors, road salt, This could be a good training topic, not just one we'd take action on politically. U of MN and other state colleges have done a lot of work on this stuff. What about the lead/leadshot/bullet issues.
- Actual theme for next year is up to the board.

Diana recommended we be involved or active in larger coalitions/partnerships will give us a better voice, traction, and potential future memberships. E.g. MCF, Mn Outdoor Heritage Alliance, MEP, etc. Have we given any consideration in how we'd be more active with those groups. Tax status may be involved on this. Ray N. suggested the board take up the issue and provide some recommendations to members at next year's meeting.

Nicholas Snavely motioned that MACP support LSOHC by honoring the constitutional amendment by making sure professionals current workload is not supplanted, but instead supplemented to meet LSOHC goals, etc....., Diana 2nd. Is this part of the previous motion, or are we empowered to make changes as needed or treat this as stand alone issue, etc. Yes, empowered to go stand alone or integrate into existing actions as determined by the board discretion. Passed. Board will take this up as a separate action item or fold into other recommendations regarding LSOHC, fee increases, etc.

Fundraising

- Winners of the silent auction items were announced.
- Income and expenses for 2010 annual meeting (provided March 2010): Silent auction made approximately \$787.00, with memberships & provisions bringing in \$545.00. 2010 annual meeting expenses totaled \$627.00.

Having no more business, Bill Faber made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Mike Larson seconded the motion. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.